

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Jan. 28, 1968]

REDS TESTING GLOBAL POWER OF UNITED STATES, NIXON SAYS

NEW YORK.—Richard M. Nixon, a likely prospect for the Republican presidential nomination, warned yesterday that the Pueblo incident was part of a worldwide Communist test of the "credibility and utility" of U.S. global power.

"The Communist world has been jointly testing the proposition that the United States is over-extended, over-committed, and underprepared to act," the former vice president said in a statement.

"Whether these Communist powers have been acting in concert, or whether they have acted independently, the effect has been jointly to take the measure of the United States," Nixon said. "What is being tested is not the quantity of America's power—but its credibility and its utility."

Nixon charged the government with a "tactical blunder" in failing to provide air and sea cover for the reconnaissance ship U.S.S. Pueblo on its patrol "within sight of the North Korean shore."

"But the longer-range need is to re-establish the credibility of American policy by re-establishing the credibility of American power," he said.

"The Pueblo seizure has further undermined that credibility. What we have to ensure is that it has not been irrevocably undermined," he said.

Nixon said Americans should recognize that an incident like the Pueblo should never have happened and must not be allowed to happen again.

"We need make no apology for the Pueblo's presence in the waters off North Korea," he said. "The repeated belligerent acts and true violations by North Korea presented a clear and present threat to the peace."

"But it seems all but incredible that we should have been guilty of such a tactical

blunder: that an almost unarmed, low-speed craft, crammed with supersecret equipment, should have been sent alone on regular reconnaissance patrol within sight of the North Korean shore without taking the elementary precaution of having adequate air and sea cover available—even after repeated harassments and specific warnings by the North Koreans had made its danger clear."

Nixon, who is expected to announce his candidacy for the GOP presidential nomination shortly, issued the statement from his New York law office.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 6, 1968]

NIXON CRITICIZES CURB ON BOMBINGS, SAYS UNITED STATES MUST PROSECUTE WAR MORE EFFECTIVELY

GREEN BAY, WIS., February 5.—Richard M. Nixon, accelerating his attack on President Johnson's handling of the Vietnam war, said today that the Administration had been wrong to suspend the bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong before the recent Communist offensive.

He went on to suggest that the fact that the bombing pause had been followed almost immediately by a renewed Communist offensive merely demonstrated the folly of attempting to win over the Communists through peace overtures. Referring to the recent Vietcong attacks in Saigon, he declared:

"I believe that these latest actions, the most aggressive of the war, coming on top of the recent peace offensive—cutting back on the bombing, and softening the San Antonio formula [for ending the war]—points clearly to the fact that the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong are not going to change their attitude by virtue of the U.S. protesting for peace."

Mr. Nixon went on to say that "the only effective way to convince Hanoi that 'peace is in their interests' is to 'prosecute the war more effectively.'"

The former Vice President has often said that he shared the Administration's commitment to the war in Vietnam but disagreed with its methods of prosecuting the war. His comments today represented the sharpest and most specific presentation of that general thesis.

Mr. Nixon also said the Vietcong attacks had exposed what he suggested was the fraudulence of the Administration's own public statements on the war. The Administration, he charged, has too often told the country that the "war is going better" and that "peace is around the corner."

Mr. Johnson would be "much better advised to tell the truth," the former Vice President added.

SUGGESTS PUEBLO APOLOGY

Asked about the Pueblo incident, Mr. Nixon suggested that the United States might "apologize" to the North Vietnamese if it would help secure the safe return of the 83 crewmen on the captured ship.

In the 1960 campaign, Mr. Nixon berated his opponent, John F. Kennedy, for suggesting that United States apologize to the Soviet Union when an American U-2 reconnaissance plane was shot down in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Nixon said that if the Pueblo had strayed within the 12-mile limit off the North Korean coast, "without permission and without notice," it was "a direct violation."

"I'm not suggesting under any circumstances," he went on, "that there should be an apology unless it is clear that that was done. Under those circumstances, I think we could consider it."

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1968]

He (Mr. Nixon) termed the capture and detention of the American intelligence ship Pueblo by North Korea "an incredible humiliation of the United States."

SENATE—Friday, April 18, 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:

O God, whom to know aright is life and peace, deliver us now from the turbulent world about us and the vexing problems which lay hold upon us here that in this moment we may focus upon Thy sovereignty, Thy holiness, Thy compassion, and Thy love. Bestow upon us the gift of the quiet soul, the serene spirit, the disciplined mind that each of us may be channels of Thy grace and power. And if at times we have been cruel when we should be kind, vindictive when we should be charitable, little when we should be magnanimous, forgive us. Free us forever from all the vices of the spirit that blight the life, tarnish the character, and dim the holy vision.

Bless our Nation, O Lord, and make us a blessing to others. Renew within us pure religion and a lofty patriotism that we may be fit sponsors of freedom under Thine eternal law. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 15, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 458. An act for the relief of Yuka Awamura; and

S. 672. An act for the relief of Charles Richard Scott.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1507. An act conferring jurisdiction under the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo da la Torre Sanano and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanano;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant;

H.R. 2218. An act for the relief of William John Moher;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarzki;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Ellsabetta Horwath;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Henry E. Dooley;

H.R. 3040. An act for the relief of Lee In Sook;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 4148. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4546. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

H.R. 6366. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Milinko;

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin;

H.R. 6607. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss;

H.R. 6670. An act for the relief of Teresina Fara;

H.R. 6931. An act for the relief of Giuseppe De Stefano; and

H.R. 10158. An act to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1507. An act conferring jurisdiction under the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of John T. Knight;

H.R. 1632. An act for the relief of Romeo

da la Torre Sanao and his sister, Julieta de la Torre Sanao;

H.R. 2005. An act for the relief of Lourdes M. Arrant;

H.R. 2218. An act for the relief of William John Moher;

H.R. 2336. An act for the relief of Adela Kaczmarek;

H.R. 2464. An act for the relief of Ellsabetta Horwath;

H.R. 2940. An act for the relief of Henry E. Dooley;

H.R. 3040. An act for the relief of Lee In Sook;

H.R. 3348. An act for the relief of the estate of Pierre Samuel du Pont Darden;

H.R. 4546. An act for the relief of Anna Del Baglivo;

H.R. 5136. An act for the relief of George Tilson Weed;

H.R. 6366. An act for the relief of Mrs. Aranka Mlinko;

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin;

H.R. 6607. An act to confer U.S. citizenship posthumously upon Sp4c. Klaus Josef Strauss;

H.R. 6670. An act for the relief of Teresina Fara; and

H.R. 6931. An act for the relief of Giuseppe De Stefano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4148. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

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

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 115, 116, and 117 only.

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

JOHN (GIOVANNI) DENARO

The bill (S. 265) for the relief of John (Giovanni) Denaro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 265

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, John (Giovanni) Denaro shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence of October 23, 1962.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-126), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

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

GONG SING HOM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1625) for the relief of Gong Sing Hom, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment, strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That, for the purposes of sections 203(a)(4) and 204 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Gong Sing Hom shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien son of Mrs. Tom Wah, a United States citizen, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 212(a)(19) of the said Act, he may be issued a visa and be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is otherwise admissible under the provisions of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided*, That the natural parents of the said Gong Sing Hom shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act: *And provided further*, That the exemption granted herein shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice has knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-127), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of the bill, as amended, is to grant the status of a fourth preference immigrant to the adopted son of a U.S. citizen, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien married sons and daughters of U.S. citizens. The bill also provides for a waiver of the excluding provision of existing law relating to one who has misrepresented a material fact in applying for a visa. The bill was amended to conform the language to established precedents.

CHI JEN FENG

The bill (S. 1531) for the relief of Chi Jen Feng was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1531

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Chi Jen Feng shall be held and considered to have been lawfully ad-

mitted to the United States for permanent residence as of August 1, 1954.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91-128), explaining the purposes of the bill.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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

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

OZARK REGIONAL COMMISSION

The bill clerk read the nomination of E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

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

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The bill clerk read the nomination of John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

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

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

CONVENTION ON CONDUCT OF FISHING OPERATIONS IN THE NORTH ATLANTIC—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive D, 91st Congress, first session, the Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, transmitted to the Senate, on April 16, 1969, by the President of the United States, and that the Convention, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be

printed, and the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As in executive session, the request, without objection, is granted.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Convention on Conduct of Fishing Operations in the North Atlantic, done at London, June 1, 1967. The Convention has been signed on behalf of seventeen governments, including the United States of America, which represent the great majority of vessels engaged in the fisheries in the area.

For the information of the Senate, I also transmit the report by the Secretary of State with respect to the Convention.

The Convention establishes a generally uniform system of identification, marking, light signals, conduct, and enforcement for fishing vessels and support vessels in a large part of the North Atlantic. The Convention is sufficiently flexible that it might be extended to other areas of the Atlantic if developments in the fishery pattern make this desirable.

Many European fishing vessels have followed a code of conduct laid down in the 1882 Convention for Regulating the Police of the North Seas Fisheries, even though many of the European governments did not actually become party to the Convention. This code was gradually extended throughout the Northeast Atlantic as congestion on the fishing grounds gradually spread beyond the North Sea. Eventually, the code extended to the Northwest Atlantic.

Since foreign fishermen rarely operated close to our Atlantic coast, such a code was of little direct concern to our fishermen. This situation has changed dramatically during the past few years. Complaints of harassment or impaired operating freedom due to congestion on the fishing grounds have become frequent. As a result, our fishermen have called for a modern code of conduct to assist them. Their needs in this respect were made known to our negotiators.

I believe that the requirements of American fishermen in dealing with problems caused by the heavy concentration of vessels on the fishing grounds in the Convention area are substantially met by the terms of the Convention. The Convention will also assist us in our continuing effort to promote harmony in the international fisheries through agreements with other governments.

Proposed legislation to carry out the provisions of the Convention will be submitted.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Convention.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 16, 1969.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR TALMADGE, SENATOR DODD, AND SENATOR HARTKE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclu-

sion of the transaction of morning business and the morning hour, the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) be recognized for 35 minutes, the distinguished Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) be recognized for 30 minutes, and the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be recognized for 20 minutes.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1969, the Secretary of the Senate, on April 16, 1969, and April 17, 1969, received messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received on April 16, 1969, and April 17, 1969, see the end of the proceedings of today, April 18, 1969.)

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of April 15, 1969, the following report of a committee was submitted on April 16, 1969:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. Res. 85. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate relative to commitments to foreign powers (Rept. No. 91-129).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the administration and management of the biology and medicine research program of the Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), dated April 16, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the need for improvement in procuring and stockpiling jewel bearings produced at the Government-owned William Langer Jewel Bearing Plant, Rolla, N. Dak., Office of Emergency Preparedness, Department of Commerce, General Services Administration, dated April 17, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

BUILDER'S COST CERTIFICATION FOR ROSSMOOR LEISURE WORLD DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, pertaining to the decision of the Federal Housing Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development, not to require builder's cost certification for Rossmoor Leisure World developments (with an accompanying letter); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEFERRAL OF CONSTRUCTION CHARGES FOR THE EDEN PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting on the deferral of construction charges for the Eden project, Wyoming, due in 1969, 1970, and 1971 under re-

payment contract with the Eden Valley Irrigation and Drainage District in the total amount of \$49,620 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION PROVIDING MAIL SERVICE FOR MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1970

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, regarding the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission proposed bill for authorization of Appropriations, fiscal year 1970 (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 11

"Whereas, the General Court is greatly concerned with the cost of financing Title IV the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, and

"Whereas, the present provisions will impose upon the State beginning July 1, 1969, because of the 'freeze' portion of said title, a great financial burden,

"Now therefore be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate Concurring:

"That it respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to re-evaluate the present and prospective costs of Title IV, the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program, which under the present federal legislation will be excessive and require unrealistically large contributions by the state, and to make revisions in said federal statutes to repeal the 'freeze' portion so as to bring state costs of the same within realistic bounds, and

"Be it further resolved that the clerks of the House and Senate of the General Court of New Hampshire be directed to transmit a copy of these resolutions to all four members of the New Hampshire congressional delegation, to the clerks of the federal House of Representatives and Senate, to Senator Russell Long and Representative Wilbur Mills.

"WILMONT S. WHITE,

Clerk, Senate.

"J. MILTON STREET,

Clerk, House of Representatives."

A House joint memorial by the ways and means committee of the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL No. 3 BY THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

"A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho assembled in the Fortieth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the range livestock industry is a major industry of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas, the public lands comprise at least two-thirds of the land area of the State of Idaho; and

"Whereas, the range livestock industry is

dependent upon such public lands for grazing; and

"Whereas, the proposed increased grazing fees upon such public lands shall cause great economic hardship and business failures within such range livestock industry.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully request that the Congress of the United States direct and require the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Interior to hold in abeyance all increases in the rates to be charged as grazing fees upon the public lands until such time as Congress has had sufficient time to study and review the final report of the Public Land Law Review Commission.

"Be it further resolved, that the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward copies of this Memorial to the leadership of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, and to the members of the Idaho Congressional Delegation."

Petition by the Inventions to Order petitioning Congress to allow open hearings on the development of a new type of automobile internal combustion engine which materially reduces smog, etc.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., requesting the President and Congress to take action to provide that January 15 of each year shall be celebrated as a national holiday in memory and in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 3832. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the total active strength of the Marine Corps exceeds 200,000 (Rept. No. 91-130).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. DOMINICK, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Curtis W. Tarr, of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Air Force.

By Mr. MCINTYRE, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Lt. Gen. Robert E. Cushman, Jr., U.S. Marine Corps, to be Deputy Director, Central Intelligence Agency.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. SPARKMAN) (for himself, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. TOWER, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. BROOKE):

S. 1832. A bill to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1833. A bill to provide for the distribution of motor vehicle tires, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 1834. A bill for the relief of Rafael Martinez Echeverria; and

S. 1835. A bill for the relief of Raymond N. Habiby; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina:

S. 1836. A bill to amend the Federal Seed Act (93 Stat. 1275), as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1837. A bill for the relief of Ting Kan Cheung aka Kam Tin Cheung;

S. 1838. A bill for the relief of Sul Wah Cheng; and

S. 1839. A bill for the relief of Shui Yin Cheung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1840. A bill for the relief of Cheong Ip;

S. 1841. A bill for the relief of Shiu Hung To;

S. 1842. A bill for the relief of Sheung Kam Wong;

S. 1843. A bill for the relief of Heung Mau; and

S. 1844. A bill for the relief of Ping Kam Hui; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1845. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph D. Hilbert; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD (for himself, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. HART, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PACKWOOD, Mr. PELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1846. A bill to revise the system of congressional nominations for appointments to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1847. A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Robert L. King (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON:

S. 1848. A bill for the relief of St. Johns' College at Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1849. A bill to amend title 19 of the Social Security Act to permit States greater flexibility in establishing and modifying medical plans; and

S. 1850. A bill to provide for the free entry of certain tools and equipment imported for the use of Eastern New Mexico University in establishing a program of training in watch repairing; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. YOUNG of South Dakota, and Mr. MCCARTHY):

S. 1851. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1852. A bill for the relief of Emmanuel Fragoulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware:

S. 1853. A bill to terminate price support

operations on tobacco and to discontinue the export subsidy on tobacco under Public Law 480 of the 83d Congress; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1854. A bill for the relief of Mattie Nagel Grinnell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1855. A bill for the relief of Charles F. Leahy; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 1856. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY:

S. 1857. A bill to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HART, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1858. A bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. MATHIAS:

S. 1859. A bill to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1860. A bill for the relief of Marin N. Calinescu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLELLAN (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1861. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1862. A bill to amend section 8(c)(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit projects for paid advertising under marketing orders applicable to tomatoes; and

S. 1863. A bill to amend the provisions of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, to authorize an increase in license fee, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1864. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. COOK, Mr. DOLE, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. PERCY, and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1865. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in the establishment of programs designed to provide for the advancement of medical knowledge with re-

spect to the causes and effects of malnutrition and to facilitate the detection and treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. GOODELL):

S. 1866. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 with respect to the appointment of State advisory councils; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1867. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption of a child by the taxpayer;

S. 1868. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a separate occupational tax for limited retail dealers in distilled spirits;

S. 1869. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide credit against income tax for an employer who employs older persons in his trade or business; and

S. 1870. A bill to amend title 3 of the Sugar Act of 1948 to provide for the establishment of fair and reasonable minimum wage rates for workers employed on sugar farms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1871. A bill to provide that in determining the amount of retired pay, retirement pay, or retainer pay payable to any enlisted man, all services shall be counted which would have been counted for the same purpose if he were a commissioned officer; to the Committee on Armed Services;

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

By Mr. INOUE (for himself, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1872. A bill to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. INOUE:

S. 1873. A bill to amend the War Claims Act of 1948 and the Trading With the Enemy Act to provide for the submission of certain claims and the reinstatement of certain claims;

S. 1874. A bill to provide for the inclusion of years of service as judge of the Circuit Court for the territory of Hawaii in the computation of Federal judicial service of the Honorable Martin Pence; and

S. 1875. A bill to provide cost-of-living allowances to judicial employees stationed outside the continental United States or in Alaska and Hawaii; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1876. A bill to provide credit under the Civil Service Retirement Act for periods of separation from the service of certain employees of Japanese ancestry during World War II; and

S. 1877. A bill to extend the benefits of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944 to persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States during peacetime; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PASTORE:

S. 1878. A bill to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and

for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. PASTORE (by request):

S. 1879. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses, and for other purposes;

S. 1880. A bill to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1881. A bill to amend section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1882. A bill to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1883. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial licenses for facilities and certain research and development licenses for facilities and for other purposes; and

S. 1884. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. PASTORE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 1885. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

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

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1886. A bill for the relief of Dr. Max Ruetger Hasche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S. 1887. A bill to provide relief for Emma Zimmerli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANSFIELD (for himself and Mr. DIRKSEN):

S. 1888. A bill to change the composition of the Commission for extension of the U.S. Capitol; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HART:

S. 1889. A bill to provide partial reimbursement for losses incurred by commercial fishermen as a result of State-imported restrictions on commercial fishing; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1890. A bill to amend the provisions of the United States Code with respect to the jurisdiction of courts of appeals of the United States to review orders of administrative officers and agencies, and for other purposes; and

S. 1891. A bill to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation to exchange fingerprint information with registered national security exchanges and related agencies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1892. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

S. 1893. A bill to limit the categories of questions required to be answered in decennial censuses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JACKSON:

S. 1894. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to correct certain inequities with respect to the premium pay of certain employees performing irregular and unscheduled duty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1895. A bill to reorganize and coordinate control of the narcotic and drug abuse laws under the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. HART, Mr. MOSS, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1896. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. KENNEDY (for himself, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. PROUTY):

S. 1897. A bill to remove financial barriers so that all individuals will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. MCINTYRE:

S. 1898. A bill for the relief of Orlando J. S. Mendonca;

S. 1899. A bill for the relief of Manuel C. DaSilva;

S. 1900. A bill for the relief of Norberto B. Santos;

S. 1901. A bill for the relief of Manuel Silveira Soares;

S. 1902. A bill for the relief of Aldino Avila Bettencourt;

S. 1903. A bill for the relief of Joao Tomas Bettencourt;

S. 1904. A bill for the relief of Carlos M. Ferreira; and

S. 1905. A bill for the relief of Judite da Concelcao Frias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1906. A bill for the relief of Chigusa Tsuzuki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PROXMIRE:

S.J. Res. 94. A joint resolution to provide for a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the U.S. Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost and disruption factors of a restoration project; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the carving on Stone Mountain, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. PROXMIRE when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL):

S.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the completion of the carving on Stone Mountain, Ga.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1832—INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), I ask unanimous consent that a statement he intended to make today be printed in the RECORD, together with the bill and other

material. The Senator from Alabama is unable to deliver the statement at this time because of his absence from the Chamber temporarily on official business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the other material will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 1832) to provide for the more efficient development and improved management of National Forest commercial timberlands, to establish a high timber yield fund, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD (for Mr. SPARKMAN and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1832

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 Timber Supply Act of 1969".

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds that it is necessary to increase substantially the timber yield from national forest commercial timberlands in order to increase the supply of wood products which are needed to meet increasing national demands, including the demand for home construction. The Congress further finds that it is necessary to provide a reliable and adequate source of funds required to increase timber yield rates on such national forest commercial timberlands.

DEFINITION

SEC. 3. As used in this Act the term "commercial timberlands" includes timberlands classed as commercial in the Forest Survey conducted under the Act of May 22, 1928, as amended (16 U.S.C. 581-581-1) and which are not withdrawn or reserved from commercial timber production.

HIGH TIMBER YIELD FUND

SEC. 4. There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a high timber yield fund, hereinafter referred to as the "fund". Except as hereinafter provided, during the period beginning July 1, 1969, and ending June 30, 1994, there shall be credited to the fund all receipts from the sale of timber and other forest products from the national forests. The foregoing shall not be construed as amending or repealing any provision of law that authorizes and directs that income from the sale of timber and other forest products from national forests be used for a specific purpose. Such income shall continue to be utilized for the purposes so specified by law and shall not be deposited into the high timber yield fund.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 5. Moneys credited to the fund shall be available for expenditure for the purposes of this Act only when appropriated therefor. Such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available until expended. Any money credited to the fund and not subsequently authorized for expenditure by the Congress within two fiscal years following the fiscal year in which such money was credited to the fund shall be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

ALLOCATION OF MONEY IN THE FUND

SEC. 6. Moneys appropriated from the fund shall, unless otherwise allocated for the purposes of this section in the Appropriation Act making them available, be allocated in each fiscal year for expenditure in each national forest in substantially the same pro-

portion as the amount of money contributed to the fund from such national forest in the immediately preceding two fiscal years bears to the total amount of money contributed to the fund from all the national forests in such preceding two fiscal years. Money allocated to any national forest under this section shall be used only for increasing timber yield in such national forest by—

(1) obtaining regeneration at the earliest practical date after harvesting, and for reforesting unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands;

(2) pre-commercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition;

(3) semi-commercial thinning both to control spacing or stand composition and to produce material with commercial value in excess of the additional costs required for its harvesting and processing;

(4) pruning, if justified by a subsequent reduction in age at which the trees become marketable;

(5) preparation, including marking, f.l.r thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales;

(6) road construction in advance of planned harvest cutting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage, and understory-removal sales;

(7) fertilization;

(8) development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics; and

(9) such other timber production improvement practices as the Secretary of Agriculture deems appropriate.

IMPLEMENTATION

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall immediately establish programs to carry out the policy and purposes of this Act and shall specifically—

(1) develop into optimum timber productivity as soon as possible the national forest commercial timberlands; and

(2) revise the allowable annual harvesting rates in national forests to take into account (A) rotation ages appropriate for conversion technology and anticipated market requirements at the expected time of harvest, (B) the need for and benefits from use of high level current harvest rate options available within sustained yield limitations, and (C) increased timber yields which will result from application of the measures authorized by section 6 of this Act.

The material, presented by Mr. MANSFIELD, follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR SPARKMAN

Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill to establish a self-supporting government fund to provide for more intensive management of our national forests' commercial timberlands. The bill, entitled The National Timber Supply Act of 1969, would authorize that timber receipts from the national forests be "plowed back" into the forest to increase timber yields in order to assure a continuous supply of lumber to meet our ever-growing national needs. By crediting receipts from the sale of timber in the national forests to the fund to be called "the high timber yield fund" the Federal government would have an ever-ready supply of funds to update forest management practices and to apply them intensively and continuously to the national forests.

Our national forests are one of the nation's greatest natural resources which belong to all of our people and deserve the best and most advanced management treatment to enable them to produce the lumber needed for our growing housing and other needs without disturbing their invaluable contribution to our nation's needs for conservation, beautification and recreation.

I am introducing this bill as a result of hearings conducted last month by my Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs on

critical shortages and skyrocketing prices of lumber and softwood products. We heard testimony that there is a current annual shortage of 2 to 3 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood and that, in less than one year's time, lumber prices had gone up 50 percent and plywood prices had risen over 100 percent. The homebuilders told us that, not only were the rising prices prohibitive for home construction purposes, but the lumber suppliers were refusing to promise future delivery at any price. Furthermore, we were told that, unless some action was taken, the price and supply situation would continue to get worse and could be the means for frustrating the nation in meeting its national housing goals.

In a statement to the Senate on April 3, 1969, I reported on the hearings and gave 10 recommendations about the action that needed to be taken to resolve our current crisis and to avoid a more serious crisis in the future.

In my statement, I referred to national housing policy and, particularly, the 1968 Housing Act which calls for a 10-year building program of 26 million housing units, for an average of 2.6 million units a year. Last year our housing starts were 1.5 million, so we are talking about an increase of over 70 percent on the average over existing construction levels.

HUD Secretary Romney testified that if we were to meet our goals, the lumber supply must be increased by 15 billion board feet per year in 10 years. By 1978 he said we would have to double today's lumber supply going into residential building.

Secretary Romney made a number of recommendations and also explained the action taken by President Nixon's Task Force which he believed would help provide relief in the current crisis. In fact, during the Subcommittee hearings, we heard that the combination of the hearings and the President's directives had already caused a cutback on lumber prices by as much as 30 percent.

It was obvious from the hearings, however, that this was a long-range problem which demanded immediate attention or we would be faced with a more serious crisis in the future.

Almost two-thirds of the nation's softwood timber is on federal public lands. Industrial and other private timber holdings are already being harvested at close to maximum justifiable rates compatible with sound forest management. This is not true of national forest commercial timberlands, principally because the federal appropriation process does not provide a system for assured investment of funds for the purpose of improving timber growth and yield, and partly because present Federal timber management policies are not firmly and permanently oriented to improvement of timber growth and yield.

Edward C. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, testified before a Senate Committee on November 26, 1968:

"In addition to the Douglas-fir Supply Study still under way, other studies have been made of investment opportunities on National Forests throughout the country. They show that allowable cuts could—in time—be increased about two-thirds by intensifying timber culture on the more productive portions of National Forest commercial timberlands. Substantial investments would be required to accomplish this, but the returns in terms of increased wood supplies and other benefits of forest management would more than offset the costs."

He further stated that he could not sanction these increases in harvest until he could be assured of the necessary investment.

It is the purpose of this bill to create a responsible and continuing method for the federal government to provide the competence necessary to increase timber growth so that forest products can be harvested at rates

that will meet public requirements for building and other needs.

Past experience clearly shows that the normal annual appropriation process cannot be relied on to provide either the level or the stability of funds required to operate an intensive timber management on the national forests.

On September 21, 1961, President Kennedy sent to both Houses of Congress a report entitled "Development Plan for the National Forests." The plan included a work schedule, part of which was a provision for \$417,891,000 over a ten-year period for reforestation and timber stand improvement. Appropriations for this activity have been in the neighborhood of \$16,000,000 for the last several years, or just two-fifths of the annual average of the requirements of the systematic plan endorsed by the late President.

The national forests contain over one trillion board feet of sawtimber, which is more than half of the nation's present inventory. The national forests, therefore, merit intensified scrutiny to insure that they are managed for high level effectiveness in meeting the nation's timber needs.

These lands and their forests were reserved from the public domain almost three-quarters of a century ago largely because of an unjustified concern about an impending national timber famine. With projected demands for wood product consumption showing a steady rise, the national forests must play an increasingly important role in growing and supplying the necessary timber. Despite Federal ownership of more than half of the nation's present softwood timber resources, only about one of every three logs made into lumber or plywood now comes from the national forests. Although large volumes of timber are sold from the national forests with substantial receipts estimated at over \$300 million for next year, it is nonetheless true that the commercial timberlands in the national forests are an underutilized and underdeveloped resource. With a wood products scarcity now at hand, the nation can no longer afford the luxury of semi-management for more than half of its softwood sawtimber supply. I believe that my bill, the proposed National Timber Supply Act, if approved by the Congress, will provide the solution to this vexing problem. It would provide Congressional directives for creating and implementing more effective management of national forest timber for the purpose of assuring increasing supplies of wood to meet increasing demands.

Its basic premise is that, once the funds are made available and the Forest Service embarks on an intensive management program, the allowable cut can be increased immediately by the U.S. Forest Service.

The proposed Act contains three broad directives upon which allowable cuts are to be premised. It would require the Forest Service to take into account: (1) tree size requirements of market and industrial techniques of the 21st Century as these become apparent; (2) comparison of gains and losses caused by withholding the harvest of over-mature timber with the gains and losses which could result from conversion of the acres now serving as storehouses for over-mature timber into growing new timber crops; and (3) the effects of intensive management measures for which financing provisions are made in the proposed Act.

By placing the available receipts into a special fund, called the "high timber yield fund," the Forest Service could be assured of long-term financing for its management and development of the forests.

Establishment of such a high timber yield fund in the Treasury to finance optimum timber productivity on the commercial timberlands of the national forests is necessary for assuring continuity of effort and objective. The intensive management measures necessary to increase timber yield must, to be

effective, be applied continuously, and not on a stop-and-go-basis. If harvest-rate determinations are made on the premise that future yields will be those obtainable from intensive management there must be assurance that intensive management will occur. The high timber yield fund supplies this assurance.

The plan to finance the high timber yield fund from timber receipts assures that expenditures will be kept in step with the significance of national forest timber to the economy. Other safeguards in the proposal are:

(1) The life of the fund is limited to 25 years. This limitation will force a review based on accumulated experience before the fund is renewed; otherwise a full-scale review might never occur.

(2) Section 5 of the bill requires that expenditures from the fund be made only after appropriation. This insures regular Congressional review and approval of the program of activities to be financed from the fund.

(3) Section 5 also provides that funds not appropriated within two years be transferred to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. This provision insures that deposits in excess of needs will not be accumulated in the fund. It will be an effective but more flexible limitation than a stated maximum dollar amount.

The portion of national forest receipts which under existing law are paid to the States or other special funds would not be disturbed by the enactment of the National Timber Supply Act. This, the 25 per cent of national forest receipts payment to States (16 USC 500) and 10 per cent of national forest receipts for roads and trails (16 USC 501) would not be changed.

Section 6 of the bill specifies that allocations from the fund will be made by national forests in amounts substantially proportionate to contribution to the fund from each forest during the preceding two fiscal years. This provision will put 65 per cent of timber receipts back for expenditure on the forest where they were earned. (Twenty-five per cent of each forest's receipts are turned over to the counties in which the forest is located and ten per cent are available for forest roads and trails within the State in which the forest is located.)

Timber receipts are the product of the volume of timber cut and its average unit price, subject to minor annual variations due to changes in the level of advance deposits maintained by timber purchasers. The provision for use of a two year average will iron out effects from fluctuations in advance deposit levels.

Volume cut and its average unit price are guides to the areas with better rates of growth and better quality species. Hence timber receipts by forests are a simple and reliable index of opportunities and needs to increase timber yields.

Other simple indices, such as commercial forest area or volume cut, would result in some diversion of funds from areas with better growth potential for preferred quality species to areas where unit timber values are low and where intensive management measures would result in less than average yield increases.

The bill establishes allocations in proportion to receipts as a basic guideline, but recognizes that variations may be necessary in a few isolated cases to justify a larger proportion of funds going into a forest that has outstanding potential for increased yield. Thus, if the allocation by receipts formula should fail to meet the needs and opportunities on any forests, it can be modified without amending the basic act.

There were 50 forests which had receipts of less than \$100,000 in fiscal year 1967. Forty of these forests are in eastern Montana, the Rocky Mountain and Inter-

mountain states, in southern Arizona and in New Mexico. All of these forests have a low proportion of commercial forest land and their commercial lands are relatively arid and of low productivity. The opportunities and needs for intensive timber management on these forests is roughly proportionate to the low level of receipts they have attained. In addition to this group of 40 forests there are ten other forests with less than \$100,000 annual timber receipts. These are: a) the four southern and one east side Sierra forests in California where timber production is minor and incidental to watershed and recreation management; b) three acquired forests in Missouri, Illinois and Indiana-Ohio. Two of these have the two smallest areas of commercial forest land (except for extremely arid western forests) in the national forest system. The Missouri forest is made up primarily of acquired hard cut lands which because of low growth rates have been slow in recovery to full productivity; and the two forests in Alaska. The Chugach Forest is still close to marginal operability and has very limited opportunities for intensive management in the immediate future.

The Tongass forest in Alaska is a special case because under the Tongass Timber Act of 1946, all timber receipts are deposited into a special fund to be held for disbursement until Indian claims on the Tongass forest are adjudicated. Hence there are no deposits from timber cutting into the national forest receipt fund. While the cut on this forest is now close to 500 million board feet annually, the opportunities and need for intensive management measures are neither large or pressing. It is probable that either a portion of the Tongass timber fund will be released to national forest receipts by special authorization or that the Indian claims will be adjudicated before it becomes urgent to have funds available for intensive management measures on this forest.

There are nine listed broad purposes for which allotted funds could be used. These purposes are:

(1) Obtaining regeneration at earliest practical date after harvesting and for reforestation unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands. This would permit planting or seeding of cut-over lands in the first planting season after slash disposal or after termination of harvesting operations where slash disposal is unnecessary. The objective is to establish full stocking with a minimum delay in regeneration. Reforestation of unsatisfactorily stocked high site lands is also included. Such seeding or planting of unsatisfactorily stocked areas would be limited to timberlands of good potential for commercial timber production.

(2) Pre-commercial thinning to control spacing or stand composition. Such thinning is the primary means to accelerate growth at an early age. They are also an effective means to favor production of desirable species.

(3) Semi-commercial thinnings both to control spacing and composition and to produce material with value for commercial utilization in excess of additional costs required for its production. Semi-commercial thinning is a step between pre-commercial thinning and commercial thinning. Pre-commercial thinnings deal with material that is unusable because of its small size. Semi-commercial thinnings produce material acceptable for commercial utilization especially pulpwood but for which full production and delivery costs exceed its market value. Such thinned material should be utilized so long as the added cost to produce and deliver it (minus the cost of any work such as limbing made unnecessary by utilization) does not exceed its value.

(4) Pruning if justified by a subsequent reduction in the age at which the trees become marketable. Some desirable tree species retain juvenile limbs on the lower bole for excessive periods. In such circumstances

pruning at an early age is a necessary and justifiable activity to obtain logs suitable for sawing or peeling at a younger rotation age.

(5) Preparation, including marking, of thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales. Unit costs for thinning and salvage sales are higher than for harvest sales. Such sales have never been financed to the extent of their full potential by regular timber sale appropriations. Financing of sale preparation for thinning and salvage sales from the high timber yield fund is needed to market the very significant timber volumes now being lost through overcrowding or deterioration.

(6) Road construction in advance of planned harvesting to standards necessary for facilitating thinning, salvage and understory-removal sales and for protection against ravages of fire and insect. Thinning and salvage sales alone can rarely support road construction. Hence, thinning and salvage cutting is now generally limited to roaded areas.

This provision would finance road construction to standards necessary to facilitate thinning and salvage cutting in unroaded areas, and would incidentally supply access needed for protection purposes. It is not contemplated that the high timber yield fund would be used to finance regular timber access road construction.

(7) Fertilization of good sites to increase timber growth rates is now being undertaken by several major industrial timberland owners in the Northwest and the South. Fertilization is a promising avenue to increase yields and shorten rotations. As further knowledge of costs and returns develop, it is logical that the high timber yield fund be used for fertilization on suitable federal timberlands.

(8) Development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics. Work is underway by both the Forest Service and industry to identify superior seed sources and develop seed orchards for volume production of superior seed. The high timber yield fund would finance intensification of this activity on the national forests.

(9) Implementing other methods and practices that are demonstrated to increase timber production.

The common purpose of all nine of these listed cultural practices is to increase timber yields on the national forests above those yields presently attainable from the regularly financed activities. The high timber yield fund is designed to provide the additional effort to work towards optimum yields. It is not expected to displace the regular financing of federal timber sales, protection from fire and pests, or the Forest Development Road Program.

Of the nine listed activities for use of financing from the high timber yield fund all but two are silvicultural measures which could also be financed from funds regularly appropriated for national forest reforestation and timber stand improvement. The high timber yield fund must be expended only on measures for increasing timber yield and must be allotted to individual forests in amounts proportionate to the contributions of the forest to the fund. Hence the high timber yield fund is not available to finance reforestation for scenic or watershed protection purposes. Needs in these areas or activities not adequately covered by the high timber yield fund must continue to be financed from regularly appropriated funds.

Preparation for thinning, salvage and understory removal sales, which is an authorized high timber yield fund activity under Section 6 of the bill, can also be financed from regularly appropriated funds for national forest timber sales. A small volume of thinning and salvage sales are now being made by this means. Such sales unavoidably have a poorer ratio between costs and returns than regular harvest sales. Progress has been disappointingly slow in obtaining appropriations for timber sales in amounts

which will take care of the regular harvest cut sale program and leave more than a token amount for salvage and thinning sales. These sales are desirable even if costs equal returns because yields are increased.

Large salvage sales should continue to be financed from regular timber sale appropriations. Sale preparation for only small salvage sales of scattered trees should be financed from the high timber yield fund.

Much the same distinctions between use of regularly appropriated funds and the high timber yield fund applies to road construction in advance of planned harvest cutting which is also an authorized high timber yield fund activity. Regularly appropriated forest road funds are available for advance road construction but it is virtually impossible to justify such construction in competition for appropriated funds with other pressing road needs. Such advance road construction is essential for full scale operation of thinning and scattered tree salvage sales. Use of high timber yield funds for this purpose will generally be the only practical means to get advance roads built. High timber yield funds should not be used to construct access roads into large salvage sales areas.

Reforestation and timber stand improvement are conducted on recently cut over areas with funds obtained from timber purchasers under the provisions of the Knutsen-Vandenberg Act (16 USC 576). Deposits of more than \$23 million were thus obtained in Fiscal Year 1967. These funds must be used on cut over areas within a few years after cutting. The principal use of these funds is to obtain regeneration on sale areas. For all practical purposes K-V funds are an authorized diversion of payments from timber purchasers which otherwise would be timber receipts. Enactment of the National Timber Supply bill would make use of the K-V act obsolete. If the K-V act is not used, timber receipts will be correspondingly increased and 65 percent of such increase will go into the high timber yield fund.

High timber yield funds are not subject to the location and time requirements applicable to K-V funds. The counties do not get a 25 percent share of the moneys which go into the K-V fund. This has been a source of long standing irritation. With substitution of the high timber yield fund for the K-V act the 25 percent fund for payments to counties will automatically include the moneys formerly diverted from timber receipts. A source of much hard feeling would thus be removed.

Section 7 of the bill explicitly directs the Secretary of Agriculture immediately to carry out the therein stated policy and purposes. This provision should dispel any question that there may be delays in full use of the high timber yield fund as soon as it becomes available. This directive also requires early action on the review and revision of allowable cut determinations under the guidelines established in this section.

These revisions cannot be accomplished overnight but should be completed in closer to 90 days than half a year. Expanded sale programs would then be developed. Provision for financing the increased volume of timber offerings would have to be obtained. But there should be no lengthy delay in increasing the allowable cut once the necessary funding is at hand and the process for improved timber management is well underway.

Mr. President, the advantages of this proposed legislation is manifold. Most importantly it will make a significant contribution towards fulfilling the nation's housing policy. This policy is, in fact, the law of the land and every resource of our nation should be mobilized to attain the goal dictated by this policy. More than this, however, the legislation makes good economic sense. It is a money-making proposition for the Federal

Government. Mr. Cliff, Chief Forester of the U.S. Forest Service, reported to us his estimate that \$1 million invested in intensive management practices would net a return of \$215,000 annually. Where else could one get a better investment with a higher yield and at the same time produce material so essential to the well-being of our people? Furthermore, improved forests will make a significant contribution for the benefit of all for recreational, conservation and beautification purposes.

I believe that the Federal forests should be managed by the Department of Agriculture at the same degree of intensity that the Department advocates for other crop lands. The Department has done miracles in developing the techniques and the management practices for crops and I see no reason why our forest lands should not be treated the same way.

Mr. President, I can think of six benefits if the Federal forests were managed at the level the Department is capable of once it receives the necessary funding support from the Congress. I base this not on hearsay, but what is already being accomplished by some of our best-managed private forest lands. I would list these as follows:

1. Enough reasonably-priced building materials to meet all of our housing goals.
2. More and better camping and recreation facilities.
3. More wildlife.
4. More dependable water supplies for our cities.
5. Better grazing lands.
6. Healthy, vigorous forests that can supply all of our nation's wood needs forever.

Mr. President, assuming that the receipts from the sale of timber are approximately \$300 million in the coming year, and that 65 percent of this amount would flow into the high timber yield fund, we can expect that this fund would start out initially with approximately \$200 million. As K-V collections are eliminated and timber sale volumes increase with possibly a decline in unit values for stumpage, the annual high timber yield collections may rise. Based on the approximately 100 million acres of commercial forest land owned by the U.S. Forest Service, the fund would start with an average of \$2.00 per acre per year investment in increasing timber yields spread over the total national forest commercial timber acreage. It should rise in the future. These are not excessive rates of expenditure to install and maintain an intensive timber management system which will make it possible to increase yields by about 10 million board feet, or nearly double current cutting rates on the national forests.

It is not considered feasible to put a strict cost benefit check on expenditures into the bill at this time. The bill limits expenditures to those which will increase timber yields. The basic motivation for establishment of the high timber yield fund is to reduce and if possible eliminate payment of scarcity premiums for lumber and plywood by domestic consumers. A good deal more experience and research is needed before progress toward this objective can be translated into monetary terms for comparison with costs of work performance in the nine activities listed in Section 6 of the bill.

It should also be recognized that the annual requests for appropriations from the high timber yield fund will be reviewed and must be approved by the Bureau of the Budget. That agency is now greatly concerned with cost benefit ratio tests. Hence pressure to develop techniques to apply cost-benefit ratio tests to activities under the high timber yield fund are virtually assured.

Finally, the objective, workability and significance of the National Timber Supply bill would be destroyed if there is any significant broadening of the purposes for which the high timber yield fund may be used. The

prospective amounts which would go into the high timber yield fund appear to be approximately adequate for the job to be done. These amounts will clearly not be adequate if diluted by assignment of additional purposes to the fund. The National Timber Supply bill is a proposal to put the national forests on a timber management level which can yield sufficient raw materials to cope with the domestic consumer shortage in lumber and plywood. These management measures would be financed from the proceeds of the timber made available for this purpose. If the funds were turned into an all-purpose jackpot, it would deteriorate into a purposeless device to make receipts available to supplement appropriations in supporting national forest administration.

The time has come to manage the national forests for the full timber yields which they can produce to meet the housing needs of the American people. This has always been a basic purpose of the national forests. It was stated well by President Theodore Roosevelt on March 26, 1903, when he said:

"First and foremost, you can never afford to forget for one moment what is the object of our forest policy. That object is not to preserve the forests because they are beautiful, though that is good in itself; nor because they are refuges for the wild creatures of the wilderness, though that, too, is good in itself; but the primary object of our forest policy, as of the land policy of the U.S. is making of prosperous homes.

"It is part of the traditional policy of making in our country. Every other consideration comes as secondary. The whole effort of the government in dealing with the forests must be directed to this end, keeping in view the fact that it is not only necessary to start the homes as prosperous, but to keep them so."

SUPPLY AND PRICE OF SOFTWOOD LUMBER

(Statement by Senator SPARKMAN in the Senate on April 3, 1969)

MR. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today on a subject which is vital to the success of our Nation's housing program—that is, the supply and price of softwood lumber.

Skyrocketing lumber prices in recent months have reached such serious proportions to threaten our basic housing program and our efforts to meet the national housing goal established by the 1968 Housing Act.

On March 19, 20, and 21, the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs held hearings to determine the reasons for the current crisis in lumber and what could be done about it. We received verbal testimony from a large number of witnesses representing all segments of private and government groups involved in producing and distributing lumber for homebuilding purposes, as well as consumer and conservation groups.

The witnesses were excellent, and I believe that the hearing record is the best ever recorded on this very involved subject. Although we do not pretend to be experts on the subject, we feel that we were able to get to the bottom of the issue and to understand it well enough to identify the problem and to make recommendations on its solution.

Mr. President, I bring this matter to the attention of the Senate because I believe that it is a nationwide issue covering not only those States having large timber resources, but every State in the Union involved in housing programs and the rebuilding of our cities. In my statement today, I will explain the issue briefly and make some tentative recommendations. Later on, the Housing Subcommittee will submit a report containing a more thorough explanation of the subject and final recommendations on the best course of action to take to remedy this serious problem.

The committee undertook the hearings primarily because of our concern that mount-

ing lumber prices and shortages could frustrate our endeavors to meet the Nation's housing goals. A few days after we announced the hearings, I was pleased to see that the President had established a task force to make recommendations for a course of action to meet this serious problem. The day before our hearings started, the President announced a four-pronged program to relieve the current pressure on lumber prices. Also a few days after we announced the hearings, we learned that plywood prices had taken a 20-percent drop.

These actions may represent only temporary relief, and it is obvious that our problem is more than a temporary one. Nevertheless, I am satisfied that our hearing did prompt forthright action to help solve the current crisis.

In the past year, softwood prices have increased by 100 percent for plywood, and by 50 to 80 percent for 2 by 4's and other softwood lumber products used in homebuilding. The National Association of Home Builders reported that the increased lumber prices pushed up the cost of a \$25,000 house by \$1,268 on a national average. However, in one area, the homebuilders reported to us that the lumber increases have caused a \$2,000 rise in a \$20,000 house. Furthermore, we are told that, not only are the lumber prices exorbitant, but the entire marketing system for lumber is in a state of chaos. The lumber dealers will not commit themselves on advance prices and, in many cases, the homebuilders are unable to rely on deliveries of this essential product at any price. Obviously, such conditions cause serious delays in production schedules, disrupt labor forces, and place many small homebuilders in serious financial difficulties.

Not only is this a serious matter for industry, it is even more serious for the American people who are seeking decent housing at reasonable costs. Furthermore, it may represent a critical blow to attaining our national housing goals as spelled out so forcibly in the 1968 Housing Act.

To get to the bottom of the price issue the Housing Subcommittee looked into the functioning of the entire marketing process of lumber from the forests to the mill and to the wholesaler, to the retailer, and to its use in the construction of a home. We learned that the final price was a product of each step in this process, but that the price rise to the consumer was basically the result of rising stumpage prices established by auction. Furthermore, because the government is by far the largest single seller of sawtimber, the current auction prices are those set in connection with the sale of Government-owned logs. The Government has a procedure for establishing an appraised value of logs and will not accept a bid for less than the appraised value but has no compunction about the bid going far above this value. In fact, in recent bids, the final selling price of Government-owned timber has been 2½ times the value established by the Government itself as the appraised value.

I understand that this system has been used for a long time and has years of experience behind it, but I believe that the appropriate committee should look into this process. The result is truly inflationary causing higher prices all along the line. Furthermore, now that our Government is committed to subsidizing housing, I wonder if we are not going around in circles. In the long run, the profits of one agency of the Government are borne by subsidies paid by another agency of the Government.

Another important factor related to the sharp price increase is the disappearance of many small lumber mills which traditionally have been the balance wheel in the lumber industry. For example, the number of lumber mills in western Washington and western Oregon, the center of softwood production, has dropped to about one-quarter of the

number in existence 20 years ago. In previous periods of lumber shortages, these mills would quickly come to life because of the improved economic climate and often, with their increased production, would be very effective in making up the shortage.

Secretary Romney showed his concern about the high lumber prices and the closing of so many small sawmills and has requested the Department of Justice to determine whether there is a cause for action in connection with the absorption of so many mills by the giant lumber interests.

The Secretary's conclusion, however, in which I heartily concur, is that the solution to the problem does not rest on the issue of prices. The price structure is a product of supply and demand and the sure way of correcting excessively high prices is to increase the supply in proportion to the demand.

Last year, in the Housing Act of 1968 we established a 10-year goal of housing construction and thus have, in fact, established the level of demand for lumber products for the next 10 years.

The 10-year goal calls for an average of 2.6 million units built annually. This compares with current production of about 1.6 million units, so you can see that we need to increase production by more than 60 percent in the years ahead. This 2.6 million units goal was not haphazardly arrived at and should not be taken lightly. It is the law of the land to use this Nation's resources to meet this goal.

Unless we develop new substitute materials for homebuilding, the demands for lumber in the next decade must match the 60-percent increase in housing starts. I believe that we have no choice but to match the supply to meet this demand.

This can be done. It is not an impossible task. We have the basic resources and it is now a matter of aggressively working to improve the efficiency of these resources. It seems to me to be a simple matter of economics and good business practices to invest in our national forests the same kind of research and up-to-date cultural and management practices that we so successfully used in developing our agricultural lands.

Amazing success has already been demonstrated through the latest techniques of "tree farming" or "silviculture." The important thing is to use these techniques nationwide, particularly in Government-owned forests, and there would be no doubt about meeting our production goals.

The trees are there to produce the amounts of lumber and plywood we need but, for the most part, they are in national forests and other Federal timberland owned and operated by the Government. It was evident to us that the increased production required of our Federal timberlands is impossible under the presently restricted appropriations in the U.S. Forest Service in the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Land Management in the Department of the Interior.

Industrial forests operated by private companies, and the other timberlands in private ownership, are now producing to their full capacity, if not perhaps a little over their true capacity, under prudent forestry management. In fact, we were a little startled to learn that the forest industries, with ownership of 17 percent of softwood sawtimber, is harvesting 33 percent of the total softwood, that other private ownerships with 18 percent of softwood standing timber are producing 28 percent of the total output, but that the Forest Service, with ownership of 54 percent of all softwood timber in the Nation, is only producing 30 percent of total output.

To put it another way, the forest industries are harvesting 3.8 percent of their standing timber inventory annually; other private ownerships are harvesting at the rate of 2.8 percent of inventory, but the Forest Service, the greatest forest owner of all, is

able, under present conditions, to harvest only nine-tenths of 1 percent of its huge inventory.

The imbalance in the harvesting between Government and private lands has many explanations. One is that many private owners are overcutting their forests and destroying their use for the future.

It is obvious that this condition cannot continue for long. Mr. Edward Cliff, of the U.S. Forest Service, said:

"The softwood resources in private ownership are being overcut. . . . Log supplies from these lands must decline substantially over the next few decades. . . . Any sustained increase in log harvests in the West thus must come from public lands."

There are many reasons why the National Forests, comprising the greatest reservoir of timber in the Nation, can account for only one-third of the production of softwood. Chief among them seems to be the fact that the Forest Service has been obliged to operate with insufficient funds to reach the necessary softwood output to support our housing programs.

I am not being critical of the Forest Service. It has some of the most dedicated foresters in the world. Within the limits of the funds made available, it has protected and managed the great forest empires under its jurisdiction. But it simply has not been given the funds necessary to meet our overall national wood requirements and, in particular, to make available and market the sawlogs required for the housing programs we have authorized.

It was because of the handicaps imposed on our housing programs by the critical shortage of softwood lumber and plywood and consequent price spurts that we conducted our hearings.

We heard a large number of witnesses, representing every element in the picture—homebuilders, contractors, Federal agencies, the forest industries, the carpenters' and sawmill unions, conservation groups, foresters and others concerned with the available sawtimber and housing dilemma confronting the Nation.

The Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, George Romney, put the problem clearly in his appearance before our subcommittee. Secretary Romney told us that, in order to sustain the housing programs we have established, we will need an additional annual production of 15 billion board feet of softwood lumber and plywood by 1978. Softwood lumber consumption last year ran to a record 35.1 billion board feet.

The Secretary said that there are three ways to increase the supply domestically.

He would have the private companies do a more efficient job without jeopardizing the future supply. He gave the private companies credit for doing better with their harvesting practices than public managers, but believes there is further room for improvements. Furthermore, he recognized the vast areas of privately owned woods and forests in the hands of farmers and small plot owners which, if efficiently managed, would make a significant contribution to make up the shortage.

Secondly, Secretary Romney believes that we should look at the Alaskan supply which is now all going to Japan. This is a transportation problem complicated by the Jones Act, which requires the shipment of Alaskan lumber or logs in American bottoms.

Third—and this is by far the most important—Secretary Romney says we must take steps to make the harvest of our publicly owned lands more efficient. It is obvious that the 15 billion board feet that the Secretary reports is needed by 1978 can come out of the nationally owned forests without jeopardizing the protection of the natural resources necessary for recreation or conservation purposes.

Secretary Romney also informed us that

the President, acting on the recommendations of the special White House task force on the problem, has directed the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to increase immediately the sales of Federal timber for manufacture into lumber and plywood by 1.1 billion board feet.

The President is to be commended for his prompt action. But, with a need for 15 billion more board feet per year, it is obvious that the President's action is only a first step, and that other actions are required to bring the production of softwood lumber and plywood up to the annual 15 billion additional feet required for housing for our people.

The Chief Forester of the United States, Mr. Edward Cliff, confirmed to our subcommittee his previous testimony before the Senate Committee on Small Business, on which I serve, last November, that on many national forest lands, production could be increased by two-thirds if the Forest Service were given sufficient funds, on a continuing basis, to build needed forest access roads and trails, and to employ sufficient personnel to intensify forest management. Many witnesses pointed out to us that forest management performance on industrial forest lands is superior to those presently possible on Federal lands, but that Federal management practices can be upgraded if assured long-term funding is provided.

The Chief Forester told us that, in response to the rapidly increasing needs for lumber and plywood, the Forest Service is seeking short-run increases in timber sales through salvage and thinnings, but that this would require additional funds and personnel. It is worth noting that, in his directives to the Departments of Agriculture and Interior, the President instructed both Departments promptly to present to the Appropriations Committees supplemental budget estimates to enable them to speed up their operations and make more sales of Federal timber possible.

Chief Forester Cliff indicated that appropriations for the work of the Forest Service have been running far behind authorizations. For example, in fiscal 1970, the Forest Service requested \$170 million for access roads and trails, but only some \$91 million had been appropriated.

He said that more access roads are needed to make increased timber harvest possible and that other management tools are needed, such as, use of genetically superior planting stock for reforestation; commercial thinnings which would utilize timber otherwise lost to mortality; noncommercial thinnings to release trees in stagnated stands; increased salvage of fire-and-insect-destroyed timber and closer utilization of the timber that is harvested to use residuals not now used commercially.

Mr. Cliff reported that, in 1970, his budget would be only 29.5 percent of the level that he said was needed to carry out an effective reforestation and stand improvement program. With such limited funds, his agency could not nearly carry out the intense forest management program so badly needed.

Mr. Cliff, in answers to questions from members of the subcommittee, said that the reduced appropriations for his agency have had an adverse effect on the availability of timber. Furthermore, he said increased spending is absolutely essential to increasing the output. However, it is not money lost but is, in fact, an excellent investment. He said that for each \$1 million invested in planting and timber culture, we can add 11 million board feet of annual production, worth \$215,000 yield annually at current sales prices.

On the consumer level, the most significant witness appearing before us was Mr. Eugene Gullidge, president of the National Association of Home Builders, which represents 75 percent of all housing constructed in the United States.

The residential construction industry, of course, represents the largest single consumer of softwood lumber and wood products in the country. Shortage of supply and uncertainty of lumber and plywood deliveries, Mr. Gullidge stated, is seriously affecting the ability of the homebuilding industry to produce the volume of housing required by the ever-expanding demand for new homes. Other types of construction, he said, also are being held back by the crisis.

While the housing industry's projection of private nonfarm housing starts for 1969 was, at the beginning of this year, in the range of 1.6 million new housing units as compared to 1.5 million starts in 1968, it now appears, according to Mr. Gullidge, that we may not reach the 1.6 million unit figure, which itself is one million units short of our national housing production goal.

This is a serious situation, when the need for new housing is at an historic peak.

The National Association of Home Builders declared that it appears that a shortage in available lumber of about 10 percent may already have developed. If this is true, Mr. Gullidge testified, then we are heading for even more serious price and supply problems as we undertake to reach higher housing production levels.

A clear, reasoned, and convincing case was presented to us by representatives of the Nation's lumber and plywood manufacturing and timber-growing industries. Spokesmen who formed a panel in presenting statements and answering questions included expert witnesses from the National Forest Products Association, Western Wood Products Association, American Plywood Association, Southern Pine Association, North West Timber Association, Industrial Forestry Association, Western Lumber Manufacturers, Inc., National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, and Western Forests Industries Association. In addition, we also received testimony from representatives of the Architectural Woodwork Institute, National American Wholesale Lumber Association, and the National Lumber and Building Materials Dealers Association.

We therefore had evidence from virtually every sector of the forest industries and the principal distributors and users of lumber and plywood. All expressed great concern about the problems we face, and made many suggestions for short-term and long-term solutions.

Basically, the forest industry spokesmen asserted that the current domestic situation can be blamed mostly on an inadequate supply of logs to meet growing domestic requirements and pressures for exports. Increased demand for lumber and plywood for house construction, they said, to meet needs for the 1.6 million new housing units projected for this year, plus a record export volume of 2.2 billion board feet of logs in 1968, have resulted in shortages of logs and timber available for immediate harvesting. They emphasized that the 1968 total softwood log production of about 38 billion feet, a record, was less than 2 percent of the total softwood timber inventory of more than 2 trillion board feet. Higher total log production to meet current demand levels, they testified, is justified by present timber inventory and growth rates.

Industry witnesses were unanimous in pointing out that since privately owned forest lands are now operated at peak capacities, the necessary increase must come from the great timber reservoirs of the Federal forests which are being operated at far below capacity. As one witness put it:

"The federal government holds the key to the log supply and to domestic wood prices in the way it chooses to manage this timber."

He declared that the additional timber required for our housing goals will not be

available for cutting unless national timber policies are adjusted.

Testimony the committee received from industry witnesses and others about Alaskan forests as a possible source of some relief from the shortages was disturbing. There is a fairly extensive federally owned timber resource in southeastern Alaska, but it is unavailable to the domestic market because of the Jones Act requirements on intercoastal shipping.

The Jones Act requires that products moving in coastal and intercoastal shipping—see section 27 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1927, as amended—between U.S. ports be shipped in American ships. This imposes a disadvantage of substantially higher freight rates than the rates prevailing for foreign registry shipping. The cost effect on lumber and plywood appears to be about a \$20 per thousand board feet increase. The lack of a U.S. merchant fleet compounds the issue.

Consequently, the sizable amount of available Alaskan lumber that can be produced is unable to reach consuming markets in the United States without a prohibitive competitive disadvantage.

Consequently, Alaskan timbers and lumber are sold to Japan, thus depriving domestic users of this untapped domestic source of timber supply.

Suggestions were advanced by industry witnesses that the Jones Act should be repealed, or at least modified. Their objective is to allow Alaskan lumber to be moved to market in this country at the same rates, for example, as are enjoyed by Canadian lumber producers, who can, and do, move their lumber to Eastern United States markets in foreign flag ships.

The industry witnesses recommended six short-term proposals to relieve lumber and plywood availability problems:

First. Immediate sale offerings of the billion board feet of unsold allowable cut on national forests.

Second. Sale offerings of the full current annual allowable cut by stepping up road construction and timber preparation activities on national forests.

Third. National Forest timber sale offerings where little or minimum access road construction is needed.

Fourth. Exemption of Forest Service personnel from replacement restraints to assure the staff required for timber sale administration.

Fifth. Establishment of a team of specialists within the Forest Service to devise and execute an accelerated national timber sales program.

Sixth. Support for the Interstate Commerce Commission's recent general order for the return of boxcars suitable for lumber and plywood shipments, which has been a chronic to acute problem for forest products manufacturers.

On a long-term basis, the witnesses agreed that the only practical solution offering lasting relief from supply-demand crises is a national determination to utilize the Nation's forest resources in a way directly related to other national goals established in the interest of all the people—mainly, intensive and scientific management of our Federal timber.

They also emphasized that the Forest Service should have assurances of the long-term financing needed for roads and intensive management practices. In the past, they said, with ample or surplus availability of forest products, funds to apply intensive timber management on the national forests have been denied. Now, they pointed out, with untold millions of dollars in scarcity premiums at stake each year, a new look at providing the means for long-term financing for such intensive timber management is imperative.

The same point was stressed by the home-building industry in its presentation. The

national goal of 26 million housing units over the next decade by new construction or rehabilitation, and a goal within this of 6 million units for low- and moderate-income families, as set forth under title XVI of the Housing Act of 1968, necessarily implies compatible and concurrent national timber policies and resource requirements. Mr. Gulledge, the housing industry representative also added that the current experience of lumber and plywood shortages shows the need for far more perceptive timber and resource management planning in conjunction with national housing needs. They are convinced, he told our subcommittee, that strong protection can be given to our conservation and preservation interests in the continued life of our national forests, which they fully support, at the same time that the forests are put to work much more usefully for the interests of all the people in the Nation.

Conservation interests were represented before our subcommittee by witnesses from the Sierra Club, a large organization devoted to preserving wilderness and scenic areas throughout the country. They raised no objections to the proposals that the Forest Service increase its output of sawlogs from the commercial forest areas, provided this increase is carried out within the limits of sound forest management. Mr. Brock Evans, the Club's Pacific Northwest representative, stated that it would approve Federal commercial forest lands development to a greater extent if the best type of intensive forest management was pursued.

Testimony was also received from a representative of labor, Mr. Peter E. Terzick, general treasurer of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America. Mr. Terzick was forthright in his statement that wages have very little effect on the dramatic increase in lumber and plywood over the last year. In reply to a question he pointed out that the union's 3-year contract expires this year but that, based on past experience, labor's wage demands are very small in relation to other prices. He also replied that there is no shortage of labor for the mills nor for lumbermen who do the cutting and logging in the forests. He also urged a study of pricing policies and the development by the government of a mechanism for maintaining stability over a period of time.

A further suggestion was advanced by several witnesses that some way should be found to permit the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to plow back a substantial part of their receipts from timber sales into more intensive timber management. This, of course, is a matter requiring legislation that is within the jurisdiction of the Agriculture Committee, but we are convinced the proposal has high merit. We feel that it should be done, that this is one of the basic, necessary steps to put the forest policies of the Nation into phase with our housing programs and national requirements for softwood products.

We therefore strongly recommend that Congress carefully study this matter and consider bringing about the necessary adjustments through legislation.

The conclusion is inescapable that our Federal forests, containing such vast amounts of sawtimber, are woefully under-producing the amounts of logs, the Nation needs, and are perfectly capable of stepping up their outputs to the necessary levels if sustained, long-term funding for intensified forest management is made available—funding that can be repaid to the Federal Treasury from timber sales.

This is what is done in industrial forests and on certain State-owned timberlands. It is also the system used on Department of Defense forest lands. It has enabled them to reach excellent production levels far above the production levels of Federal forests. As I understand it, Senator RICHARD RUSSELL sponsored a provision in the Defense De-

partment's 1961 Appropriations Act which authorized the Department to use a portion of its timber sales revenue to effect management costs. As a result of this authority which, in effect, provided assured funds for up-to-date management of Department of Defense forests, the income from these forests has increased 2½ times and has resulted in a substantial return to the U.S. Treasury.

Another unfortunate fact that was developed in our hearings is the lack of funds has hampered construction of access roads in the Federal forests, with the result that in many areas, overmature trees, or stands damaged by windstorms, fire, disease, or insects cannot be harvested or salvaged and simply go to waste, reaching an estimated annual loss of 10 billion board feet of timber, nearly as much as is produced. This is a form of gross waste of a valuable natural resource. Not cutting trees that are ready for harvest, or which have been damaged by natural causes, is much like not harvesting fruit, wheat or other valuable foodstuffs when they are ripe for harvest. Just like growing food, overmature timber rots, or salvageable timber decays and rots, and goes to complete waste.

Scholars have termed this type of waste "waste by underuse."

In some areas, Federal timber management agencies have not had a chance even to inventory their standing timber. Or personnel is not available to prepare necessary bid schedules for selling trees that should be harvested.

Our problem in the South is somewhat different from that in the West. The large amount of interspersed timberlands in private hands calls for an even greater degree of cooperation by all concerned.

The Southern Pine Association advised our subcommittee that the South produced, mainly through large producers, 7 billion board feet, which was higher than the average 10 years prior thereto. This amounts to more than 20 percent of the total softwood lumber and plywood produced in the United States. At the same time, the pulpwood industry in the South quadrupled its production, and this industry, of course, draws upon the softwood reserve supply.

Since much of the timber supply in the South is in private hands, large and small, there is need for progressive cooperation in projects such as the Southern Forest Resources Analysis, combining the interests of manufacturers, farmers, and producers toward the objective of accelerated tree planting and timber stand improvements. There is a need also for the Government to increase its efforts for cooperation between industry, government, and private landowners, sponsoring at the same time efforts that can take advantage of education and advances in procedures and technology that can come from our institutions of higher learning.

The problems involved in bringing about solutions to our demand-supply-price problems fall within the jurisdiction of other committees of the Congress, particularly the Committees on Agriculture and Appropriations. I am reviewing these issues in this manner to bring them to the attention of these most effective committees so they will be aware of the problems and can bring their outstanding expertise to bear on finding solutions so that our housing goals are not thwarted.

I should like to draw attention to the following recommendations:

First. The urgent needs of our housing programs, and the high goals we have established as national policy require that prompt action be taken to increase the timber outputs of our forests.

Second. The greatest source of timber is owned by the Federal Government and, thus, our shortage can be relieved only by a greater utilization of the forest resources owned and operated by the Federal Government.

Third. Increasing the allowable cutting

from federally owned lands can be made without sacrificing the sustained yield principle provided there is proper funding and adoption of the latest silviculture techniques.

Fourth. Proper funding can only be effective if it is sustained over a long period of time. Sustained funding is an urgent necessity to enable Federal agencies to carry out a program of intense forest management without which we will never obtain the wood to meet our housing needs.

Fifth. Considerable more resources must be directed to developing advanced techniques for improving our knowledge of forestry. The Department of Agriculture should supply some of its great knowledge on increasing crop yields to the Nation's forests.

Sixth. More attention must be paid to improve the efficiency of privately owned forests and wood lots. Fifty-nine percent of all forest lands are owned privately and although such lands only have 18 percent of the inventory, I should think that a nationwide campaign to educate the private owners to the latest forestry techniques would bear fruit in future years.

Seventh. A thorough analysis should be directed to the pricing of lumber, starting at the Federal Government's own appraising and auctioning of saw-timber.

Eighth. The Commerce Committee should investigate the Jones Act in connection with shipping of lumber from Alaska and the Western States. As it is working now, the only beneficiary is Japan. Is there not some way to protect American shipping and still not deny domestic markets in the U.S. mainland from having access to Alaskan and Western lumber? Other transportation difficulties, including the shortage of boxcars, must be resolved also. I am pleased to note the action taken by President Nixon in this regard, but I hope this is not just a temporary measure.

Ninth. We should examine the import of lumber from Canada which, in 1968, amounted to 5.8 billion board feet. Considering the great potential untapped supply from our neighbor to the North, there is no reason why this could not be substantially increased. One impediment to increasing the import of plywood is the 20 percent tariff. I believe that we should study the tariff requirement and see whether our short supply of plywood needed to meet our national housing goals does not demand a repeal of this provision.

Tenth. The export of logs to Japan needs immediate attention. We have a major conflict of interests that must be resolved between Japan's housing plans, estimated at 1.9 million units for 1969, and the U.S. current production of 1.6 million units per year. This has both shortrun and longrun implications.

In the short run, witnesses before our subcommittee suggested that the United States explore with Japan the possibility of "borrowing" several million feet of logs it has purchased, but which are stockpiled in West Coast ports because of a shipping glut. This proposal suggests that the "borrowed" logs could be replaced later with other logs when a better flow of raw materials begins to come off the Federal forests. I feel this is a matter worthy of exploring, and could provide some temporary relief of our domestic shortage.

The Morse amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1968, which I helped sponsor, has set a limitation of 350 million board feet on logs which can be sold from western Federal forests after January 1, 1969 for export to Japan. This figure is considered by most authorities to be a normal amount of export that could be supplied without serious effects on the domestic forest industries.

The Morse amendment also provides that logs not covered by the act can be prevented from being substituted for logs by covered

logs within the discretion of the Department. Apparently it will be some little time before the relief envisioned by the amendment can become effective.

This is a complicated issue. I fully recognize, but I urge that the Departments of Agriculture and Interior consider the early implementation of the Morse amendment in relation to the Nation's housing needs and the recent crises in lumber and plywood price and supply.

Eleventh. Substitutes for lumber products in construction of both residential and non-residential buildings must be developed. The plastic and concrete products, steel and aluminum industries have already come forth with many innovations that should be encouraged.

A fundamental issue we face lies in striking a proper balance between the management of our forest resources, and their production and sale of timber, and the requirements of the American people for forest products. The two elements—national needs and management and use of our natural resources—are utterly out of phase. They must be meshed and put into phase in order to accomplish our national housing goals.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, my very able colleague, the Honorable JOHN J. SPARKMAN, Senator from Alabama, has just introduced a bill to establish policy for more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands and to establish a higher timber yield fund.

This bill is of vital importance to my constituents in the State of Montana, where the Federal Government owns 68.2 percent of all commercial forest land in the State.

Certainly few States in this Nation are more cognizant of the need for better management leading to greater timber yield from the Federal forests than is the State of Montana. Although Montana is not faced with the immediate problem of finding housing for the many millions of urban dwellers, we in the State are concerned with the problem of providing the basic raw material—lumber and plywood—to provide that needed housing.

The Housing Act of 1968 was a great stride forward in establishing the national goal of 2.6 million housing units annually for the next decade to meet the requirements of our Nation. It was with a great shock that we in the Senate discovered that not only was there not appropriate availability to a supply of timber, the basic raw material for housing, but that the fault lay with the Federal Government itself. This fact was brought out in the week-long hearings held by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Both the subcommittee and the full committee are chaired by our colleague from the State of Alabama, and I have the utmost respect and admiration for his single-minded purpose and clear perception in determining the problem and seeking an equitable solution to it.

Of great importance to me as a Senator from the State of Montana is that Senator SPARKMAN's bill provides for intensive management of commercial forest land now under Federal ownership. We in Montana recognize the need for family recreation in the outdoors, and

praise the Forest Service for providing, within its present limited budget, both commercial forestry and developed outdoor recreation on the national forests as well as grazing, fish and wildlife, and watershed values.

We also recognize that there is need for wilderness areas specifically set aside for man to enjoy the great experience of solitude in the magnificent high alpine country of Montana. We have now in Montana more than 3 million acres in reserved classification, including the first of the wilderness areas, the Bob Marshall Wilderness, named for that great conservationist and forest ranger, Bob Marshall, and established as one of the very first wilderness areas under Forest Service administration edict in 1940.

It therefore is a great compliment to my colleague that his bill provides for adequate and intensive management of commercial forest land to meet the housing requirements of the Nation, and yet recognizes that existing wilderness areas also serve a purpose. As a nation we have carefully considered, and provided for man's spiritual and recreational needs. It is appropriate now, in the face of urgent housing requirements, that we fulfill man's housing needs. This can be done through Senator SPARKMAN's bill.

The actions of Senator SPARKMAN in first, defining the problem through public hearings on the subject, and then following through with legislation to solve that problem, are a fine example of his outstanding statesmanship and devotion to his responsibilities as the chairman of the committee which has done so much for all our people in this area.

The Forest Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture is composed of many dedicated men, anxious to do the job that their country demands of them in meeting the wood needs of the Nation. This bill provides the tools for them to do their job. I earnestly hope that the Congress and the administration will combine to enable these dedicated Forest Service personnel to do the job of which they are capable and provide them with the legislative and fiscal needs to do it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I address the Senate today on a matter of importance to the residents of my own great State of Illinois as well as to the Nation. This is the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from the State of Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) which would establish a policy for the more efficient development and improved management of national forest commercial timberlands.

Although the Senator from Alabama serves on the opposite side of the aisle, his concern for the shelter needs of the Nation transcends political boundaries. So must that of all of us. President Nixon has demonstrated the national concern for housing and its components through the establishment of a Cabinet-level task force to study softwood lumber and plywood supply which are directly relative to fulfilling that housing goal.

That task force, under the able direction of the Honorable Robert P. Mayo, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, has

made some specific recommendations which the President has ordered carried out. But this is only the beginning of the trail leading toward the solution of the problem. Both the task force and the Senate hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Housing and Urban Affairs of the Committee on Banking and Currency, under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN), have found that there is a shortage, not in timber itself, for we are blessed with vast potential forest acreages. The problem is availability of that timber.

The problem was brought into sharp focus by the Housing Act of 1968. That law, sponsored by Senator SPARKMAN, established a national goal of 26 million new housing units to be built during the next 10 years. We have no great commercial forests in Illinois of the size of which Senator SPARKMAN's bill speaks—indeed, we are more familiar with rolling cornfields rather than acres of housing—but the use of lumber itself is of great concern in our gigantic metropolitan areas. We in Illinois are deeply and greatly concerned with the needs of our city and suburban dwellers for adequate housing at a price they can afford. The Sparkman bill provides the answer to those needs which has been determined both by the extensive hearings his subcommittee has held and by the studies conducted by the Cabinet-level task force of President Nixon.

Trees, like any other replenishable vegetation, are a crop, and as such, must be cared for, even as we in Illinois care for our fields of corn to provide lush, productive and financially contributive stands.

I notice with great interest that Senator SPARKMAN's bill makes provision for the development and procurement of seed or stock with superior growth characteristics for the creation of what might be termed a "supertree."

I presume we have not thought of it quite in that light, but having been nurtured close to the soil and still trying to keep my feet planted on the bosom of this sweet earth, I think of all these living and growing things as crops, and that is true of the tree. It is only that it takes longer to produce a tree, and I would assume it is going to take longer to produce a supertree.

I am not like the lady who went to the grocery store and asked the proprietor, "Do you have tree seed?"

He said, "Yes, madam."

She said, "Well, give me a couple of packages."

Then, she said, "While you are about it, throw in a couple of hooks for our hammock." She thought she was going to get the hammock hitched up "like right now." I am afraid she did not know how nature works. But there must be something like a supertree, and that, of course, fits into this scheme of things.

Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Incidentally, the distinguished Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), who is the ranking minority member of the Committee on

Banking and Currency, had developed a bill of his own but I think he substantially concurs in the Sparkman bill. We do not mean by this commendation and this endorsement that there will not be some amendatory language that might be engrafted in that bill when it comes to the floor of the Senate.

You will recall, Mr. President, that the State of Illinois is a leader in the growth and harvest of the magnificent hybrid corn which graces our dinner tables here and around the world today. Certainly it is no less important that the techniques of hybridization which have proven so valuable in the production of our golden corn also be utilized in the production of mighty new trees from which will come the needed lumber and plywood products to provide shelter for even the smallest resident of our cities, towns, and villages so that he may grow and mature in that home atmosphere which is so vital to the development of all citizens of this proud Nation of ours.

Mr. President, the importance of the softwood lumber supply to the home-building industry is well known. What is not perhaps appreciated so much but what should be of serious concern to all of us here has been the very marked sharp increase in the price of lumber. In some instances, in the price of a \$20,000 home, plywood has increased in price 100 percent and 2-by-4 and other softwood lumber products have gone up from 50 to 80 percent.

The increase in cost is serious but even more critical are the difficulties involved in contracting and making construction commitments because of advancing prices. Nondelivery of lumber because of price fluctuation causes serious delays in production schedules and the scheduling of labor requirements. This has resulted in many small homebuilders finding themselves in a straitened financial condition.

I certainly do hope that action can be taken to improve the prospects of Americans who are seeking decent housing at a reasonable cost. Lumber is a basic commodity required in construction and its shortage has resulted in the accelerated construction cost-squeeze experience. A concentrated and serious effort should be made to utilize wisely the existing resources to alleviate housing shortages.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alabama for his measure to provide sufficient timber from Federal commercial lands to make it possible for the Nation to attain its projected housing goal of 26 million units in the next decade and to guarantee our people all the benefits of well managed forests forever. I believe that the homes of America will deter-well-managed forests forever. I believe God willing, that we will realize and execute those laws which make them so.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I have joined with the chairman of our Banking Committee (Mr. SPARKMAN) in sponsoring a bill titled "The National Timber Supply Act of 1969," because I believe that an approach of the type contemplated in this bill could greatly increase the productivity of our national forests.

The need for additional production has already been recognized by the White House. Last month President Nixon announced a series of actions aimed at making 1.1 billion board feet of lumber available for sale immediately to ease the pressures on the building materials market. He also ordered restriction of Defense Department procurement of softwood lumber and plywood, and directed the Interior Department to increase the sale of timber from land controlled by the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Bureau of Land Management. These actions may provide a measure of temporary relief. But they will not do the job that needs to be done. If there is to be an increase in harvesting from our forests, there must also be an increase in production, and restricting the use of wood products cannot be considered other than for a very short period.

Secretary Romney testified before the Senate and House Banking and Currency Committees that it will take 15 billion additional feet of timber annually to meet the Nation's housing demands by 1978. This is in line with testimony from the Chief of the Forest Service. Others show these figures to be conservative.

This Congress, last year, set the Nation's 10-year housing goals at 26 million units, 2.6 million units a year, with 6 million to be built for low-income families. Such goals cannot possibly be met unless we take action to provide the necessary resources.

We can meet the timber needs of this Nation. We can increase the yields of our national forests. And do it all without—and I repeat, without—jeopardizing the long-range ability of those forests to become continually more productive in perpetuity.

In the private sector, forest yields have already been increased substantially. These methods must now be applied to our Federal lands. The techniques being employed to increase yields on many of our private forests have been used for years. In the field of agriculture, for example, harvest increases have been spectacular since 1950; wheat yields have increased from 19 to 25 bushels an acre. Rice yields have grown from 2,300 pounds to 4,400 pounds an acre. Peanut yields have increased from 900 to 1,800 pounds an acre, and corn yields have gone from 48 to 73 bushels. Many of our major crops have doubled in yield since World War II.

The private forest industry is now applying the same techniques to trees. In the South, the International Paper Co. has already launched its dynamic forest program based on a "supertree." And as a result, the company has developed trees that mature faster, grow taller, and contain more and higher quality usable wood than ever before.

The Weyerhaeuser Co. in the far West, as the result of what it calls a "high yield forestry program," has reported similar increases in forest production. As a result of its efforts, the firm will be able to increase the harvest of wood fiber on its forests as much as 33 percent.

Before I was made aware of the efforts leading to the bill which the chairman has introduced today, I had begun an investigation to determine what could be done most appropriately to improve the management of our forests under the supervision of both the Department of Interior and the Forest Service. I had written to Secretaries Hickel and Hardin expressing my concern over the rapidly rising cost of lumber to the housing industry. I mentioned in those letters that I was considering legislation which would authorize the use of the funds received from timber in our forests for the management of those forests. I did not have sufficient data on which to determine whether all of the funds other than those which are presently earmarked for other purposes could be appropriately used, whether they would be sufficient to do the job which could be done, or whether the revenues would be in excess of the amount needed for intensive forestry management. I asked these two Departments to provide me with some guidelines regarding the funds needed and provide me with information as to what they could do to improve their present practices. I have not yet received the information necessary for me to make a final determination as to how the funding could best be accomplished. In the absence of that information, I have decided it would be appropriate for me to cosponsor the bill which has just been introduced with a few comments on some of the provisions of the bill as it is presently drafted which concern me and others who have become its cosponsors.

In order for the forests to be properly managed, it is necessary that those who are in charge of their management be able to depend on the funds required to accomplish their goals. This bill sets up a system whereby a trust fund would be used to provide such funds. Then it limits the use of the moneys credited to that fund by requiring that they can be used only if appropriated by the Congress. The very problem which has resulted in the present deficient level of production is the lack of appropriations. We should be careful not to go through the whole process of setting up a trust fund, yet restrict the use of the funds therein so that they are not readily available. I feel sure that this provision was included in order to allay criticism that Congress would not have the power to control the use of the funds. The appropriations process, however, could destroy the very purpose of a trust fund. And I believe it might be a better approach to provide congressional review over the program instead of the necessity for annual appropriations. I am of the opinion that it would be desirable for the Congress to set up guidelines for the use of the funds and then authorize the Forest Service to manage the forests within those guidelines. I am also concerned about the provision in the bill which requires that the funds "be allocated in each fiscal year for expenditure in each national forest in substantially the same proportion as the amount of money contributed to the fund from such national forest in the immediately pre-

ceding 2 fiscal years bears to the total amount of money contributed to the fund from all the national forests in such preceding 2 fiscal years." We had testimony relating to this provision during our hearings, and the Chief of the Forest Service, Edward P. Cliff, explained that if this were to be the case, Oregon, Washington, and California would be getting most of the attention and some of the places where we have a job of building a forest almost from scratch would not receive the funds necessary to take care of their development.

It seems to me, therefore, in conjunction with the suggestion made earlier in my remarks that it would be more appropriate for Congress to set up guidelines making money available to the areas from which the funds are derived in order that they be intensively managed but that the Forest Service have authority to use any additional funds for the establishment or rebuilding of other areas which may be producing very little or perhaps no revenue at the present time.

In conclusion, Mr. President, let me say that there is no question that our timber resources are being strained at the present time and that demands on them will increase significantly in the future. It is imperative that we recognize this as a national problem. The land we live in can be characterized as the land of plenty only if we husband and manage our resources with extreme care and with a high degree of professional skill. In this way we can both conserve them and use them to meet the challenging needs of this Nation. These needs can only be met if we are willing to provide funds for intensive forest management which could increase production by as much as two-thirds. It is my view that we can increase the lumber productivity of our forests without diminishing their use for other important purposes. As I have expressed, the bill introduced by the chairman of our Banking Committee, Senator SPARKMAN, is an important step in this direction. I have explained my differences with the bill as drafted and intend to do what I can to see that the proposal and the alternative recommendations get early consideration by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, adequate housing for all Americans, particularly lower income families, has been a compelling spur to my activities ever since the citizens of Illinois accorded me the privilege of serving in this distinguished body.

There can be no question that the widespread unrest in our Nation today has many of its roots in the overcrowding imposed upon the less fortunate members of our society by the failure of the Nation to keep pace with housing demands.

Neither can there be any question that the worthy purposes of the Housing Act of 1968, specifically designed to overcome this national housing deficiency, will be thwarted unless the Congress of the United States acts positively to support

the Housing Act by providing the materials necessary to erect and rehabilitate 2.6 million units annually.

Today we find ourselves in a crisis with respect to the price and availability of America's fundamental construction materials—lumber and plywood. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee has conducted extensive hearings to determine the root cause for the sharp escalation of prices for these building products and their apparent insufficiency.

It became evident as the record developed that the Federal Government itself may be responsible for the current shortages and high prices for softwood lumber and plywood. Sixty percent of the Nation's softwood timber inventory is owned and administered by the National Government. Many of the witnesses testified that the principal reason for the current softwood crisis resides in the fact that Federal softwood timber has not been available for product manufacture on a scale dictated by the Nation's housing needs.

Even the Chief of the Forest Service has testified that the timber harvest in the national forests can be increased by as much as two-thirds with assurances of sustained investment for stand improvement, access roads, and the application of modern management and sale techniques.

The principal action that remains to bring wood building materials availability into line with national housing goals is positive action by the Congress. It would be paradoxical indeed if those of us who strove to hammer out a workable national housing law were to fail now to make available from Federal lands the timber necessary to make that law workable.

I therefore endorse the National Timber Supply Act proposed by the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Senator from Alabama and supported by the ranking minority Member, the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT).

I shall work for passage of this measure which holds the key to realization of our national housing goals. Unless we solve the problem of material supply which is now upon us we shall never be able to realize the promise of the Housing Act of 1968. Availability of housing for our people is a national obligation. We must act positively to rebuild America's homes and communities and we must do it now.

As Senator BENNETT has so ably pointed out, there are two provisions of this bill that concern me.

Making expenditures from the trust fund contingent upon annual congressional appropriations would undermine the theory of a trust fund. The problem in the past in obtaining adequate timber supply from Federal lands has been this very lack of congressional appropriations. I believe that Congress could well limit itself to the legislative oversight function.

The provision that allocations of funds from the trust fund be in proportion to receipts contributed from each national

forest seems backwards. This would mean that those forests that are well managed would receive the bulk of the funds, but those that are undeveloped would not receive assistance.

I believe that these problems can be corrected in the committee and therefore endorse this step to help meet the urgent lumber needs so vital to the success of the Nation's housing program.

S. 1836—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL SEED ACT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I offer, for consideration and appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal Seed Act to establish uniform standards for certification of seed moving in interstate or international commerce.

The legislation which I propose would require that the certification be accorded only by an agency specifically authorized by a State, territory or possession for that purpose and which operates under standards and procedures approved by the Secretary of Agriculture to assure genetic purity and identity of the seed certified.

Certification for international commerce under my amendment could be made only by an agency of a foreign country determined by the Secretary to be adhering to standards comparable to those set for domestic certification.

Advertising or labeling of seed as certified which has not been approved by such a qualified agency would be prohibited under the amendment.

The need for uniform standards seems obvious in light of the vast volume of seed now moving in interstate or international commerce and which under existing law might meet the standards set by one State or country but be unacceptable in another area. Uniformity would also better protect the interests of both seed producers and consumers.

My proposal has the endorsement of the Association of Official Seed Certifying Agencies, the American Seedman's Association, and the North Carolina Crop Improvement Association and will, I believe, be favorably received by the Department of Agriculture.

I sincerely hope that it will be adopted.

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

The bill (S. 1836) to amend the Federal Seed Act (93 Stat. 1275), as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 1846—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL—REVISION OF SYSTEM OF NOMINATIONS TO THE U.S. SERVICE ACADEMIES

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to revise the system of nominations to the U.S. service academies.

Joining me as cosponsors of this legislation are Senators EAGLETON, HART, HUGHES, KENNEDY, MOSS, PACKWOOD, PELL, PERCY, RIBICOFF, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YARBOROUGH.

Basically, the bill does nothing but eliminate Members of Congress from participation in the academies' selection process. Authority for nominating is transferred to the appropriate Secretaries of the armed services, who will select candidates based on geographical distribution and admission standards established by them in cooperation with the academic boards of the various academies.

I introduce this bill, because I can see no substantial reason—which I have not been able to see since I came to Congress—to justify the role which Members of Congress presently play in the academies' admissions procedures.

I firmly believe that every young man in this country should have an equal opportunity to attend one of the service academies and admission should be based solely on the merit of each applicant's qualifications. Establishment of uniform standards by the academies themselves would be the best means of assuring the acceptance of the best qualified candidates.

Aside from insuring the high quality of our future military leaders, however, a more strictly competitive selection process would be more equitable to the applicants themselves. Under the present system, a Member of Congress can make a principal nomination, and if the applicant passes his examination, he is appointed. An alternate nominee, however, who might score much higher on the examination will be rejected unless the principal fails. In the new system, all candidates will compete on an equal footing.

In surrendering our congressional prerogative in these appointments, we shall lose the opportunity to reward outstanding young people from the areas we represent in the Congress. I am well aware that we shall probably lose some political advantages, but will gain much more. Until very recently, we held the same special right or privilege of appointment with regard to post office positions. But these procedures within the Post Office Department have now been reformed on the basis that politics has no rightful place in the efficient operation of our postal service. Leadership of the armed services is, of course, even more crucial, and politics has no place in the selection of our military leaders.

We can no longer afford the luxury of the risk inherent in a procedure where others than the best qualified may be appointed to our service academies. The danger in this system is best illustrated by the fact that Gen. George C. Marshall entered the career military service through the back door as he was denied an appointment to West Point because of political differences between his father and his Congressman.

I believe, Mr. President, that maintaining the obsolete system of congressional nominations and appointments to the U.S. service academies is totally unjustifiable. It undermines efficiency. It promotes inequity. It defies logic.

I hope it will be possible for the Senate to take prompt and favorable action on this legislation.

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

The bill (S. 1846) to revise the system of congressional nominations for appointments to the U.S. Military Academy, the U.S. Naval Academy, and the U.S. Air Force Academy, introduced by Mr. DODD (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1849—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I desire to introduce a piece of legislation which I hope will be helpful in the present discussion about adequacy and availability of medicare, medicaid, and the Kerr-Mills legislation.

Many States—including New Mexico—have been driven to the wall by the fantastic costs of medicaid. Other States, which do not now have medicaid, are apprehensive over their prospective entry into the program. States must have medicaid programs by January 1, 1970, or else become ineligible for Federal matching funds toward any medical vendor payment expenditures.

There are a number of reasons for the present chaos in medicaid. Certainly the investigation now being conducted into medicaid as well as medicare, by the Finance Committee will help pinpoint many of the specific trouble spots. But the principal problems have already surfaced; namely, we are frequently paying too much for too many kinds of care for too many people.

Costs have assumed stratospheric proportions for one thing because liberalized reimbursement procedures for medical and other services under medicaid have been accompanied by almost geometric jumps in the costs of hospital, nursing home, medical and dental care.

Under present law a State which does not as yet have medicaid cannot enter the program as carefully as it might want to—it cannot test the medicaid water with a cautious foot. Under present law States which have had their medicaid programs immerse them in water far over their heads face obstacles in trying to reach a point where they can stand up.

My own State of New Mexico is now going through an agonizing period of fiscal crisis and indecision brought about by the costs of a medicaid program which far exceeded cost estimates and appropriations. New York, Massachusetts, and other States have undergone and are undergoing this same fiscal frustration. Confronted with this situation our legislature voted to drop the whole program. They authorized reentry into medicaid at a later date but only on the most minimal basis necessary to qualify for Federal matching funds.

But even this most minimal basis poses problems for New Mexico. Under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's interpretation of section 1902 (c) of the Social Security Act, New Mex-

ico cannot exclude from its medicaid plan any of the medical or other health services which it provided under its most liberal programs for any category of welfare recipients prior to medicaid. Furthermore, under that section it cannot even limit the extent of a service previously provided. For example, if New Mexico covered all prescribed drugs for people on welfare before it entered medicaid it cannot now say that we will exclude tranquilizers or aspirin or what-have-you.

This means New Mexico is locked into the program with a vengeance. It cannot modify or adjust its medicaid plan to meet changing needs or available funds.

Mr. President, the legislation which I will introduce today repeals section 1902(c). States will thereby gain breathing room. They can still have broad programs and secure full Federal matching funds—but they will not be required to have such programs. States will still be required to provide five basic services: inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital care, other laboratory and X-ray services, skilled nursing home care; and physician services. They will not be required, however, if my amendment is adopted, to go beyond provision of those services.

A related provision is also repealed by my amendment. Section 1903(e) says that States may not receive Federal matching for medicaid now unless they are moving now in the direction of providing comprehensive care and services and liberalized eligibility requirements by 1975 including coverage of people not even eligible for Federal matching payments. A number of States view this provision as mandated bankruptcy no later than 1975.

Repeal of those two provisions will in no way reduce the amounts available to any State in the form of Federal matching payments. This amendment is designed simply to give our 50 States an opportunity to determine what kind of medicaid program they are capable of financing.

Mr. President, I ask that this bill be received and appropriately referred. I sincerely hope this urgent and emergency proposal will be acted upon promptly and favorably by Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred. The bill (S. 1849) to amend title 19 of the Social Security Act to permit States greater flexibility in establishing and modifying medicaid plans, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1856—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL—NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as ranking Republican on the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I am happy to introduce on behalf of the administration, for appropriate reference, the National Science Foundation Act of 1969.

After careful deliberation, Congress revised the National Science Foundation's organic statute by the passage of Public Law 90-407 in July 1968. The act assigned new areas of responsibility to the Foundation, including the authorization to initiate and support applied research in academic institutions; broadened authority for carrying out certain important activities in international science and computers for research and education; and strengthened the Foundation's organizational structure.

Congress also opened new pathways of communication between the executive and legislative branches by requiring an annual report from the National Science Board, and by providing for specific authorizations for future Foundation appropriations.

In accordance with this new legislative framework, Mr. President, the bill I am introducing today to authorize appropriations for the Foundation for fiscal year 1970 is the first bill submitted to Congress under this new act. It is my hope that authorization hearings will follow promptly and that these hearings will not only provide an improved information channel, but will also create better understanding.

In the course of its 19 years of existence the National Science Foundation has evolved a complex and interlocking system of support mechanisms for obtaining scientific information through scientific research and science education and by improving and upgrading science facilities and institutions.

The purposes of this system, in the broadest sense, are to promote the progress of science and to advance the national welfare through the search for new knowledge and the training of scientific manpower. These objectives of the science and education enterprise are of unique importance to our whole society, both today and for the future.

However, the benefits and opportunities to our society generated through support of science and education also create new problems. Accordingly, it is intended that Congress, through its annual hearings on authorizations for the Foundation, will evaluate and examine in detail the programs proposed by the Foundation to implement its continuing and newly authorized responsibilities.

Because this is the first appropriation authorization under the new act, Mr. President, it seems desirable to provide funding authorization for but 1 year, in keeping with past annual appropriation procedures in similar situations. Furthermore, since it is important to allow the Foundation the maximum degree of flexibility and discretion in using its resources to best fulfill its mandate—an authority it has had in the past—the bill provides an authorization for the general purposes of the Foundation.

As we gain more experience under the new act, Mr. President, Congress can determine whether this broad coverage adequately meets its legislative purposes or whether more detailed provisions are needed in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill and a section-by-section

analysis of this measure be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 1856) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, 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:

S. 1856

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, to enable it to carry out its powers and duties under the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended, and under title IX of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, \$487,000,000.

SEC. 2. Appropriations made pursuant to authority provided in section 1 shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure, for such period or periods as may be specified in Acts making such appropriations.

SEC. 3. Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

SEC. 4. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

SEC. 5. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Act of 1969".

The analysis, presented by Mr. PROUTY, follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

SECTION I

This section authorizes NSF appropriations for FY 1970 in the amount of \$487 million. This authorization conforms to the totals shown in the President's budget presentation except that funds in the amount of \$20,000,000 which appear in the budget are not included in this bill because the money is available from prior appropriations. It does not include authorization for appropriations under the National Sea Grant College and Program Act of 1966 which has already been authorized for FY 1970.

SECTION II

This section provides that when specified in an Appropriation Act, amounts appropriated may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

SECTION III

This section authorizes an allowance of up to \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses to be authorized at the discretion of the Director.

SECTION IV

This section authorizes, in addition to the funds appropriated by Section I, an appropriation of up to \$3 million for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred

outside of the United States, to be financed from foreign currencies which are determined by the Treasury Department to be in excess of the normal operating requirements of the United States Government. These funds would be spent in foreign countries to support programs mutually determined by NSF and the State Department to be in the interests of improving international relations through scientific endeavor.

SECTION V

This section cites the title of the Authorization Act.

S. 1859—INTRODUCTION OF THE CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL ACT OF 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to establish the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park in Maryland and the District of Columbia.

This legislation would give proper status and full recognition to the historic 185-mile Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. It would expand the canal property enough to permit the full development of its vast recreational potential, the restoration and interpretation of its historic assets, and the conservation and protection of its great scenic and natural resources.

Toward these goals, the bill establishes a framework for cooperative action by the Secretary of the Interior, State and local governments, and private individuals and groups, under the general guidance of a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission, to include representatives of the basin States and the counties through which the canal runs.

I am introducing this bill today as a vehicle for concrete discussion and as a starting point for the action which should not be further delayed. Next weekend, for example, the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Association, which has worked for over 15 years to rescue the canal, is holding its annual reunion and hike. The Secretary of the Interior is now reviewing many projects before submitting park proposals to Congress. Next week the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments will be meeting with the Secretary to discuss many significant possibilities. Meanwhile, citizens groups throughout the basin have been meeting to refine their thinking, review alternatives, and shape concrete recommendations and priorities for action.

The last several years have been ones of great activity and discussion in the Potomac Basin. We have gained a new public appreciation of the basin's vast resources—ample water, beautiful and varied scenery, fish and wildlife, open space, and more than 300 years of history. We have focused public attention on the problems of pollution, rapid population growth, and haphazard development which have already created severe problems in the Washington metropolitan area, and have already begun to spread into the upper and lower basin as well.

Most important, we have gained a new

sense of urgency. The time to act is now. We will not have another chance.

From my many discussions with basin officials and citizens, I have sensed growing agreement that a comprehensive program for the Potomac should be based on several principles. These emerge from the character of the basin, its long history of human activity, and the tradition of cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments and the citizens who have so often taken the lead in basin conservation.

As I enunciated these principles in January, they include:

First, immediate restoration, protection, and improvement of valuable properties, such as the C. & O. Canal, which are already in public ownership;

Second, a well-financed, farsighted attack on the many forms of water pollution which plague the river;

Third, a framework which recognizes citizen initiatives and local and State governments' roles, as well as the Federal interest, and gives all parties an active voice in planning and administration;

Fourth, a park structure which is compatible with other present and future efforts in the basin, such as the proposed water resources compact, State recreational plans, and the activities of regional groups, and will encourage cooperation rather than competition; and

Fifth, imaginative use of many land conservation and protection methods, such as easements, zoning, and private voluntary action, with incentives for local action.

The bill I am introducing today is intended to advance the first of these objectives, by establishing the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park to meet immediate recreational and conservation needs and provide a central strand for more comprehensive, cooperative park development. I want to emphasize that this bill is only a first step—but it is a step which, from all indications, the vast majority of basin residents and governments support. Given this backing, I believe that this work should go forward now, even as we continue to design more comprehensive plans for meeting the basin's long-range needs.

Given the current economic condition of the Nation, this is one of the few park initiatives which can realistically be undertaken at this moment. The hour is tailor-made for the project, and the project is tailor-made for the hour.

Mr. President, I believe that development of the canal should not wait until the millenium when all of the divergent interests and groups in the basin come together behind one grand master design. By the same token, I believe that other works should continue—and indeed be accelerated—while we seek congressional and public consideration of canal legislation.

As one basin official, I am continuing my review of many ways to meet the needs of the Potomac and its estuary, to combine and refine the best thinking of all interested governments and the public, and to employ all of our energies

and resources not only to save the Potomac, but to insure its future health.

I shall be speaking on these questions in the coming weeks. Meanwhile, I shall seek prompt congressional hearings and wide public discussion of this bill.

I ask unanimous consent to include the text of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Act of 1969 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. 1859) to establish and develop the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MATHIAS, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1859

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Act of 1969."

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) "Park" means the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, as herein established.

(b) "Canal" means the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal, including its towpath.

(c) "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(d) "State" means any State, and includes the District of Columbia.

(e) "Local government" means any political subdivision of a State, including a county, municipality, city, town, or a school or other special district created pursuant to State law.

(f) "Person" means any individual, partnership, corporation, private nonprofit organization, or club.

(g) "Landowner" means any person, local government, or State owning, or on reasonable grounds professing to own, lands or interests in lands adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Park.

Sec. 3. (a) In order to realize the full potential of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal for public recreational use and enjoyment, and to preserve, restore and interpret the historic, scenic and natural features of the Canal, there is hereby established the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park, in the States of Maryland and West Virginia and in the District of Columbia. The park as initially established shall comprise those particular properties in Federal ownership, containing approximately five thousand two hundred and fifty acres, including those properties along the line of the Canal in the State of Maryland and appurtenances in the State of West Virginia designated by Presidential proclamation No. 3391 (75 Stat. 1023) as the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument, and those properties along the line of the Canal between Rock Creek in the District of Columbia and the terminus of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Monument near the mouth of Seneca Creek in the State of Maryland. The park shall also include such additional lands and interests in lands as may be acquired by the Secretary pursuant to this Act.

(b) The Secretary is hereby authorized to acquire through donation, purchase, easement, lease for terms of up to fifty years, or exchange such lands and interests in lands adjacent to or in the vicinity of the park as he deems appropriate for development and expansion of public recreational facilities, for the restoration and interpretation of ma-

for historical and engineering features of the Canal, and for the protection of scenic and natural values: *Provided*, That the total land area of such park, including land already in Federal ownership, shall not exceed fifteen thousand acres.

(c) In keeping with the purposes of this Act, the Secretary is authorized to convey such lands presently in Federal ownership which may be determined surplus to the needs of the park in exchange for other lands or interests therein of approximately equal value, except that in no instance may the continuity of the canal be interrupted. The Secretary may accept cash from or pay cash to the grantor in such an exchange in order to equalize the values of the properties exchanged.

(d) Any portion of the lands and interests in lands comprising the park shall be made available upon specific Federal statutory authorization for public nonpark uses when such uses shall have been found to have a greater public necessity than the uses authorized by this Act.

Sec. 4. (a) As soon as possible after the enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with appropriate local authorities, shall initiate a comprehensive title search and survey to determine the exact boundaries of the Federal lands initially comprising the park. The results of said search and survey, with accompanying maps, shall be made available for public inspection, and the Secretary shall allow the public at least one hundred and twenty days to comment on or question any of the findings, and shall attempt to resolve any conflicts before filing the results of the survey with the Administrator of the General Services Administration.

(b) Nothing in this section shall preclude or restrict a landowner or the Secretary in seeking adjudication or resolution of conflicting claims to land in connection with any donation, purchase, easement, lease, exchange or agreement authorized by this Act.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary is authorized to enter into cooperative programs and agreements with persons, local governments and States to carry out and promote the purposes of this Act, including public recreation, historic restoration and interpretation, conservation of agricultural or forest lands, preservation of scenic values, wildlife propagation, and related objectives.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall take into account local and State development, land use, conservation and recreational plans affecting or relating to areas in the vicinity of the canal, and shall, consistent with the purposes of this Act, exercise the authority granted by this Act in a manner that will not conflict with such local or State plans.

Sec. 6. (a) The enactment of this Act shall not affect adversely any valid rights heretofore existing, or any valid permits heretofore issued, within or relating to areas authorized for inclusion in the park.

(b) The authority granted in the Act of August 1, 1953 (67 Stat. 359), to grant easements for rights-of-way through, over, or under lands along the line of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal is hereby continued and shall hereafter be exercised by the Secretary with respect to lands included in the park.

(c) Where privately owned lands are located between the park and the Potomac River, the owners of those lands shall have access to their lands, subject only to such restrictions or requirements as the Secretary may find essential to the preservation and sound management of the park.

(d) Authority is hereby granted for individuals to cross the park by foot and by the most direct route at any point for the purpose of gaining access to the Potomac River or to non-park lands for hunting pur-

poses, in accord with State law, provided that while such individuals are on park lands firearms are unloaded, bows are unstrung, and dogs are on leash.

Sec. 7. (a) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the Secretary shall administer the park under the general laws and requirements governing areas of the national park system, in such manner as to advance the purposes of this Act: *Provided*, That the Secretary, after consultation with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission established by section 8 of this act, may make such modifications and changes in the general regulations and requirements as are within his statutory discretion, and are made appropriate or necessary by the unique character of the park.

(b) No fees shall be charged by the Secretary for public day use of the park for recreational purposes.

Sec. 8. (a) There is hereby established a Chesapeake and Ohio Canal National Historical Park Commission (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission").

(b) The Commission shall be composed of twenty-one members appointed for terms of five years each, as follows:

(1) Eight members to be appointed by the boards of commissioners or the county councils, as the case may be, of Montgomery, Frederick, Washington, and Allegany Counties, Maryland, two members to be appointed by each such board or council, as the case may be.

(2) Eight members to be appointed by the Governor of the State of Maryland, the Governor of the State of West Virginia, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, two members to be appointed by each such Governor or Commissioner, as the case may be.

(3) Five members to be appointed by the Secretary, at least three of whom shall be members of regularly constituted conservation organizations, and one of whom shall be designated Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) A member of the Commission shall serve without compensation. The Secretary is authorized to pay, upon vouchers signed by the Commission, the expenses reasonably incurred by the Commission and its members in carrying out their responsibilities under this Act.

(e) The Secretary shall, from time to time but at least semiannually, meet with, report to and consult with the Commission on general policies and specific matters related to the development and administration of the park. The Secretary shall also consult with the Commission before establishing any regulations or requirements of general applicability pursuant to section 6 or 7(a) of this Act.

(f) The Commission may advise and consult with other Federal agencies, State agencies, local governments and persons on matters relating to public recreation, historic preservation and interpretation, scenic protection, wildlife propagation, and conservation and protection of natural resources, including water resources, within and in the vicinity of the park.

(g) The Commission shall act and advise by affirmative vote of a majority of the members thereof.

(h) (1) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission shall not be considered as service bringing such individual within the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, or 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) The exemption granted by paragraph (1) of this subsection shall not extend—

(i) To the receipt or payment of salary in connection with the appointee's government service from any sources other than the private employer of the appointee at the time of his appointment; or

(ii) during the period of such appointment, and the further period of two years after the termination thereof, to the prosecution or participation in the prosecution, by any person so appointed, of any claim against the United States involving any matter concerning which the appointee had any responsibility arising out of his appointment during the period of such appointment.

Sec. 9. (a) Any funds that may be available for purposes of Administration of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal property may hereafter be used by the Secretary for the purposes of the park.

(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

S. 1867—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE IN CONNECTION WITH THE ADOPTION OF A CHILD

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill which would allow a taxpayer who adopts a child to receive a deduction from gross income for the medical, legal, and other expenses incurred in the adoption process. As you are aware, natural parents are permitted to deduct the medical expenses incurred in the birth of their child. Since their expenses are often substantial, the natural parents of a child often receive a sizable deduction. The costs of adopting a child have risen steadily and according to recent figures, it is not unlikely that these costs are becoming prohibitive and discouraging many from the adoption of a child. Since parents are permitted to deduct the medical costs, related to the birth of their child, I believe that adoptive parents should be given equal treatment to that afforded natural parents. Therefore, this measure would permit a maximum deduction of \$1,000 for expenses incurred in the adoption of a child.

I also believe that the passage of this measure will facilitate the placement of homeless children in adoptive homes. Not only is there a need for a child to have a home of his own, but the costs of raising a child in foster homes and in State and local government institutions are steadily rising. This measure, I believe, will partially help to accelerate the placement process for homeless children and reduce some costs incurred by State and local government agencies.

My bill is a companion measure to that introduced by Representative ZABLOCKI. He has received the endorsement of a large number of adoption agencies throughout the Nation for his proposal. I am hopeful that during the consideration of tax reform proposals by this Congress, serious study be given to this measure.

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

The bill (S. 1867) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a deduction from gross income for social agency, legal, and related expenses incurred in connection with the adoption

of a child by the taxpayer, introduced by Mr. INOUE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1872—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO REPEAL THE EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to repeal title II—the emergency detention provision—of the Internal Security Act of 1950, popularly called the McCarran Act.

Title II of the Internal Security Act gives the President the power to proclaim an "internal security emergency" in the event of any of the following: First, invasion of the territory of the United States or its possessions; second, declaration of war by Congress; and third, insurrection within the United States in aid of a foreign enemy. Following the declaration of an internal security emergency, title II gives the President or his agent the power to detain persons "if there is reasonable ground to believe that such a person will engage in or probably will with others engage in acts of espionage or sabotage." Following the person's arrest, title II details the procedures for the continued detention of a person. Generally, this course of action is at odds with normal judicial procedure.

As you may remember, the Internal Security Act of 1950 became law over President Truman's veto. In referring to the great majority of the provisions of this act, President Truman declared that they "would strike blows at our own liberties." Title II, I believe, violates a number of our established freedoms and constitutional rights. The procedures detailed in the act are at odds with our established judicial procedures.

In addition, widespread rumors have circulated throughout our Nation that the Federal Government is readying concentration camps to be filled with those who hold unpopular views and beliefs. These rumors are widely circulated and believed in our urban ghettos. Additional credence was added by a House Un-American Activities report of May 1968, which contained a recommendation for the possible use of these detention camps for certain black nationalists and Communists. Many dissidents in our society fear the use of title II. It stands as a barrier of trust between some people and our Government. As President Truman stated in his veto message:

It is not enough to say that this probably would not be done. The mere fact that it could be done shows clearly how the bill would open a Pandora's box of opportunities for official condemnation of organizations and individuals for perfectly honest opinions . . .

Many would respond to these rumors of concentration camps with the refrain "This couldn't happen in America." However, in times of stress and crisis American justice has not always withstood these pressures. I am naturally reminded that during World War II, 109,650 Americans of Japanese ancestry were arrested, their property confiscated and were detained in various "relocation camps" for most of World War II.

The constitutionality of title II of the McCarran Act, unlike that of title I, has never been tested in the courts. It is believed by most lawyers that someone must be detained under this title before there is just cause for judicial review. Therefore, I propose that it is the Congress' responsibility to repeal title II, and I am introducing this measure to accomplish this purpose.

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

The bill (S. 1872) to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950 (title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950) introduced by Mr. INOUE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1878, S. 1879, S. 1880, S. 1881, S. 1882, S. 1883, S. 1884, AND S. 1885—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS TO AMEND THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today I am introducing, by request, six legislative proposals submitted to the Congress by the Atomic Energy Commission. Five of these bills would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954; a sixth would authorize appropriations to the AEC for fiscal year 1970.

The five AEC bills to amend the Atomic Energy Act were all submitted to the Congress early in this session in exactly their present form. However, because the new administration had not had an opportunity to review and approve them, I refrained from introducing these bills at the time of their submission. I am now informed that the new administration supports these measures. The five bills would amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to accomplish the following:

Provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, and to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and other offenses;

Authorize the AEC to enter into agreements of indemnification for ocean transport of materials;

Modify the requirement for mandatory review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards of certain facility license applications;

Eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial and certain research and development licenses for facilities;

Authorize the imposition of civil monetary penalties.

The sixth AEC proposal—a bill to authorize appropriations to the Commission in fiscal year 1970—was also submitted earlier this session. Again, however, because the bill did not have the approval of the new administration, I refrained from introducing it. I am now informed that the bill, with certain amendments made by the new administration as a result of its budgetary review, has been approved for submission to Congress.

Finally, Mr. President, I am also introducing today two measures identical

to bills which I introduced in the last session of Congress but on which no final action was taken. These bills are not being introduced by request; they represent my views and those of any others who have joined with me in co-sponsoring the measures. One bill, which I have introduced for myself and Senators ANDERSON and BENNETT, would amend the Atomic Energy Act to authorize the AEC to make peaceful nuclear explosion services available on a commercial basis. A companion measure—H.R. 477—was introduced in the other body on January 3, 1969, under the joint sponsorship of Representatives HOSMER, HOLIFIELD, PRICE of Illinois, ASPINALL, YOUNG, BATES, ANDERSON of Illinois, and MCCULLOCH.

The other bill, which I have introduced on my own behalf, would amend the enforcement provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Among other things, the bill would effect corrective amendments to certain penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act which are necessitated by last year's Supreme Court decision in United States against Jackson; increase the criminal penalties which may be imposed under the act for diversion of special nuclear materials; and confer on the AEC authority to impose civil penalties for certain violations of the act or regulations issued pursuant thereto. In the interest of time I will not elaborate on the purport of this legislation today, but do ask unanimous consent to have included at this point in the RECORD the explanatory statement which I made on the floor of the Senate on August 1, 1968, when I first introduced this measure.

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

The bills (S. 1878) to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; introduced by Mr. PASTORE, (S. 1879) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to provide that life imprisonment shall be the maximum criminal penalty for certain offenses, to increase the criminal penalties for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material and related offenses, and for other purposes; (S. 1880) to amend section 170 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1881) to amend section 182 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1882) to amend chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; (S. 1883) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to eliminate the requirement for a finding of practical value and abolish the distinction between commercial licenses for facilities and certain research and development licenses for facilities and for other purposes; and (S. 1884) to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. PASTORE, by request, and (S. 1885) to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for

other purposes, introduced by Mr. PASTORE (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

The material, presented by Mr. PASTORE, follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 114, pt. 19, pp. 24620-24621]

AMENDMENTS TO ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, today I introduced a bill to amend various sections of Chapter 18 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, the enforcement chapter of that Act. I believe it would be helpful if I briefly explained the principal purposes of the proposed legislation and why these amendments are being offered.

One major purpose of the bill is to correct shortcomings in Chapter 18 brought about by the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *United States v. Jackson*, 36 L.W. 4277 (April 8, 1968). It was there held that the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act is unconstitutional because in permitting imposition of the death penalty only upon defendants who assert their right to be tried by a jury, it discourages assertion of, and thereby imposes an impermissible burden upon the exercise of, a constitutional right.

This decision would appear to hold significant implications for, and raise very substantial questions about, somewhat similar provisions in sections 222, 224 a., 225 and 226 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. These sections provide that where there is a violation thereof with intent to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to a foreign nation, there may be imposed punishment by a fine of not more than \$20,000 or imprisonment for not more than 20 years, or both, or, upon the recommendation of a jury, life imprisonment or death.

These penalty provisions of the Atomic Energy Act and the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act operate in the same manner; therefore, the effect of the *Jackson* decision on the former would appear to be similar to its effect on the latter. Indeed, in certain respects the decision has more far-reaching effects on the Atomic Energy Act inasmuch as both the life imprisonment penalty as well as the death penalty provided for therein are contingent upon a jury recommendation, whereas only the death penalty provision of the Federal Kidnapping Act was affected by the *Jackson* decision.

The bill which I have introduced would retain the life imprisonment penalty in the affected sections, but delete the capital punishment penalty and the requirement for a specific recommendation by the jury before the maximum penalty prescribed may be imposed upon an offender. As my colleagues are aware, the question of whether capital punishment for Federal crimes should be abolished by general legislation (S. 1760) is one that is now under active consideration within the Congress. However, I do not believe that necessary corrections to sections of the Atomic Energy Act dealing with penalties for offenses committed with intent to injure the United States or with intent to secure an advantage to a foreign nation should await enactment of this general legislation. Nor do I believe the legislative branch should continue to await the recommendations of the executive branch as to whether, and, if so, what amendments are necessary to effect corrections to sections of the Atomic Energy Act dealing, among other

things, with the theft by foreign agents of highly sensitive atomic information. Therefore, I have introduced the minimum amendments required to give effect to the intent of Congress presently reflected in the sections of the Atomic Energy Act thrown into serious question by the *Jackson* decision, but at the same time striking therefrom the provision for capital punishment which has never been—and in all probability never would be—employed.

A second principal purpose of my bill is to amend section 222 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to increase the criminal penalties which could be imposed for unauthorized diversion of special nuclear material, and for certain related offenses. This material is the principal ingredient in nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. However, if a willful diversion of this material were committed by a person in this country under circumstances where the Government was unable to prove that the person charged specifically intended to injure the United States or to secure an advantage to any foreign nation, the maximum penalty which could be imposed under section 222 would be a fine of \$10,000 and imprisonment for 5 years. Thus, a thief, a terrorist, an insurrectionist, or a criminal group might commit such a diversion and, in the absence of proof of the requisite intent, would be subject to a maximum penalty under section 222 of imprisonment for 5 years and a \$10,000 fine. For example, if the diversion were made for financially rewarding criminal purposes rather than out of political motivation, or if the unlawful sale were to the agent of an undisclosed principal and the unidentified principal was a foreign nation, the specific intent to injure the United States or gain an advantage to a foreign power might well be lacking. Section 1 of my bill would amend section 222 to increase from five to ten years the maximum imprisonment for such willful violations of the section. No increase in the maximum fine appears necessary.

An Ad Hoc Advisory Panel on Safeguarding Special Nuclear Material appointed by the Atomic Energy Commission in 1967 pointed up the weakness of the Act in this regard and recommended that it be amended to increase the penalties for unauthorized diversion of such material. The Panel noted that the maximum penalties presently provided for "... may not be a sufficient deterrent to illicit transactions involving materials valued in excess of millions of dollars. . . ." and observed, "The threat of detection and more severe criminal penalties should help deter organizations and individuals from attempting to divert materials to unauthorized uses." Moreover, increased maximum penalties for unauthorized diversion of these materials would make them more nearly comparable to those for crimes of similar gravity.

A third principal purpose of this proposed legislation is to confer on the Atomic Energy Commission authority to impose civil penalties in addition to the Commission's present authority to modify, suspend, or revoke a license for violations of AEC health and safety regulatory requirements. Specifically, the bill would authorize the AEC to impose civil fines of up to \$2,500 for individual infractions, and not to exceed \$7,500 for two or more violations occurring within a 30-day period, of certain sections of the Atomic Energy Act and rules, regulations, orders, or licenses issued thereunder. I understand that similar authority to impose civil penalties is possessed by the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Department of Agriculture, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.

It is not my intent in introducing this legislation to in any way suggest that serious

violations of the Act or of rules, regulations, orders or licenses issued thereunder are to be penalized by a mere fine. I particularly do not mean to suggest this where the violation is one involving health and safety matters. I do believe, however, that in some instances the revocation of a license or suspension thereof may be too harsh a penalty under the circumstances. Moreover, in certain cases a suspension may penalize the licensee's employees through loss of income without having any significant impact on the licensee itself. At the present time, the AEC in such cases essentially must choose between issuing a revocation or suspension order, on the one hand, or, on the other, issuing a cease and desist order which is little more than a direction to a licensee to refrain from doing whatever it was that the Commission found objectionable. Injunctions may also be obtained in appropriate cases, but here again the enforcement action may be out of all proportion to the infraction. For these reasons the imposition of a fine may be the more appropriate enforcement action in some cases.

Conferring on the AEC authority to impose civil fines, while at the same time retaining the authority to impose more severe penalties either in lieu of or in addition to a civil fine, should afford the Commission ample flexibility to deal with infractions of varying severity. I believe the AEC should have such authority. I also believe the Commission wants such authority. When queried about the matter in 1967 the Commission indicated that it was then preparing proposed legislation along these general lines for submission to the Congress. Apparently due to the inevitable delays involved in the administrative review process no such legislative proposal has as yet been cleared for submission to the Congress by the executive branch. For this reason, and in view of the limited time remaining for congressional consideration of such legislation during this session of Congress, I have included language in section 4 of my bill designed to accomplish the intended purpose.

S. 1896—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE EYE, EAR, AND DENTAL CARE UNDER MEDICARE PART B

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I am introducing today on behalf of myself, Senator HART, Senator MOSS, Senator RANDOLPH, and Senator YOUNG of Ohio, a bill which would bring under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged the areas of eye, hearing, and dental care. It will include the provision of eyeglasses, hearing aids, and dentures where they are needed, as well as the necessary attendant examinations and treatment of other conditions related to these. Under the supplementary medical insurance program for the aged, popularly known as part B of Medicare, individuals are voluntarily enrolled for monthly premiums of \$4 at present, matched by payments from the general treasury. For these sums, amounting to a premium of \$48 per year paid by each covered individual, benefits provided cover, in the language of the law, "medical and other health services." These are defined explicitly in 11 numbered items under section 1861(s), and they include among other things the services of physicians, X-ray and laboratory tests,

rental of wheelchairs and hospital beds, and so on.

But there are also some important exclusions to the items for which the separate trust fund for this program—the "Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund," to use the full name—will pay. Under "exclusions" are listed specifically three areas of health care of very considerable importance to the elderly. Indeed, these three areas of affliction are all, by testimony of the Public Health Service, more common in those over 65 than in any other age group. These are the areas of eye, hearing, and dental care. Yet, although their incidence is more frequent in the elderly, the elderly receive in proportion to these problems less care than other groups. The reason is plain—and it is the same reason which was pervasive when we adopted the part B program. That is simply that the costs are beyond the means of millions of those who are social security beneficiaries.

Let us look for a moment at the latest available statistics on the needs which my bill would care for. A February 1967 publication of the National Center for Health Statistics titled "Decayed, Missing, and Filled Teeth in Adults" reports data from the National Health Survey secured during the period 1960-62. Two factors appear to be at work here—age and income, and both of them work against the elderly.

Among those in the age range 25 to 44 the mean number of filled teeth is highest—averaging about eight per person. But for those over 65—and under 80—that average drops to about five. At the same time, the number of missing teeth increases from about eight to 19. These figures apply, of course, only to those in all ages who retain some of their own teeth. Another study in the same series, published October 1965, is perhaps even more significant. A survey of dental visits conducted during a 1-year period of 1963-64, shows that persons 25 to 44 go to the dentist more than twice as often as those over 65, even though it is apparent that the need is greater in the elderly. Part of the reason for less frequent visits, however, is that the elderly are most often those who have lost all their teeth—the survey estimates that 60 percent of those over 65 are in that category of the "edentulous." Many of these, and I am sure we all know some of them, are entirely without dentures and, because they can manage only soft foods, their general health is often impaired to some extent. Many others have a need for denture repairs or replacement of badly fitting dentures, but because of their income limitations go without seeing a dentist for these corrections.

That this is true is shown not only by the reduced number of dental visits among the elderly, but also by the much lower number of dental visits among the elderly, but also by the much lower number of dental visits by those with low incomes. For persons with family incomes of \$7,000 per year the incidence of visits to the dentists is more than twice that of persons with family incomes below

\$4,000. There is no need, in view of the common knowledge we have acquired in recent years as to the income status of the elderly, to cite statistics on that score; it is well known that the largest low-income group in the Nation is composed of the elderly, many of whom try to exist on nothing more than their social security income.

One more survey in the dental series deals with periodontal disease, which is the commonest cause of tooth loss when left unattended. Let me quote from the report, which discusses the proportion of the population with periodontal disease, or gingivitis which affects the gums and becomes ultimately a destroyer of the teeth:

Although at ages 19-24 years, for example, 70.9 percent of men and 63.2 percent of women already had either gingivitis or destructive disease, by ages 75-79 years the group with disease included as many as 93.7 percent of men and 80.1 percent of women.

The increase in severity with age was even more striking, with destructive disease far more likely to be encountered in older persons than in younger ones. Among both men and women 18-24 years of age who had periodontal disease, only about 15 percent had periodontitis. By ages 75-79, however, the percentage with obvious pocket formation had risen to 64.0 and 60.4 respectively.

These figures, it might be noted, apply only to those who still have some remaining teeth, not to those who have current dentures or denture needs.

A second area of need covered by my bill is that of eye care. Again, the basic facts are the same: it is the elderly who are in the greatest need because they have the greatest sight impairment, but because of their limited income they are far more likely to live with their disability rather than have it properly cared for to make their latter years as enjoyable as they might be. Again, data from the National Health Survey of 1963-65 reveals the facts.

Here the survey is quite specific:

About 56 percent of all cases of visual impairments were among persons with a family income of less than \$4,000. The high prevalence of visual defects among persons in the lower income groups was influenced by the older age composition of these population groups.

An accompanying chart shows that at the time of the survey 24.4 percent of those over 65 had incomes below \$3,000 and another 12 percent were under \$4,000. At the same time, the over-65 age group comprised nearly half—46.4 percent—of all those with visual impairment. I quote again:

The number of visually impaired persons per 1,000 population increased sharply with age. From a rate of 0.6 among young people under 25, the rate of severe visual impairments increased to 97.5 among persons 75 years and older. The corresponding rates for other visual impairments were from 6.9 to 77.4 and 131.3.

As may be judged from this wording, the study makes a distinction between "severe visual impairments" and "other visual impairments." The "severe" impairment means that glasses will still not give sufficient help to allow the reading

of ordinary newspaper print. In this group, more than 55 percent of those affected over 65 years of age have some degree of limitation of their activities as a result. In the Nation as a whole, there are an estimated 1,342,000 with the "severe" impairment, an average rate of 6.6 per 1,000 of the population; but as the citation shows, this jumps to 23.6 per thousand in the 65 to 74 age bracket and nearly one in 10 are among those over 75.

The leading cause of severe impairment among the elderly is the presence of cataracts, which is more than three times as frequent as in those under 65. In fact—and this figure may be surprising—nearly 40 percent of all visual impairments among those over 65 are due to cataracts. This, of course, is a condition which can be relieved by surgery at the proper stage, and such surgery is covered under the law as in any other surgery.

But—and this is an important part of the problem—it is obvious that a cataract must be diagnosed before it can be treated by surgery or otherwise. And at this point, the law leaves the expense of a diagnostic visit to the individual, without coverage under part B as I am proposing. Specifically excluded section 1862a7—are "procedures performed during the course of any eye examination to determine the refractive state of the eyes," as well as exclusion of expenses for "eyeglasses or eye examinations for the purpose of prescribing, fitting or changing eyeglasses."

The result is obvious: thousands of the elderly whose vision is impaired by cataracts do not know they have them and are thus barred from the treatment by surgery which the law provides. This is a situation which cries out for change. Providing the opportunity for the elderly to visit an ophthalmologist, or an optometrist under part B medicare would lead to the discovery and treatment of uncounted cases of cataract now undetected.

Quite unrelated to the problem of the patient in need of eye care, or at least of most importance from another viewpoint, is that of the present evasion of the law, which I am told by those in the profession, takes place on a fairly extensive scale. Some of the more sophisticated among those under medicare, or perhaps even more responsible for the situation are some in the ophthalmology profession, now secure eyeglasses at the expense of medicare by means of subterfuge. I have no notion how widespread the practice is, but I am sure that any doctor of ophthalmology will tell you that there are some who provide the excluded services but list their work as in the area of pathology and hence eligible for reimbursement because their claim states the patient has received eligible treatment for disease of the eye. Certainly it is understandable that a doctor in this field has a little difficulty making the distinction between diagnosing and treating a patient who comes to him with cataracts or glaucoma and prescribing glasses which will help the condition, even

though a refractory examination is outside the law's care provisions.

The third area in which my bill removes the present exclusion is that of hearing impairment. Actually, the rate of hearing impairment is considerably greater than that of visual impairment, although I venture that most people, seeing so many more eyeglasses than hearing aids in use, would be much surprised to know that fact. Whereas there are an estimated 5,390,000 persons in the Nation with eye problems at least severe enough to make them unable even with glasses to recognize a friend walking on the other side of the street, more than 8½ million have by their own or a family member's account in answering the health survey questions—"deafness or serious trouble hearing with one or both ears." The incidence per 1,000 of the population is, respectively, 28.8 for "all visual impairments" as defined and described earlier, and 45.7 for hearing impairments.

Again, the burden of this disability falls heaviest on the elderly. Indeed, in comparison to the rest of the population, this is an even greater problem for them, as the figures attest. Among those under 25 years of age the incidence of hearing impairment is only 9.5 per 1,000, but among those over 75 the figure is more than 33 times as great, 317.2 per 1,000 or nearly a third of all persons in that age bracket. The rate for those in the 65 to 74 bracket is less, but still more than 17 times the rate for the young, or 162.1 per 1,000. And again, there seems to be some statistical significance to the income factors:

Among persons under 65 years of age, those with a family income less than \$3,000 had a relatively high rate of hearing impairment. For persons with higher incomes, there were only slight differences between the rates of hearing loss . . . Among older persons, the rate of hearing impairment decreased steadily from 242.5 per 1,000 persons with a family income of less than \$3,000 to 173.3 per 1,000 with a family income of \$7,000-\$9,999.

There is little need to say more; the argument and the circumstances are all but identical with those concerning dental and eye care. Why should we retain the present exclusions in the medicare law? The only reason I can suggest is the one which time after time pulls up short our good intentions for increasing the national well-being—unless it is considered "essential" to our Military Establishment, no matter how minor its claim to necessity—and that is the cost.

There are presently under part B, paying in their monthly \$4—or rather, having it deducted from their social security checks—some 19½ million persons over 65. From the general funds of Government matches that amount, which totals thus nearly \$1¾ million. Estimates I have received from the Office of the Actuary in the Social Security Administration indicate that the cost of the three services I propose would run approximately \$750,000,000. Of this, \$500 million would go for dental care, \$150 million to meet visual problems, and \$100 million for hearing care. Under the pres-

ent financing, this would necessitate an increase in the cost to those electing part B, an increase from the present \$4 to approximately \$6 per month, with an equivalent increase in the Federal share. Consequently, and because I believe we should bear the burden through Federal financing rather than increasing the load of the social security beneficiary, my amendment also includes a change in the financing of part B from a 50-50 sharing to a one-third and two-thirds sharing. This would fully cover the additional financing for those covered without increasing the present \$4 as now fixed for fiscal 1970.

Mr. President, there is need for these three services, now excluded not on the basis of whether or not this is true but solely on the basis of whether or not their provision will cost more in an era when we are holding the budget line in a tight-fisted manner at every point.

It is the fervent hope of America that the great costs of Vietnam will be lifted at least in part with the earliest possible conclusion of active hostilities. But I would remind you that the \$750 million for which my bill calls is, after all, less than a day's cost for that war—more precisely, the cost of about 19 hours of that special expense. For that money we would be able to provide help to great numbers of the 4 million old persons who are hard of hearing, the 700,000 or so with a difficult visual impairment, and the vast numbers who need dental care they are not receiving. The benefit in improved health will be significant, the last years of our older citizens will be made less difficult and more endurable, and we will have come closer to completing the full package of health benefits under medicare's voluntary insurance program whose potential remains to this extent unfulfilled.

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

The bill (S. 1896) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. ALLEN) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 864), providing for the expansion of trade in manufactured products.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from

Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1290), to incorporate the College Benefit System of America.

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

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1076), to establish in the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. ANDERSON), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1520) to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers.

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

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1635) to exempt a member of the Armed Forces for service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. 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 names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), and the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1816) to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants for treatment and rehabilitation centers for drug addicts and drug abusers, and to carry out drug abuse education curriculum programs, and to strengthen the coordination of drug abuse control programs by establishing the National Council on Drug Abuse Control.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from

Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1384), to protect the freedom of choice of Federal employees in employee-management relations.

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

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1449), to provide for an appropriation of a sum not to exceed \$250,000 with which to make a survey of a proposed Golden Circle National Scenic Parkway complex connecting the national parks, monuments, and recreation areas in the southern parks, monuments, and recreation areas, monuments, and recreation areas situated in northern Arizona, northwestern New Mexico, and southwestern Colorado.

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

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S.J. Res. 70), to provide that the nuclear accelerator to be constructed at Weston, Ill., shall be named the "Enrico Fermi Nuclear Accelerator" in memory of the late Dr. Enrico Fermi.

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

RESTORATION OF FREDERICK DOUGLASS HOME AS A HISTORIC MUSEUM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am pleased to join the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) as a cosponsor of his bill, S. 835, to appropriate needed funds for the repair and refurbishing of the home of Frederick Douglass, a slave who rose to become one of the most distinguished Negroes of his day.

In 1962, Congress established the Douglass home, called Cedar Hill and located in Anacostia at the southeast edge of the District of Columbia, as part of the National Capital park system. It was the intent of Congress that Cedar Hill be restored, refurbished, and developed as a historic home museum. The \$25,000 which was originally authorized for this purpose, however, proved insufficient because of unanticipated hurricane and other damage to Cedar Hill. The Department of the Interior estimated, in August 1968, that full restoration would cost \$450,000, the sum which S. 835 would make possible.

I support the establishment of Cedar Hill as a historical museum so that Americans and visitors from abroad, who come to the Nation's Capital, can see the home of a man hailed as one of the most influential Negroes of his time. The paper he founded, the North Star, has been generally recognized as the most important newspaper demanding emancipation and elevation of the Negro before the Civil War. This great journalist, orator, and antislavery leader campaigned for the Presidency of Abraham

Lincoln, and later served him as an adviser. Douglass also served as Marshal and Recorder of Deeds in the District of Columbia, and in 1888 was appointed Minister of Haiti, a position he held for 2 years.

Frederick Douglass was never told the date of his birth, but in his adult life, he selected February as his birthday so that it would fall in the same week as that of Abraham Lincoln.

On February 4 of this year, I introduced legislation, Senate Joint Resolution 41, to designate Negro History Week as a national observance. Negro History Week, which has been celebrated locally in some communities since 1926, is observed during the 7-day period containing the birthdays of Lincoln and Douglass.

In further recognition, I am proud today to add my name to S. 835, legislation to make sure that Cedar Hill truly takes its place as one of the important historical landmarks of the Greater Washington area.

S. CON. RES. 19—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE EFFORTS OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA JAYCEES

Mr. THURMOND submitted, on behalf of himself and Mr. HOLLINGS, a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19) endorsing the efforts of the South Carolina Jaycees; which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. THURMOND, which appears under a separate heading.)

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 19—RESOLUTION ENDORSING EFFORTS OF SOUTH CAROLINA JAYCEES

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) a concurrent resolution; and I ask for its appropriate reference.

Mr. President, the Jaycees of my home State of South Carolina are currently engaged in a most noteworthy project which deserves the encouragement and support of the Congress. This project has as its goal the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States. The South Carolina Jaycees have begun by establishing a volunteer program aimed at seeking out illiterates and encouraging their enrollment in various existing adult education programs.

Although begun on a State level in South Carolina, the Jaycees in our State are asking the U.S. Jaycees to adopt this as a national project with the aim of reducing the number of adult illiterates from 8 million, which is the present number, to 4 million by 1980. This program has the widespread endorsement of leaders in Government and civic groups and in various religious denominations. It is an excellent example of private citizens working in a free society

to solve human problems. The financing of this project will be sought not from the Government but from the private sector.

Mr. President, I believe it is important that the South Carolina Jaycees receive all the encouragement we can give them in this worthwhile endeavor. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 19), which reads as follows, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

S. CON. RES. 19

Whereas, the South Carolina Jaycees have been engaged in a project that has as its aim the elimination of illiteracy by enrolling adults in established education programs; conducting a door to door education census; by organizing for those who cannot attend classes, volunteer literacy groups with a goal of "Each One Teach One"; and

Whereas, said project has the unqualified endorsement of that State's Department of Education, all existing education programs, leaders of all major religious denominations, numerous civic groups and public officials in that State; and

Whereas, funding of said project is being sought from the private sector of this Nation; and

Whereas, the South Carolina Jaycees will seek this month (March) to have said project adopted by the United States Jaycees with the aim of reducing by one-half the number of functional illiterates in this Nation by 1980, which number is now over eight million adults: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States of America, does hereby endorse, encourage and support said project.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEGISLATION

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, every Member of the Senate, together with all other citizens, is deeply troubled by the recent disastrous oil spill in the Santa Barbara Channel, and all of us are concerned that there should be no recurrence of such a tragedy.

The distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has sponsored proposed legislation, S. 1219, that would deal with the situation on both a short-term and a long-term basis. Senator CRANSTON's bill would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of 1953, under which the sea bottom lands on which the Santa Barbara leak occurred were leased by the Federal Government.

The bill that became the Outer Continental Shelf Act was considered and worked out by the Interior Committee in the 83d Congress, and quite properly the proposed legislation amending the act was referred to the Interior Committee.

On behalf of the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuel of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to announce that public hearings on S. 1219 have been scheduled for Tuesday, May 13, in the Interior Committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 o'clock.

Any interested Member of the Senate is invited to participate in these hearings, or to submit a statement. The Secretary of the Interior is being invited to present his views personally as are officials of California. Any spokesmen for other coastal States or private citizens who have pertinent information will of course be welcome.

It is requested that the committee staff be advised of witnesses who wish to appear in person at our hearings.

Problems connected with oil and gas operations in the offshore areas along our coasts are extremely complex, both technically and environmentally. On the one hand our country needs the oil, gas, and other minerals that are produced from them, and our National Treasury needs the revenues derived from these operations under our traditional American system of private enterprise.

At a recent executive briefing before the Interior Committee on operations under the Outer Shelf Act, Dr. William Pecora, Director of the U.S. Geological Survey, testified that the total value of production of all materials under the act had come to nearly \$6 billion. The Federal Treasury is \$4.4 billion richer. Private enterprise has invested billions of dollars and has property values that must be respected under the Constitution of the United States.

On the other hand, we must not have our shorelines ruined, our ocean waters polluted, our fish and wildlife destroyed, and our environment changed devastatingly. These are among the issues with which the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials, and Fuels will attempt to come to grips at the May 13 hearing.

Mr. President, Senator CRANSTON was joined in his sponsorship of S. 1219 by the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG).

The bill is short, and in view of its potentially far-reaching effects, I ask unanimous consent that its text be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1219

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall immediately—

(1) order termination of all drilling for oil, gas, or other minerals in the Santa Barbara Channel off the coast of the State of California under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act;

(2) order the suspension of all such drilling under all other leases issued pursuant to such Act for areas off the coast of the State of California until the completion of the investigation and study pursuant to section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior shall as soon as practicable (1) make an investigation and study to determine methods of

drilling for, producing, and transporting oil under leases issued pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, which will remove the threat of pollution and other damage to the environment and ecological community, (2) make an investigation and study of methods of phasing out oil production under said Federal leases in the Santa Barbara Channel, and (3) report the results of such investigations and studies to the President and the Congress.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Herbert F. Travers, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts for the term of 4 years, vice Paul F. Markham.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Friday, April 25, 1969, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON FEDERAL SUPPORT OF PROJECT GRANTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Governmental Research of the Committee on Government Operations will hold a hearing on "Federal Support of Project Grants: Indirect Costs and Cost Sharing" on April 22, 1969, at 10 a.m. in room 1318, New Senate Office Building.

The hearing will continue on April 23 at the same time and place and on May 1 in room 457, Old Senate Office Building.

A second set of hearings on the same subject is tentatively planned for the latter part of May.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON INDIAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I wish to announce that public hearings on the nomination by President Nixon of Mr. Brantley Blue, of Tennessee, to be a Commissioner of the Indian Claims Commission, have been scheduled for Thursday, April 24, at 10 a.m. in room 3110 New Senate Office Building.

Any interested Members of the Senate, and the public, are invited to participate in these hearings, or to submit a statement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of Mr. Blue be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

BRANTLEY BLUE

Born October 11, 1925 in Pembroke, North Carolina.

EDUCATION

Attended public schools of Pembroke, North Carolina. Attended Pembroke State College, and received L.L.B. from Cumberland University in 1949.

OCCUPATIONAL BACKGROUND

Montgomery Ward Company, Baltimore, Maryland, 1942-43. United States Navy, 1944-46. City Judge in Kingsport, Tennessee, 1955-59. Engaged in the general practice of law in Kingsport, Tennessee, 1949-present.

ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Blue Key Honorable Fraternity (Law School).

Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity (Law School).

American Legion, Hammond Post #3 (Former Commander).

Vice Chairman, National Americanism Council, American Legion.

Kingsport Exchange Club (Past President).

Kingsport Bar Association (Past President).

Kingsport Chamber of Commerce.

Tennessee Bar Association.

Former Judge Advocate, American Legion, Department of Tennessee.

FAMILY DATA

Married to former Dorothy Milam of Kingsport, Tennessee. Two children: Janet and Patricia, both living at home.

THE GAP BETWEEN THE GENERATIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the April 29, 1969, issue of Look magazine is an article entitled "To an Angry Old Man," by Leo Rosten. I have read the article several times, and I must say that in my view Mr. Rosten's comments are to the point of what is happening in the world today with respect to the relationship between the older and younger generations.

There have been serious difficulties among young people, to be sure, but there has also been a good deal of fanaticism in reaction. In this situation, there is no justification for pomposity on the part of the older generation anymore than there is for anarchism on the part of the younger generation.

That there is a gap between the old and young is an inescapable biological reality. Nothing can be done about that except to accept it. That there is a lack of credibility or of mutual tolerance of ideas between the generations is also a fact. That difference, too, has a certain inevitability; down through the generations, it has been more the norm than the abnorm between old and young.

We need only go back, in all honesty, to our own younger days to sense the similarity between past and present. There were strains and tugs then as there are now. The principal difference is that we who are older, now, were younger then and were doing most of the straining and tugging.

The older generation has its faults which, in my judgment, tend to center on a shirking of responsibilities toward the young who, in their own way, for better or for worse, are striving to grapple with a world which they did not make. The faults of the younger generation, in turn seem to me to center on a tendency to reject whatever has gone before as, at best, irrelevant. On the part of the mini-

minorities, moreover, there is an apparent determination not merely to reject the past but to rampage over past, present, and future and reduce them all to a rubble heap.

What is needed is a realistic appraisal of the situation. The present generation of youngsters was born into a world which they did not make and which we elders helped to make. These kids are not to be dismissed as some sort of monsters from another planet. They are, after all, our progeny. If we start from that point, perhaps we can bridge the gaps between the generations with a degree of honesty and humility, even if we cannot close them.

I would also have the temerity to suggest to young people that they resist the temptation to blame everything on the previous generation. Those of us who are older should, in turn, act our age and stop the flatulent berating of youngsters when we ourselves are not without blame. Young people have to make their own lives. They have to find a way to face the responsibilities which go with life. They have to make and correct their own mistakes along with the accumulated mistakes of the past and, in that way, to come forward, as we tried in our turn to do, with a responsible and reasonable way of life of their own.

I urge my colleagues to read Mr. Rosten's article. In my judgment, he has a lot to say that is worth saying about the difficulties which confront us and about our most profound obligation—young and old—which is to keep this society, this Nation and this world livable not only for ourselves but for those many generations which will come after us.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled "To an Angry Old Man," written by Leo Rosten.

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

TO AN ANGRY OLD MAN

(NOTE.—I could massage your heartstrings or curl your hair, depending on your politics, by quoting from the torrential reaction (laudatory, furious, flattering, venomous) to my evangelical letter *To an Angry Young Man* (Look, November 12, 1968). Before it was printed, a friend urged me to soften my stand, saying, "It may play into the hands of the Right!" And of the sermon you are about to read, others may say, "It will play into the hands of the Left!"

(Both positions seem to me indefensible. Surely, the validity of an idea has nothing to do with who agrees or disagrees with it. To censor the expression of your thinking because of whom it may please or displease is simply to let others do your thinking for you. I detest thought control. Here, *sans* apology, is my answer to some overheated letter writers from the Right.)

DEAR MR. X: Thank you for writing—and that's about all the thanks you'll get from me. You say, "Let's throw all these young rebels out of college!" Over my dead body. Free speech does not stop at the gates of a campus. On the contrary, it should find a special sanctuary there, for it is indispensable to the search for truth. A student has a perfect right to protest, picket, petition,

dissent. When students riot, set fires, throw rocks, stop others from attending classes, use bullhorns to disrupt the peace—they are acting not as students but as hoodlums. Let the law attend to them—the swifter the better.

But you want students "thrown out" simply for protesting, which is what the Communists and Fascists do—from Russia to Spain, China to Cuba. They expel, intimidate or imprison those who question or complain. Don't emulate them.

You say, "Draft these college punks into the Army and let our GI's knock sense into their heads!" You horrify me. I don't want anyone to "knock sense" into anyone's head. To put the point sharply, I quote a great jurist: "Your freedom to move your fist ends at the point where my nose begins." I have a long nose.

As for the draft: I consider the present draft impractical, unnecessary and morally indefensible (it would take more than this page to explain why. The young have every right to speak, petition and argue against it (this has nothing to do with Vietnam)—peacefully.

"Why let these creeps wear stinking clothes and beards? Line them up, hold them down, bathe them, shave them, wash out their mouths with soap!!" I loathe your bullyboy views more than their childish flight into dirtiness. Kooky clothes break no laws (though courts have ruled on schoolboard regulations governing dress, hair, etc.). Young slobbs pollute the nearby air—but the courts have not yet ruled on that.

The defiant cultivation of filth is, of course, a clinical sign of psychological disturbance. I feel sorry for the kids who cannot know the psychological price they will pay for regressing to the anal level. But your excessive response to the dirty is as distasteful to me as their sad glorification of discomfort disguised as "freedom."

You praise me for "speaking out for those students who are not newsworthy because they don't riot" and add: "Defend our wonderful Establishment!" Well, the only Establishment I defend is the one called Reason. I find violence abhorrent, fanaticism disgusting, and demagoguery unspeakable. The terrorist tactics of adolescents may parade as "idealism," but they shatter that consensus of civility that is the very heart of a civilization. Your blind veneration of the status quo cannot help us solve problems that must and can be solved—by intelligence, not force.

You ask, "What do students have to be so unhappy about in our colleges?" A great deal: gargantuan classes and bursting dormitories; professors who hate teaching because it interferes with their research; educator-bureaucrats who reward the publication of trivia much more than dedication to students and teaching; academic tenure, which encourages some pedants to "goof off" in lectures and subsidizes others to indulge their nonacademic hobbies.

But this does not mean we should turn our colleges over to self-dramatizing militants whose most conspicuous talent is a capacity to oversimplify problems whose complexity they do not begin to comprehend. Rabble-rousers (Right or Left) are rabble-rousers, no matter what songs they sing, with what lumps in their throats, with whatever ambiguous dreams in their eyes. Nazi students also flaunted "rights" they held superior to the lawful processes of "hypocritical," "fake" democracy—and many of their professors, in Germany and Austria, cheered them on.

Rebels who think they should prevail because they dissent are deluded: Dissenters have no greater moral of political rights than non-dissenters.

You ask, "What has basically bugged these

hippies, anyway?" First, their parents, I suspect, who confused political liberalism with indecisiveness; who felt so guilty about discipline that they appeased temper tantrums and rewarded rage with concessions (forgetting that infants *want* boundaries placed on their freedom); who never gave their progeny a clear model of responsible conduct. I think many militant students are unconsciously searching for adults who will act as adults—without apology or ambivalence or guilt; adults who will not be bamboozled by adolescent irrationality; adults who respond with swift rebuffs to those challenges to authority that are, at bottom, a testing by the young of the moral confidence of their elders. Prof. David Riesman says we are witnessing the rebellion of the first generation in history "who were picked up whenever they cried."

You say, "Why not show the young how wonderful our education system is?" It is remarkable in what it has done (the greatest, widest mass education in history) and in what it *can* achieve. But I hold a very gloomy view about schools that can produce students (and teachers) who are so strikingly ignorant about (1) how this society actually works; (2) what the economic bases of a democracy must be; (3) what the irreplaceable foundations of freedom, and the inviolable limits of civil liberties, must be; (4) how conflicts between minorities and majorities must be managed. (Suppose that Ku Klux Klanners in Alabama occupied classrooms, asserted the right to appoint faculty, threatened to burn down buildings, and demanded total amnesty in advance?)

Immature students are mesmerized by utopian slogans that rest on fantasies; and they are ill-educated enough to mouth the obsolete clichés of anarchism, the "revolutionary" nostrums even Lenin called "infantile leftism," the grandiose "demands" that demonstrate a plain lack of sense and a massive ignorance of history. ("Student power" has simply ruined South and Central American universities.)

You ask, "Why doesn't anyone brand these troublemakers as the Communists they are?" That organizers plan and foment trouble, going from campus to campus, is becoming clearer each day. That they are professed Communists is neither clear nor likely. Student incantations about Ho Chi Minh, Che and Mao are not so much evidence of Communism as of naïveté. The young enjoy baiting their elders with shocking symbols, and ignore what Che, Ho and Mao stand for—total despotism over the mind. Dictatorship is no less vicious because it *claims* to seek "superior" freedom.

Students who are *not* Communists are, alas, employing Communist/Fascist tactics: "confrontations" designed to force the authorities to call in the police—and then to force the police to use force, which is decried (and televised) and used for propaganda purposes. They dare not reflect on what Mao has done to the Chinese "student cadres" he encouraged; or on what happens to students who criticize the Establishment in Moscow or Havana.

You say, "Professor Marcuse should not be allowed to teach at San Diego!" Dr. Marcuse has a right to say or write whatever he wants—however mushy, opaque, unsupported by data, insupportable in logic and ludicrous as economics it is. His competence and integrity as a teacher are for his colleagues—not you or me—to decide. And if San Diego has no professors who are able to punch holes in old Herbert's gaseous balloons, it should promptly hire some.

Incidentally, Marcuse, like you, wants to deny freedom of speech to "certain" people; you and he differ only on *whom* you want to confer the blessings of dictatorship: Marcuse

has publicly said (at Rutgers, June, 1965) that since Negroes are "brainwashed," and presumably vote in a hypnotized manner, "I would prefer that they did not have the right to choose wrongly." Such thinking fills prisons and concentration camps.

Finally, to my angry old and young compatriots: If we cannot pursue knowledge with moderation and mutual respect in our colleges, then where on earth can we? "Society cannot exist," wrote Burke, "[without] a controlling power upon will. . . . The less of it there is within, the more there must be without. . . . Men of intemperate minds cannot be free. Their passions forge their fetters."

LEO ROSTEN.

P.S.—Once, after long and sober research, I estimated that 23.6% of the human race are mad. I was wrong. I am now convinced that 32.6% are.

Mr. AIKEN subsequently said: Mr. President, I rise, first, to express my wholehearted agreement with the remarks of the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the majority leader, which were made at the beginning of the morning hour.

I would like to add further, however, that I hope the public is not condemning the youth of today. In my opinion, it is a very small percentage of youth, the lawless and the extremists, who undertake to commit acts and demonstrations which could lead to a breakdown of government, or at least to a breakdown in the management of the colleges and universities which they are attending.

Unfortunately, it is the worst element that gets most of the publicity. Sometimes I think this worst element monopolizes the news media. I am sure that 90 percent of youths attending college or other educational institutions today are seriously concerned not only with the functioning of their government but also with their own welfare and the welfare of the world generally.

Furthermore, it is not always the students who create difficulties. Sometimes it is the management of the institutions. I am sure of that. Sometimes it is members of the faculty. I might point out that a few days ago I read a report that the faculty of Tufts College voted to do away with the ROTC, when a great majority of its students asked that the ROTC be retained.

I feel that we should be very careful, and not condemn the great majority of law-abiding students for the reckless and irresponsible acts of a small percentage of them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excerpt from the annual report of Lyman S. Rowell, president of Vermont University, entitled "The Challenge to Our Nation's Colleges and Universities."

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

THE CHALLENGE TO OUR NATION'S COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

(Excerpt from the annual report of Lyman S. Rowell, president of the University of Vermont)

Colleges and universities all across our country are being challenged by new and sometimes conflicting forces.

Students have made clear they are not satisfied with colleges the way they are, at the same time that they compete in ever greater numbers and ever greater intensity to enter college.

Perhaps unfairly, those students who have made the most noise, who have been most disruptive, and who are least representative, least sincere in their desire to win constructive changes—those students have won most of the headlines, most of the focus of television cameras.

Less known to those constituencies who are not closely associated with college life today are the more significant efforts of a majority of today's students to obtain a meaningful and constructive dialogue by which they may work with administrators and faculty to make the college and university of today and tomorrow a better, more responsive institution. Perhaps it is wrong to limit this to college and university students, for today's high school students are very much a part of this student activity.

Traditionally, faculty members have tolerated administrators as, at best, necessary evils. Today, teachers are more concerned with participating in the administration of colleges and universities. They are seeking membership on board of trustees, participation in all levels of decision making including key roles in the selection of college presidents.

Part of the renewed action by teachers for a greater role is the result of an awakened understanding by teachers that students are often more critical of faculty rules and regulations and attitudes than they are of college and university administrators.

Students wish to participate in faculty evaluation, in changing curricula, and—in particular, in introducing more courses reflecting current social and political concerns.

Colleges and universities are being challenged as well by a free enterprise society which more than ever recognizes a dependency on U.S. higher education not just for a continuing supply of recruits, but for a growing program of research and service. Any county, state or regional development organization can attest that business and industry today more than ever prefer to locate in communities, counties, states or regions where there are strong higher education institutions—preferably with graduate and research programs.

Perhaps the greatest challenge to higher education today comes from government—from the smallest local to the largest federal unit. More and more do governments look to higher education to provide resources which government may bring to bear on the most pressing array of problems which society has faced.

At the same time, the rising costs which have affected all sectors and activities of our free enterprise economy have greatly complicated the relationship between government and education. At the same time that education is seen as a cornerstone upon which continued freedom and prosperity rest, the cost of funding quality programs of education from kindergarten through post-doctoral levels has increased and will continue to do so.

The federal government, since WWII, has invested vast new sums in support of higher education. This support, however, has tended to go to areas and programs of special interest to the Congress and to the President and the men and women in this Cabinet. It has tended, as well, to go to the nation's largest and strongest universities.

It is significant, I think, that in November seven major U.S. higher education associations joined in urging direct federal institutional grants to all accredited higher education institutions, public and private, two year and four, colleges and universities. Their

statement, which I endorse, called institutional support "the number one unmet need in the pattern of federal relations with the academic community," and said a new program of institutional grants should complement, not supplant or diminish present federal programs.

Never has our future been more uncertain. But I choose to interpret that positively. Never have we enjoyed a greater opportunity to seek and find in an uncertain future those certainties which advance the continuing potential that tomorrow's children shall have a greater opportunity than today's.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER BY MRS. CHARLOTTE T. REID

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on Monday of this week, April 14, some 5,000 women began the 17th annual Republican Women's Conference, convening at the Sheraton Park Hotel here in Washington, D.C. At the supper gala that night one of the first items on the program was a beautiful tribute paid to our former President and Commander in Chief, Dwight David Eisenhower, by a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Mrs. CHARLOTTE T. REID, of Illinois. Through the years and especially during the past weeks, respect, appreciation, love, and compassion have been poured on General Eisenhower, but I believe you will join me in feeling that no finer and more appropriate tribute has been paid than the one so elegantly expressed by Mrs. REID.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUPER GALA—REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S CONFERENCE, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 14, 1969

It was just two weeks ago tonight—as dusk settled over the Capitol, that official Washington said a final farewell to perhaps the best-loved American of this century. The slow-paced cortege, with its caisson bearing the simple G.I. coffin, followed by the riderless horse, symbol of the fallen hero—had come to a halt. The solemn processions of the State Funeral had reached Union Station. The last echoes of the cannon and bugles had faded away. Now Dwight David Eisenhower was going home to Abilene for the last time—home to his chosen resting place in the heartland of America from whence he had come.

For three days, Heads of State and Ministers—great men and women from every part of the world—had come to mourn with citizens from all walks of life—of all races and religions—at the somber Lincoln Catafalque in the hushed vastness of the Capitol Rotunda—and to raise their voices in the triumphant words of "Onward Christian Soldiers" and "God of Our Fathers" in the majesty of the Washington Cathedral. And as the funeral train began its long and lonely journey across mountain and plain, river and farm, an entire Nation stood at attention in final salute—hat in hand, and for most of us a lump in the throat. Yes, in death just as so often in life, Dwight David Eisenhower had once again touched his people deeply.

Each of you here tonight will always have a special memory of General Eisenhower—and each his own personal tribute to one who so joyously took the journey of life, who took it with vision and foresight, and with

all the courage and determination at his command.

His deeds were great and many, and historians will so record them. They will tell of Eisenhower the soldier, whose devotion to his country was the motivation of a lifetime in its service—Eisenhower, the Commander of the mightiest expeditionary force ever assembled in the cause of freedom—and Eisenhower, the General, receiving the surrender of the Hitler armies in World War II.

They will tell, also, of Eisenhower the educator, as President of Columbia University—one of the Nation's great center of learning and culture.

They will tell of Eisenhower, the crusader for world peace and international understanding and brotherhood while Supreme Commander of NATO.

And they will tell of Eisenhower, our 34th President, with his magnetic grin, who brought to the Nation a welcome period of peace and order—and a strength of purpose and conviction in America.

Yes, every trust we Americans had in our power to bestow was freely given him. It was bestowed because he reflected in his own life and personality the best traditions of a free people—and our Nation's faith and hope. We admired his courage of mind and heart, his strength of character, his idealism, his devotion to his family, his belief in the worth of his fellow man, his simplicity, his understanding warmth, and his candor. Everyone "liked Ike"—for most seemed to see in him and his homely virtues some small reflection of themselves. He was so typical of America that each in his own way could see a bit of himself in the soldier-President.

And even in death, I think that General Dwight D. Eisenhower performed one last service which must not go unheeded. Sad though it has been, this period of mourning—with all its memories of the simple heritage of this man from Abilene who brought such inspiration to so many—of his belief in the creed of "duty, honor, country"—of his devotion to the principles on which this Republic was built—of the peace and tranquility which characterized his years in the White House—all this has reminded millions not only of the achievements of a great fellow American, but of our own achievements as well. It has reminded us of our own priceless heritage and the hard fought origins of our country.

And as he faded quietly away—as old soldiers are said to do—he left with each of us who kept vigil with him a little of his pride in America, a little of his awareness of God, and a little of his responsibility to mankind.

May the Lord bless his memory—and may the Lord give to each of us the strength and courage to carry on those ideals and goals which he lived in life and which were his legacy in death.

Yes—America and the world like Ike. There can be no finer tribute!

INCOME TAX: REFORM AND REALITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, several years ago in a course of testimony on several bills, including tax measures which were pending before the Committee on Finance I suggested, and the chairman concurred in the suggestion, that the committee hear Roger A. Freeman of the Hoover Institution at Stanford University in California with respect to matters relating to taxes and unemployment.

Mr. Freeman proved to be one of the most refreshing and knowledgeable wit-

nesses ever to come before the committee. He is a student and a scholar who not only does his homework but does it extremely well.

He has written an article which appeared in the March 12, 1969, issue of the Los Angeles Times under the caption "Topical Comment: Unhappy Returns." The subhead for the article is "Income Tax: Reform and Realities."

When Mr. Freeman first entitled this article he called it "Many Unhappy Returns of the Day." I thought the latter title was certainly appropriate and quite significant. I will let the article speak for itself. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD so that it will not only come to the attention of the Members but also to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD everywhere.

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

TOPICAL COMMENT: UNHAPPY RETURNS—INCOME TAX: REFORM AND REALITIES
(By Roger A. Freeman)

(NOTE.—Economist Roger A. Freeman is a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace at Stanford University. Among his publications are "Crisis in College Finance?" and "Taxes for Schools.")

Last Jan. 17, three days before he left office, Secretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr issued a stern warning to Congress:

"We now face the possibility of a taxpayer revolt if we do not soon make major reforms in our income taxes. The revolt will not come from the poor but from the tens of millions of middle-class families and individuals with incomes from \$7,000 to \$20,000 . . .

"The middle classes are likely to revolt against income taxes not because of the level or amount of the taxes they must pay but because certain provisions of the tax laws unfairly lighten the burdens of others who can afford to pay."

Are middle-class taxpayers about to resort to violence after the manner of militants on our campuses and in our urban centers? Not really. But taxpayers are in a belligerent mood, as evidenced by the flood of enraged letters that swamped the Treasury and Congress early in 1969. That their ire is not directed at "the level or amount of taxes they must pay," as Secretary Barr suggested, I for one doubt. The "take" of all governments in the United States (federal, state and local), which just hit a new high at 40% of the national income, is still headed upward, and the federal income tax is by far its largest component.

Contrary to Barr's implication, however, the middle class does not bear a disproportionate share of the federal income tax. It receives 55% of the income and pays 52% of the tax:

Adjusted gross income bracket	[In percent]	
	Adjusted gross income	Tax liability
Under \$7,000.....	29.5	17.5
\$7,000 to under \$20,000.....	55.3	51.9
\$20,000 and over.....	15.2	30.6
Total.....	100.0	100.0

This does not at all mean that the tax treats everybody fairly. At last count, in

1966, the federal income tax applied to less than half of all personal income—49% to be exact. Exemptions, deductions, exclusions, credits and underreporting accounted for the other half. The Treasury could gather about as much revenue through a flat 10% tax on all personal income as it does from our 14% to 70% rate schedule on half the income.

STORY'S OTHER SIDE

Who escapes the federal income tax? The rich, Barr replies. There were, he said, "155 tax returns in 1967 with adjusted gross incomes above \$200,000 on which no federal income taxes were paid, including 21 with incomes above \$1 million."

This is true as far as it goes, but it is not the whole story. Barr did not mention that the 21 millionaires—whose combined income exceeded \$60 million—had given it away under a little known clause which permits unlimited deduction of charitable contributions to persons who so donated more than 90% of their income in at least 8 of the preceding 10 years. There were 626 millionaires in 1966 who did pay income tax—at an average rate of 56% of their taxable income.

Less than half of the \$587 billion personal income in 1966 was taxable, \$301 billion went untaxed. Could we, by eliminating some of those "loopholes," recoup enough revenue to lower tax rates substantially?

Let us look what that \$301 billion tax-free income consists of: \$117 billion is for personal exemptions (\$195 million exemptions of \$600 each), \$63 billion is for Social Security and other welfare payments and exempt labor income, \$54 billion is for itemized deductions (state and local taxes, interest payments, medical expenses, charitable contributions, casualty losses, etc.), \$22 billion is for standard deductions; \$33 billion is merely "imputed" income such as rental value of owner-occupied homes. It is obvious that most of the nontaxed income accrues to persons in the low to middle income brackets. For example, of \$182 billion deductions and exemptions, \$168 billion is claimed by the under \$20,000 income group.

If we relate taxable income (line 11d on form 1040) to adjusted gross income (line 9 on form 1040) we find that persons under \$3,000 income pay taxes on 27% of their income, those in the \$5,000 to \$7,000 bracket on 53%, those between \$10,000 and \$15,000 on 66%. From \$20,000 to \$100,000 79% is taxable, and at an income of \$100,000 and over 80%.

To be sure, the Internal Revenue Code contains many clauses that enable wealthy persons to escape the full impact of the tax rate schedule. But there are also benefits for the middle class and the poor, for the young and the old, for the owners and executives and for the workers. Most of those provisions were intended by Congress to afford relief to low-income persons or for special burdens, to avoid a detrimental impact on certain industries or on the whole economy, or to stimulate desirable activities.

It is true that genuine loopholes, that is unintended benefits, have developed over the years and abuses have crept in. That is why tax reform is such a never-ending job. Probably no subject has been studied more thoroughly by Congress and numerous amendments have been passed to stop leakages or provide new benefits. That no major structural reform was enacted, subjecting to taxation multi-billion dollar amounts of presently tax free income, does not mean that Congress is not eager to take such action. But Congress is no less divided than the public on the question which specific benefits should be cut.

What results can we expect from the tax

reform hearings which the House Ways and Means Committee is presently conducting?

If past experience and the mood of Congress are any guide, some seepage around the edges will be stopped, certain loose provisions will be tightened, several abuses ended. But, unless I misread the signs, there will be no major structural reform of the income tax in 1969-70. The balance of power is too evenly distributed for a significant breakthrough.

Where is action most likely to take place? Will the tax exemption of foundations and other nonprofit institutions be abolished? Not likely, but their privileges will be more closely prescribed and the use of the foundation gimmick for personal gain or political ends cut, if not ended. Charitable purposes may be more precisely defined and limitations imposed.

Will a floor be established for charitable contributions and other itemized deductions, similar to the present 3% rule on medical expenses? Only over the dead bodies of influential forces I expect to remain alive for a long time.

Will long-term capital gains be subjected to normal income tax rates? That is extremely unlikely because it could have a detrimental impact on economic expansion and job creation. But capital gains treatment may be severely tightened and there could even be a sliding scale geared to the length of holding an asset. Capital gains taxation at death may be added sometime, if not now.

Will Congress repeal the percentage depletion on oil production? No, because that might discourage exploration and could boost gasoline prices. But rates could be reduced and depletion limited.

The tax exemption of interest on state and local bonds poses a number of hard questions. Is the end near for that exemption? Probably no nearer than it has been for the past 30 years, if governors, mayors and school boards have any say about it—and they do.

Tax reform means to most people that they will pay lower taxes. Thus, if revenue is gained from tightening loopholes, it is likely to be used for liberalizing other benefits.

The personal exemption has remained at \$600 since 1948, while in the same period consumer prices have risen 50%; to retain its value the exemption should now be \$900. But this is the most expensive form of tax relief there is: every \$100 increase in personal exemptions costs the Treasury at least \$3.6 billion a year.

A boost in the standard deduction to 14% and to a maximum of \$1,800 for a couple would simplify tax returns for many people. What it might do to some religious or charitable organizations and whether it would improve equity is another question. Like higher personal exemptions it would increase the incidence of "representation without taxation" which is a perilous trend in a democracy.

There will be a strong drive for tax credits in education—for tuitions and other expenses and for donations—as well as for training the unskilled and hiring the hard-core unemployed. It could succeed: President Nixon has long advocated such plans and Congress appears to be favorably inclined toward the idea.

Federal revenue sharing with states and cities has been getting growing attention and governors and mayors are clamoring for it. Others object because they feel that "the pleasure of spending public money should be tied to the pain of raising it." Revenue sharing could possibly be used to replace many of the more than 500 categorical grants-in-aid to states which now total \$25 billion.

A more effective way of giving relief to taxpayers and aiding state and local governments while maintaining fiscal and political responsibility would be to allow federal tax credits for property, income and sales taxes

instead of permitting only deductions from the tax base.

WOULD INCREASE UNBALANCE

Should the "temporary" 10% surtax be made permanent, as the governor of one of our largest states proposed at a White House meeting a few weeks ago?

That would make the U.S. tax structure even more lopsided than it already is: we rely more heavily on income taxes and go more lightly on consumption taxes than any other country. A permanent raise in the oppressive income tax rates would make our tax system even more punitive than it is.

We are now the only industrial country which does not levy a broad-based national consumption tax. A value-added tax on the European pattern could provide a badly needed balance in our tax system.

If American taxpayers were asked what they want most in regard to taxation, most of them would certainly answer: "Less." That wish could be realized if at least part of the national increase in revenues were devoted to tax reduction rather than to the expansion of public services.

A plan to cut income tax rates in annual steps over a period of, say, five years would not only help to promote stable economic growth and general prosperity; it might even be good politics. It would of course require fiscal restraint and tight expenditure control—which Congress has been hard put to accomplish in the past—but it could prove to be the best kind of tax reform.

HAYAKAWA ON THE HARVARD DISORDERS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an interview with Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, acting president of San Francisco State College, which appeared in this morning's Washington Post and after listening to the distinguished majority leader's remarks a few moments ago on this subject, I believe that this article will be of interest to everyone.

President Hayakawa, because of his own courageous refusal to knuckle under to his own campus extremists, has become a symbol of national resistance to campus extremism everywhere.

Unfortunately, as Prof. Sidney Hook pointed out in a speech which I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this last January 28, there are too many "spineless administrators and cowardly members of the faculty" who are prepared to yield to extremist blackmail.

In much the same vein, Dr. Hayakawa took the Harvard faculty to task for failing to back President Pusey.

A bunch of kids come in and bodily carry out the dean—

He said, in a reference to last week's takeover of Harvard's University Hall by a group led by Students for a Democratic Society.

They occupy the building and start rifling secret files. That's the time and place to call the cops, so why the hell doesn't the faculty back him up?

Hayakawa said that the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of the police is "one of the real psychological puzzles of our time." He said that this dual standard was related to "an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college educated against

those who are not college educated, a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals, and businessmen. They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

Dr. Hayakawa gave some advice to President Pusey that every college president would do well to study.

His first advice was that, whenever there is a threat of disorder, police should be brought onto the campus in such numbers that those who want to teach and study know they will be protected.

His second piece of advice was to avoid faculty meetings.

Until the crisis is over—

He said—

every decision made by the faculty should be by secret ballot distributed to the entire faculty. Don't let anything be decided in a meeting. The radical faculty packs the meetings.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article concerning the interview with Dr. Hayakawa which was published in the Washington Post on April 18, 1969.

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

HARVARD "DOUBLE-CROSSED" BY FACULTY,
HAYAKAWA SAYS
(By David S. Broder)

SAN FRANCISCO, April 17.—Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, the acting president of San Francisco State College, today condemned Harvard University faculty members for their failure to support Harvard President Nathan M. Pusey's decision to use police against campus demonstrators.

He said their attitude was typical of the "deep-rooted prejudice" many intellectuals harbor against those less educated.

In an interview, the plain-spoken semantist, who kept police on his campus for four months this winter to handle student and faculty strikes, said, "Pusey was doing the right thing, but he was double-crossed by his faculty.

"A bunch of kids come in and bodily carry out the dean," he said, in a reference to last week's takeover of Harvard's University Hall by a group led by Students for a Democratic Society. "They occupy the building and start rifling secret files. That's the time and place to call the cops, so why the hell doesn't the faculty back him up."

DISTORTED REFLEX

The answer, Hayakawa said, lies in the same distorted psychological and political reflex he saw on his own campus during the winter confrontation that won him national renown.

The San Francisco campus is calm today, but despite his apparent victory over student militants, Hayakawa still speaks with open bitterness of the "cultural snobbery" of faculty members who supported the students, as their counterparts across the continent at Harvard are doing now.

Noting that Harvard's star-studded faculty has used the student strike to pressure Pusey to grant some old demands of their own, Hayakawa said, "It's exactly the same thing" his own college went through.

CHAIN REACTION

"First you have the uproar created by students," he said. "Then an element in the

faculty has to defend the students. The more they have to show the students are justified, the more they have to find out reasons they (the faculty) have got problems and grievances, too."

Hayakawa offered "the beginning of an answer" to what he called "one of the real psychological puzzles of our time," the tendency of some faculty members to condone violence by students but to condemn it on the part of police.

"Professors, in a way, love their students," he said, "so they want earnestly to believe that whatever their students do is rationally motivated. . . . They're willing to condone anything, because, after all, they've been devoting their lives to teaching students rational behavior. So if the students violate the common courtesies and even resort to violence, they sit around agonizing and say there must something terribly wrong with the world if the students feel that way."

DOUBLE STANDARD

But, Hayakawa continued, such faculty members "are not willing to give the police that much of a break. If the police get rattled and start striking out, then that's goddam police brutality. That's the nature of the dirty sons of bitches.

"There's an unconscious cultural snobbery on the part of the college-educated against those who are not college-educated," he said, "a deep-rooted prejudice among some intellectuals that they are a superior order of being because they are intellectuals. Some of them believe the world has no damn business being run by politicians, generals and businessmen. They think it should be run by literary critics and philosophers."

PLATO CITED

With a wry grin, Hayakawa said Plato, who advocated rule by philosopher-kings, was "the first and most brilliant example of the disgruntled intellectual. If he were alive now, he'd have been president of our campus chapter of the AFT," referring to the American Federation of Teachers union, which led the San Francisco State strike.

Hayakawa said he would offer only two bits of advise to Pusey. One was to have police on campus, whenever there is a threat of disorder, in such numbers that those who want to teach and study know they will be protected. The other was to avoid faculty meetings.

"Until the crisis is over," he said, "every decision made by the faculty should be by secret ballot distributed to the entire faculty. Don't let anything be decided in a meeting. The radical faculty packs the meeting."

He recalled that a predecessor of his at San Francisco State had once pledged to make it "the Harvard of the West."

"Now," Hayakawa said, "Harvard looks like the San Francisco State of the East."

FAIRFIELD STUDENTS TAKE ACTION IN APPALACHIA

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, once again, the newspapers are filled with deplorable accounts of campus disorder. This week, the student body of one of the finest universities in the world has turned to violence as the means of bringing about changes within the university and within their country.

It is a sad commentary on the present time, Mr. President, that, although this is an issue of national focus, few people find it truly shocking. Instead, it is regarded as merely another link in a long chain of similar occurrences. Appalling as they are, these outbreaks have become commonplace.

In light of this incident, however, I was particularly pleased to see that another side of the American college student was given attention on network television this week. I refer to a newscast relating recent activities by a group of students from Fairfield University in Fairfield, Conn.

These students spent their spring vacation in a poor, rural area in the State of Kentucky.

Their goal was to register a protest against the conditions under which many of their fellow men are forced to live.

Their means of protest was concrete action in the form of unsparing physical exertion.

The result of their labor is more than the land which they cleared. It is a deep impact on the people with whom they worked in Appalachia, and a new awareness within themselves. It is a greater perception of the meaning of poverty and of their own role in dealing with the problems it engenders in the community.

I believe this incident is indicative of the spirit with which a great many young people are approaching the need for change. It is unfortunate that we often tend to overlook the worthwhile efforts of so many in our concern with the dissident minority.

I commend these students for their willingness to undertake this task and for their mature and practical outlook.

I also congratulate the president of Fairfield University, Rev. William C. McInnes, S.J., and the members of the administration and faculty who were instrumental in encouraging and executing the Appalachia project.

I am proud to know that one of Connecticut's fine educational institutions has taken the leadership in promoting constructive social action among its students.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

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

INACCURATE STATEMENT RE THE PROPOSED SPANISH BASE AGREEMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, stories in the press this morning concerning the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the national commitments resolution, Senate Resolution 85, refer to a passage in a classified memorandum regarding the Spanish bases. The committee report stated that the memorandum was given to Spanish authorities by "a high American military official." The committee report did not name the U.S. military official involved nor did it imply that he or any other military official, acted improperly or outside guidance supplied by higher civilian authorities.

A grave injustice has been done by any reporter who went beyond the language of the committee report. The front page article in this morning's Washing-

ton Post uses the name of Gen. David A. Burchinal, deputy chief of U.S. forces in Europe, in connection with the memorandum. In fact the story implies the committee "rebuked" General Burchinal. Nothing can be further from the truth, and to my knowledge no member of the committee or its staff has in any way implied that General Burchinal was the military official involved. In fact, he was not.

The Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, and the full Foreign Relations Committee, sought from the beginning to avoid dealing in personalities. The committee's purpose in using that particular sentence was to emphasize its view that the executive branch in this case acted through its highest military officer, Gen. Earle Wheeler, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to redefine in secret negotiations with Spanish military officials the relationship that has developed between the United States and Spain. We did not use General Wheeler's name, even though we were given specific permission to quote precisely that language, because we were interested in the thrust of the remarks and not the person who made them.

Therefore, the press conclusion—assumed without checking with the committee—has done what may be irreparable damage to General Burchinal, a fine officer and a man who, as far as I know, has acted in the best tradition, taking orders from his superiors and following the policy guidance directly to General Wheeler by former Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

MINUTEMEN FAIL TESTS—ADDITIONAL REASON TO GO SLOW ON ABM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was stated in the press this morning that doubts were being expressed about whether the Minuteman missiles will really work; and that these doubts arose when a Minuteman test, scheduled for October 19, 1966, at Michigan, N. Dak., failed because a substandard resistor was discovered in the launching power supply.

Also that the test was rescheduled for October 28, but failed a second time because of a miniature capacitor in the guidance system going out of whack.

It was then asserted that in August 1968 another test was scheduled, but failed because of a faulty pin in one of its connectors.

All this, it was said, has made the people begin to wonder whether the Minuteman missiles are really worth the billions the Pentagon has spent on them, especially as the Minutemen tested were supposed to leave their silos for only a 7-second flight, and to land some 100 miles away.

The press says that Acting Secretary of the Air Force Alexander Flax wrote Senator MILTON YOUNG, as follows:

In order to verify the adequacy of our new procedures, Flax explained on March 9, "we must conduct actual launches from standard launch facilities. We have prepared plans

for short range (7-second) launches from several silos. These plans also include testing of launch facilities with dummy missiles, in which the igniters and other ordnance are disabled. The specific sites in which the tests are to be conducted will be selected within the next few weeks. The first tests are expected to be conducted before the end of the year.

As one of my colleagues said to me, "If this system cannot go 100 miles on its third test, how can we expect it to go 5,000 miles and land squarely on target?"

Mr. President, I believe this Minuteman system will eventually have the bugs out of it and work within reason. But all this shows only too clearly why the infinitely more complicated Sentinel-Safeguard system, which could turn out to be a modern technological maginot line, should be researched and developed more before it is actually deployed.

I do not believe this country can remain secure by cutting back heavily on its offensive weapons and digging a lot of defensive holes in the ground.

Let us never forget that as a result of the sad and total failure of the maginot line, France would have been destroyed if others had not come to the rescue of that great country.

THE LATEST ABOUT OUR DEFENSES AND THE SOVIET THREAT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the press reports this morning that the Secretary of Defense told the American Society of Newspaper Editors yesterday that the Soviets are building a lot more submarines than is the United States.

If this is correct, why do not we build more submarines instead of currently cutting back some \$105 million out of our submarine program in the recently presented Defense budget?

According to the press, the Secretary then continued:

The Russians have gone ahead of us in the number (of ICBMs) on launch pads and under construction. We are now in a position where they have gone beyond us.

If this is true, then why is the Defense Department slowing down the production of Minuteman III by currently cutting some \$150 million from the original budget request for these missiles?

Because of my conviction with respect to the theory of overkill, I do not necessarily say we should increase this production. But if this is emphasized as being so important, it is logical to ask the question.

In this address, it was mentioned that "the Russians slowed down last year the deployment of a missile defense for Moscow, now consisting of 67 missiles. But he said this was to allow time to test the advance system."

Perhaps the Soviets are now having the same trouble with their single deployment around one city—the Galosh around Moscow—that we had with our Nike-Hercules, Nike-Zeus, and then Nike X; therefore are testing rather than deploying their own version of something comparable to the Sentinel—now Safeguard.

In summary, it would appear the So-

viets have reduced their planned single deployment around Moscow, and are testing a new system.

Instead, therefore, of unilaterally starting a new escalation in the arms race by announcing that we intend to deploy this Safeguard missile system all around the United States, and then putting this announcement into practice by asking for the money to purchase the land for 12 sites, why do we not limit our own efforts to the research and development of a truly effective ABM system?

THE 15TH ANNUAL REPORT ON THE INVENTORY OF DELINQUENT TAXPAYER ACCOUNTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, today I present my 15th annual report on the inventory of delinquent taxpayer accounts.

Referring to taxes in this report as delinquent, written off, or abated in 1968 does not mean the normal tax obligations for calendar year 1968; these would not be due until April 15, 1969. These delinquencies refer to recognized tax obligations for prior periods that are past due, and even then they were only classified as delinquent in 1968 after a series of unsuccessful attempts had been made to collect.

At the end of calendar year 1968 taxpayer accounts carried as delinquent totaled \$1,586,611,000, an increase of \$190 million over the \$1,398,623,000 in delinquencies at the end of 1967. This \$1,586,611,000 carried as delinquent on December 31, 1968, does not include, however, the \$326,787,000 which were marked off as uncollectable in that year, nor does it include the \$236,444,000 which were abated in the same period. When these writeoffs and abatements are taken into consideration it means that a total of \$2,149,842,000 in past due taxes remained uncollected in 1968.

What makes this report even more disturbing is the fact that on December 31, 1968, employment tax delinquencies totaled \$339,428,000, an increase of 32 percent above the \$255,768,000 carried as delinquent in that same category in 1967. It should be emphasized that employment taxes represent taxes deducted from the pay envelopes of the employees by the employers and that these moneys do not belong to the employer. The expanded delinquencies in this category, therefore, are indefensible. These moneys should be treated as trust funds, and the Government should not condone these continuous delinquencies, oftentimes of the same companies.

I am incorporating in this report a series of charts to show how each office is functioning. Chart No. 1 is an itemized breakdown of these accounts still carried as delinquent, the taxes written off, and the amounts abated in each of the respective collection districts along with a comparison as to how that district performed the preceding year.

Chart No. 2 is a Treasury report of amounts carried in inventory as delinquent in each of the collection districts at the end of 1967 and 1968. This chart gives a breakdown of the delinquent in-

come taxes, delinquent employment taxes, and delinquencies in other categories. Both the active and the inactive accounts referred to in this chart are included in the grant total of tax delinquencies. The inventory of delinquent accounts does not include, however, any of the amounts written off as uncollectable or abated.

The third chart is a Treasury breakdown of the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated in each of the collection districts in 1968 and 1967. The category of abated taxes represents the writeoffs due to recomputations of tax liabilities or court decisions as to the actual amounts of taxes owed as compared to the amounts originally assessed. Abatements also include the amounts written off in compromise settlements.

Chart No. 4 represents the Treasury report showing the total amount of revenue collections for the period July 1, 1967, to July 1, 1968, in each of the respective offices. This latter chart is included in order to show a comparison as to the amounts collected and the amounts uncollected or written off in the various offices of comparable size and can be used to determine the manner in which the respective offices are performing as compared to the national average.

I ask unanimous consent that the above-described charts, Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4, be printed following my remarks.

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

(See charts 1, 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I shall now discuss the performance record of the various offices.

NORTH-ATLANTIC REGION

Albany, N.Y.: Uncollected taxes in 1968 in the Albany office totaled \$21,963,000, an increase of 40 percent over the 1967 period. The Albany office wrote off as uncollectable \$5,134,000 in 1968, or nearly seven times the \$780,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. The remaining inventory of tax delinquencies in 1968 in this office increased from \$14,195,000 in 1967 to \$15,341,000 in 1968.

Augusta, Maine, has a fairly good report. Uncontrolled taxes in 1968 totaled \$3,402,000 as compared with \$3,042,000 in 1967, but the amount written off as uncollectable dropped from \$266,000 in 1967 to \$193,000 in 1968.

Boston, Mass., does not have a good report. Total uncollected taxes for 1968 in the Boston office were \$75,383,000, an increase of over 33 percent over the \$54,806,000 in 1967. In the same year Boston wrote off as uncollectable \$10,127,000, or three times the \$2,943,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. At the same time the Boston office abated \$15,074,000 as compared with \$5,720,000 in 1967. A further disturbing factor in this office is that employment tax delinquencies jumped from \$12,390,000 in 1967 to \$17,518,000 in 1968. Again it should be emphasized that these employment taxes represent income taxes, social security taxes, et cetera, that are withheld from the paychecks of the employees. They are in effect trust funds and should be treated as such.

Brooklyn, N.Y.: This is another office that needs attention since the delinquencies and the amounts marked off as uncollectable are exorbitant as compared to the national average. In the past 2 years, 1967 and 1968, the Brooklyn office has written off as uncollectable over \$58 million. Another \$34 million has been abated or marked off in the same 2-year period while the delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 still stayed at \$87,036,000. What makes these total delinquencies more serious is the fact that nearly one-third, or \$25,901,000, of the amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year represent uncollected employment taxes.

Buffalo, N.Y.: This office has a mixed report. The total for uncollected taxes in 1968 is \$27,133,000 as compared with \$25,307,000 in 1967, but both the amounts abated and the amounts written off as uncollectable are lower as compared with the earlier years. The disturbing factor is that over one-half of the accounts carried in this office as delinquent at the end of 1968 represented employment tax delinquencies. These employment tax delinquencies in 1968 totaled \$11,656,000, more than double the \$4,982,000 of the preceding year.

Burlington, Vt.: This office has not done so well. Uncollected taxes in 1968 have jumped from \$1,732,000 in 1967 to \$2,840,000 in 1968, while the amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year, after writeoffs and abatements, is nearly double the preceding period. Employment tax delinquencies jumped from \$415,000 in 1967 to \$666,000 in 1968. When these delinquencies are compared to the national average they are too high.

Hartford, Conn., is another office which does not have a good report. Delinquent accounts as of December 31, 1968, total \$37,222,000, which is an increase of \$8 million over the preceding year; but even this figure was arrived at only after the Hartford office had written off as uncollectable \$2,160,000 in 1968—as compared with \$846,000 in 1967—and had abated \$3,170,000 in 1968—as compared to \$2,533,000 in 1967.

Manhattan, N.Y.: The delinquent accounts in this office at the end of 1968 totaled \$221,706,000 as compared with \$181,633,000 in 1967. During the year 1968 the Manhattan office wrote off as uncollectable \$26,903,000. This heavy writeoff came on top of the \$87,673,000 that this office wrote off in 1967. Abatements in 1968 totaled \$21,652,000 as compared with \$27,260,000 in 1967. A question may well be asked, Why should the Manhattan office write off as uncollectable a total of \$114 million in a 2-year period plus an additional \$48 million being abated? Furthermore, it should be noted that in the Manhattan office employment tax delinquencies jumped to \$52,348,000 in 1968 as compared to \$30,611,000 in 1967. This is a \$22 million increase in employment tax delinquencies during the 12-month period. This office needs attention; there is no excuse for such large amounts being written off in either Manhattan or Brooklyn.

Portsmouth, N.H.: The total of uncollected taxes in Portsmouth for 1968 is \$3,014,000 as compared with \$2,140,000

uncollected in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in this office jumped to \$926,000 in 1968 as compared to \$479,000 in 1967.

Providence, R.I.: The inventory of delinquent accounts as of December 31, 1968, totaled \$5,468,000 while total taxes uncollected in 1968, including the amounts written off and abated during the year, were \$7,541,000 as compared to \$5,879,000 in 1967. This entire North-Atlantic region needs special attention since the amounts being written off as uncollectable, the amounts abated, and the inventory of delinquent taxes at the end of the year after these large writeoffs are significantly higher percentage-wise than the national average.

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Baltimore, Md.: Tax delinquencies at the end of 1968 in Baltimore totaled \$38,267,000, or an increase of \$3 million over the preceding year while amounts written off as uncollectable totaled \$6,055,000 as compared with \$4,884,000 in 1967. Total taxes uncollected for 1968 were \$49,061,000, an increase from the \$44,898,000 uncollected in 1967.

Newark, N.J.: This office does not have a good report. In 1968 it reported \$92,858,000 as the total taxes uncollected as compared to \$82,800,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Newark office totaled \$14,422,000 in 1968 as compared with \$13,389,000 in 1967. Newark handles less revenue than Philadelphia yet its amount of uncollected taxes is considerably higher.

Philadelphia, Pa.: Philadelphia reports a reduction in its delinquent accounts with \$42,331,000 reported delinquent as of the end of 1968 as compared with \$47,253,000 in 1967; however, to arrive at this reduced figure the Philadelphia office wrote off as uncollectable \$15,169,000 in 1968, or nearly three times the \$5,622,000 written off as uncollectable in 1967. During the same period—1968—\$7,105,000 were abated as compared to \$6,644,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Philadelphia office at the end of 1968 were \$9,663,000 as compared to \$9,335,000 in 1967.

Pittsburgh, Pa.: Delinquent accounts in the Pittsburgh office at the end of 1968 jumped from \$16,459,000 in 1967 to \$24,007,000 in 1968. A substantial part of this increase is represented by an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which jumped from \$4,772,000 in 1967 to \$7,667,000 in 1968. During the year 1968 the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated were slightly lower than the preceding year.

Richmond, Va.: Delinquent taxes at the end of 1968 totaled \$16,502,000, an increase from the \$13,922,000 reported delinquent at the end of 1967; however, the total amount of uncollected taxes in the Richmond office for 1968 was lower than the preceding year due to the fact that the amounts written off as uncollectable and abated were less than the preceding year. The Richmond office does, however, show an increase in its employment tax delinquencies, or \$5,031,000 at the end of 1968 as compared to \$3,904,000 at the end of 1967.

Wilmington, Del.: Since this is the office in my home State I am proud to report that it is one of the offices that has a much better record for tax collections than the national average. The 1968 total for uncollected taxes in the Wilmington office was \$4,763,000 a reduction from \$6,549,000 reported in 1967, while the amounts written off as abated and uncollectable in 1968 were \$1,877,000, a reduction from the \$3,158,000 written off and abated in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in the Wilmington office were reported at \$531,000 in 1968 as compared to \$520,000 in 1967. This is far below the national average for uncollected taxes, as related to the revenue collections. The Wilmington office reported 99.6 percent of assessed taxes being collected. This is one of the best reports in the country.

Compare this with other offices in the northeast region, some of which showed a collection rate as low as 96 percent. For example, total revenue collections in Brooklyn in fiscal 1968 were \$3,372,823,000, or about three times the \$1,114,987,000 total revenue collections for Wilmington, Del.; but in the 2-year period 1967-68 the Brooklyn office wrote off as uncollectable over 30 times as much as was written off in the Wilmington office. During this same 2-year period the Brooklyn office, which collected about three times as much as the Delaware office, abated over \$34,000,000 in taxes, or nearly 10 times the amount abated in the Wilmington office. At the end of 1968 after all these large abatements and writeoffs, the delinquent accounts still totaled \$87,036,000 in the Brooklyn office, or 30 times the amount of delinquent accounts in the Wilmington office.

When one considers that the Brooklyn office is only responsible for about three times the collections of the Delaware office it emphasizes the inefficiency in that area and the need for attention.

SOUTHEAST REGION

Atlanta, Ga.: Uncollected taxes in 1968 in this office totaled \$25,267,000, of which amount \$16,896,000 were still carried as delinquent at the end of the year after amounts written off as uncollectable and abated. This compares with \$23,174,000 uncollected taxes in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in Atlanta rose from \$2,855,000 in 1967 to \$4,427,000 in 1968.

Birmingham, Ala.: Employment tax delinquencies in this office doubled in 1968, rising from \$1,715,000 in 1967 to \$3,638,000 in 1968, while the total for uncollected taxes dropped from \$17,325,000 in 1967 to \$15,016,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollectable in this office dropped from \$4,560,000 in 1967 to \$1,980,000 in 1968.

Columbia, S.C., reports a 50 percent increase in employment tax delinquencies, or a rise from \$1,076,000 in 1967 to \$1,629,000 in 1968. The amount carried as delinquent at the end of the year, after writeoffs and abatements of \$2,604,000, rose from \$6,869,000 in 1967 to \$8,176,000 at the end of 1968.

Greensboro, N.C.: This is another office reporting a 60 percent increase in delinquent employment taxes, or a jump from \$2,054,000 in 1967 to a total of

\$3,213,000 in 1968. Delinquent accounts after all writeoffs and abatements in the Greensboro office rose from \$12,406,000 in 1967 to \$16,490,000 in 1968. Greensboro's total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was \$22,228,000.

Jackson, Miss., reports a rise in employment taxes from \$1,040,000 in 1967 to \$1,378,000 in 1968. Delinquent accounts after deducting writeoffs for uncollectable accounts and abatements rose from \$4,466,000 in 1967 to \$4,769,000 in 1968. This increase is substantially accounted for by the rise in delinquent employment taxes.

Jacksonville, Fla.: This is another office which does not have a good collection record. Employment tax delinquencies are still large—\$12,691,000 at the end of 1968 as compared with \$11,984,000 at the end of 1967.

During 1968 the Jacksonville office wrote off as uncollectable \$19,316,000, and this followed a writeoff of \$19,368,000 as uncollectable in 1967. In 1968 the Jacksonville office abated an additional \$23,743,000 in taxes, or three times the abatements of the \$7,351,000 in 1967. The Jacksonville office in fiscal 1968 had total revenue collections of \$2,986,346,000, or about the same amount as the \$2,914,748,000 in the St. Paul, Minn., office, yet Jacksonville wrote off as uncollectable and abated a total of \$43 million in 1968 and still reported a remaining delinquent tax account of \$93,684,000. This represents a total of \$136,743,000 in uncollected taxes at the Jacksonville office in 1968, which is over 10 times the \$12,001,000 uncollected taxes in the St. Paul, Minn., office. The Jacksonville office needs urgent attention. Why are these accounts being written off or abated so freely?

Nashville, Tenn.: Employment tax delinquencies in the Nashville office jumped 60 percent, or from \$2,709,000 in 1967 to \$4,560,000 in 1968. During 1968 the Nashville office wrote off as uncollectable \$4,671,000 as compared with \$2,812,000 written off in 1967. Abatements during 1968 dropped from \$4,259,000 in 1967 to \$2,576,000 in 1968.

CENTRAL REGION

Cincinnati, Ohio: Uncollected taxes for 1968 in the Cincinnati office were about 20 percent higher than those reported for 1967, or \$31,436,000 uncollected in 1968 as compared to \$26,183,000 in 1967. Included in these totals were \$7,642,000 written off as uncollectable in 1968 as compared to \$4,219,000 written off in 1967. An additional \$4,840,000 was abated in 1968 as compared to \$3,220,000 in 1967. In each of the years the remaining inventory of delinquent taxes minus the writeoffs was about the same. Employment tax delinquencies in Cincinnati in 1968 were \$4,785,000 as compared to \$3,823,000 in 1967.

Cleveland, Ohio: The delinquent tax inventory in Cleveland at the end of 1968 was \$44,399,000 as compared to \$36,150,000 in 1967; however, the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated during 1968 were lower than those for 1967. Uncollected taxes in the Cleveland office in 1968 totaled \$52,931,000 as compared to \$50,623,000 in 1967

with nearly all of this increase being represented by an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which rose from \$5,001,000 in 1967 to \$7,010,000 in 1968.

Detroit, Mich.: The total for uncollected taxes in Detroit for 1968 is \$67,595,000 as compared to \$59,053,000 in 1967. The amount marked off as uncollectable in 1968 was \$3,849,000 as compared with \$3,279,000 in 1967 while abatements during the same year were about \$2 million higher than in the preceding year, or \$7,118,000 against \$5,016,000. Again we find the same pattern of increase in employment tax delinquencies with \$14,046,000 delinquencies in 1968 as compared to \$12,330,000 in 1967. However, when we consider the amount of revenue handled in the Detroit office this is a good report. The total revenue collections for Detroit in fiscal 1968 were \$12,649,256,000. Tax collections in the Detroit office were considerably better than the national average. Revenue collections in Detroit were over four times the total collected in the Jacksonville, Fla., office yet Jacksonville reported nearly five times as much written off as uncollectable as did the Detroit office.

Indianapolis, Ind.: In 1968 the Indianapolis office wrote off as uncollectable \$6,487,000 representing a 50-percent increase over the \$4,017,000 written off in 1967. In the same year 1968 the Indianapolis office abated \$3,716,000 as compared to \$3,446,000 in the preceding year. Employment tax delinquencies in Indianapolis rose from \$5,298,000 in 1967 to \$6,142,000 in 1968. The total for uncollected taxes in the years were \$35,591,000 in 1968 as compared to \$31,529,000 in 1967.

Louisville, Ky.: Employment tax delinquencies in Louisville rose over 50 percent in 1968, or from \$2,046,000 in 1967 to \$3,222,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes in 1968 rose from \$14,620,000 in 1967 to \$17,856,000 in 1968.

Parkersburg, W. Va.: Employment tax delinquencies rose about 60 percent in this office, or from \$1,044,000 in 1967 to \$1,623,000 in 1968, thus bringing its total of uncollected taxes to \$7,785,000 as compared to \$6,206,000 in 1967.

MIDWEST REGION

Aberdeen, S. Dak.: Employment tax delinquencies in the Aberdeen, S. Dak., office rose from \$154,000 in 1967 to \$284,000 in 1968 with the total for uncollected taxes rising from \$1,269,000 in 1967 to \$1,632,000 in 1968.

Chicago, Ill.: In 1968 the Chicago office wrote off as uncollectable \$19,128,000, an increase of nearly \$3,000,000 over the \$16,868,000 written off in 1967. Abatements in the Chicago office were lower in 1968, or \$8,698,000 as compared to \$12,028,000 in 1967. The inventory of delinquent accounts in Chicago minus the writeoffs and abatements was \$48,210,000 in 1968 as compared to \$50,102,000 in 1967, but delinquent employment taxes rose spectacularly in this office, or from \$8,602,000 in 1967 to \$14,185,000 in 1968.

Des Moines, Iowa, has a good report, but it does report an increase in its employment tax delinquencies with the 1968 total rising to \$1,249,000 as compared to \$879,000 in 1967; however, the

Des Moines office as a whole has a good report. The amounts written off as uncollectable dropped from \$2,311,000 in 1967 to \$696,000 in 1968 while abatements dropped from \$1,586,000 in 1967 to \$1,118,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes for the Des Moines office in 1968 including the writeoffs were \$6,941,000, a drop from the \$8,274,000 reported in 1967. When we consider that in fiscal 1968 the Des Moines office's total revenue collections were \$1,304,909,000 this is considerably below the national average for uncollected taxes. This office should be complimented.

Compare Des Moines report with that of Jacksonville, Fla., which handled about two-and-one-half times the collections of the Des Moines office, yet Jacksonville's total for uncollected taxes were nearly 20 times that of the Des Moines office. Furthermore, the amounts written off as uncollectable and the amounts abated in the Jacksonville office totaling over \$43 million in 1968 as compared with less than \$2 million written off and abated in the Des Moines office.

Fargo, N. Dak.: Employment tax delinquencies rose from \$246,000 in 1967 to \$389,000 in 1968 while the total for uncollected taxes, including writeoffs and abatements, in this office is \$1,423,000 in 1968 as compared to \$1,233,000 in 1967.

Milwaukee, Wis.: This office has a good report although it reports the same trend of increased employment tax delinquencies with \$2,957,000 reported at the end of 1968 as compared to \$2,422,000 delinquent in 1967; however, the Milwaukee office shows an overall decline in its reported total for uncollected taxes. In 1968 \$2,384,000 was written off as uncollectable as compared to \$3,943,000 written off in 1967. Abatements were slightly higher than those in 1967, but the inventory of delinquent accounts minus writeoffs was lower. The total of uncollected taxes in the Milwaukee office dropped from \$17,361,000 in 1967 to \$15,896,000 in 1968. Overall this is an excellent report for this office when we consider that the total revenue collections for the year in Milwaukee were \$3,079,873,000, about equal to the \$3,372,823,000 revenue collections in the Brooklyn office; yet Brooklyn reported uncollected taxes of \$138,540,000 in 1968, or over eight times the \$15,896,000 uncollected in Milwaukee.

Omaha, Nebr., has a good report with its total of uncollected taxes dropping from \$10,690,000 in 1967 to \$7,358,000 in 1968. Delinquent employment taxes were \$741,000 in 1968 as compared to \$670,000 in 1967. Abatements dropped from \$3,205,000 in 1967 to \$1,734,000 in 1968 while the amounts marked off as uncollectable dropped from \$710,000 in 1967 to \$562,000 in 1968.

St. Louis, Mo., while reporting a higher total of uncollected taxes in 1968, still has a good report as compared to the national average. Total revenue collections in St. Louis office in fiscal 1968 were \$4,314,622,000 or about 30 percent larger than the Brooklyn office collections, yet its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 is

\$26,126,000 as compared to \$138,540,000 uncollected taxes in the Brooklyn office. The collection record for St. Louis is far above the national average.

St. Paul, Minn., has a good report. This office, which has total revenue collections in 1968 of \$2,914,748,000 reports a drop in its total of uncollected taxes from \$13,796,000 in 1967 to \$12,001,000 in 1968. Jacksonville and Brooklyn, each with about the same amount of revenue collections, had 10 times as many writeoffs and uncollected taxes as St. Paul.

Springfield, Ill., also has a report better than the national average. This office, which handled \$1,887,006,000 in revenue collections last year reported only \$8,910,000 total uncollected taxes in 1968 as compared to \$8,508,000 in 1967. The amounts being written off as uncollected in 1968 dropped from \$2,377,000 in 1967 to \$712,000 in 1968. This is a good report for an office of this size.

SOUTHWEST REGION

Albuquerque, N. Mex.: Employment tax delinquencies rose from \$867,000 in 1967 to \$1,147,000 in 1968 while the total of uncollected taxes, including amounts written off and abated rose from \$7,541,000 in 1967 to \$8,511,000 in 1968.

Austin, Tex.: This office does not have a good report. Employment tax delinquencies jumped from \$5,771,000 in 1967 to \$8,585,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable jumped from \$7,202,000 in 1967 to \$12,140,000 in 1968 while the amount abated rose from \$4,652,000 in 1967 to \$5,690,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes in the Austin office rose from \$72,093,000 in 1967 to \$81,573,000 in 1968.

This is far above the national average for uncollected taxes; for example, the total annual revenue collections of the Austin office were \$3,764,738,000 as compared to the \$4,314,622,000 in revenue collections in the St. Louis, Mo., office. Yet, Austin, which handled less revenue, reported uncollected taxes in 1968 of \$81.5 million, or over three times the \$26.1 million uncollected taxes in the larger St. Louis office.

Cheyenne, Wyo.: Uncollected taxes in the Cheyenne office showed a slight increase, rising from \$1,527,000 in 1967 to \$1,559,000 in 1968 with the most of this increase representing an increase in employment tax delinquencies, which rose from \$329,000 in 1967 to \$432,000 in 1968.

Dallas, Tex.: This office does not have a good report. Employment tax delinquencies in the Dallas office jumped from \$4,935,000 in 1967 to \$6,486,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable rose from \$5,831,000 in 1967 to \$7,919,000 in 1968 while the amount of abatements rose from \$3,646,000 in 1967 to \$4,071,000 in 1968. The total for uncollected taxes in Dallas, including writeoffs, in 1968 was \$72,082,000 as compared to \$71,072,000 in 1967.

This is far above the national average; for example, the total revenue collections in the Dallas office were \$2,943,214,000, or considerably less than the \$3,436,792,000 revenue collections for the Cincinnati, Ohio, office; yet the total of uncollected taxes in the Dallas office was

more than double that of the Cincinnati office.

There are far too many writeoffs and uncollected taxes in both Dallas and Austin. They need attention.

Denver, Colo., has a good report. The amounts written off as uncollectable in the Denver office dropped from \$4,068,000 in 1967 to \$2,246,000 in 1968 while the amounts abated in the same period dropped from \$3,564,000 in 1967 to \$1,908,000 in 1968. The total uncollected taxes, including writeoffs, in the Denver office in 1968 were \$16,472,000. Employment tax delinquencies in the Denver office rose from \$3,149,000 in 1967 to \$3,703,000 in 1968.

Little Rock, Ark.: The total for the uncollected taxes in Little Rock dropped from \$13,117,000 in 1967 to \$11,589,000 in 1968; however, the amounts written off as uncollectable showed a substantial increase, rising from \$752,000 in 1967 to \$2,315,000 in 1968. In this same period delinquent employment taxes jumped by 40 percent, or from \$1,015,000 in 1967 to \$1,444,000 in 1968.

New Orleans, La.: This office has a bad report. Employment tax delinquencies in the New Orleans office jumped from \$4,178,000 in 1967 to \$7,372,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollectable rose from \$2,897,000 in 1967 to \$4,496,000 in 1968, and abatements during the year rose from \$1,345,000 in 1967 to \$2,864,000 in 1968. Its remaining inventory of delinquent taxes, after these writeoffs, rose from \$15,693,000 in 1967 to a total of \$21,871,000 in 1968. This brought the total for uncollected taxes in the New Orleans office in 1968 to \$29,231,000. This office handles about 40 percent more revenue collections than the Wilmington, Del., office, yet their amount of uncollected taxes is over six times larger than the Delaware office.

Oklahoma City, Okla.: This is another office reporting a rise in employment tax delinquencies, or from \$2,551,000 in 1967 to \$3,184,000 in 1968 with the total for uncollected taxes during the year of 1968 rising to \$16,891,000 from the \$14,547,000 figure reported in 1967.

Wichita, Kans.: Employment tax delinquencies in Wichita rose nearly 50 percent, or from \$1,397,000 in 1967 to \$2,096,000 in 1968 while its inventory for delinquent accounts rose from \$7,006,000 in 1967 to \$10,487,000 in 1968, thus bringing its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 to \$12,628,000 as compared to \$10,422,000 in 1967.

WESTERN REGION

Anchorage, Alaska: When compared with the total amount of revenue collections for an office, Anchorage has a poor report. The total revenue collections for Anchorage were \$118,827,000 while its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was \$2,939,000 as compared to \$2,694,000 in 1967. The amount of uncollected taxes as related to the total revenue collections in that office were considerably above national average. Employment tax delinquencies in Anchorage rose over 35 percent, from \$683,000 in 1967 to \$946,000 in 1968.

Boise, Idaho, does not have too good

of a report. The total revenue collections in this office were \$337,240,000 while its total for uncollected taxes in 1968 was \$4,096,000 as compared with \$3,761,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in Boise rose from \$757,000 in 1967 to \$826,000 in 1968.

Helena, Mont.: This office has shown improvement although employment tax delinquencies had a slight increase, from \$361,000 in 1967 to \$368,000 in 1968, but the total for the amount of taxes not collected dropped from \$2,743,000 in 1967 to \$2,494,000 in 1968. The amounts written off as uncollected in Helena likewise dropped from \$766,000 in 1967 to \$486,000 in 1968.

Honolulu, Hawaii: Employment tax delinquencies rose over 50 percent, from \$780,000 in 1967 to \$1,199,000 in 1968 while the amount carried as delinquent at the end of 1968 had risen from \$2,395,000 in 1967 to \$3,738,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectible in Honolulu rose from \$227,000 in 1967 to \$581,000 in 1968, but there was a substantial drop in the amount abated in this office, this figure being \$579,000 in 1968 as compared to \$2,756,000 in 1967.

Los Angeles, Calif.: This office has a high ratio of uncollected taxes in 1968. It marked off as uncollectible \$66,107,000 in 1968 as compared to \$45,011,000 marked off in 1967. Taxes abated during 1968 totaled \$6,782,000 as compared to \$5,927,000 in 1967.

Even after these substantial writeoffs and abatements the remaining inventory carried as delinquent taxes on December 31, 1968, totaled \$118,685,000 as compared to \$92,522,000 in 1967. Employment tax delinquencies in 1968 were \$16,021,000, slightly less than the \$17,744,000 carried as delinquent in 1967. This means, however, that the Los Angeles office, whose annual revenue collections totaled \$8,812,169,000, was reporting a total of uncollected taxes in 1968 of \$191,754,000.

This is not a good report as compared to other offices; for example, the Detroit office, which has annual revenue collections totaling \$12,649,256,000 only reported uncollected taxes in 1968 of \$67,595,000. Yet the Los Angeles office, which is two-thirds the size of the Detroit office in revenue collections, reports a total for uncollected taxes in 1968 of \$191,574,000, or nearly three times that of Detroit. The Los Angeles office needs attention.

Phoenix, Ariz.: Employment tax delinquencies in Phoenix jumped nearly 40 percent, or from \$1,517,000 in 1967 to \$2,113,000 in 1968. The amount written off as uncollectable in 1968 was nearly double the amount written off in 1967, or \$3,380,000 in 1968 as compared to \$1,875,000 in 1967. The amount abated during 1968 totaled \$1,767,000 as compared to \$1,316,000 in 1967. The remaining carried as delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 totaled \$9,290,000, an increase from the \$7,460,000 carried as delinquent at the end of 1967. Altogether the total for uncollected taxes in the Phoenix office for 1968 was nearly 40-percent higher than the total for uncollected taxes for 1967.

Portland, Oreg.: Employment tax delinquencies in Portland were more than double the delinquencies in the preceding year, or \$2,860,000 in 1968 as compared with \$1,372,000 in 1967; however, the amount marked off as uncollectable in Portland in 1968 dropped substantially, or from \$2,585,000 in 1967 to \$1,268,000 in 1968. Abatements likewise declined in 1968, with \$1,778,000 listed for abatements in 1968 as compared to \$2,703,000 in 1967. However, after these writeoffs the balance carried as 1968 delinquent accounts in Portland showed a 50-percent increase, rising from \$6,082,000 in 1967 to \$9,962,000 in 1968, bringing the total for uncollected taxes in the Portland office to \$13,008,000.

Reno, Nev.: This office has a bad report. Employment tax delinquencies in the Reno office rose from \$1,897,000 in 1967 to \$2,038,000 in 1968. Amounts marked off as uncollectable in Reno likewise jumped from \$2,348,000 in 1967 to \$3,636,000 in 1968 while abatements were correspondingly higher, rising from \$699,000 in 1967 to \$947,000 in 1968. Even after these increased writeoffs and abatements the balance carried as delinquent accounts on December 31, 1968, was still nearly double the delinquent account balance in 1967, or \$12,140,000 in 1968 as compared to \$6,452,000 in 1967. The total for uncollected taxes in Reno in 1968 was \$16,723,000. Total revenue collections in the Reno office in fiscal 1968 was only \$308,093,000, or about one-fourth the size of the collections in the Wilmington, Del., office, yet the amount of uncollected taxes in Reno was over three times those of Delaware.

Salt Lake City, Utah: Employment tax delinquencies rose about 20 percent, or from \$852,000 in 1967 to \$1,032,000 in 1968. This office marked off as uncollectable \$991,000 in 1968 as compared to \$1,299,000 in 1967, but abatements during the year were sharply higher with \$1,928,000 abated in 1968 as compared to \$711,000 in 1967.

San Francisco, Calif.: Employment tax delinquencies in San Francisco rose from \$8,446,000 in 1967 to \$9,752,000 in 1968 while during the same year it marked off as uncollectable and abated a total of \$19,463,000 in 1968 as compared to \$15,202,000 in 1967. Even after considering these increased writeoffs and abatements, however, the balance carried as delinquent accounts at the end of 1968 had risen from \$50,441,000 in 1967 to \$59,372,000 in 1968. A total of \$78,835,000 in 1968 taxes remained uncollected in this office.

Seattle, Wash.: Delinquent employment taxes increased 50 percent, from \$1,830,000 in 1967 to \$2,754,000 in 1968 while the total for uncollected taxes rose from \$13,112,000 in 1967 to \$15,362,000 in 1968; however, when the size of this office, whose annual collection totaled \$2,302,670,000, is taken into consideration its report for tax collections is better than the national average. For example, Seattle, with its \$2.3 billion revenue collections reported a total of only \$15,362,000 in uncollected taxes in 1968 as compared with Jacksonville, Fla., with its \$2.9 billion revenue collections which reported \$136,743,000 as uncollected in 1968. Thus the Jacksonville office, which

is about 30 percent larger in total revenue collections than the Seattle office, reported delinquent and uncollected taxes over eight times that of the Seattle office.

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS

Puerto Rico: Employment tax delinquencies dropped from \$1,946,000 in 1967 to \$1,441,000 in 1968, but the total for uncollected taxes in 1968, including the \$1.2 million marked off as uncollectable and abated, was \$3,902,000, or about the same as the preceding year. Yet this office only handled \$199,297,000 in annual revenue collections, and the \$3.9 million being reported as uncollected taxes is considerably higher than the national average.

All others: This category under International Operations includes delinquent accounts of American citizens who are stationed abroad, and it is alarmingly high. The annual revenue collections of the Federal Government from this classification were \$450,866,000, yet the total for uncollected taxes in this same category in 1968 is \$77,778,000. This represents a 14-percent loss in collections. This is 10 times the national average and needs considerably more attention than has been given to this area in the past.

In this report it should be noted that the offices of Brooklyn and Manhattan, N.Y.; Jacksonville, Fla.; both offices in Texas, Austin, and Dallas; Los Angeles, Calif.; and Reno, Nev., are mentioned as having a poor record of collections. Some explanations should be forthcoming as to why people in those areas have not been paying their taxes.

The collection of taxes classified under International Operations have likewise been very poor as compared to the national average. This, too, needs attention.

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968, AND 1967
[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
NORTH-ATLANTIC REGION		
Albany, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	\$5,134	\$780
Abated during year.....	1,488	628
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	15,341	14,195
Total uncollected taxes.....	21,963	15,603
Augusta, Maine:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	193	266
Abated during year.....	643	316
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,566	2,460
Total uncollected taxes.....	3,402	3,042
Boston, Mass.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	10,127	2,943
Abated during year.....	15,074	5,720
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	50,182	46,143
Total uncollected taxes.....	75,383	54,806
Brooklyn, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	25,836	32,354
Abated during year.....	25,668	8,572
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	87,036	89,287
Total uncollected taxes.....	138,540	130,213
Buffalo, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,974	2,719
Abated during year.....	3,035	4,382
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	22,124	18,206
Total uncollected taxes.....	27,133	25,307
Burlington, Vt.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	176	133
Abated during year.....	247	232
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,417	1,367
Total uncollected taxes.....	2,840	1,732

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC 31, 1968 AND 1967—Con.
[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
NORTH-ATLANTIC REGION—Con.		
Hartford, Conn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	\$2,160	\$846
Abated during year.....	3,170	2,533
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	37,222	29,011
Total uncollected taxes.....	42,552	32,390
Manhattan, N.Y.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	26,903	87,673
Abated during year.....	21,652	27,260
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	221,706	181,633
Total uncollected taxes.....	270,261	296,566
Portsmouth, N.H.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	233	398
Abated during year.....	581	155
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,200	1,587
Total uncollected taxes.....	3,014	2,140
Providence, R.I.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,493	1,100
Abated during year.....	580	541
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	5,468	4,238
Total uncollected taxes.....	7,541	5,879
MID-ATLANTIC REGION		
Baltimore, Md.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	6,055	4,884
Abated during year.....	4,739	4,871
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	38,267	35,143
Total uncollected taxes.....	49,061	44,898
Newark, N.J.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	7,392	9,040
Abated during year.....	10,236	12,249
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	75,230	61,511
Total uncollected taxes.....	92,858	82,800
Philadelphia, Pa.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	15,169	5,622
Abated during year.....	7,105	6,644
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	42,331	47,253
Total uncollected taxes.....	64,605	59,519
Pittsburgh, Pa.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,790	2,448
Abated during year.....	4,499	5,729
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	24,007	16,459
Total uncollected taxes.....	30,296	24,636
Richmond, Va.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,858	1,960
Abated during year.....	2,881	6,942
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	16,502	13,922
Total uncollected taxes.....	21,241	22,824
Wilmington, Del.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,273	298
Abated during year.....	604	2,860
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,886	3,391
Total uncollected taxes.....	4,763	6,549
SOUTHEAST REGION		
Atlanta, Ga.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	3,612	4,828
Abated during year.....	4,759	4,404
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	16,896	13,942
Total uncollected taxes.....	25,267	23,174
Birmingham, Ala.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,980	4,560
Abated during year.....	4,061	3,109
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	8,975	9,656
Total uncollected taxes.....	15,016	17,325
Columbia, S.C.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,147	1,903
Abated during year.....	1,457	1,286
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	8,176	6,869
Total uncollected taxes.....	10,780	10,058
Greensboro, N.C.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,073	3,027
Abated during year.....	3,665	4,679
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	16,490	12,406
Total uncollected taxes.....	22,228	20,112
Jackson, Miss.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,982	1,504
Abated during year.....	926	1,449
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	4,769	4,466
Total uncollected taxes.....	7,677	7,419

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968, AND 1967—Con.

[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
SOUTHEAST REGION—		
Continued		
Jacksonville, Fla.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	\$19,316	\$19,368
Abated during year.....	23,743	7,351
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	93,684	89,704
Total uncollected taxes.....	136,743	116,423
Nashville, Tenn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	4,671	2,812
Abated during year.....	2,576	4,259
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	16,249	14,379
Total uncollected taxes.....	23,496	21,450
CENTRAL REGION		
Cincinnati, Ohio:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	7,642	4,219
Abated during year.....	4,840	3,220
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	18,954	18,744
Total uncollected taxes.....	31,436	26,183
Cleveland, Ohio:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	4,096	4,986
Abated during year.....	4,436	9,487
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	44,399	36,150
Total uncollected taxes.....	52,931	50,623
Detroit, Mich.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	3,849	3,279
Abated during year.....	7,118	5,016
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	56,618	50,758
Total uncollected taxes.....	67,595	59,053
Indianapolis, Ind.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	6,487	4,017
Abated during year.....	3,716	3,446
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	25,388	24,066
Total uncollected taxes.....	35,591	31,529
Louisville, Ky.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,532	2,731
Abated during year.....	1,673	2,642
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	14,651	9,247
Total uncollected taxes.....	17,856	14,620
Parkersburg, W. Va.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	568	897
Abated during year.....	623	764
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	6,594	4,545
Total uncollected taxes.....	7,785	6,206
MIDWEST REGION		
Aberdeen, S. Dak.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	94	196
Abated during year.....	293	164
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	1,245	909
Total uncollected taxes.....	1,632	1,269
Chicago, Ill.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	19,128	16,868
Abated during year.....	8,698	12,028
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	48,210	50,102
Total uncollected taxes.....	76,036	78,998
Des Moines, Iowa:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	696	2,311
Abated during year.....	1,118	1,586
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	5,127	4,377
Total uncollected taxes.....	6,941	8,274
Fargo, N. Dak.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	135	92
Abated during year.....	245	156
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	1,043	985
Total uncollected taxes.....	1,423	1,233
Milwaukee, Wis.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,384	3,943
Abated during year.....	2,960	2,354
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	10,552	11,064
Total uncollected taxes.....	15,896	17,361

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968 AND 1967—Con.

[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
MIDWEST REGION—Con.		
Omaha, Nebr.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	\$562	\$710
Abated during year.....	1,734	3,205
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	5,062	6,775
Total uncollected taxes.....	7,358	10,690
St. Louis, Mo.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	3,099	6,718
Abated during year.....	2,930	4,495
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	20,097	13,919
Total uncollected taxes.....	26,126	25,132
St. Paul, Minn.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,131	3,678
Abated during year.....	2,167	3,201
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	8,703	6,917
Total uncollected taxes.....	12,001	13,796
Springfield, Ill.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	712	2,377
Abated during year.....	1,484	1,052
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	6,714	5,079
Total uncollected taxes.....	8,910	8,508
SOUTHWEST REGION		
Albuquerque, N. Mex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	686	656
Abated during year.....	1,414	1,096
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	6,411	5,789
Total uncollected taxes.....	8,511	7,541
Austin, Tex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	12,140	7,202
Abated during year.....	5,690	4,652
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	63,743	60,239
Total uncollected taxes.....	81,573	72,093
Cheyenne, Wyo.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	171	249
Abated during year.....	349	153
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	1,039	1,125
Total uncollected taxes.....	1,559	1,527
Dallas, Tex.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	7,919	5,831
Abated during year.....	4,071	3,646
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	60,092	61,595
Total uncollected taxes.....	72,082	71,072
Denver, Colo.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,246	4,068
Abated during year.....	1,908	3,564
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	12,318	9,736
Total uncollected taxes.....	16,472	17,368
Little Rock, Ark.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,315	752
Abated during year.....	918	1,178
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	8,356	11,187
Total uncollected taxes.....	11,589	13,117
New Orleans, La.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	4,496	2,897
Abated during year.....	2,864	1,345
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	21,871	15,693
Total uncollected taxes.....	29,231	19,935
Oklahoma City, Okla.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,414	3,244
Abated during year.....	1,656	2,060
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	12,821	9,243
Total uncollected taxes.....	16,891	14,547
Wichita, Kans.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	878	850
Abated during year.....	1,263	2,566
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	10,487	7,006
Total uncollected taxes.....	12,628	10,422

CHART 1.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, AS OF DEC. 31, 1968 AND 1967—Con.

[Figures in thousands]

	1968	1967
WESTERN REGION		
Anchorage, Alaska:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	\$424	\$883
Abated during year.....	266	197
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,249	1,614
Total uncollected taxes.....	2,939	2,694
Boise, Idaho:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	148	208
Abated during year.....	455	872
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	3,493	2,681
Total uncollected taxes.....	4,096	3,762
Helena, Mont.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	486	766
Abated during year.....	443	405
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	1,565	1,572
Total uncollected taxes.....	2,494	2,743
Honolulu, Hawaii:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	581	227
Abated during year.....	579	2,756
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	3,738	2,395
Total uncollected taxes.....	4,898	5,378
Los Angeles, Calif.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	66,107	45,011
Abated during year.....	6,782	5,927
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	118,685	92,522
Total uncollected taxes.....	191,574	143,460
Phoenix, Ariz.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	3,380	1,875
Abated during year.....	1,767	1,316
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	9,290	7,460
Total uncollected taxes.....	14,437	10,651
Portland, Oreg.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	1,268	2,585
Abated during year.....	1,778	2,703
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	9,962	6,082
Total uncollected taxes.....	13,008	11,370
Reno, Nev.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	3,636	2,348
Abated during year.....	947	699
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	12,140	6,452
Total uncollected taxes.....	16,723	9,499
Salt Lake City, Utah:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	991	1,299
Abated during year.....	1,928	711
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	4,159	5,076
Total uncollected taxes.....	7,078	7,086
San Francisco, Calif.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	11,896	12,277
Abated during year.....	7,567	2,925
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	59,372	50,441
Total uncollected taxes.....	78,835	65,643
Seattle, Wash.:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	2,107	2,357
Abated during year.....	2,293	3,199
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	10,962	7,556
Total uncollected taxes.....	15,362	13,112
INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS		
Puerto Rico:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	292	262
Abated during year.....	914	852
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	2,696	2,793
Total uncollected taxes.....	3,902	3,907
All other:		
Marked off as uncollectible.....	7,536	2,768
Abated during year.....	3,171	4,493
Balance delinquent a/c Dec. 31.....	67,071	69,501
Total uncollected taxes.....	77,778	76,762

CHART 2.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, DECEMBER 1968 AND 1967

Region and district	Tax groups											
	Income				Employment				Other			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total	558,967	619,511	1,003,955	946,788	246,845	222,740	339,428	255,768	53,805	32,383	243,232	196,067
North Atlantic	123,893	141,758	254,750	255,233	57,395	52,366	120,847	82,346	9,410	4,583	70,668	50,547
Mid-Atlantic.....	97,474	108,481	131,461	114,141	34,027	32,419	44,225	38,118	6,868	5,950	23,538	25,420
Southeast.....	69,308	69,723	117,858	110,473	35,666	29,508	31,536	23,433	7,594	5,836	15,845	17,515
Central.....	76,957	88,154	98,985	92,978	30,900	28,274	36,828	29,542	8,475	3,671	30,800	20,990
Midwest.....	52,357	57,997	65,858	69,821	23,647	19,383	29,441	19,586	3,879	2,961	11,454	10,718
Southwest.....	56,687	63,392	137,954	135,588	31,699	27,241	34,449	24,192	6,461	3,991	24,735	21,835
Western.....	77,452	85,206	133,425	102,174	30,555	30,040	39,909	36,239	10,958	5,239	62,281	45,440
International operations.....	4,839	4,800	63,664	66,380	2,956	3,509	2,193	2,312	160	152	3,911	3,602
North Atlantic region:												
Albany.....	7,936	7,966	6,688	5,614	3,471	2,208	4,639	3,598	464	280	4,014	4,982
Augusta.....	2,205	2,064	1,909	2,152	930	681	576	292	246	41	81	16
Boston.....	19,938	28,923	27,865	31,628	10,269	10,859	17,518	12,390	1,777	680	4,800	2,125
Brooklyn.....	30,677	40,777	48,757	55,759	12,014	11,905	25,901	24,000	1,993	852	12,378	9,528
Buffalo.....	12,018	11,774	7,512	10,704	6,443	4,496	11,656	4,982	771	331	2,957	2,720
Burlington.....	999	944	1,422	878	744	608	666	415	293	53	329	74
Hartford.....	10,878	9,551	12,759	8,728	4,147	3,288	5,240	4,183	647	380	19,224	16,099
Manhattan.....	35,449	35,955	144,165	136,318	17,069	16,612	52,348	30,611	2,897	1,659	25,193	14,704
Portsmouth.....	1,810	1,665	1,184	1,093	851	576	926	479	117	20	90	16
Providence.....	1,983	2,139	2,489	2,359	1,457	1,133	1,377	1,396	205	287	1,602	483
Mid-Atlantic region:												
Baltimore.....	23,334	26,535	27,845	24,779	4,956	4,885	6,911	6,198	1,234	940	3,511	4,166
Newark.....	23,937	28,152	50,835	39,391	10,024	10,656	14,422	13,389	2,037	1,950	9,973	8,731
Philadelphia.....	23,829	23,861	26,794	30,200	7,499	6,937	9,663	9,335	1,359	1,214	5,874	7,718
Pittsburgh.....	10,123	11,114	14,080	9,791	4,606	3,965	7,667	4,732	1,215	925	2,260	1,896
Richmond.....	13,183	15,374	9,786	8,328	6,139	5,205	5,031	3,904	862	751	1,685	1,690
Wilmington.....	3,608	3,445	2,121	1,652	803	771	531	520	161	170	235	1,219
Southeast region:												
Atlanta.....	10,218	10,684	8,122	8,564	5,697	3,980	4,427	2,855	1,468	1,017	4,347	2,523
Birmingham.....	6,770	6,421	4,287	5,610	3,934	3,283	3,638	1,715	987	607	1,050	2,330
Columbia.....	5,842	5,377	5,394	5,384	2,726	1,977	1,629	1,076	748	485	1,153	409
Greensboro.....	12,160	10,874	12,289	9,520	4,384	3,460	3,213	2,054	675	695	988	832
Jackson.....	4,162	4,691	2,973	3,128	2,242	2,117	1,378	1,040	490	565	418	297
Jacksonville.....	19,925	21,704	74,691	69,453	11,022	10,416	12,691	11,984	2,451	1,490	6,302	8,268
Nashville.....	10,231	9,973	10,102	8,814	5,661	4,275	4,560	2,709	775	977	1,857	2,856
Central region:												
Cincinnati.....	12,759	13,272	11,767	11,942	4,609	4,378	4,785	3,823	1,433	464	2,402	2,980
Cleveland.....	13,941	16,344	29,874	26,684	5,986	5,044	7,010	5,001	2,026	834	7,516	4,464
Detroit.....	28,303	35,207	28,565	30,877	9,712	10,389	14,046	12,330	2,589	1,396	14,016	7,551
Indianapolis.....	10,666	12,046	15,647	14,362	4,942	4,415	6,142	5,298	1,184	621	3,599	4,406
Louisville.....	8,306	8,542	9,913	6,759	3,893	2,682	3,222	2,046	779	240	1,515	742
Parkersburg.....	2,982	2,743	3,219	2,354	1,758	1,366	1,623	1,044	464	116	1,752	1,147
Midwest region:												
Aberdeen.....	1,116	990	850	609	542	362	284	154	122	64	111	145
Chicago.....	19,169	24,329	31,329	36,942	7,931	7,172	14,185	8,602	925	855	2,695	4,557
Des Moines.....	3,782	4,112	3,149	2,624	1,746	1,338	1,249	879	543	555	728	875
Fargo.....	880	1,084	456	663	563	385	389	246	116	52	199	76
Milwaukee.....	5,692	6,435	6,473	7,193	2,727	2,101	2,957	2,422	323	275	1,122	1,449
Omaha.....	2,156	1,910	3,826	5,170	870	787	741	670	215	106	495	934
St. Louis.....	9,800	9,668	10,523	8,775	4,947	3,591	5,375	3,700	631	466	4,199	1,443
St. Paul.....	4,922	5,157	5,201	4,474	2,391	2,015	2,531	1,566	658	375	972	878
Springfield.....	4,840	4,312	4,051	3,371	1,930	1,632	1,730	1,347	346	213	933	361
Southwest region:												
Albuquerque.....	1,785	2,052	4,928	4,227	1,234	1,152	1,147	867	234	167	335	695
Austin.....	14,624	14,917	42,131	41,379	7,493	6,080	8,585	5,771	1,290	817	13,027	13,089
Cheyenne.....	858	919	533	685	560	522	432	329	111	91	75	112
Dallas.....	13,100	13,644	50,974	53,937	6,112	5,424	6,486	4,935	1,381	841	2,632	2,723
Denver.....	4,568	6,385	6,663	5,472	3,248	2,950	3,703	3,149	1,006	656	1,952	1,115
Little Rock.....	3,860	3,921	6,642	10,004	2,145	1,687	1,444	1,015	430	191	270	168
New Orleans.....	6,724	9,487	11,799	9,179	5,100	4,288	7,372	4,178	573	453	2,700	2,336
Oklahoma City.....	6,314	7,298	7,087	5,685	3,304	3,000	3,184	2,551	791	443	2,550	1,008
Wichita.....	4,854	4,769	7,197	5,020	2,503	2,138	2,096	1,397	545	332	1,194	589
Western region:												
Anchorage.....	949	1,159	979	861	496	448	946	683	110	31	324	70
Boise.....	1,372	1,297	2,508	1,838	845	639	826	757	207	148	160	86
Helena.....	1,462	1,159	1,081	1,053	648	586	368	361	227	150	116	158
Honolulu.....	1,554	1,316	2,191	1,507	748	604	1,199	780	126	66	348	109
Los Angeles.....	27,854	32,089	74,011	50,910	9,791	11,450	16,021	17,774	3,390	1,720	28,653	23,867
Phoenix.....	3,938	4,000	5,032	5,347	1,605	1,337	2,113	1,517	700	236	2,145	596
Portland.....	6,165	5,653	5,757	4,253	2,854	1,859	2,860	1,372	930	392	1,344	457
Reno.....	1,814	2,153	4,937	3,442	1,069	1,102	2,038	1,897	485	93	5,164	1,113
Salt Lake City.....	2,364	2,314	2,433	3,661	1,155	1,116	1,032	852	227	189	694	564
San Francisco.....	23,339	28,595	28,484	24,771	8,635	8,728	9,752	8,446	3,397	1,889	21,137	17,225
Seattle.....	6,641	5,471	6,012	4,531	2,709	2,171	2,754	1,830	1,159	325	2,196	1,195
International operations:												
Puerto Rico.....	794	834	1,256	834	2,576	3,251	1,441	1,956	160	151	1	13
All other.....	4,045	3,966	62,408	65,546	380	258	752	366	160	151	3,911	3,589

Region and district	Tax groups—Total				Inactive			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total	859,617	874,634	1,586,611	1,398,623	117,630	146,515	638,361	621,157
North Atlantic	190,698	198,707	446,262	388,127	28,527	34,374	163,028	162,285
Mid-Atlantic	138,369	146,850	199,223	177,679	17,431	25,757	73,261	82,719
Southeast	112,568	105,067	165,239	151,422	13,721	17,603	85,288	82,970
Central	116,332	120,099	166,614	143,510	15,344	19,141	53,882	53,882
Midwest	79,883	80,341	106,753	100,127	12,806	15,726	29,813	29,153
Southwest	94,847	94,624	197,138	181,613	11,680	13,077	109,822	1

CHART 2.—INVENTORY OF TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS, DECEMBER 1968 AND 1967—Continued

Region and district	Tax groups—Total				Inactive			
	Number		Amount (thousand dollars)		Number		Amount (thousand dollars)	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
North Atlantic region:								
Albany.....	11,871	10,454	15,341	14,195	1,487	1,873	3,163	2,558
Augusta.....	3,381	2,786	2,566	2,460	544	623	1,035	1,078
Boston.....	31,984	40,462	50,182	46,143	3,163	5,070	10,454	9,943
Brooklyn.....	44,684	53,534	87,036	89,287	7,443	7,700	36,197	37,238
Buffalo.....	19,232	16,601	22,124	18,206	2,531	2,977	6,767	6,725
Burlington.....	2,036	1,605	2,417	1,367	299	433	360	398
Hartford.....	15,672	13,219	37,222	29,011	2,398	2,572	22,126	19,536
Manhattan.....	55,415	54,226	221,607	181,633	9,642	12,147	80,964	83,161
Portsmouth.....	2,778	2,261	2,200	1,587	516	377	632	714
Providence.....	3,645	3,559	5,468	4,238	504	602	1,330	934
Mid-Atlantic region:								
Baltimore.....	29,524	32,360	38,267	35,143	3,309	4,387	16,249	18,138
Newark.....	35,998	40,758	75,230	61,511	5,021	8,145	29,943	32,781
Philadelphia.....	32,687	32,012	42,331	47,253	4,362	6,598	14,258	19,446
Pittsburgh.....	15,944	16,004	24,007	16,549	2,110	2,670	6,932	6,163
Richmond.....	20,184	21,330	16,502	13,922	2,168	3,241	5,165	5,479
Wilmington.....	4,032	4,386	2,886	3,391	461	716	714	712
Southeast region:								
Atlanta.....	17,383	15,681	16,896	13,942	2,238	2,800	6,103	5,493
Birmingham.....	11,691	10,311	8,975	9,656	1,740	1,885	2,846	3,952
Columbia.....	9,316	7,839	8,176	6,869	782	1,200	3,145	3,921
Greensboro.....	17,219	15,029	16,490	12,406	1,914	2,811	7,351	6,556
Jackson.....	6,894	7,373	4,769	4,466	678	973	1,388	1,707
Jacksonville.....	33,398	33,610	93,684	89,704	4,361	5,169	60,867	57,633
Nashville.....	16,667	15,224	16,249	14,379	2,008	2,765	3,589	3,708
Central region:								
Cincinnati.....	18,801	18,114	18,954	18,744	2,588	3,124	3,824	5,548
Cleveland.....	21,953	22,222	44,399	36,150	2,843	3,448	18,268	17,149
Detroit.....	40,604	46,952	56,628	50,758	5,161	6,981	17,695	15,807
Indianapolis.....	16,792	17,082	25,388	24,066	2,193	2,853	11,097	10,623
Louisville.....	12,978	11,464	14,641	9,247	1,987	2,070	4,892	3,430
Parkersburg.....	5,204	4,225	6,594	4,545	572	665	1,521	1,325
Midwest region:								
Aberdeen.....	1,780	1,416	1,245	909	190	264	290	286
Chicago.....	28,025	32,356	48,210	50,102	3,829	4,269	9,894	8,931
Des Moines.....	6,071	6,005	5,127	4,377	1,171	1,606	1,498	1,973
Fargo.....	1,559	1,521	1,043	985	356	398	174	430
Milwaukee.....	8,742	8,811	10,552	11,064	1,623	2,018	3,407	4,137
Omaha.....	3,241	2,803	5,062	6,775	783	719	3,417	4,528
St. Louis.....	15,378	13,725	20,097	13,919	2,436	3,073	6,721	4,709
St. Paul.....	7,971	7,547	8,703	6,917	1,307	1,810	2,341	2,116
Springfield.....	7,116	6,157	6,714	5,079	1,111	1,569	2,070	2,043
Southwest region:								
Albuquerque.....	3,253	3,371	6,411	5,789	442	563	3,067	2,246
Austin.....	23,407	21,814	63,743	60,239	1,938	2,247	38,442	38,260
Cheyenne.....	1,529	1,532	1,039	1,125	335	342	286	378
Dallas.....	20,593	19,909	60,092	61,595	2,636	2,663	46,432	48,474
Denver.....	8,822	9,991	12,318	9,736	1,389	1,432	3,205	3,801
Little Rock.....	6,435	5,799	8,356	11,187	880	975	5,342	8,488
New Orleans.....	12,497	14,228	21,871	15,693	1,697	2,046	8,404	6,241
Oklahoma City.....	10,409	10,741	12,821	9,243	1,099	1,417	2,231	2,377
Wichita.....	7,902	7,239	10,487	7,006	1,264	1,392	2,413	1,850
Western region:								
Anchorage.....	1,555	1,638	2,249	1,614	113	189	399	315
Boise.....	2,424	2,034	3,493	2,681	571	572	1,925	969
Helena.....	2,337	1,895	1,565	1,572	354	440	359	673
Honolulu.....	2,428	1,986	3,738	2,395	373	457	1,568	915
Los Angeles.....	41,035	45,259	118,685	92,522	5,650	6,291	54,774	38,606
Phoenix.....	6,243	5,573	9,290	7,460	746	862	3,417	2,477
Portland.....	9,949	7,904	9,962	6,082	1,292	1,167	2,485	2,169
Reno.....	3,368	3,348	12,140	6,452	551	518	4,458	1,943
Salt Lake City.....	3,746	3,619	4,159	5,076	632	729	1,718	2,843
San Francisco.....	35,371	39,212	59,372	50,441	4,416	5,807	18,229	15,572
Seattle.....	10,509	7,967	10,962	7,556	1,683	1,795	3,260	2,566
International operations:								
Puerto Rico.....	3,370	4,086	2,696	2,793	829	1,038	1,569	1,368
All other.....	4,585	4,375	67,071	69,501	911	973	25,691	27,617

Note: Rounded figures may not add to the totals which are based on unrounded figures.

CHART 3.—TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS REPORTED AS UNCOLLECTABLE AND ABATED, CALENDAR YEARS 1968 AND 1967

(Dollar amounts in thousands)

Region and district	Uncollectable				Abated			
	Number		Amount ¹		Number		Amount	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
Total.....	252,622	305,224	\$326,787	\$347,100	131,025	162,411	\$236,444	\$216,305
North Atlantic.....	52,002	63,433	74,230	129,212	22,282	34,801	72,136	50,339
Mid-Atlantic.....	29,859	33,366	33,539	24,249	23,200	31,217	30,065	39,293
Southeast.....	38,193	45,599	34,781	38,001	19,707	23,089	41,185	26,538
Central.....	28,269	31,503	24,176	20,128	17,039	22,265	22,404	24,576
Midwest.....	28,948	35,778	27,942	36,892	16,678	19,499	21,632	28,241
Southwest.....	28,745	32,257	33,265	25,752	13,316	13,616	20,134	20,262
Western.....	43,936	60,348	91,026	69,836	16,288	15,890	24,805	21,710
International operations.....	2,670	2,940	7,827	3,031	2,515	2,034	4,083	5,346

See footnotes at end of table.

CHART 3.—TAXPAYER DELINQUENT ACCOUNTS REPORTED AS UNCOLLECTABLE AND ABATED, CALENDAR YEARS 1968 AND 1967—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Region and district	Uncollectable				Abated			
	Number		Amount ¹		Number		Amount	
	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967
North Atlantic region:								
Albany	1,611	1,459	\$5,134	\$780	\$1,171	\$1,054	\$1,488	\$628
Augusta	525	752	193	266	415	463	643	316
Boston	7,110	5,450	10,127	2,943	3,711	4,516	15,074	5,720
Brooklyn	17,663	25,117	25,836	32,354	5,036	8,214	25,668	8,572
Buffalo	4,900	4,783	1,974	2,719	2,153	3,064	3,035	4,382
Burlington	353	361	1,176	133	456	466	247	232
Hartford	2,372	2,249	2,160	846	1,812	2,854	3,170	2,533
Manhattan	15,895	21,756	26,903	87,673	6,928	13,822	21,652	27,260
Portsmouth	650	724	233	398	174	68	581	155
Providence	923	782	1,493	1,100	426	280	580	541
Mid-Atlantic region:								
Baltimore	7,107	8,345	6,055	4,884	4,059	4,433	4,739	4,871
Newark	7,326	10,408	7,392	9,040	6,124	7,112	10,236	12,249
Philadelphia	6,828	5,796	15,169	5,622	6,270	12,318	7,105	6,644
Pittsburgh	2,900	3,260	1,790	2,448	2,683	3,181	4,499	5,729
Richmond	4,942	4,821	1,858	1,960	3,701	3,653	2,881	6,942
Wilmington	756	736	1,273	298	363	520	604	2,860
Southeast region:								
Atlanta	5,279	7,059	3,612	4,828	3,466	3,796	4,759	4,404
Birmingham	3,877	5,256	1,980	4,560	1,982	2,681	4,061	3,109
Columbia	2,445	3,253	1,147	1,903	1,695	2,154	1,457	1,286
Greensboro	5,373	7,207	2,073	3,027	3,395	4,243	3,665	4,679
Jackson	3,041	2,534	1,982	1,504	1,152	1,487	926	1,449
Jacksonville	12,582	14,619	19,316	19,368	5,113	5,645	23,743	7,351
Nashville	5,096	5,671	4,671	2,812	2,904	3,083	2,576	4,259
Central region:								
Cincinnati	5,485	6,366	7,642	4,219	2,409	2,964	4,840	3,220
Cleveland	6,824	6,784	4,096	4,986	3,534	4,809	4,436	9,487
Detroit	7,504	8,723	3,849	3,279	4,961	6,240	7,118	5,016
Indianapolis	5,162	5,343	6,487	4,017	3,136	4,108	3,716	3,446
Louisville	2,350	2,984	1,532	2,731	2,258	3,134	1,673	2,642
Parkersburg	944	1,303	568	897	741	1,010	623	764
Midwest region:								
Aberdeen	270	487	94	196	435	337	293	164
Chicago	13,605	17,868	19,128	16,868	4,275	7,646	8,698	12,028
Des Moines	1,431	1,704	696	2,311	1,809	1,554	1,118	1,586
Fargo	430	375	135	92	450	346	245	156
Milwaukee	3,429	3,887	2,384	3,943	2,340	2,298	2,960	2,354
Omaha	839	824	562	710	1,094	850	1,734	3,205
St. Louis	4,843	5,776	3,099	6,718	2,699	3,527	2,930	4,495
St. Paul	2,394	3,288	1,131	3,678	1,870	1,702	2,167	3,201
Springfield	1,707	1,751	712	2,377	1,706	1,239	1,484	1,052
Southwest region:								
Albuquerque	865	1,295	686	656	644	854	1,414	1,096
Austin	6,060	6,674	12,140	7,202	3,151	3,757	5,690	4,652
Cheyenne	413	624	171	249	273	225	349	153
Dallas	7,430	9,213	7,919	5,831	2,108	1,673	4,071	3,646
Denver	2,903	2,258	2,246	4,068	1,639	1,262	1,908	3,564
Little Rock	1,423	1,821	2,315	752	952	1,427	918	1,178
New Orleans	3,995	4,024	4,496	2,897	1,717	1,077	2,864	1,345
Oklahoma City	4,099	4,536	2,414	3,244	1,509	1,798	1,656	2,060
Wichita	1,557	1,812	878	850	1,323	1,543	1,263	2,566
Western region:								
Anchorage	530	1,061	424	883	219	189	266	197
Boise	541	839	148	208	601	798	455	872
Helena	786	1,072	486	766	505	553	443	405
Honolulu	589	601	581	227	385	505	579	2,756
Los Angeles	16,712	21,042	66,107	45,011	4,846	2,030	6,782	5,927
Phoenix	2,467	2,800	3,380	1,875	986	1,061	1,767	1,316
Portland	2,515	4,927	1,268	2,585	1,419	1,622	1,778	2,703
Reno	1,179	1,750	3,636	2,348	310	320	947	947
Salt Lake City	920	1,500	991	1,299	727	690	1,928	711
San Francisco	14,780	20,434	11,896	12,277	4,361	6,056	7,567	2,925
Seattle	2,917	4,242	2,107	2,357	1,929	2,066	2,293	3,199
International operations:								
Puerto Rico	798	1,015	292	262	1,184	1,017	914	852
All other	1,872	1,925	7,536	2,768	1,331	1,017	3,171	4,493

¹ In calendar year 1968 \$34,041,000 were collected on accounts previously reported uncollectable. In calendar year 1967 these additional collections amounted to \$27,948,000.
² The amount of abatements in Boise for 1967 has been adjusted to compensate for invalid assessments which were erroneously closed as abatements in calendar year 1967 and subsequently, in calendar year 1968, properly reversed.
³ As explained in the report on this subject to Senator Williams dated Apr. 24, 1968, the corrected calendar year 1967 abatement figure for Omaha is \$3,205,000 instead of the —\$498,000 previously reported.

Note: Rounded figures may not add to the totals which are based on unrounded figures. CP:C:A: Jan. 28, 1969.

CHART 4.—INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS BY INTERNAL REVENUE REGIONS, DISTRICTS, STATES, AND OTHER AREAS

[States represented by single districts indicated in parentheses; totals for other States shown at bottom of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Internal revenue regions, districts, States, and other areas	Total internal revenue collections
Total, United States	153,636,838
North Atlantic region	39,766,833
Albany (see (c) below)	1,849,222
Augusta (Maine)	411,057
Boston (Massachusetts)	4,755,100
Brooklyn (see (c) below)	3,372,823

CHART 4.—INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS BY INTERNAL REVENUE REGIONS, DISTRICTS, STATES, AND OTHER AREAS—Continued

[States represented by single districts indicated in parentheses; totals for other States shown at bottom of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Internal revenue regions, districts, States, and other areas	Total internal revenue collections
North Atlantic region—Continued	
Buffalo (see (c) below)	3,300,953
Burlington (Vermont)	189,566
Hartford (Connecticut)	3,056,857
Manhattan (see (c) below)	21,669,454
Portsmouth (New Hampshire)	386,395
Providence (Rhode Island)	775,407

CHART 4.—INTERNAL REVENUE COLLECTIONS BY INTERNAL REVENUE REGIONS, DISTRICTS, STATES, AND OTHER AREAS—Continued

[States represented by single districts indicated in parentheses; totals for other States shown at bottom of table]

[In thousands of dollars]

Internal revenue regions, districts, States, and other areas	Total internal revenue collections
Mid-Atlantic region	24,080,351
Baltimore (Maryland and District of Columbia)	4,092,512
Newark (New Jersey)	5,855,707
Philadelphia (see (e) below)	6,363,812
Pittsburgh (see (e) below)	4,140,157
Richmond (Virginia)	2,513,176
Wilmington (Delaware)	1,114,987
Southeast region	13,166,006
Atlanta (Georgia)	2,488,051
Birmingham (Alabama)	1,122,438
Columbia (South Carolina)	829,953
Greensboro (North Carolina)	3,567,050
Jackson (Mississippi)	531,311
Jacksonville (Florida)	2,986,346
Nashville (Tennessee)	1,640,857
Central region	29,690,441
Cincinnati (see (d) below)	3,436,792
Cleveland (see (d) below)	6,692,291
Detroit (Michigan)	12,649,256
Indianapolis (Indiana)	3,860,905
Louisville (Kentucky)	2,491,416
Parkersburg (West Virginia)	559,782
Midwest region	26,199,055
Aberdeen (South Dakota)	199,651
Chicago (see (b) below)	11,366,734
Des Moines (Iowa)	1,304,909
Fargo (North Dakota)	187,735
Milwaukee (Wisconsin)	3,079,873
Omaha (Nebraska)	943,777
St. Louis (Missouri)	4,314,622
St. Paul (Minnesota)	2,914,748
Springfield (see (b) below)	1,887,006
Southwest region	13,804,137
Albuquerque (New Mexico)	340,048
Austin (see (f) below)	3,764,738
Cheyenne (Wyoming)	121,969
Dallas (see (f) below)	2,943,214
Denver (Colorado)	1,936,202
Little Rock (Arkansas)	542,122
New Orleans (Louisiana)	1,524,387
Oklahoma City (Oklahoma)	1,564,460
Wichita (Kansas)	1,066,998
Western region	21,376,268
Anchorage (Alaska)	118,827
Boise (Idaho)	337,240
Helena (Montana)	244,276
Honolulu (Hawaii)	440,237
Los Angeles (see (a) below)	8,812,169
Phoenix (Arizona)	613,180
Portland (Oregon)	1,151,313
Reno (Nevada)	308,093
Salt Lake City (Utah)	404,623
San Francisco (see (a) below)	6,643,639
Seattle (Washington)	2,302,670
Office of International Operations	650,162
Puerto Rico	199,297
Other	450,866
Undistributed:	
Federal tax deposits and depository receipts	-15,581,913
Transferred to government of Guam	-7,114
Gasoline, lubricating oil, and excess FICA credits	365,453
Withheld taxes of Federal employees	127,157

TOTALS FOR STATES NOT SHOWN ABOVE

(a) California	15,455,808
(b) Illinois	13,253,740
(c) New York	30,192,452
(d) Ohio	10,129,083
(e) Pennsylvania	10,503,969
(f) Texas	6,707,952

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield. Mr. PROXMIRE. First, Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Delaware for having made this presentation, as he has done each year for many years. It is an excellent contribution, to make the Senate, Congress, and the country aware of this very important matter.

I point very proudly to page 8 of the Senator's remarks. In discussing the Milwaukee, Wis., office, the Senator says:

The total of uncollected taxes in the Milwaukee office dropped from \$17,361,000 in 1967 to \$15,896,000 in 1968. Overall, this is an excellent report for this office when we consider that the total revenue collections for the year in Milwaukee were \$3,079,873,000, about equal to the \$3,372,823,000 revenue collections in the Brooklyn office; yet Brooklyn reported uncollected taxes of \$138,540,000 in 1968, or over eight times the \$15,896,000 uncollected in Milwaukee.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware for making this particular reference. As a Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud of the record this office has.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Wisconsin has every right to be proud of his State's record. There are several offices, including the one in my own State, which I have cited as having excellent reports. There are other offices to which I have called attention which have very poor collection records as compared to the national average, and I have suggested that they should be given particular attention.

For example, in this report it should be noted that the offices of Brooklyn and Manhattan in New York; Jacksonville, Fla.; both of the offices in Texas, Austin and Dallas; Los Angeles, Calif.; Reno, Nev.; and the New Orleans office are all mentioned as having a poor record of collections; and I have suggested that some explanation should be forthcoming as to why the people in those areas have not been paying their taxes as have others. I might also say that I am very proud of the collection record in my own State, which is likewise one of the best in the country inasmuch as the record shows that in Delaware they collected 99.6 percent of the assessed taxes that were due last year. Like the Senator from Wisconsin, I am very proud to cite our State as having an excellent record of payment of taxes.

I have asked the Treasury Department to give their special attention to those areas where taxes are not being paid in line with the national average because there is an exceptionally large amount being written off in many of these offices as uncollectible. I do not think we can let it go by unnoticed because to the extent that these taxes are not paid by the respective taxpayers who owe them, other taxpayers have to make up the deficiency.

I was particularly critical of the high increase of delinquency in employment taxes over almost the entire Nation. I cite, for example, that \$339,428,000 was carried as delinquent in 1968, as compared with \$255,768,000 delinquent in the same category the year before. That is a 32-percent increase in the delinquency for employment taxes. There is no excuse for this. These are trust funds and do not belong to the employers.

It should be emphasized over and over that the employment taxes do not belong to the employer. These moneys withheld, the income taxes, social security taxes, and so forth, are withheld by the employers, but they belong to the employees. They are trust funds, and should be transmitted to the Government. I have been greatly concerned, over the years, at the manner in which this delinquent

account seems to be expanding in this category.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin.

MAIL SERVICE FOR MRS. MAMIE DOUD EISENHOWER

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 10158.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate H.R. 10158, a bill to provide mail service for Mamie Doud Eisenhower, widow of former President Dwight David Eisenhower, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of the bill.

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

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this measure, which passed the House of Representatives yesterday, provides for mail service to Mrs. Eisenhower during the rest of her natural life. It will permit her, by her signature or signature facsimile, to use the mails within the continental United States, and also within Puerto Rico, free of postage. For the cost of that mail service, the Post Office will be reimbursed by the Treasury.

This proposal follows a long established precedent, Mr. President, and I think it would be most appropriate for the Senate to act upon it expeditiously. I urge that the bill be passed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, obviously this measure has the full concurrence of the minority.

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

S. 1857—INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1970

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last year Congress passed Public Law 90-407, a major revision of the National Science Foundation's organic statute, to strengthen the Foundation's structure and reemphasize and extend its responsibilities for research. This year, our continuing commitment is to see to it that the Foundation has the legislative support and funding needed to carry out its new, as well as its continuing tasks.

To achieve these ends, there must be an exchange of ideas and opinions between the parties involved. Congress has now provided a time and a place for such a dialog, by requiring congressional authorization as a prelude to appropriation. Consequently, and in accordance with the statute, I am pleased to announce that a Special Subcommittee on the National Science Foundation, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has been formed. At some point, it will hold hearings on the first National Science Foundation authorization bill, which I am introducing today. I am very pleased to serve as chairman of this subcommittee.

During these authorization hearings,

we will, of course, hear from Dr. Leland J. Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, who, I regret to inform the Senate, has announced his intention to leave the Foundation when his term expires in June of this year. Although it might be more appropriate for a later occasion, I cannot let this moment pass without saying that Dr. Haworth has been a source of integrity, insight and inspiration during his outstanding career. He will be sorely missed.

It is particularly important that the fine tradition and exemplary record of statesmanlike, nonpartisan leadership of the NSF established by its first director, Dr. Alan Waterman, and carried on so ably by his successor, Dr. Haworth, be continued unblemished into the future. For if there is one area of this Nation's activities that should transcend political divisiveness, it is the scientific pursuit of truth through research and the education of our young people to pursue this honorable profession. Science, with its untold benefits for human betterment, constitutes a major national resource that belongs equally to all segments of our society, and that has always operated—and should continue to operate—outside the arena of political pressures. The National Science Foundation needs this kind of leadership; the Nation demands it.

I, therefore, share the distress of the scientific community, as outlined in the April 18 issue of Science magazine, that the administration appeared to have chosen an outstanding leader of the scientific community, Dr. Franklin A. Long, to serve as the next Director of NSF, and then had reversed its decision. The NSF is engaged solely in civilian, non-military research; it will benefit no one if the apolitical status of the NSF is changed.

Among the other distinguished witnesses we should hear are Dr. Philip Handler, Chairman of the National Science Board and President-elect of the National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Lee DuBridge, Director of the Office of Science and Technology in the Executive Office; and other informed scientists and educators as well.

With such a diverse and knowledgeable group of witnesses, I am sure that the subcommittee will benefit from a broad range of views and advice, so that our recommendation will be grounded on the most reliable and informed judgments.

Fortunately, when we convene it will be more as a factfinding than a fault-finding committee. Of course, American science has problems of funding, coordination, and competing demands for limited resources, as do other elements of our complex Government and society. But at the same time, basic research in the United States has never been more important or vital than it is right now. Scientific results have contributed directly, and through technology, to the improvement of national security, health and longevity, and the economic development of our society. One need only see the dramatic increase in the number of American Nobel laureates, the dominance of American journals in the

world's scientific literature, and the pervasive expansion of technology through all facets of our society to conclude that our investment has been sound.

I say it has been sound because we must never lose sight of the fact that each scientific investigation represents a leap into the unknown, which is by no means a sure thing. It is this driving thirst for knowledge, not the assurance of utility, which distinguishes and elevates the pursuit of science. In testimony before the House committee on this authorization bill, Dr. Handler described some interesting advances which illustrate the point. Recently, scientists synthesized ribonuclease, an important enzyme produced in the body, and other scientists have produced organic compounds which can withstand temperatures of 800 degrees centigrade without turning to charcoal. Whether these products have any value is not known today—but we do know that science grows from deposits of knowledge of this sort, and that we must continue to lay down these deposits if our technology and scientific knowledge is to continue to advance. For, while the value of each scientific investigation is an unknown, the overall value of general scientific advance is definitely known—and it amounts to continued prosperity and progress for our society.

A quotation from Dr. Handler's House testimony vividly portrays the challenge currently confronting our scientific enterprise:

There are those who say science isn't relevant to all our important and pressing social problems. But it seems to me that their attitude doesn't arise from the failure of science and technology so much as from its wholesale success; that it is precisely because of our great capabilities which have so expanded the gross national product and life for eighty percent of the people . . . that we have twenty percent whose aspirations quite naturally rose and perhaps they rose more rapidly than our nation knew how to meet them. But the reason for these social problems is not the failure of science and technology, it is the success of science and technology. And we are not through. Whether you are concerned with the public health, with pollution problems, with urban sprawl, the national defense, transportation, communication, age or population control, in every one of these areas what is required is more science, to provide new technologies, not less.

In face of this challenge and despite the enviable position of leadership developed by the United States over the past 25 years, the scientific establishment is currently, in the words of Dr. Jerome Wiesner, the provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, in "a state of disarray." This condition is the result of budgetary cuts for research at universities and national research centers; a reduction in support for graduate science education; and deferral of the acquisition of many vital research facilities and much-needed equipment. Is it any wonder that scientists and concerned citizens alike are worried that the structure of science, so laboriously erected, is being undermined? Dr. DuBridge said recently:

Scholarship and research have shed light on many problems which have puzzled the human intellect. Why are some problems unsolved? . . . Today we are overwhelmed

with knowledge—and we scream with pain because we don't know everything . . . Success had thus led only to rising expectations and to mounting accusations of failure.

Given these conditions, it is both timely and propitious that our subcommittee consider for the first time the authorization bill of the National Science Foundation. In the past, the triumphs of science and its contributions to the national welfare and society made for rapid, almost unquestioning support. Although acceptance of science on such grounds continues to be widespread, we have come to be more aware that we need "wisdom to deal with knowledge." Perhaps if we had come to this realization sooner, we might have avoided the adverse consequences mentioned, and been better able to help maintain a better legislative balance between economy, urgent national needs clamoring for attention, and the scientific programs on which progress depends.

The authorization hearings we are about to undertake offer a new opportunity for the Senate to be better informed. At the same time, it will provide a new forum for the Senate to express its views and secure specific answers to its questions. As such, these hearings should be the indispensable first step to responsible and purposeful action by the Senate when it considers this bill.

Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1970, and ask that it be appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill, and a sectional analysis of it, be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and the sectional analysis will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Massachusetts.

The bill (S. 1857) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation pursuant to Public Law 81-507, as amended, 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:

S. 1857

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the National Science Foundation for the following programs:

(1) Support of scientific research	248.6
(2) Computing activities in education and research	22.0
(3) Institutional support of science	69.0
(4) Science education support	112.5
(5) Science information activities	13.0
(6) International cooperative science activities	2.0
(7) Planning and policy studies	2.9
(8) Program development and management	17.0

Sec. 2. (a) When so specified in an Appropriation Act, any amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(b) Appropriations made pursuant to this Act may be used, but not to exceed \$2,500, for official reception and representation expenses upon the approval or authority of the Director, and his determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officers of the Government.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act—

(a) No amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program deleted by the Congress from requests as originally made to either the House Committee on Science and Astronautics or the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare;

(b) No amount in excess of 5 per centum of the amount appropriated for any program pursuant to this Act may be used for any program in excess of the amount actually authorized for that particular program by Section 1; and

(c) No amount appropriated pursuant to this Act may be used for any program which has not been presented to or requested of either such committee, unless—

(A) a period of thirty days has passed after the receipt by the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate and each such committee of notice given by the Director or his designee containing a full and complete statement of the action proposed to be taken and the facts and circumstances relied upon in support of such proposed action; or

(B) each such committee before the expiration of such period has transmitted to the Director written notice to the effect that such committee has no objection to the Foundation proceeding with the proposed action before the expiration of the thirty days.

Sec. 4. Section 14 of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950, as amended by Public Law 90-407, 82 Stat. 360, is amended by adding to the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the authorization of any appropriation to the Foundation shall expire (unless an earlier expiration is specifically provided) at the close of the third fiscal year following the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted, to the extent that such appropriation has not theretofore actually been made."

Sec. 5. In addition to such sums as are authorized by section 1 hereof, not to exceed \$3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside the United States to be paid for in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department determines to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States.

Sec. 6. This Act may be cited as the "National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1970."

The material, presented by Mr. KENNEDY, follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE BILL

Section I: This section breaks the NSF appropriation authorization into seven program sub-appropriations and one management sub-appropriation. These items conform to the line items shown in the President's annual budget presentation except that funds in the amount of \$20,000,000 which appear in the budget are not being authorized because the money is available from prior appropriations. This \$20 million reduction is spread through deductions of \$10 million from Scientific research, \$5 million from Institutional support for science, and \$5 million from Science education support.

Section II: (a) Provide that when specified in an Appropriation Act, amounts appropriated may remain available without fiscal year limitation.

(b) Section 2b authorizes an allowance of up to \$2,500 for official reception and representation expenses to be authorized at the discretion of the Director.

Section III: This section prohibits—

(a) the restoration of any program deleted by the Congress;

(b) the addition of program amounts, in excess of 5% of the amount appropriated for

use in any program in excess of the amount authorized by Section I; and

(c) the use of funds for any program not previously presented to either committee; unless the Director notifies the House and Senate of such transfers and waits thirty days, or receives earlier written notice of no objection to earlier action.

Section IV: This section amends the NSF Act of 1950, as amended by P.L. 90-407, to provide that all outstanding unfunded authorization would automatically expire at the close of the third fiscal year after the fiscal year for which the authorization was enacted. This provision would not be required in subsequent annual authorization acts.

Section V: This section authorizes, in addition to the funds appropriated by Section I, an appropriation of up to \$3 million for expenses of the National Science Foundation incurred outside of the United States, to be financed from foreign currencies which are determined by the Treasury Department to be in excess of the normal operating requirements of the United States Government. These funds would be spent in foreign countries to support programs mutually determined by NSF and the State Department to be in the interests of improving international relations through scientific endeavor.

Section VI: This section cites the title of the Authorization Act.

S. 1858—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE SUGAR ACT OF 1948

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and 11 other Senators—Senator BROOKE, COOPER, CRANSTON, GOODELL, HART, JAVITS, MONDALE, MOSS, PELL, SCOTT, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and YOUNG of Ohio—I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the sugar quota presently allocated to the Republic of South Africa. Identical legislation was introduced yesterday in the House of Representatives by Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM, of New York.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to terminate a special economic benefit now conferred on the Republic of South Africa by the United States. The present racial policies of South Africa are repugnant to the principles and ideals of all Americans. They have been condemned by the overwhelming majority of the nations of the world, both in the United Nations and elsewhere. They violate the basic human rights provisions of the United Nations Charter, and they threaten to plunge the entire African continent into racial conflict. Under these circumstances, I believe it is morally wrong for the United States to continue a program of special financial assistance under which the Republic of South Africa has received millions of dollars in sugar subsidies from the United States in recent years.

It is important to recognize, however, that nothing in the proposed legislation seeks to impose diplomatic, economic or other affirmative sanctions against the Republic of South Africa. The bill is not an attempt to place economic quarantine or trade isolation on that nation. Its sole purpose is to withdraw a positive privilege now bestowed on South Africa, not to impose a negative sanction or other punitive measure.

Although the goal of the bill is narrow, its principle is important. At a time when other types of disengagement from South Africa are finding increasingly broad support in this country, I believe we in Congress can at least reach wide and bipartisan agreement on the principle that the United States should not now be conferring a direct economic benefit on a nation whose basic policies are at war with the fundamental values of mankind. We must recognize that the Sugar Act is foreign aid, not foreign trade, and we must act to adjust our policies accordingly.

Traditionally, we have always given the closest scrutiny to our foreign aid programs, to insure that they are consistent with our overall moral, political, and economic interests. To continue a program of direct foreign aid to South Africa is intolerable. It is inconsistent with the goals of our domestic policy at home and our foreign policy abroad. And, even apart from the crucial moral principle involved, it is inconsistent with the basic theory of our foreign economic assistance programs.

At home, support for South Africa is an insult to millions of Americans and an affront to the precious goals of equality and social justice we pursue. Abroad, support for South Africa impairs our efforts to improve relations with the emerging nations of the world. Economically, financial support for South Africa makes no sense, because South Africa is already a highly developed nation, with one of the strongest economies of the world.

There can be no question that South Africa today receives substantial financial benefits from the United States through the sugar subsidy. At present market values, South Africa's quota for 1969 is worth more than \$5 million in subsidies above the world market price. Over the past 7 years, the large sugar producers of South Africa have received more than \$19 million in special benefits generated by the subsidy.

Although the Sugar Act of 1948 is complex in its detail, its general outlines may be simply stated. The overall purpose of the legislation is to regulate the distribution of sugar in the United States by setting quotas on the amounts of sugar that can be sold in this country by domestic and foreign producers. The basic statutory plan was enacted in Congress in 1948. Over the years, the act has been amended on a number of occasions—most recently in 1965—to extend its operation and to meet changing circumstances.

Under the present act, domestic sugar growers are guaranteed the dominant share—approximately 60 percent—of the total annual sugar requirement of the United States. In general, the remainder of the annual requirement is assigned under the statute to some 30 foreign countries, based on percentages specified in the law. At the present time, as in recent years, most foreign sugar-producing nations are anxious to participate in the program, since the current protected sugar price in the United States is about 6 cents per pound, or 4 cents per pound higher than the world market price of 2 cents per pound.

Under the amendments adopted in 1965, domestic and foreign quotas were adjusted to their present levels and the operation of the act was extended through 1971. South Africa's statutory share was set at 1.06 percent. Based on the most recent determination by the Department of Agriculture that U.S. sugar requirements for 1969 are 10.7 million tons, and adjusted upward because of deficits in the quotas of other nations, South Africa's quota is 56,000 tons for the current year. At the present time, 14 foreign nations have larger quotas than South Africa's, ranging from 57,000 tons for the French West Indies to 1.1 million tons for the Philippines. Sixteen nations have current annual quotas smaller than South Africa's.

Under section 202(d) of the act, the administration has the power to suspend a foreign nation's sugar quota by executive action if it finds that continuation of the quota is contrary to our national interest. Congressman BINGHAM has already urged the administration to invoke this provision to suspend the South Africa quota. Both the Congressman and I agree, however, that it is essential for Congress to take the necessary legislative steps at this time to remove the quota permanently from the statute.

There are clear precedents under the Sugar Act for suspension or withdrawal of foreign sugar quotas because of moral, political and foreign policy considerations. Under the terms of the Sugar Act itself, the entire quota for Cuba is withheld during the current suspension of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba. The Cuban quota was originally canceled by President Eisenhower in July 1960, pursuant to authority requested by the President and granted by Congress in response to the expropriation of American property by the Castro regime.

In addition, in November 1965, President Johnson took administrative action under the act to suspend the sugar quota for Rhodesia. The President acted in response to Rhodesia's unilateral declaration of independence from Great Britain and to the repressive racial policies of the Rhodesian Government. In addition to suspending the sugar quota, a number of other actions were also taken against Rhodesia at about that time, including the imposition of an embargo on arms and on the shipment of petroleum products to Rhodesia, a prohibition on certain imports from Rhodesia, and the recall of our consul general from Salisbury. Subsequently, as is well known, the United Nations Security Council adopted a resolution denouncing the actions of the Rhodesian Government as a threat to international peace and security, and calling for the imposition of mandatory economic sanctions against that nation.

Just as in the case of Cuba and Southern Rhodesia, I believe that continuation of South Africa's sugar quota is not in our national interest. The racial policies of South Africa have been condemned by a long line of resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council of the United Nations. For far too long, we have waited and watched and hoped that our existing policies toward South Africa might somehow allow us to influence the regime to eliminate or modify its detest-

able doctrine of apartheid. While we have waited, we have seen no perceptible beneficial change in that doctrine in South Africa, and we have stood by while South Africa exported the doctrine to South-west Africa. Indeed, if anything, we have seen the hated doctrine grow stronger and more repressive with the passage of time.

The tragedy of apartheid in South Africa was clearly brought home to Robert Kennedy on his visit to that nation in 1966. Traveling from Pretoria to Cape-town, to Johannesburg, and along the Indian Ocean coast to Durban, he was everywhere impressed with the warmth and vitality of all the people of South Africa, of whatever political persuasion or race. As he told the students of the University of Capetown:

In the world we would like to build, South Africa could play an outstanding role. . . . This is without question a preeminent repository of the wealth and knowledge and skill of the continent. Here are the greater part of Africa's research scientists and steel production, most of its reservoirs of coal and electric power. Many South Africans have made major contributions to African technical development and world science; the names of some are known wherever men seek to eliminate the ravages of tropical diseases and pestilence. In your faculties and councils, here in this very audience, are hundreds and thousands of men who could transform the lives of millions for all time to come.

But the help and the leadership of South Africa or the United States cannot be accepted if we—within our own countries or in our relations with others—deny individual integrity, human dignity, and the common humanity of man. If we would lead outside our borders; if we would help those who need our assistance, if we would meet our responsibilities to mankind, we must first, all of us, demolish the barriers which history has erected between men within our own nations—barriers of race and religion, social class, and ignorance.

The time is now ripe to begin a reassessment of our overall policy toward South Africa. Whatever further steps we take, we can at least now embrace the sound principle that nothing in our official governmental actions should lend positive economic support to the South Africa regime. It is especially deplorable that we continue to provide even the current modest sugar subsidy to South Africa in view of the advanced state of South Africa's economic development. There are many young sugar-producing nations in Africa and in the world whose economic development is far less advanced than South Africa's but who pursue multiracial policies far more congenial to the policies of the United States. It is these nations whom we should be assisting through subsidies such as the sugar program, not nations whose policies we abhor.

In the legislation I have proposed, the quota now available to South Africa would be prorated among other quota nations according to the existing provisions of the act. Under those provisions, the President would have broad authority to transfer part—or, in some circumstances, all—of the South Africa quota to the most deserving nations under the act, nations whose economies would receive major benefit from increased sugar quotas.

To be sure, our action in terminating the South Africa quota could not realistically be expected to have a substantial impact on South Africa, either on its economy or its policy of apartheid. The policy is too deeply entrenched and the value of the subsidy is too small, especially in light of the fact that South Africa's economy is highly developed and its sugar exports to the United States account for only a small proportion—about 7 percent—of its total sugar exports.

Nevertheless, as I have tried to indicate, termination of the South Africa sugar quota would have at least four important benefits:

First, the action would be a significant moral gesture from our Government to all our citizens. It would bring new conviction to our determination to seek justice and racial equality at home, and a new sense of dedication to the entire range of our domestic programs designed to reach these goals.

Second, the action would be a significant moral gesture from the United States to the world community at large. As the most powerful Nation in the world, it is vital that we maintain a strong, consistent and correct position on the great moral issues of our generation. If we are ambivalent in our attitude, if our deeds belie our principles, then we lose stature in the eyes of nations who look to us for leadership. If, on the other hand, we are strong in our moral resolve and our house is in order, then we set an example for other nations and peoples, especially the new nations of Africa and the black majority in South Africa, and we strengthen their trust in our commitment to their interests. As Julius K. Nyerere, President of Tanzania, stated in a perceptive article in *Foreign Affairs* in 1966:

Free Africa is now waiting, with some impatience, to see whether the West really intends to stand on the side of human equality and human freedom.

Third, by terminating the South Africa sugar quota, we remove a favorite argument of many who refuse to assert their opposition to South Africa's policy of apartheid, because, they say, our own Government itself continues to provide financial assistance to the regime. In the United States, for example, there is growing pressure on private businesses and other institutions to withdraw their investments in South Africa in protest against the policy of apartheid. The total investment of American firms in South Africa now totals over \$700 million. The pressures to withdraw are especially strong in the case of firms with major operations in South Africa, or institutions lending money directly to the South Africa Government. Too often, American firms have been able to resist such pressures simply by pointing to the sugar subsidy available to South Africa, and asserting that our Government itself continues to subsidize the regime. By terminating that subsidy, we can give new impetus to the current movement toward private economic disengagement from South Africa.

And, fourth, by terminating the South Africa quota, we can provide substantial

economic assistance to other, more deserving sugar-producing nations in Africa and elsewhere, at no cost to the current operation of our sugar system or our other limited foreign aid programs.

In sum, the bill that I am proposing is a modest first step toward greater wisdom in our South Africa policy. Although its direct impact on South Africa may be negligible, it will have significant moral influence in our relations at home and overseas. Suspensions of the sugar quota for South Africa is a step of moral leadership we should take at the earliest opportunity, and I look forward to prompt enactment of this legislation by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proposed legislation be printed in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks. In addition, I have here certain materials relating to South Africa and the Sugar Act that may be of interest to Members of the Senate. The principal item is a passage from a recent book by Prof. Rupert Emerson of Harvard University in which he deals with apartheid and American and United Nations policy toward South Africa, including the involvement of American business in South Africa. Other materials are: a publication by the Department of Agriculture explaining the operation of the Sugar Act, and a recent press release by the Department establishing current sugar quotas; an excerpt from *Africa Digest* assessing apartheid in South Africa today; a recent news article discussing the proposed "tribal homelands" legislation in South Africa; and a brief article by Arthur J. Goldberg, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, proposing a series of steps to disengage American Government and business from South Africa.

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

The *PRESIDING OFFICER*. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The bill (S. 1858) to amend the Sugar Act of 1948 to terminate the quota for South Africa, introduced by MR. KENNEDY, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

S. 1858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Congress hereby finds that it is not in the interest of the United States to provide official support in any form to a country whose racial policies are anathema to the conscience of the world and have been so denominated by the United Nations, and that the Republic of South Africa, having adopted such policies, should therefore not enjoy the privilege and benefit of a quota under the Sugar Act of 1948.

SEC. 2. Section 202(c)(3)(B) of the Sugar Act of 1948 is amended by deleting "South Africa----- 1.06".

SEC. 3. A quantity of sugar equal to the amount of the quota withdrawn from South Africa shall be prorated in the same manner as deficits are prorated under Section 204 of the Sugar Act of 1948.

The material, presented by Mr. KENNEDY, follows:

[From the "Africa and United States Policy" (Prentice-Hall, 1967), pp. 84-94]

SOUTH AFRICA

The Republic of South Africa is on all counts the country which is the most difficult to fit into an anti-colonialist world dedicated by the Charter of the UN to respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all "without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." With the doctrine of apartheid as its guiding star, South Africa is a society uniquely dedicated to the principle of distinctions of race as the basis of its existence. The separation of race from race and the maintenance of the purity and supremacy of the white race are the foundations of the system which the Afrikaner-dominated South African government has brought into being. It can be a matter of no surprise that South Africa has been more frequently and more consistently censured by the UN than any other country, that it is the country on which the independent African states look with the greatest abhorrence, and that it is here, rather than anywhere else in Africa, that the United States is likely to be confronted by the gravest decisions and the most threatening conflicts.

Apartheid has met with almost universal denunciation. Indeed, a recent American study asserts that with the exception of South Africa itself, every government in the world has declared it to be wrong, undesirable, and at odds with international standards of human rights and justice.²⁸ Many of those who have attacked apartheid have used far more vigorous language; and even the delegate from Great Britain, still presumably South Africa's closest friend among the Powers, attacked it in a General Assembly committee in 1962 as "morally abominable, intellectually grotesque, and spiritually indefensible."

Primarily for foreign consumption, but also for the squeamish and idealists at home, South Africa has devised a formulation of apartheid which is not without a certain seductive appeal when it is divorced from the harsh reality of present-day South African life. This version rests upon the proposition that the races of man differ so profoundly from each other that each should be given an opportunity to develop separately and thus achieve its distinctive cultural destiny. In essence this is a radical translation to the African scene of the now discredited American principle of "separate but equal" as the guideline for race relations, and it has as little likelihood of furnishing a satisfactory solution in Africa as it had in the United States. From this racial starting point, it follows that South Africa does not, and should not, constitute a single nation but that it contains a number of distinct nations, including several Bantu peoples, each of which deserves an autonomous territory of its own. These are the so-called Bantustans, of which only one, the Transkei, has so far been brought into being as a subordinate African political system to which distant hope is held out of self-government and association on more equal terms with white South Africa. The emphasis which apartheid has placed on the tribal distinctions within the African community is counted on to fragment the opposition to white supremacy, but it is doubtful that the momentum of the swing away from tribalism generated by white rule can now be reversed, particularly since the modern sectors of the economy are still drawing African labor away from the tribal reserves. Apartheid might be portrayed as a fulfillment of the principle of self-determination, but not if the element of consent plays a role, since only the white minority has been consulted

as to whether it wants the kind of self-determination thrust upon all South Africans.

The fatal flaw in apartheid is that its prime motivating force is the desire of the white community, led by the Afrikaner majority, to hold on to its privileged position, to maintain its separate identity, and to secure to itself the benefits flowing from the highly productive society which it has created with the aid of cheap African labor. These are goals which the governing Nationalist Party is prepared to pursue with ruthless zeal, as experience has amply demonstrated. Probably no scheme of apartheid could have succeeded in South Africa, no matter how equitably, generously, and idealistically conceived and administered. Certainly ultimate failure is inevitable when some 3,500,000 whites hold the whiphand over more than 12,000,000 Africans, 1,800,000 Coloreds (persons of mixed blood), and 500,000 Indians. The true nature of the relationship between white and black South Africans is vividly illuminated by two figures which are in good part no more than two sides of the same South African coin. The minority white community has reserved to itself 87 per cent of the land of South Africa, while the African majority is endowed with the remaining 13 per cent. This gross imbalance renders incredible the idea that Africans might be persuaded to settle for the reserves or Bantustans into which they are now being crowded. The second figure, showing the reverse of the coin, reveals that only some 40 per cent of the African population is found in the "Bantu homelands," and that despite apartheid the remaining 60 per cent live and labor in the white domain, more or less evenly divided between urban and rural areas. In these areas they have no status as of right and are at the disposition of the white authorities who do not accept them as even potential members of a single South African society.

Since the African leaders have been jailed, exiled, or otherwise silenced, it is difficult to get an accurate picture of the African reaction, but the constant tightening of the official security measures presumably reflects the pressure from below. The transformation of South Africa into a police state is already far advanced, although both the judiciary and the press continue to have a surprising degree of freedom. The government is equipped with extraordinary powers, with a large, well-organized and well-equipped police force and with a network of informers black as well as white, which have crippled all efforts to construct opposition political movements. The military forces have expanded to the point where internal security and defense expenditures have increased fourfold since 1960 and now absorb more than a quarter of the budget. The ruling circles evidently regard their regime as being under severe attack; but the preparations which they have taken leave no doubt that both internal and external opponents of the regime face a grim struggle.

The direct American concern with South Africa is somewhat greater than with most of the rest of the continent, but it does not begin to measure up to that of the British, whose deep involvement inevitably influences American policy. Politically and strategically, in the ever-present setting of the Cold War, South Africa is an ardently anti-Communist power whose position at the southern extremity of Africa still gives it potential strategic importance. If prime significance is attached to the Communist issue, then it may well seem folly to take any steps which endanger the present South African government, although it is also arguable that its racist practices are sure to act as a major stimulant to Communism at home and abroad. The spokesmen for the existing regime make much of the stability and pros-

perity of South Africa as contrasted with the rest of Africa's independent states and stress the relative material well-being and educational advance of its African population. In May, 1962, Prime Minister Verwoerd expressed somewhat scornful doubt that the United States would cut itself off from the benefits which it derives from its relations with South Africa and would allow the country to "be thrown to the wolves or be swallowed up by the fluctuating ideological streams which, inspired partly by communism, flow across Africa, rather than accept her as being, by nature, a safe and sure and permanent friend."²⁹

It is in this latter light that American businessmen and investors have been inclined to view South Africa. Thus, General Norstad, billed by the South African Information Service in May, 1965 as "retired NATO supreme commander and now a top American businessman," coming to South Africa with a big investment blueprint, was quoted as stating that "We have full confidence in South Africa—not only we as individuals but the United States and the American people as well."³⁰ Such a statement, of course, sharply contradicts the official American position; but it is also noteworthy that while the State Department and American delegates to the UN used strong words about South Africa, the Department of Commerce continued to promote American trade with, and investment in, the country or at least to regard it with benevolent neutrality.

Estimates as to American private investment in South Africa differ widely, but a frequently cited figure is \$600 million to \$700 million or some 15 per cent of the total foreign investment in the country, while the British investment is estimated to come to more than \$2.5 billion, or well over half the total.³¹ The South African economy has proved attractive to American investors, and the return on investment has been unusually high. The matter was succinctly put by a correspondent of *The Christian Science Monitor* on December 10, 1965 in answer to a query as to what American interests profit from apartheid:

"What they are is simply a who's who among corporations on the New York Stock Exchange. All the big names are there as investors operating plants in a booming economy—Ford, General Motors, General Electric, Minnesota Mining, IBM, Standard Oil of California, Borden, Chrysler, Coca-Cola, etc.—over 80 big corporations were recently listed."³²

It is the customary plea of the concerns undertaking investment in South Africa that their problem is profit and not politics. Whether they appreciate the kind of order and stability which has been imposed or regret the obligatory racial discrimination, their activities in fact serve to bolster the Nationalist government and therefore its universally condemned system of apartheid. The unusual rate of profit which has attracted them to the country derives, at least in part, from the low wages of African workers, which are inherent in the system. Since new investment from both the United States and Great Britain has been slight or nonexistent in recent years, it is this high return which has made the expansion of investment possible through the plowing back of profits.

American investment in South Africa comes to just over 1 per cent of total American foreign investment, and American trade with South Africa represents approximately the same percentage of total American foreign trade. In 1963 the value of American exports to South Africa was \$276 million while the imports from South Africa came to \$259 million. The British share in South African trade has been more than double the American, and the more vulnerable British economy, 5 per cent of whose exports go to South Africa, is far more dependent on this trade and the return from its investment

Footnotes at end of article.

than is the United States.³³ In terms of the magnitude both of British investment in the country and of the purchase of British goods, South Africa stands fourth among the countries of the world. The great bulk of both British and American exports to South Africa falls in the category of manufactured goods: machinery and vehicles, textiles, and chemicals; while the imports, in addition to gold, are primarily minerals and other raw materials and foodstuffs.

In most summary terms it may be said that the cutting off of all economic intercourse with South Africa, which has become at least a speculative possibility since more and more UN members have called for sanctions, would impose only relatively incidental burdens on the United States. Such a cutting off would, however, seriously impair the British economy, which has already suffered heavy losses because of the Rhodesian sanctions. Prime Minister Wilson informed the Commonwealth conference in London in September, 1966, that the cost of the sanctions to Britain had risen to £100 million. A survey of British interests in South Africa undertaken under the auspices of the Royal Institute of International Affairs in 1965 concluded that a total interruption of commerce would cause "the immediate loss of a twentieth of Britain's export trade, the disappearance of a traditional source of supply for a number of items, and the sudden drying up of £60 million a year in foreign exchange."³⁴ Some 150,000 workers would be thrown out of work; the earnings derived from the trade in gold would dry up; and British shipping, banking, and insurance operations would be hard hit. These are consequences which no British government could lightly face, particularly at a time when balance of payments problems are already grave.

If one looks at the matter from the other side of the fence, it is, of course, evident that South Africa is economically much more dependent on Britain than Britain is on South Africa. About one-third of South Africa's foreign trade is conducted with Great Britain, which also furnishes South Africa a number of important services, but it must be taken into account that any damage inflicted on South Africa might also have serious consequences for Botswana, Lesotho, and Swaziland.

Although the direct American stake in South Africa is not great, for the last two decades the United States has been unavoidably entangled in that country's affairs, in part through the UN where South Africa has been habitually under attack. Three major issues have been involved: the treatment of Indians in South Africa, apartheid, and the relations with Southwest Africa. As the years have gone by, attention has come to be focused more and more on the central theme of apartheid, which also figures in the charges against South African policy toward Southwest Africa, whose problems have occupied much International Court attention.

When the issue of racial conflict in South Africa, which meant apartheid, appeared on the General Assembly docket in 1952, the United States for some years abstained on resolutions attacking it, contending both that the UN was not authorized to intervene in South Africa's domestic affairs and that such intervention was not likely to achieve the desired results. A change came in 1958 as Washington was becoming aware that it could no longer evade the emergence of a new Africa. Then the United States was prepared to accept the Assembly's right to chide South Africa for actions inconsistent with the human rights provisions of the Charter; and, in keeping with its new attack upon its own race problems at home, it specifically expressed its dislike of a society based on segregation and discrimination. On such grounds, it voted for the first time for a res-

olution which mildly expressed "regret and concern" about South Africa's racial policies.

The next major turn in American policy came as a result of the notorious Sharpeville incident when, on March 21, 1960, the police fired into a crowd of African demonstrators, reportedly killing 67 and wounding 186. This shooting down of Africans caused worldwide consternation and led to an immediate official statement in Washington deploring violence and the tragic loss of life. The Security Council was called into action and adopted a relatively strong resolution, backed by the United States although Britain and France abstained, which deplored South Africa's policies and actions and held that the situation might come to endanger international peace and security.

The coincidence of Sharpeville with the multiplication of African states in the UN led to pressure for stronger action to force South Africa to abandon its racial practices and move with the winds of change which Prime Minister Macmillan had evoked in his speech to the South African Parliament on February 3, 1960. Resolutions of the conventional type, regretting and deploring, were obviously ineffective in inducing South Africa to yield. As a result, the United States now found itself confronted by the necessity of dealing with an increasingly insistent demand for sanctions. As one pamphlet put it:

"It appeared that no sooner had the United States moved to the point where it could, in good conscience, vote for a mildly condemnatory resolution, than the majority of world opinion took another long stride ahead, leaving the U.S. again in the minority, along with the 'colonialist' nations."³⁵

In 1961 the United States and its associates were able to defeat a resolution calling for sanctions, but in the following year the more intransigent foes of South Africa succeeded in passing a sanctions resolution which requested the breaking off of diplomatic relations and a boycott of South African shipping and aircraft as well as of trade in both directions, specifically including a ban on the export of arms and ammunition. The anti-colonialists mustered 60 votes for this resolution, but the fact that 16 members opposed and 21 abstained indicated how wide a difference of opinion existed. Even more important was the fact that the 16 states which voted against the resolution embraced the leading Western powers, including the United States, Britain, and France, as well as Japan, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. South Africa's Foreign Minister, Eric Louw, took pleasure in pointing out the salient fact that "The nations not supporting sanctions absorb 79.6 per cent of South Africa's exports and send her 63.7 per cent of her imports."³⁶ Since the resolution was only a recommendation, lacking binding force, it was idle to expect that in such circumstances it could have much impact on South Africa, and even some of the African states have been accused of not observing its provisions.

The United States had for some years expressed its disapproval of South Africa's course in strong language—in 1962, for example, declaring it to be a policy which could lead to "bloodshed, war, and disaster for all races." On October 19, 1962, it went a step further when Adlai Stevenson informed the General Assembly that the United States was forbidding the sale to the South African government of arms and military equipment which could be used to enforce apartheid either in South Africa or in Southwest Africa. On August 2, 1963, he told the Security Council that the United States expected to stop, before the end of the year, the sale of all military equipment to the South African government apart from the need to honor certain existing contracts, and the British immediately thereafter announced that they would ban all export of arms which could be used to further the

policy of apartheid. The setting for these announcements was, however, a futile anti-colonialist effort to obtain Security Council endorsement for a boycott of South Africa which won only five votes. The resolution which finally passed on August 7, 1963, "solemnly calls upon all states" to cease the sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, and military vehicles to South Africa. Nine Council members, including the United States, voted for this resolution, while Britain and France abstained. Stevenson contended that to apply mandatory sanctions would be both bad policy and bad law. The Security Council, he held, was not empowered to apply coercive measures in such a situation, since—although South Africa failed to live up to certain of its Charter obligations—it did not aggressively threaten the peace.

As is true of so much of its African policy, the relations of the United States with South Africa are marked by a cautious gradualism which can either be praised as a sensible and realistic appraisal of the situation or criticized as a refusal to face up to the hard facts of life as Africans and Asians see them. The readiness of the United States to take drastic action against China, Cuba, and other Communist regimes is inevitably contrasted with its scruples and hesitations about doing more than entering verbal and diplomatic protests in other cases. As American critics put it: "The United States presently boycotts and embargoes countries in which over a third of the world's population lives. Yet it has been unwilling to go beyond a ban of arms and ammunition to implement UN resolutions against apartheid."³⁷

With almost the sole exception of its prompt hostile reaction to the Sharpeville incident, the United States has followed along well behind the UN majority and has continued on the whole to maintain normal and friendly relations with South Africa, including the presence in South Africa of American satellite tracking facilities. If a number of private American groups and organizations have given valuable aid to Africans within the country and in exile, a number of other Americans and corporations have participated in white South Africa's prosperous economy. Apartheid-minded South Africans, while pained at American condemnation of their government's policies, have taken comfort from American participation in the Stanleyville paratroop landing and its backing for Tshombe and his white mercenaries as well as from the general unreadiness of the United States to break with their country.

A worsening of relations with South Africa came in the aftermath of the deplorable failure of the International Court in its decision of July 18, 1966, to rule on the substantive issues which had been so long argued before it in the case brought by Ethiopia and Liberia against South African rule in the mandated territory of Southwest Africa. On July 27, the Department of State pointed out the limited nature of the Court's ruling and emphasized that the mandate continued in force, as the Court had affirmed in earlier advisory opinions, and that South Africa remained responsible to the UN for its administration of the territory. A major manifestation of the disaffection aroused by the Court's ruling was a resolution presented to the General Assembly by a number of African and Asian states, which condemned South Africa and called upon the UN itself to take over the administration of Southwest Africa. On October 12, Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg, speaking for the United States, took the unexpected step of declaring in the Assembly's debate on this resolution that South Africa had forfeited "all right to continue to administer the territory of Southwest Africa."³⁸ and a fortnight later joined the overwhelming majority of the Assembly in voting for a resolution which asserted that South Africa's mandate was terminated and that Southwest Africa was henceforward a direct responsibility of the UN. The South African Foreign

Footnotes at end of article.

Minister promptly responded that his country would resist with all the power at its disposal any moves which endangered the safety of peoples committed to its care.

That the Africans have legitimate grievances against the usual passivity of the Western attitude toward the fatherland of apartheid and that there are a number of untried ways in which the United States might bring pressure to bear on South Africa should not be allowed to lead without very serious examination to the conclusion that mandatory sanctions would provide the proper answer. It may be that such sanctions will prove to be inescapable if apartheid's evils are to be rooted out, but they would constitute a drastic step whose consequences for the United States, its major allies, and the world at large would surely be very serious. Confronted by the threat of sanctions or other hostile operations, South Africa has done much to improve its ability to stand by itself. The Minister of Defense has declared that the country is practically self-sufficient in armaments production, and the ability to survive an oil embargo seems much greater than a few years ago. Undoubtedly, serious damage could be inflicted on South Africa if substantially all countries lived up to the call for sanctions, but this is a condition which can derive little support from the available precedents, including the Rhodesian case. For Britain, the breaking off of economic relations would have such dire implications as to make the adoption of sanctions highly improbable. This would obviously be a matter of great concern for the United States, as would the likelihood that American forces would have to play a major role in imposing a blockade on what might come to be some 3,000 miles of coastline, if the Portuguese territories are added to South and Southwest Africa, in order to make sanctions effective.

Even assuming effective sanctions, one must still entertain doubts as to what the results would be. Would the Nationalists and their supporters cave in under pressure, or would they be driven to a last-ditch resistance; and, if the latter, what kind of South Africa would be left at the end, and who would pick up the pieces? C. W. de Kiewiet has pointed out that "The past decade has given Americans a painful experience in bringing men to compliance with the verdict of even the highest court," adding that it would be hard to expect unanimity in American opinion over involvement in the racial affairs of a distant country.³⁰

One of the possibilities which must enter into the calculation is that the United States, hesitating to take decisive steps, might at some point find itself confronted by a coalition of African states, with much of Asia and of the Communist world behind them, for action against South Africa to break the back of apartheid. At this distance it is difficult to see how such a grouping of states could bring very effective pressure to bear upon South Africa, but the mere fact that the United States resorted to neutralist abstention would make its moral and political position difficult and unhappy. The probable result would be to alienate many African countries already bitter over the Rhodesian situation, and push them toward an alignment with the Communist powers.

In the interim, as sanctions are debated and rejected by the United States and its partners, relations between the United States and South Africa become somewhat more difficult, with neither side prepared to seek a showdown with the other.⁴⁰ Thus the United States has maintained full diplomatic relations with South Africa but has since 1963 held multiracial receptions at the American Embassy which have been protested and boycotted by the South African government as in violation of the customs of the country; but the United States has sent no Negro Foreign Service officers. The

Prime Minister has announced that his government would not permit Negroes to be assigned to the satellite tracking facilities which the United States continues to operate in South Africa, and the American aircraft carrier "Independence" bypassed Cape-town when the South African government decreed that no Negroes could be landed from the ship. On both sides, positions have been taken which leave no doubt of sharp opposition in matters of basic policy, but there was a deliberate refusal to spell them out in detail and in public. At least to outward appearance, South Africa remained confident that the United States, despite verbal attacks, would not abandon the advantages and profits of various kinds it draws from continued friendly intercourse, as it remained confident that Britain would not endanger its larger economic stake and its agreed access to the Simonstown base, north of the Cape of Good Hope, which London indicated in 1966, Britain was prepared to abandon.

The lesser Rhodesian affair has perplexed statesmen and sharpened racial antagonisms. The far greater South African issue, which might turn into a major catastrophe, was still only gathering its explosive force in the mid-1960's.

FOOTNOTES

³⁰ Amelia C. Leiss and Vernon McKay in *Apartheid and United Nations Collective Measures*, ed. Amelia C. Leiss (New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1965), p. 5. Waldemar A. Nielsen comments in *African Battleground* (New York: Harper, 1965), p. 64: "Today, even though diplomatic and economic relationships with South Africa are generally maintained, its moral isolation from the world community is virtually total. Never in modern times, and perhaps never in history—not even in the case of Hitler Germany or Stalinist Russia—has a government brought down upon itself so unanimously the moral disapproval of the world."

³¹ Cited in *South African Crises and United States Policy* by Collin Gonze, George M. Houser, and Perry Sturges (New York: American Committee on Africa, 1962), p. 46.

³² *South African Scope* (New York: Information Service of South Africa, May, 1965), p. 12. He was joined in this statement by Harold Boeschstein, who was identified as "Chairman of the biggest fiberglass manufacturing organization in the world."

³³ *Survey of Current Business*, Department of Commerce (Washington, September, 1966) states American direct private investment in South Africa to be \$528 million in 1965. Much valuable information on economic relations is contained in *United States-South African Relations* (Hearings before the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, House of Representatives, 89th Cong., 2nd session, Part 1). See particularly the testimony of Assistant Secretary of State Williams and Assistant Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge on March 1 and 2, 1966. I am indebted to Dr. Sanford D. Greenberg for allowing me to consult his unpublished Harvard doctoral dissertation, submitted in 1965: "United States Policy Toward the Republic of South Africa, 1945-64."

³⁴ The correspondent, Earl W. Foell, added that the New Jersey financier, Charles W. Englehard, listed as a director of 23 South African companies, "is also a heavy contributor to the Democratic Party and a friend of President Johnson." Drew Middleton, writing from Johannesburg, stated that there are 247 U.S. companies in South Africa, "most of them profitable and some making profits of 20 per cent on their investments." (*The New York Times*, April 30, 1966.) See the 1966 *United States-South African Relations* hearings, pp. 15-26, for a list of U.S. subsidiaries, affiliates, and branch offices in South Africa.

³⁵ The UN Secretariat in a report dated Aug. 22, 1966, prepared for the Special Committee

on Apartheid, estimated that the earnings of the United Kingdom on its direct investment in South Africa rose from 11 per cent in 1961 to 16 per cent, in 1964, of all its earnings from direct overseas investment. The comparable American figures were 1.4 and 1.7 per cent. (Tables 13 and 15 in UN Doc. A/AC.115/L.56/Rev. 2.)

³⁶ Dennis Austin, *Britain and South Africa* (London, New York, Toronto: Oxford University, 1966), p. 160. Other estimates of the probable impact of sanctions may be found in *Sanctions Against South Africa*, ed. Ronald Segal (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1964), particularly pp. 167-203; Leiss, *Apartheid and United Nations*, Chapter 6; and the *Report of the Expert Committee Established in Pursuance of Security Council Resolution S/5773* (S/6210).

³⁷ Gonze, Houser, and Sturges, *South African Crises*, p. 44.

³⁸ *A New Course in South Africa* (New York: United Nations, 1964), p. 29. This is the report of the Group of Experts, headed by Alva Myrdal, which was established by the Security Council in resolution S/5471 on December 4, 1963, to examine methods of resolving the South African situation.

³⁹ "Partners in Apartheid: United States Policy on South Africa," *Africa Today*, March, 1964, p. 11.

⁴⁰ *The New York Times*, Oct. 13, 1966.

⁴¹ C. W. de Kiewiet, "South Africa's Gamble with History," *Virginia Quarterly Review*, XL, No. 1 (Winter, 1965), 6. Waldemar A. Nielsen concludes his brief and well-balanced analysis of the problem with the assertion that for the United States to adopt any course other than a rejection of mandatory sanctions "would be a violation of its own responsibilities as a world leader and contrary to the interests of its own citizens and of all mankind." (*African Battleground*, p. 86.)

⁴² For the following incidents, see *The New York Times*, March 10, June 27-28, July 3, and August 18, 1965.

THE U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM—INCLUDING SUGAR ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

The United States Sugar Program has a three-fold purpose:

To protect the welfare of the U.S. sugar industry.

To provide U.S. consumers with ample sugar supplies at reasonable prices.

To promote and strengthen the export trade of the United States.

To achieve these goals, the Sugar Act establishes a quota system (shares of the U.S. market), thus regulating supplies of sugar sold in the United States. The largest part of the sugar consumed in the United States comes from domestic areas and the remainder from foreign countries.

The U.S. program is not unique. The government of nearly every sugar-producing country, both importers and exporters, exercises some degree of control over the production, refining, and marketing of sugar. World trade in sugar is characterized by special marketing arrangements. More than half of total world exports enters international trade channels under preferential arrangements.

The U.S. Sugar Act has six main features:

1. Setting U.S. Sugar Requirements: The quantity of sugar needed to maintain adequate supplies at reasonable prices for U.S. consumers and to assure fair prices to U.S. producers is determined for each year.

2. Establishing Sugar Quotas: This yearly sugar requirement is divided among specified domestic and foreign producing areas through quotas assigned to each.

3. Providing Marketing Allotments: Within domestic quotas allotments are established for domestic processors, when needed, to keep the sugar movement in marketing channels an orderly one.

4. Setting Farm Proportionate Shares: Domestic farm production is limited, as needed, within acreage required to produce the sugar

needed to meet domestic quotas and to maintain sugar inventories.

5. Making Grower Payments: Payments are made to growers to augment farm income and as a means of compensating them for adjusting their production.

6. Obtaining Equitable Division of Sugar Returns: Provisions to assure an equitable division of returns from sugar among beet and cane growers, farm workers, and processors.

HOW THE U.S. SUGAR PROGRAM WORKS

(1) Determining Sugar Requirements: A determination of how much sugar will be needed by consumers in the Continental United States is made each year. The determination is announced between Oct. 1 and Dec. 31 for the following year and may be revised as the year progresses if sugar needs change. This establishes the amount of foreign sugar that may be imported and the amount of domestic sugar that may be marketed in the United States during the coming year.

The amount of sugar distributed during the preceding 12-month period ending Sept. 30 is used as a base in making the first estimate. Allowances are made for deficiencies or surpluses in the Nation's sugar inventories and for shifts in use caused by changes in population and demand. Also considered is the relationship between the price for raw sugar, which may result from the determination, and the parity index (index of prices paid by farmers) so that sugar prices will be neither excessive to consumers nor too low to give adequate protection to the domestic sugar producing industry.

In recent years, the U.S. sugar requirement has ranged around 10,000,000 tons and in 1966 was 10,375,000 tons.

(2) Establishing Quotas: After the overall requirements have been determined, each domestic and foreign area supplying the United States with sugar is assigned a quota or share of the U.S. market.

The statutory formula is shown on page 6 and the quantities assigned to the domestic and foreign areas for the years 1963 through 1966 appear on page 9.

DOMESTIC AREA QUOTAS

Under the provisions enacted in 1965, the five U.S. producing areas (continental U.S. cane-producing area, continental U.S. beet-producing area, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands) are assigned basic quotas totalling 6,390,000 short tons, raw value. (Raw value is the term used in the Sugar Act to express in a common unit the types of raw and refined sugars that move in commerce. One ton of refined sugar equals 1.07 tons of sugar, raw value.)

Continental cane and beet quotas are increased by 65 percent of requirements in excess of 10.4 million tons and decreased by the same percentage of requirements falling below 9.7 million tons. These increases or decreases are shared by the two areas in proportion to their basic quotas—this figures out to be approximately three-fourths for beet sugar and one-fourth for mainland cane sugar.

Within limits, the quotas for Hawaii and Puerto Rico are adjusted upward when production exceeds their basic quotas. These increases are offset by reducing the quotas of foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands.

THE REPUBLIC OF THE PHILIPPINES

Beginning in 1962, the Republic of the Philippines' quota was fixed at 1,050,000 tons of sugar. This was about 70,000 tons more than previously provided in either the Philippine Trade Agreement or the Sugar Act. The 1965 amendments increased that quota by 10.86 percent of any increase in requirements above 9.7 million tons up to 10.4 million tons.

OTHER FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Quotas for 30 other foreign countries are established as fixed percentages of U.S. requirements above the amounts set for quotas for (1) domestic areas, (2) the Republic of the Philippines, (3) Ireland, and (4) Bahama Islands.

Ireland has a fixed quota of 5,351 tons and beginning in 1968 the Bahama Islands, which are currently producing no sugar, will be entitled to 10,000 tons if the sugar can be produced.

QUOTAS MAY BE WITHHELD IN NATIONAL INTEREST

The 1965 amendments provide that the President may in the national interest withhold or suspend all or any part of a quota for a foreign country.

During the current suspension of diplomatic relations with Cuba, its entire quota is withheld. When U.S. sugar requirements are not more than 10 million tons, the withheld quota is prorated to foreign countries, other than the Republic of the Philippines, Ireland, and the Bahama Islands, entitled to quotas. When U.S. requirements are more than 10 million tons, the Cuban share of the amount over 10 million tons is prorated only to member countries of the Organization of American States in proportion to their basic quotas.

The 1966 quota for Southern Rhodesia was withheld and prorated to Western Hemisphere countries.

OTHER MODIFICATION OF QUOTAS

No quota is to be established for any country, other than the Bahama Islands, Bolivia, Honduras, and Ireland, which imported a total quantity of sugar equal to or in excess of its exports, excluding those to the U.S., during a period of 24 months ending June 30 prior to the calendar year for which quotas are established.

If any country without adequate justification fails to fill its quota for any year, the quota for future years will be reduced. The reduction would equal the lesser of the shortfall or the difference between 115 percent of the preceding year's quota and actual imports in the shortfall year.

Quotas are established for a calendar year. However, limitations may be applied to imports from foreign countries during the first half of the year (on a quarterly basis) whenever it is necessary to achieve the law's objectives.

EMERGENCY PROVISION

If under unusual circumstances adequate supplies of sugar cannot be obtained by increasing foreign quotas, authority is provided to obtain supplies on a first-come first-served basis from countries in diplomatic relations with the U.S. with special consideration to countries agreeing to purchase for dollars additional agricultural products.

IMPORTS LIMITED TO RAW SUGAR

The sugar to fill the quotas for foreign countries must be in raw form, except the quota for Ireland and small quantities from the Philippines and Panama may be refined sugar. Limitations apply also to the quantities of sugar in refined form within quotas of Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

For quota purposes, sugar not more than 99 percent pure is regarded as raw sugar, provided it is subjected to designated refining processes. Other sugar is called "direct-consumption sugar," and includes primarily white refined and other types of sugar similar to that for home consumption.

STATUTORY QUOTA FORMULA

For the domestic areas and three foreign countries, the law provides for specified tonnage quotas as shown in the following table. For the other 30 countries, quotas are shown as a percentage of remaining U.S. sugar requirements.

Of the U.S. sugar requirements remaining after specified tonnage quotas, 50 percent is allocated to 29 foreign countries. The other 50 percent is allocated to the Cuban reserve, which, as previously noted, is withheld from Cuba until such time as diplomatic relations are resumed. The Cuban reserve is apportioned as temporary quotas among the 29 countries.

Country or area	Basic quota (tons)	Increases or decreases related to each 100,000 tons of sugar requirements	
		In excess of 10,400,000 tons	Less than 9,700,000 tons
DOMESTIC AREAS			
Domestic beet sugar.....	3,025,000	+47,667	-47,667
Domestic cane sugar.....	1,100,000	+17,333	-17,333
Hawaii.....	1,110,000	0	0
Puerto Rico.....	1,140,000	0	0
Virgin Islands.....	15,000	0	0
Total.....	6,390,000	+65,000	-65,000
FOREIGN COUNTRIES			
Republic of Philippines.....	1,050,000	0	0
Ireland.....	5,351	0	0
Bahama Islands.....	10,000	0	0
Total specified tons.....	7,455,351	+65,000	-65,000

¹ Plus 10.86 percent of the increase in requirements between 9,700,000 tons and 10,400,000 tons.

² Effective in calendar year 1968 and subsequent years if assurances are given that quotas will be filled.

Note: Remaining U.S. Sugar Requirements: 50 percent to Cuban reserve; 50 percent to specified foreign countries.

[In percent]

	Permanent quota	Temporary quota from Cuban reserve ³
FOREIGN WESTERN HEMISPHERE COUNTRIES		
Mexico.....	7.73	7.73
Dominican Republic.....	7.56	7.56
Brazil.....	7.56	7.56
Peru.....	6.03	6.03
British West Indies.....	3.02	3.02
Ecuador.....	1.10	1.10
French West Indies.....	.95	.95
Argentina.....	.93	.93
Costa Rica.....	.89	.89
Nicaragua.....	.89	.89
Colombia.....	.80	.80
Guatemala.....	.75	.75
Panama.....	.56	.56
El Salvador.....	.55	.55
Haiti.....	.42	.42
Venezuela.....	.38	.38
British Honduras.....	.22	.22
Bolivia.....	.09	.09
Honduras.....	.09	.09
Subtotal.....	40.52	40.51
FOREIGN COUNTRIES OUTSIDE THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE		
Australia.....	3.60	3.60
Republic of China.....	1.50	1.50
India.....	1.44	1.44
South Africa.....	1.06	1.06
Fiji.....	.79	.79
Thailand.....	.33	.33
Mauritius.....	.33	.33
Malagasy Republic.....	.17	.17
Swaziland.....	.13	.13
Southern Rhodesia.....	4.13	4.13
Subtotal.....	9.48	9.48
Total.....	50.00	50.00

³ When U.S. requirements are over 10 million tons, the Cuban share of the amount over 10 million tons is prorated only to member countries of the Organization of American States in proportion to their basic quotas.

⁴ Proration of quota for Southern Rhodesia was withheld for 1966 in accordance with a Presidential Finding of November 20, 1965, pursuant to Section 202(d)(1)(B) of the Sugar Act. This quota for 1966 was prorated among Western Hemisphere countries.

ALLOCATION OF DEFICITS IN QUOTAS

(1) If any domestic producing area or foreign country in the Western Hemisphere (except the Bahama Islands) cannot market its full quota, the deficit is allocated by assigning an amount equal to 47.22 percent of the deficit to the Philippines. The balance is assigned to Western Hemisphere countries other than the Bahama Islands on the basis of their quotas then in effect with one exception. This is that any deficit in the quota for a country which is a member of the Central American Common Market will be allocated only to the other member countries.

In making allocations of deficits to Western Hemisphere countries, special consideration must be given to those countries purchasing U.S. agricultural commodities.

(2) If the Republic of the Philippines is unable to fill its quota, the deficit is allocated to Western and Eastern Hemisphere countries on a pro-rata basis.

The Philippines' share of any deficit from any country in the Western Hemisphere which it is unable to fill will be reallocated to other countries in that Hemisphere.

(3) If any country in the Eastern Hemisphere, or the Bahama Islands, is unable to fill its quota, the deficit will be allocated by prorating 47.22 percent of the deficit to the Philippines and the remainder to countries in the Eastern Hemisphere (excluding Ireland).

The share of any deficit from any country in the Eastern Hemisphere which the Philippines is unable to fill will be allocated to Eastern Hemisphere countries except Ireland.

(4) In the event that none of the eligible countries referred to in paragraphs 1 and 3 are able to fill a deficit, the unfilled amount may be apportioned on such basis and to such countries as needed to fill the deficit.

(5) Notwithstanding the methods of allocating deficits as provided above, the President may in the national interest allocate any part of any deficit to one or more countries with a quota on such basis as he finds appropriate, except for any deficit allocation to which the Republic of the Philippines is entitled and can fill.

IMPORT LIMITATIONS OF SUGAR-CONTAINING PRODUCTS

If it is determined that the prospective importation or bringing into the continental U.S., Hawaii or Puerto Rico, of any sugar-containing product or mixture substantially interferes with attainment of the objectives of the Sugar Act, limits may be put on quantities of such product or mixture that may be imported or brought in.

QUOTA-EXEMPT SUGAR

The Act makes certain exemptions for sugar imported, brought into, or produced or manufactured in the United States in any calendar year, as follows:

1. The first ten short tons, raw value, of sugar or liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines;
2. The first ten short tons, raw value, of sugar or liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, for religious, sacramental, educational, or experimental purposes;
3. Liquid sugar imported from any foreign country, other than Cuba and the Republic of the Philippines, in individual sealed containers of such capacity as determined not in excess of one and one-tenth gallons each; and
4. Any sugar or liquid sugar imported, brought in, or produced or manufactured in the United States (a) for livestock feed or for the production of livestock feed, or (b) for distillation of alcohol (including all polyhydric alcohols), or for the production (other than by distillation) of alcohol, including all

polyhydric alcohols, but not including any alcohol or resulting by-products for human food consumption or (c) for export as sugar or in sugar-containing products.

ACTUAL SHARE OF U.S. SUGAR MARKET

The following table shows the final adjusted quotas for domestic areas and foreign countries for the period 1963 through 1966.

FINAL ADJUSTED SUGAR QUOTAS, 1963-66 (SHORT TONS, RAW VALUE)

Area	1963	1964	1965	1966
Domestic:				
Beet.....	2,698,590	2,698,590	3,025,000	3,025,000
Cane.....	1,009,873	911,410	1,100,000	1,100,000
Hawaii.....	1,070,000	1,110,000	1,136,753	1,200,227
Puerto Rico.....	870,000	951,000	815,000	711,000
Virgin Islands.....	15,000	15,832	5,232	5,405
Total, domestic areas.....	5,663,463	5,650,832	6,081,985	6,041,632
Foreign:				
Republic of Philippines.....	1,247,618	1,219,790	1,718,216	1,202,978
Argentina.....	229,701	20,000	68,723	58,820
Australia.....	223,706	215,098	200,307	187,786
Belgium.....	7,547	182	1,973	0
Bolivia.....	0	0	0	4,681
Brazil.....	447,489	182,363	269,243	478,143
British Honduras.....	10,758	5,988	5,115	12,884
British West Indies.....	141,630	142,524	148,605	176,886
Republic of China.....	71,269	82,613	72,436	78,243
Colombia.....	77,611	30,346	34,182	50,597
Costa Rica.....	40,637	58,119	42,459	71,527
Dominican Republic.....	605,103	402,822	469,244	602,931
Ecuador.....	57,805	58,039	60,233	69,570
El Salvador.....	19,659	20,551	21,091	44,204
Fiji Islands.....	48,704	54,556	48,823	41,209
France.....	22,935	845	6,103	0
French West Indies.....	94,297	34,290	52,248	55,644
Guatemala.....	51,050	45,023	42,734	60,277
Haiti.....	40,540	20,326	22,603	26,564
India.....	119,461	110,553	103,919	73,403
Ireland.....	10,000	10,000	2,398	5,351
Malagasy Republic.....	0	11,559	7,871	8,867
Mauritius.....	66,605	0	16,008	17,213
Mexico.....	387,041	479,425	475,017	488,896
Nicaragua.....	42,224	50,454	49,416	19,000
Panama.....	16,524	19,216	17,655	13,000
Paraguay.....	10,758	0	0	0
Peru.....	414,224	234,391	292,892	381,375
Reunion.....	9,893	0	2,373	0
South Africa.....	132,272	119,960	103,862	55,292
Southern Rhodesia.....	10,589	10,260	0	0
Swaziland.....	0	0	9,648	6,781
Thailand.....	0	0	0	17,213
Turkey.....	6,578	0	1,574	0
Venezuela.....	11,907	0	2,873	24,033
Unallocated.....	30,402	509,875	0	0
Total, foreign areas.....	4,736,537	4,149,168	3,829,798	4,333,368
Total requirements.....	10,400,000	9,800,000	9,911,783	10,375,000

HOW IMPORTS AND MARKETINGS ARE KEPT WITHIN QUOTAS

Importers of sugar file an application for approval by the Department specifying the quantities to be imported, the country of origin, and the port of arrival, among other details. The approved application is the basis on which the Bureau of Customs permits entry of foreign sugar into the U.S.

Approval of the application by the Department is keyed to the actual shipment and the earliest date an application becomes eligible for approval is 5 days before the scheduled sailing date of the vessel.

The approval of applications provides the basis on which the Department keeps a record of quota balances for each country.

This procedure is also followed for shipments from Hawaii and Puerto Rico.

Domestic beet sugar and mainland cane processors submit monthly reports of their sugar distribution. This provides the record for charging sugar to quotas and to individual processor allotments when in effect.

(3) Establishing Marketing Allotments: One important function of the sugar program is to promote orderly marketing. If a domestic area has more sugar available for marketing than its quota, processors might rush sugar on the market so that they could sell their sugar before the area quota is filled. This could bring about temporary over-supply, anxious sellers, a weakened price structure and deprive other area processors of an equitable share of the market.

If the supply pressures are likely to cause disorderly marketing, the quota is allotted among the processors. The allotment is based on three factors: past marketings, ability to market, and on sugar processings

from beets or cane to which "farm proportionate shares" pertained.

(4) Farm Proportionate Shares: In addition to marketing allotments for processors when needed, the law also provides for farm proportionate shares if necessary to restrict sugar production in any area. This avoids a build up of sugar supplies in a given year beyond that needed to meet the area's quota and to provide a normal carryover inventory.

This determination is made for the coming crop year after due notice and opportunity for an informal public hearing.

When the crop is restricted as for the 1965 and 1966 crops in continental U.S., each sugar-producing farm in the area gets its fair share of the market. To accomplish this individual farm proportionate shares are established.

In mainland cane sugar and sugar beet areas, shares are established in terms of acres. However, in Puerto Rico farm shares are in term of sugar recoverable from the sugar cane. In establishing farm shares, consideration is given to past production and the farm's ability to produce the sugar crop.

In establishing shares, the Act requires protection of, insofar as practicable, the interests of small producers and new producers, of producers who are tenants or sharecroppers, and of producers whose past production was seriously affected by abnormal and uncontrollable natural conditions.

The Act also requires protection of, for a period of not more than three years for use in establishing proportionate shares, the sugar beet production history for farm operators (or farms) who are unable to use all or part of their proportionate share acreage

because of crop-rotations or for reasons beyond their control.

Producers are not required to comply with their assigned proportionate shares. However, they must do so if they wish to qualify for payments authorized under the Act.

Generally, too, processors will not purchase sugarcane or sugar beets marketed above the farm proportionate share because sugar produced cannot be considered in establishing the processor's marketing allotment. However, this sugar can be sold for livestock feed outside the allotment.

ACREAGE RESERVE FOR NEW AREAS

The 1962 amendments to the Sugar Act provided acreage for the growth and expansion

of the sugar beet industry. The sugar beet acreage reserve was for allocation primarily to new producing localities.

The Act authorized reserving each year from the national sugar beet acreage requirement the acreage required to yield 65,000 short tons, raw value of sugar. All reserve acreage has been committed and the 1965 amendments to the Act do not provide for reserving any acreage after 1966.

The acreage was committed to farmers in new localities and to farmers in localities served by expanded existing plants.

After public hearings, commitments were made to farms served by factories in the following localities:

LOCALITIES SERVED BY NEW FACILITIES

Locality	Acreage	Effective year	Processing company
Mendota, Calif.....	19,000	1963	American Sugar Co.
Hereford, Tex.....	24,730	1964	Holly Sugar Co.
Drayton, N. Dak.....	31,000	1965	American Crystal Sugar Co.
Auburn, N.Y.....	29,500	1965	Empire State Sugar Co.
Presque Isle, Maine.....	33,000	1966	Maine Sugar Industries, Inc.
Phoenix, Ariz.....	20,000	1966	American Sugar Co.

LOCALITIES SERVED BY EXPANDED FACILITIES

Ottawa, Ohio.....	2,415	1964	Buckeye Sugars, Inc.
Idaho Falls, Idaho.....	8,140	1964	Utah-Idaho Sugar Co.
Carrollton and Crosswell, Mich.....	4,030	1964	Michigan Sugar Co.

Under the reserve legislation, the acreage levels established for the new areas are protected against any reduction for the first three years of operation.

SUGAR BEET ACREAGE RESERVE FOR SMALL PLANTS

The Act authorizes reserving from the national sugar beet acreage requirements for 1966, 1967 and 1968 crops, an acreage estimated to yield not more than 25,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar. This acreage is to be used to enable any non-affiliated single plant company to market up to 25,000 short tons, raw value.

Under the provisions, acreage has been allotted for the 1966 crop to Colorado and Kansas for allocation to farms served by the National Sugar Manufacturing Company of Sugar City, Colo., and to Ohio for allocation to farms served by Buckeye Sugar Inc. of Ottawa, Ohio.

SUGARCANE ACREAGE RESERVES FOR HARDSHIP CASES

The Act also authorizes reserving for the 1965 and 1966 crops of sugarcane in the mainland cane areas, the acreage equivalent of 16,000 short tons, raw value, of sugar to relieve hardships on the part of new producers. This acreage has been made available to adjust for the 1965 and 1966 crops of producers who planted sugarcane for the first time for 1962, 1963, 1964 or 1965 harvest.

(5) Grower Payments: Sugar Act payments help to maintain farm income from sugar crops and provide an incentive to growers to adjust their production to quota and carry-over needs. Conditional payments of about \$83.3 million were made on the 1965 crop to about 54,000 sugar beet and sugarcane producers in 26 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

The payment rate declines as the volume of sugar in the cane or beets marketed from the farm increases above 350 tons. The basic rate of 0.8 cents per pound of sugar commercially recoverable, raw value, \$16.00 per ton is paid on the first 350 short tons. This rate is reduced by successive steps to a minimum of 0.3 cents per pound (\$6.00 per ton) on production above 30,000 tons.

SPECIAL CONDITIONAL PAYMENTS

The program also gives limited benefits to growers through special conditional payments for crop deficiency or abandonment

caused by drought, flood, storm, freeze, disease, or insects. For a farmer to be eligible, the natural disaster must cause damage to all or a substantial part of the crop throughout the local producing area in which his farm is located.

FINANCING OF PAYMENTS

Payments to producers are financed out of the general funds of the Treasury. However, sugar taxes (an excise tax of one-half cent per pound, raw value, on all sugar marketed within the quota system) provide funds for the Treasury which more than offset all costs of the program. The revenue from this tax from 1938 through fiscal year 1966 exceeded total sugar program expenditures by about \$550 million.

(6) Equitable Division of Returns: In addition to providing an incentive to growers to adjust their production to quota and carryover needs, the payments have three objectives: (a) to help give growers adequate income from sugarcane and sugar beet production; (b) to assure growers and their field workers a fair share of the returns to the sugar industry; and (c) to prevent the employment of child labor in field work on sugar crops.

The first objective is met by the payment. The second objective is attained by requiring growers in order to be eligible for payments to pay field workers in full for work done on cane and beets at rates not less than those determined to be fair and reasonable. These minimum rates are determined and announced by the Department.

In addition, processors if they are also growers are required to pay fair prices for cane and beets purchased from other growers to be eligible for payments on their production.

The child labor provisions require that growers must not employ children under the age of 14 nor permit them to work on sugar beets or sugarcane. Children between the ages of 14 and 16 may not be employed or permitted to work for more than 8 hours a day. Growers who own at least 40 percent of the crop they are cultivating are exempted from these provisions with respect to their own children. A grower failing to observe these provisions is penalized by a reduction of \$10 from his payment for each day or part of a day during which each such child was employed or permitted to work.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

State and county Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation (ASC) committees are responsible for local administration of both the farm proportionate share (acreage allotment) and the payment parts of the program. This local administrator is based on procedures developed by ASCS and on program regulations issued by the Secretary of Agriculture or such other person so delegated by the Secretary.

Generally, regulations issued under the authority of the Sugar Act are announced publicly through a press release issued by the Department. Subsequently, the regulations are published in the Federal Register. They are codified as Title 7 Chapter VIII of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Certain regulations are preceded by public hearings. These are marketing allotment orders, fair price and fair wage determinations, proportionate share regulations, and the determination of processes and qualities which distinguish raw sugar from direct-consumption sugar.

The Collectors of Customs control the entry of offshore sugar supplies by permitting shipments of sugar to enter only upon an authorization issued by the Department of Agriculture.

PRICES AND CONSUMER BENEFITS

When sugar prices have been extremely high in the free world market in some past periods, the quota system has assured U.S. consumers adequate supplies of sugar at reasonable prices.

Under normal circumstances, the limitation that the quota system puts on total marketings of sugar in the United States brings about what is called a "quota premium." The premium is the difference, over and above duty and freight between the price at which raw sugar is sold in the United States and the so-called "world free market price" for sugar.

Thus, the quota system under most circumstances does make prices to consumers higher than might otherwise prevail. However, this system insures the production of a substantial part of our sugar requirements within the continental United States in the interests of national security. Retail prices of sugar in the United States are about the same as the average for other countries where price information is available—these countries consume most of the world's sugar.

WORLD FREE MARKET PRICE

In reality, the world free market price is actually a residual or marginal price at which only a small part—about 10 percent—of the world's sugar production is sold.

Most sugar is consumed in the countries where it is produced and usually the growers and processors in these countries are paid a much higher price for their product than the world market price, just as U.S. producers are.

Countries not self-sufficient in sugar generally require the payment of minimum prices to growers of sugarcane or sugar beets, and impose some form of restrictions on imported sugar for the protection of their domestic producers. Price pooling to distribute the impact of the different prices in different markets is common among exporting countries.

PREFERENTIAL SUGAR TRADING SYSTEMS

Several countries other than the U.S. have comprehensive trading systems involving preferential arrangements with dependent overseas territories or with independent countries with close political ties. These arrangements are in addition to domestic policies which usually have as their goal some degree of self-sufficiency through fostering and protecting home sugar industries.

Less than 25 percent of the world's sugar production moves in international trade, and about half of this movement is under these special marketing arrangements.

WORLD "FREE MARKET" PRICE FLUCTUATES WIDELY

The price for this residual or homeless sugar tends to fluctuate widely. It is extremely sensitive to any major international disturbance or threat to world peace. It moves up sharply when supplies are tight and drops precipitously when supplies are large. For example, the price for sugar at Caribbean ports went as low as 1.40 cents per pound in November 1966 to as high as 12.45 cents in November 1963. During the five-year period from 1962 through November 1966, the yearly average of monthly prices at these ports has ranged from less than 2 cents per pound to 8.50 cents per pound. In contrast, the yearly average of monthly prices for raw cane sugar at New York has varied less than 2 cents per pound during the same period. With the exception of 1963, a year of tight sugar supplies when the yearly average went to 8.18 cents per pound, prices have ranged from 6.45 cents per pound for 1962 to 6.98 cents for the first eleven months of 1966. About one cent a pound of the domestic price represents ocean shipping and tariff and should be deducted when comparison is made to prices at ports of shipment.

U.S. PRICE STABILITY BENEFICIAL

The quota system serves to eliminate both the extremely high prices for sugar, which hurt U.S. consumers, and the extremely low prices which are disastrous to U.S. producers. While assuring U.S. consumers an adequate supply of sugar, the U.S. system also enables the United States to carry out the role of a "good neighbor" to many foreign sugar-producing areas, particularly in the Western Hemisphere. The program assures these areas of a stable market for their sugar at remunerative and stable prices with a resulting favorable impact on an extremely important sector of their foreign trade.

BACKGROUND ON U.S. SUGAR INDUSTRY AND SUGAR ACT

The Sugar Industry: Per capita consumption of refined sugar in the continental United States averages about 97 pounds per year. Domestic sugarcane and sugar beet growers supply slightly over half of our sugar needs. The balance, almost all cane sugar, is imported. Further details for 1963-66 are shown in the table on page 9.

About 50 percent of our domestically produced sugar comes from sugarcane, the rest from beets. Louisiana and Florida are the mainland sugarcane producing areas. The offshore domestic sugarcane areas are Hawaii, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. The sugar beet producing area is the following 21 States (arranged in decreasing order of production importance in the 1965 crop): California, Idaho, Colorado, Washington, Minnesota, Michigan, Nebraska, Montana, North Dakota, Wyoming, Texas, Ohio, Utah, Oregon, Kansas, New York, New Mexico, Iowa, Nevada, Illinois, and Maine.

Almost 40,000 domestic farms grow sugarcane or sugar beets. To cultivate and harvest these crops about 230,000 farm workers (mostly seasonal) are required. Total investment in the sugar industry is over \$2 billion. The farm investment utilized in growing sugarcane and beets is about \$1 billion.

In 1965 the United States had 61 beet sugar factories, 110 raw cane sugar mills, and 29 refineries in operation. Approximately 62,000 workers were employed in these sugar-making plants.

Sugar from Cane: The refined sugar we use in our homes goes through two processing stages. The first process extracts, boils, crystallizes, and centrifuges cane juice and yields raw cane sugar. This process is done in raw cane mills not far from the cane fields.

Blackstrap molasses and bagasse are by-

products of this first processing of sugarcane juice. Blackstrap molasses is used in cattle feed and in making ethyl alcohol, yeast, vinegar, and citric acid. Bagasse, the fibrous portion of sugarcane, is used as fuel for the cane mills and as raw material for building boards, cardboard, and paper.

Most of the cane sugar brought to the mainland from offshore areas, both foreign and domestic, is in the raw form. The second process—the refining process—is done in refineries usually in large port cities. A few refineries, however, are in producing areas and a few are at interior cities. Refined sugars, refiners' sirups, and refiners' blackstrap molasses come from this second process.

Sugar from Beets: In contrast to the two-step process for cane sugar, sugar from beets is processed in one plant. The main by-products are beet molasses and beet pulp. The pulp is used for cattle feed. Beet molasses, like blackstrap, is used in cattle feed, and to make yeast and citric acid. Most beet molasses is put through the Steffen's process to raise the sugar yield. The resultant Steffen's waste is used in making monosodium glutamate—used to highlight food flavors.

How the Sugar Act Developed: For almost 150 years the United States protected and regulated its sugar industry almost solely by tariff duties. By the early 1930's, however, the U.S. sugar industry had become so ramified and the price and production relationships among domestic and foreign producing areas so complex that tariffs no longer were an adequate answer to the sugar problem.

To help solve the U.S. sugar problem, Congress passed the Jones-Costigan Act. The President signed it into law on May 9, 1934. Although there have been modifications made in various operating provisions, the basic philosophy underlying this Act has been carried forward in the subsequent legislation.

The Jones-Costigan Act was superseded by the Sugar Act of 1937, which in turn was

superseded by the Sugar Act of 1948. The Sugar Act of 1948, with changes made by amendments in 1951, 1956, 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1965, has been extended through December 31, 1971.

The amendments in 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1965 provided for suspending the quota for any country with which the United States is not in diplomatic relations. These amendments were prompted by the actions of the Castro Government in Cuba which had been our principal foreign sugar supplier since early in this century.

SUGAR REQUIREMENTS INCREASED AND DEFICITS REALLOCATED

The U.S. Department of Agriculture today announced an increase of 100,000 tons in the determination of domestic sugar requirements (total quotas), to a total of 10.7 million tons for this calendar year. The Department also declared a deficit of 300,000 short tons, raw value, in the sugar quota for Puerto Rico, and 15,000 tons in that for the Virgin Islands. Information available to the Department indicates that the Republic of the Philippines will be unable to participate in servicing deficits arising in other areas. Accordingly, the deficits declared at this time have been reallocated in their entirety to western hemisphere countries.

The quota for the domestic beet sugar area is increased by 47,667 tons and that for the mainland sugarcane area by 17,333 tons. The quotas and prorations of foreign countries are increased by 350,000 tons.

Because of delayed production from the current crop, receipts of raw sugar from Hawaii and Puerto Rico will be somewhat less than normal during the early part of the year. Today's action will enable foreign countries to increase the rate of their sugar exports to the United States.

Quota increases and deficit prorations, together with revised quotas are shown in the following table:

Production area	[Short tons, raw value]				
	Change in quota	Basic quota	Temporary quotas and prorations pursuant to sec. 202(d) ¹	Deficits and deficit prorations	Total quotas and prorations
Domestic beet area.....	47,667	3,168,000	3,168,000
Mainland cane area.....	17,333	1,152,000	1,152,000
Hawaii.....	1,200,000	1,200,000
Puerto Rico.....	-300,000	1,140,000	-300,000	840,000
Virgin Islands.....	-15,000	15,000	-15,000	0
Total, domestic areas.....	-250,000	6,675,000	-315,000	6,360,000
Philippines.....	1,126,020	1,126,020
Mexico.....	67,161	222,905	237,660	60,722	521,287
Dominican Republic.....	65,683	218,002	232,433	59,386	509,821
Brazil.....	65,683	218,002	232,433	59,386	509,821
Peru.....	52,391	173,883	185,393	47,368	406,644
British West Indies.....	22,406	87,086	73,613	21,346	182,045
Ecuador.....	9,556	31,720	33,819	8,641	74,180
French West Indies.....	7,049	27,395	23,157	6,715	57,267
Argentina.....	8,080	26,818	28,593	7,305	62,716
Costa Rica.....	7,731	25,664	27,362	6,991	60,017
Nicaragua.....	7,731	25,664	27,362	6,991	60,017
Colombia.....	6,951	23,069	24,597	6,284	53,950
Guatemala.....	6,516	21,627	23,059	5,892	50,578
Panama.....	4,866	16,148	17,218	4,399	37,765
El Salvador.....	4,779	15,860	16,910	4,321	37,091
Haiti.....	3,649	12,111	12,913	3,299	28,323
Venezuela.....	3,301	10,958	11,683	2,985	25,626
British Honduras.....	1,632	6,344	5,363	1,555	13,262
Bolivia.....	782	2,595	2,767	707	6,069
Honduras.....	782	2,595	2,767	707	6,069
Australia.....	1,260	103,811	87,194	191,005
Republic of China.....	525	43,254	36,331	79,585
India.....	504	41,524	34,878	76,402
South Africa.....	371	30,566	25,674	56,240
Fiji Islands.....	277	22,781	19,134	41,915
Thailand.....	115	9,516	7,993	17,509
Mauritius.....	115	9,516	7,993	17,509
Malagasy Republic.....	58	4,902	4,116	9,018
Swaziland.....	46	3,749	3,149	6,898
Ireland.....	5,351	5,351
Bahamas.....	10,000	10,000
Total, foreign.....	350,000	2,579,436	1,445,564	315,000	4,340,000
Total.....	100,000	9,254,436	1,445,564	0	10,700,000

¹ Proration of the quotas withheld from Cuba and Southern Rhodesia.

² Direct-consumption limits in tons: Hawaii, 36,594; Puerto Rico, 160,500; Philippines, 59,920; Panama, 3,817; Ireland, 5,351.

[From Africa Digest, Jan. 19, 1969]

APARTHEID COMES OF AGE

The policy of apartheid became the official policy of the South African Government twenty-one years ago when the Nationalist Party led by Dr. Malan came into power. In these twenty-one years South Africa's industrial economy has expanded steadily except for the setback in 1960 caused by the Sharpeville shootings. Legislation imposing apartheid on every aspect of the nation's life has been passed with ever-increasing speed as the Nationalist majority has grown in Parliament. And yet the growing number of Africans in the urban areas and the slow development of the Bantustan system show that the achievement of total racial separation throughout the Republic is no nearer today than it was in 1948. Despite the enormous weight of oppressive legislation the percentage of Africans in the industrial labour force has increased from 70 to 75 per cent over the past ten years, and it will continue to increase. The industrial labourer is essentially resident in the white urban areas of South Africa.

In the view of Stanley Uys (G. 9/1): "The record of these 21 years is of a steady expansion of the might of the apartheid State, and yet apartheid today is a washed-up ideology. Everyone here knows this, even the Government-supporting Afrikaner intellectuals—and clergymen, editors, academics, and others—whose warnings that the apartheid policy is becoming a farce have become too strident to ignore. 'A whole philosophy and way of life is now at stake, and with it the foundation of Afrikaner nationalism,' wrote *Dagbreek*, the largest-selling Afrikaans Sunday newspaper. 'It is this—or integration.'"

In the Transkei, South Africa's showpiece Bantustan, Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima's ruling party has defeated the opposition Democratic Party which rejects the Government's policy of apartheid. Stanley Uys wrote (OFNS 6/12): "With a second five-year term of office ahead of him now, Matanzima must see whether he can make the Bantustan experiment work. If he cannot the whole apartheid ideology falls apart. The question which the elections pose is why should Africans vote for apartheid? There are several answers.

"First, although Matanzima now holds 82 of the seats in the 109-member Transkei Legislative Assembly, most of his support comes from the hereditary chiefs whose office entitles them automatically to membership of the Assembly. There are 64 chiefs in the Assembly, and at least 54 support Matanzima. It works in a circle: the chiefs support Matanzima, who supports Vorster, who supports the weakened tribal system and pays the chiefs their salaries. The chiefs, too, are in a position to influence the tribesmen, many of whom are illiterate. In the recent elections, with their help, Matanzima's candidates won 28 of the 45 elected seats in the Assembly. This is still only just over half the electorate, but in the last election in 1963 Matanzima won only 15 of the 45 elected seats. Undoubtedly, he has made progress.

"Finally, the promise of ultimate independence for the Transkei obviously appeals to many Africans. The Democratic Party's defeat, therefore, is a defeat for the cause of multi-racialism. In the last Assembly, the Democratic Party, led by a highly intelligent lawyer, Mr. Knowledge Guzana, held 27 of the 45 elected seats; today it holds only 14. With the 10 hereditary chiefs who support it, the Democratic Party thus controls only 24 votes in the 109-member Assembly. On the face of it, therefore, the Democratic Party's multi-racialism exercises a dwindling appeal for the Transkei's 1,500,000 citizens. The Democratic Party rejects the whole concept of separate development and of ultimate independence for the Transkei. It considers that the African reserves should be treated as provinces of the Republic of

South Africa, and their citizens should have a voice in the central Government in Pretoria, and that the chiefs gradually should surrender their powers to the democratic will of the people. . . ."

Reviewing the development of South Africa's Bantustan policy, as seen in the Transkei, Stanley Uys said: "The Transkei, about 16,500 square miles in extent, supports a population of about 1,500,000 African peasants engaged in subsistence farming. The Vorster Government's task is to assist the Transkei to develop economically so that it can support not only its own population (at present tens of thousands of Transkei men work as migratory labourers in the 'white' areas of South Africa), and the natural increase in its own population, but also more and more Africans who will be sent to it from the 'White' areas. After 20 years of Nationalist Government rule, and after five years of limited Transkei 'self-rule', very little progress has been made in the realization of this aim. The Transkei is still a country of peasants who cannot support themselves.

"The Government's basic blueprint requires that hundreds of thousands of men, women and children should be taken off the land so that the farming units can be enlarged and made viable. But even if this is accomplished it will be sucked into the migratory flow, unless industrial and other jobs are created for them in the Transkei itself."

According to figures quoted in the South African Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition, Sir de Villiers Graaf, only 1,700 industrial jobs have been created in the Transkei so far. Yet private White capital cannot be invested in the Transkei so far.

Yet private White capital cannot be invested in the Transkei and in the similar "homelands." The Vorster Government does not permit this, because it would entail an influx of Whites into the "homelands," the re-establishing of "economic colonialism", and the blurring (and ultimately eradication) of the dividing line between White and Black areas, crucial to the apartheid ideology.

Stanley Uys pointed out that the number of government supporters expressing doubts about the workability of "separate development" is growing. If the Bantustans cannot be made to work, where will the Whites in South Africa then turn for a policy? Will they revert to controlled integration (which the Vorster Government has rejected already as spelling the doom of the White man) or will they rule simply as supremacists discarding the thin moral veil of "separate development"? Paramount Chief Kaiser Matanzima is as anxious to know the answers to these questions as anyone else. He has complained already that he does not want unemployed Africans from the White areas dumped in his territory, where there are no jobs for them; he has demanded, too, more land—land presently held by Whites; he wants more industries established in the Transkei. And, embarrassingly, some of his supporters want him to hasten the pace towards ultimate independence—a prospect which certainly will not meet with the approval of many of Mr. Vorster's own White supporters. The next five years in the Transkei, then, will be the testing time for apartheid. If the Transkei experiment does not work, nothing else about apartheid will work.

"If the theoretical framework of apartheid is collapsing, can Matanzima look idly on?" asks Stanley Uys in his *Guardian* article (9/1). "Originally apartheid was simply another word for White supremacy. Then, in about 1958—10 years after the beginning of apartheid rule—Dr. Verwoerd, yielding international pressure to demonstrate a moral case for apartheid, announced that the African reserves in South Africa would be turned into potentially self-governing and inde-

pendent homelands—to compensate the 12,570,000 Africans for being denied a stake in the so-called White areas."

The Bantustan system has itself created a double dilemma for the supporters of apartheid. First by creating a Legislative Assembly for the Transkei with an electorate, a public service and a cabinet it is inevitably undermining the tribal system. In time as the electorate becomes politically educated, and the landholding system is changed, as the Government intends it should be, from the present one-man-one-plot system of subsistence agriculture to a system of viable farming units, with the displaced peasants re-employed in secondary and tertiary industries, the tribal system will disappear, and the political influence in support of apartheid exercised by some chiefs will also go. The economic, political, and social differences between a Bantustan and its neighbouring White area will then have disappeared.

Stanley Uys continued: "There is another, even more important, flaw in the whole homelands concept: the White Government insists that private White capital should not be allowed to enter the homelands freely for investment. Otherwise, it is argued, the Whites will simply engulf the homelands. The dilemma is genuine and fundamental: without the investment of private White capital, the homelands will never reach even the economic launching pad, and yet with the help of private White capital, the homelands and the White sector will become so intertwined economically that the lines dividing them will become blurred to the point where they will eventually disappear—and bang will go the whole apartheid concept of 'separate development.'"

He described the alternative before the Government as either surrender to Black-White integration or the return to White supremacy, pre-1958, plain and unadorned.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 10, 1969]

SOUTH AFRICA WILL ISSUE PAPERS TYING "HOMELANDS" AND AFRICANS

JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, April 9.—Citizenship papers linking all Africans with their tribal "homelands" will be issued by the South African Government regardless of whether the Africans live in these territories.

The Bantu Homelands Citizenship Bill, introduced by the Minister of Bantu Administration, M. C. Botha, has begun moving through Parliament in Capetown. It is part of the policy of strengthening apartheid, or racial segregation, and giving status to the homelands.

The Transkei is the only homeland in existence after 20 years of the apartheid policy. Granted internal rule in 1963, it provides territorial citizenship for 3.5 million Xhosa—members of the largest tribe in South Africa—most of whom live and work outside the territory.

The new bill seeks to extend citizenship to all other tribes and to establish homelands, known officially as Bantustans, as fast as possible.

Two more Bantustans are being prepared. One is for the Ovambos in South-West Africa, or Namibia as it is called by the United Nations, and the other is for the Zulus in eastern Natal.

Besides being expensive, the process is slow, partly because the homelands cannot provide enough jobs for the Africans and industry is reluctant to relocate because of the extra cost of transporting finished products.

The program to provide employment near the homelands has cost \$440-million in the last eight years, a report to Parliament said today. In that time, 54,000 jobs have been created—a cost per job of more than \$8,000. The report said that 135 companies had been started and 74 expanded.

The country's African population totals 12.5 million and most of its work force is concentrated in the industrial Witwatersrand region centering in Johannesburg, and in the ports coastal industrial areas and large cities.

GREAT ANXIETY REPORTED

The establishment of Bantustans has been opposed by many Africans who, while identifying themselves as Zulus or Xhosa, for instance, have never seen the homelands and are urbanized.

Mr. Botha's bill aims to give Africans a sense of identification with their homelands, according to the Department of Information in Pretoria.

According to the Institute of Race Relations, however, the bill is arousing great anxiety among Africans, particularly urban ones. They were said to fear that to get a job they may have to apply in their homelands and that this might affect the urban residence of their families.

Discussing the bill, the institute said, "It is difficult to see what purpose the bill will fulfill other than to symbolize in a new document that the Government regards all Africans as aliens."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post,
Sept. 13, 1968]

THE UNITED STATES SHOULD SEVER ALL TIES WITH SOUTH AFRICA

(By Arthur J. Goldberg)

In light of South Africa's unyielding and intensified policy of apartheid—so abhorrent to our commitment to equality for all races—the United States Government immediately should disentangle itself from remaining economic, military, and scientific ties with that country.

We have long recognized that South African race policies offend human dignity today and might threaten peace tomorrow. We have long sought through diplomatic channels to induce changes in South Africa racial policies. Unfortunately, our efforts have had little impact of consequence.

The South African government has ignored United States representations while continuing to build its repugnant system of total racial segregation—apartheid. It has increased its suppression of democratic liberties for its people, blacks and whites alike.

Now, even at some cost to ourselves, our Government should take steps which would visibly disengage us from South Africa.

PROTECT OUR MORAL POSITION

By so doing we will protect our moral and political position in the world. We will also lend practical support to those who are working toward the reconciliation and equality of the races in South Africa. And we will strengthen the defense of American interests in the rest of Africa and the non-white world—including the high level there of U.S. investments and trade.

Among these fast-growing, large-magnitude economic American interests, are oil in Libya and Nigeria, copper in Zambia, rubber and iron ore in Liberia, bauxite in Ghana.

We often overlook the fact that the value of these interests in Africa north of Rhodesia now substantially exceeds our economic interests in Southern Africa. And we tend also to overlook the political value of fostering the good will of more than 30 black African governments representing 150 million people. This should not be.

I propose the following major governmental steps:

Arms embargo

Stricter enforcement of the South Africa arms embargo, including a ban on sales of American "dual-purpose" items such as trucks and executive-type planes which can be used by their military.

We should close loopholes such as the recent authorization for sale of American components in some "non-weapons" military equipment sold to South Africa by other countries.

We should use our influence to halt such sales by Japan, France and other countries. In the United Nations Security Council, we should see that such violations are cited by name if they do not cease. By so doing, we could help assure that orders not filled by American suppliers are not thereby lost to foreign competitors.

Missile and space program

We should close our missile and space tracking stations in South Africa and shift to facilities elsewhere as soon as physically possible.

Nuclear agreement

We should carefully examine whether continuance of the U.S.-South African nuclear cooperation agreement is in our over-all interest.

Fueling by official ships

No American official ships should use South African ports. Alternative fueling arrangements should be provided for research and communications vessels as well as Navy ships such as the aircraft carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt. The additional expense is worth bearing.

(The carrier FDR stopped in segregated Capetown, South Africa, in February, 1967. After protests by U.S. Negro leaders and 40 members of Congress, shore leave for 3800 sailors was cancelled.)

Economic ties

Government Export-Import Bank loans and investment guarantees for South Africa should be disallowed across the board. The present case-by-case consideration should be discontinued.

The United States Government should actively discourage private loans and investment by American businessmen and bankers in South Africa. Those who engage in such enterprises are profiting from and strengthening a system which (as our official speeches have made clear) is built on racism.

Commerce Department trade promotion publications for South Africa should be discontinued.

The United States sugar quota for South Africa should be abolished.

We also should support a realistic and peaceful United Nations program of bringing independence to the Territory of South-West Africa, now illegally held by South Africa.

FOLLOW SUIT ON PORTUGAL

As in the case of South Africa, I urge visible disengagement from Portugal in the Portuguese-ruled African territories of Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea.

We should make it an announced policy to reject AID investment guarantees for Portuguese African ventures.

We should reject Export-Import Bank participation in Portuguese Africa in the future. The reduction of Ex-Im participation in the recent large-scale American project for Angola did not go far enough.

As a result of UN Security Council action, we have embarked upon a similar policy of disengagement and disassociation with regard to Rhodesia. We should under no circumstances relax our support for this UN embargo.

All that I propose with respect to Southern Africa is peaceful action. I do not advocate the use of force; on the contrary, I oppose it.

But at the same time that we reject force, we must offer more than words to prove our moral abhorrence of the racist cancer in Southern Africa.

We must take all peaceful and practical steps, within the capacity of our Govern-

ment, to help stop the spread of that cancer and, with all reasonable speed, to eradicate it.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it was my honor to serve as a delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its fall session in 1968, and to have charge, on behalf of the U.S. Government, of the item in the General Assembly last fall, I join as a cosponsor of Apartheid of the Government of South Africa." I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD my speech to the Special Political Committee of November 8, 1968.

In accordance with the position I stated in my speech in the General Assembly last fall, I join as a cosponsor of the bill introduced by the senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY). I wish to point out that the foundation of the statement I made on apartheid was based on the proposal made in the Senate last year by the junior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE).

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE TO THE 23D SESSION OF THE UNITED NATIONS GENERAL ASSEMBLY, IN THE SPECIAL POLITICAL COMMITTEE, ON THE POLICIES OF APARTHEID OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA, NOVEMBER 8, 1968

It has been an informative experience to sit as a member of this Committee, and to hear the report of the Special Committee and general debate on the policy of apartheid of the Government of the Republic of South Africa. Whatever views may be held by member states upon the correctness of its recommendations, the report of the Special Committee is markedly comprehensive, factual and objective. The Delegation of the United States joins others who have spoken in commending the Committee upon its report.

I am sure that the members of this Committee know the position of the United States on this issue. Nevertheless I think it will be useful to state again the policy of my Government concerning apartheid.

We are in agreement with the large majority of member states in their condemnation of apartheid and, as a concrete demonstration of our attitude and policy, the United States has prohibited the sale and shipment to South Africa of arms, ammunition, military vehicles, and equipment and materials for their manufacture and maintenance. I would like to take this occasion Mr. Chairman, to reiterate that the United States has faithfully kept and intends to continue keeping its commitment to prohibit the sale and shipment to South Africa of all forms of military equipment.

It has been the view of the United States in the past that by maintaining normal diplomatic and economic relationships with South Africa we would be in a better position to urge upon South Africa the reform of its policy. Thus, the United States has repeatedly urged the Government of South Africa to change its policies both at home and in South West Africa. These efforts, however, have not produced the desired results.

I must say further that there is a body of opinion in my country which questions the wisdom of a state or even this peaceful organization undertaking to intervene in the internal affairs of another country unless the conditions prescribed by Chapter VII of the Charter obtain. This opinion cannot help but be influenced by events elsewhere in the

world, as nations do find special justifications for forcible and coercive intervention.

Having commented briefly upon the policy of my Government with respect to this issue, I would not want to proceed without giving the members of the Committee and the governments they represent some understanding of public opinion in the United States on the practices of apartheid in South Africa.

I believe that the vast majority of the people of the United States condemn the cruel policy of apartheid imposed on the nonwhite and, in some cases the white peoples of that country, in contradiction of the progress which has been made in other countries and in contradiction of the principles of the Charter and human decency.

Since World War II many countries have become independent. Many of these new countries have enacted constitutional and statutory measures to declare and enforce by law the equality of political, economic and social rights for all their citizens. And beyond the legal declaration of political, economic and social rights, many countries are seeking means—private as well as governmental—to secure these rights and to give them content and meaning in actual life.

Despite all the progress that has been made in these nations, and despite the condemnation of apartheid by world opinion, and now in a year in which human rights ought to be considered of paramount importance, the Government of South Africa has determined to maintain its policies, to enforce and further entrench discrimination and racism by governmental authority and power.

The report of the Special Committee is comprehensive and I will not attempt to repeat its contents and to detail the measures which the Government of South Africa has undertaken. Their consequence has been to set apart the largest segment of its population—the non-whites—as an inferior people, outside the political, economic and social life of the country.

And then, in a studied process, it has enacted measures in an attempt to hide the facts, and to stifle the inevitable cries of protest. The Government has made provision for political arrest and imprisonment for those who disagree. It has imposed restrictions on enlightened white people, but its restrictions have the most cruel effect against the majority who are held in thrall by the cruel impact of the policy of apartheid.

The trend of these measures over the past two decades has been to deprive all persons in South Africa of the protection of the courts in an increasingly widely defined area in which Parliament has vested in the executive branch and, particularly in the police, wide power over the individual. The General Assembly last year had reason to examine carefully the most recent legislation of this kind—the Terrorism Act of 1967—as applied to South West Africa. This trend was documented by the International Commission of Jurists in its publication, *The Erosion of the Rule of Law in South Africa*. The Government of South Africa presented its own views in a pamphlet entitled *The Rule of Law in South Africa* which has been given wide distribution. The pamphlet serves to illustrate the inflexible attitude of the Government of South Africa, and only draws attention to the deterioration of the rule of law in South Africa. Even the *South African Law Journal* carried a critique of the claims made by the Government's publication, I quote in part:

"The crisp question is whether these fundamental safeguards, implicit in the Rule of Law, are at all times assured by the South African courts. The truth of the matter appears to be that the very legislation which the author seeks to justify, precludes the courts from assuring these rights—and the courts, by virtue of the nature of our Constitution (which lacks a "Bill of Rights"),

are themselves precluded from questioning the validity of these preclusions.

"By reason of a variety of legislative provisions . . . our courts in certain respects have been effectively pinioned and rendered powerless to insure that no person be detained or punished without charge or trial."

There are many forms and practices of discrimination throughout the world. In some countries as in South Africa discrimination is in force against members of society because of their race, color, religious or political beliefs. In some states it is designed to repress the expression of opinion by citizens who do not agree with those in authority. In other countries repression is directed by the authorities of a state against other states—there is the assertion of a superior right to determine the policies of another state and its people, to repress free expression, an arrogance directed by fear and enforced by power. But in whatever form, these practices go against the trend of events, the principle of the Charter and ignore world opinion. They are practices against decency and against the human spirit. It cannot be challenged, I believe, that the apartheid policy practiced by the Government of South Africa represents one of the most callous and inhuman forms of discrimination.

A hopeful sign within South Africa is that some elements of its people and particularly its religious community are expressing increasing concern and disagreement with the inhumanity of the Government's policy—built upon the separation of its peoples, because of race or color, and maintained by governmental dictate and force.

I do not suggest any information that the Government of South Africa is about to reverse its policy, but even small signs are welcome as the distinguished representative of Mexico has said. And these small signs emphasize the necessity—as many in this Committee including our rapporteur have urged—of laying before the world and indeed the people of South Africa the true portrait of apartheid.

Earlier I discussed the policy of my Government briefly and the considerations upon which it is based. I would point out, however, there is a growing concern among many elements of the United States about the refusal of South Africa to correct its policy of apartheid. While there have been no express calls for coercive measures against the Government of South Africa, one current of opinion in the Congress of the United States, which I share, is that the United States should disengage itself from South Africa in trade and investment as long as South Africa continues its policy of apartheid.

In a speech made on the floor of the Senate of the United States, on April 29 of this year, reporting on a trip to Africa, my colleague Senator Edward Brooke of Massachusetts said, "I believe we must make clear to South Africa that, lacking evidence of that Government's willingness to move toward social justice and equality for the African population it controls, the United States will begin to disengage from its burgeoning economic ties to that country."

I cannot as one individual predict what the eventual result of this particular opinion will be because there are diverse views as to the best way to deal with the problem and because a new Administration in my country will want to reexamine the situation. I must say, however, that the Government of South Africa must take into account that the Government of the United States and its people have not in the past, and will not in the future, ignore South Africa's continuing refusal to move with the rest of mankind towards equality. Discrimination, the subjugation of human rights and the human spirit, whether directed by the governing authorities of the state against its own people, or by one nation against another, must not and will not prevail, and cannot be supported.

S. 1865—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INSTITUTE COURSES IN THE STUDY OF MALNUTRITION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send a bill to the desk for appropriate reference.

The certainty now that there are at least some pockets of hunger—and of malnutrition amounting to hunger—in our country has shocked the conscience of our Nation as nothing else in the war on poverty. Testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, on which I serve as ranking minority member, has indicated that our medical schools have not been adequately preparing their students for detecting and treating malnutrition and its related illnesses. Even though many of our medical schools do have courses in which some attention is given to malnutrition, few make the study of malnutrition an identifiable part of their curriculum. We have learned that too few doctors have a background which equips them to recognize and treat malnutrition as it exists in our poverty areas. For too long, the study of malnutrition has been given secondary attention in our medical, graduate, and nursing schools to the shame and dismay of us all. My bill is designed to rectify this situation.

Mr. President, the bill will provide funds to medical, nursing, and appropriate graduate schools for instituting courses in the study of malnutrition or which make such study an identifiable part of their curriculums. The bill will also provide for grants-in-aid to such schools as well as hospitals, laboratories, and other public or private institutions, individuals, or groups of individuals for research into malnutrition, its causes, effects, and means for detection and treatment of conditions resulting therefrom.

In addition, Mr. President, the bill will provide funds for special projects designed to provide students in courses in malnutrition with practical training and work experience and with fellowships to encourage such students to work in poverty areas to help combat conditions of malnutrition and its related illnesses.

The select committee has found, during the course of its hearings, that malnutrition is an acute problem in poverty areas, often to the degree of inhibiting mental and physical development; this is especially tragic for prenatal mothers and infants. It is for this reason, Mr. President, that the bill will give priority to those schools and institutions which are located in poverty areas. Many medical schools in the city of New York, for example, are located in, and have clinics in, such areas. These clinics provide an excellent opportunity for the schools' students to pursue practical training and gain experience in this most important, and for too long neglected, area of medical training.

Mr. President, a few months ago I brought together in New York a statewide committee of medical school deans to investigate hunger in New York. I will have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times which fully describes the committee. I feel that every

Member of the Senate should consider forming a similar group in his State, because we must surely do all that we can in our own States to see that conditions of hunger and malnutrition are recognized and eliminated. I am pleased to report that Senators COOK and DOLE, who have joined in cosponsoring this bill, plan to establish similar statewide groups in Kentucky and Kansas, respectively.

Mr. President, the bill is sufficiently broad to include such statewide groups and would provide funds to assist them in their efforts. Also, I am pleased to report that Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, and Secretary of Agriculture, Clifford Hardin, have indicated that they support the formation of such groups and will do all they can to aid in their work.

Finally, Mr. President, it is my hope that my bill will help to produce more physicians like Dr. Donald Gatch of Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C., and Dr. John Kerr of Buncombe County, N.C., both of whom have been crusaders in the fight against hunger and malnutrition in their communities. Their outstanding, selfless and dedicated work is a fine example of how the medical profession can help in the fight against malnutrition in the United States.

I will also have printed in the RECORD, Mr. President, two brief articles which describe the work of these men. The first is from the April 3d issue of *Jet* magazine and tells how Dr. Gatch, who for so long helped to rid his patients of parasites, finally became infested himself. The second article is from the *Charlotte Observer* in Charlotte, N.C., and offers a fine description of the work of Dr. John Kerr. Mr. President, we should all be proud of these two physicians as they represent the dedication and tireless efforts that are so necessary in the fight against malnutrition and hunger. I submit this bill with the greatest confidence that our medical, nursing, and graduate schools today have among their students hundreds, and perhaps thousands, of potential Dr. Gatches and Dr. Kerrs. I am equally confident that, given the opportunity and financial assistance, they will come forward. It is with this confidence and in this spirit that I submit this bill.

Mr. President, I am pleased that I am joined in sponsoring this bill by Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN, chairman of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, and Senators BAKER, BROOKE, COOK, DOLE, GOODELL, HATFIELD, PERCY, and SCOTT, whose States are representative of a broad cross-section of our Nation. The problems of hunger and malnutrition recognize no geographic boundary and, therefore, our attack on these problems must similarly recognize no such boundary.

Mr. President, initially, programs established under this bill would be implemented in a total of approximately 100 medical, nursing, and appropriate graduate schools throughout the United States. I have been informed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the National Institutes of Health that such a program would have an estimated yearly program cost of \$32,000,000. These funds would be allocated

in the following manner: Curriculum, \$10 million, administrative costs for groups of schools, hospitals, institutions, or individuals in 50 States, \$150,000; special project, such as on-the-job training for students in neighborhood health center projects, \$20 million; and fellowships, including postdoctoral and predoctoral, two at each of the 100 schools, \$1.2 million.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will give early attention to the measure. I am very proud that the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the chairman of our Select Committee, has joined with me in the sponsorship of the bill.

I believe that such a program is needed in our Nation and is long overdue. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and various supporting articles and editorials be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1865) to amend the Public Health Service Act to assist in the establishment of programs designed to provide for the advancement of medical knowledge with respect to the causes and effects of malnutrition and to facilitate the detection and treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), 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:

S. 1865

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That part A of title III of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 310a. (a) In order to reduce the incidence of malnutrition in the United States, to advance medical knowledge in the causes and effects of malnutrition, and to encourage and facilitate the provision of early detection and effective treatment of malnutrition and the conditions which result therefrom, the Secretary is authorized, out of the funds available for carrying out the purposes of this section, to:

"(1) make grants-in-aid to and enter into contracts with medical schools, appropriate graduate schools, and nursing schools to assist such schools in establishing courses, dealing with malnutrition, its causes and effects, means for its early detection, and effective treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom;

"(2) make grants-in-aid and enter into contracts with universities, medical schools, hospitals, laboratories and other public or private institutions, and individuals and groups of individuals for research into malnutrition, its causes and effects, means for its detection, and into the effective treatment of malnutrition and conditions resulting therefrom;

"(3) establish special projects designed to provide to students of courses in malnutrition practical training and experience in the field of malnutrition; and

"(4) provide fellowships and otherwise financially assist students to encourage and enable them to pursue studies and engage in activities in poverty areas relating to malnutrition.

"(b) In selecting schools and institutions

to carry out the purposes referred to in paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (a), priority shall be accorded to those schools and institutions which are located in poverty areas.

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year, commencing with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, such amounts as may be necessary."

The material, presented by Mr. JAVITS, follows:

MEDICAL SCHOOL DEANS TO STUDY EXTENT OF MALNUTRITION IN STATE: JAVITS ANNOUNCES FORMING OF A COMMITTEE—DOUBTS IT WILL FIND WIDE HUNGER

(By Thomas F. Brady)

Senator Jacob K. Javits announced yesterday the formation of a committee of the 12 deans of New York medical schools to investigate possible hunger and malnutrition in the state.

Dr. Lewis Thomas, dean of the New York University School of Medicine, joined Mr. Javits in a news conference in the Senator's office here.

Announcing that the new committee would meet within the next two weeks, they said it would survey poverty areas and report to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, which is about to begin a nutrition survey in the state. Then, they added, the committee will help in carrying out its own recommendations and those of the Government's survey.

Senator Javits said he believed the committee's work would draw medical students into poverty areas to "help identify and root out cases of malnutrition."

LITTLE STARVING HERE SEEN

The Senator predicted that only isolated cases of malnutrition would be found in New York because of what he called an efficient welfare program.

But, he said, "we must meet the charge that we are always zeroing in on the Southern states—we must make the case that we are also examining ourselves."

Senator Javits also outlined his program in a speech later in the day at the annual Alumni Day of the New York University School of Medicine.

He announced the following legislative proposals that he said he would introduce in the Senate:

Subsidize medical and nursing students in malnutrition work.

Provide grants to medical schools for courses that deal exclusively with malnutrition and related diseases.

[From *Jet* magazine, Apr. 3, 1969]

ANGERED WHITES BY EXPOSING BLACK HUNGER

Dr. Donald E. Gatch catalogued the horrors of hunger in South Carolina to prod the conscience of Congress. For his efforts, he said, he was vilified by his fellow physicians in the Beaufort, S.C., area, subjected to a campaign of intimidating telephone calls and lost nearly all his white patients.

Exhausted from working almost round-the-clock, Dr. Gatch, 38, was reported in "satisfactory" condition at Freedmen's Hospital.

He suffered from malnutrition. His body was infested with worms, characteristic of many of the undernourished Negro patients he treated. But he pledged to go back to South Carolina to continue fighting hunger in the poverty pockets of the world's most affluent nation.

Dr. Gatch rose beyond the status of a small-town doctor when he served as the "contact man" for Sen. Ernest F. Hollings (D., S.C.). The Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs credited Dr. Gatch with perhaps doing more than anyone to attract

national attention to the problem of hunger among the Negroes he treated. After Sen. Hollings testified before the committee, the panel persuaded the Agriculture Department to experiment with giving free food stamps for the poorest of the poor in rural Beaufort and Jasper Counties, S.C.

Dr. Gatch said he began researching hunger and parasitic infestation shortly after he opened practice in South Carolina ten years ago. But the recent publicity resulted in a loss of white patients, upon whom he depended for support. Then he was forced to sell his home in Beaufort, S.C., Dr. Gatch said, and move.

[From the Charlotte (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 18, 1969]

TO MANY, DOC IS A SAVIOR

(By Bob Dennis)

SANDY MUSH.—To many here in the Leicester section of Buncombe County, Jesus Christ has a moustache and a British accent.

He also wears boots, a tweed jacket, a snappy hat and quotes Shakespeare.

He is Dr. John G. Kerr, who doctors the mountain people of Sandy Mush and the Leicester community.

Through Kerr, the mountain people of Sandy Mush have a certain measure of health and well-being they did not have three years ago. It was then that Kerr opened a clinic up at the Sandy Mush school and began giving flu shots, free vitamins, worm medicine, setting broken bones and providing for the first time for many of the mountain people an avenue to feeling better—medical care on a regular basis.

To the people back in the coves—Surrett's cove, Robinson cove, Boyd cove—Kerr is a miracle worker.

Mrs. Kay Taylor, U.S. public health nurse who assists Kerr at the clinic and who visits the cove people regularly, said, "To them, he is Jesus Christ."

Kerr is unimpressed. The measure he takes of himself is revealed in a comment he made about the traces of Elizabethan English in the speech of mountain people—words such as "lief," which means willing or gladly. Kerr quoted from Shakespeare's Julius Caesar:

"I had as lief not to be as live to be in awe of such a thing as I myself."

Kerr came to Leicester in 1953 from Massachusetts, where he was on the medical staff at Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. He was born in Scotland, educated in England and after five years of army medicine with the British 8th Army in Africa, spent several years practicing medicine in England under the National Health plan. He did not like it and came to the United States in 1951. He wanted to get into a rural practice and wrote the American Medical Association. The secretary of the association at that time was a former Buncombe County man who suggested Leicester. Kerr came to visit, liked it and stayed.

PRESIDENT NIXON RECEIVES PLEDGE FROM PHILADELPHIA YOUNGSTERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today I had the great privilege of escorting 125 members of the Police Athletic League of Philadelphia—PAL—to the White House to make a presentation to President Nixon.

PAL presented the President with scrolls containing over 300,000 names gathered from over 500 elementary, junior, and senior high schools in Philadelphia subscribing to the following pledge:

To the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America and to the Congress of the United States.

We, the undersigned, do hereby affirm our dedication to upholding law and order and promise to follow the precepts set forth in the Police Athletic League pledge, which reads:

"I pledge to learn and practice the rules of fair play, to respect the rights of others, to obey the laws of our city, state, and country, to be a credit to my family, friends, and myself, to be a leader for the good things of life and thereby prepare myself for the tasks of adulthood."

It is heartening to see the overwhelming response generated by this pledge at a time when respect for authority among the young seems to be breaking down in many cities throughout the Nation.

Each boy and girl who signed the pledge received a PAL emblem and membership card, enabling him to take part in PAL programs, in sports, hobbies, arts and crafts, and other special programs, under the guidance of specially trained policemen. There are 27 full-time policemen staffing 21 PAL facilities throughout Philadelphia. The board of directors of PAL is made up of leading Philadelphia business and civic leaders.

By coming into contact with the man in blue in this type of program the youngsters learn that he is a good friend instead of an enemy. The constructive example offered by the police helps to erode prejudices and advances the cause of community cooperation.

In addition to recreation programs, PAL also has a scholarship program which has enabled several worthy youngsters to attend college.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 94—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION ON RESTORING WEST FRONT OF U.S. CAPITOL

WILL THE FUTURE REPRESENT THE PAST?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the west front of the U.S. Capitol suffers from a structural decay that is nearing its terminal phase. Shoring and other corrective measures bring about temporary remission of symptoms, and nothing more.

The Capitol requires structural reconstruction in the near future, but the only reconstruction scheme advanced so far envisions an extension of the west front that would cost \$35 million and entomb the last vestiges of the original Capitol Building in marble.

Since no one knows what restoration would entail in risk, cost, and disruption, Congress cannot now make an informed choice between restoration and extension, although the American Institute of Architects believes the west front can and should be restored in its present location, using existing sandstone where possible or new sandstone where necessary.

In my view, the precious time gained by stopgap mending of the west front will have been wasted unless the possibility of restoring it is professionally studied and thoroughly evaluated. Failure to explore this alternative will allow the extension scheme to win by default.

Study of restoration by an impartial expert should start right away—before the condition of the west front takes a sudden turn for the worse and we are

told there is nothing to do but give it a marble burial.

For this reason, Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution authorizing a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project.

It would direct the Architect of the Capitol to select a consultant firm of architects and engineers from a list of such firms submitted by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration and approved by that agency's National Advisory Panel on Architectural Services, and to enter into a contract with that firm to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the Capitol. Any such contract shall provide that—

First, the consultant firm enter into a contract with a recognized specialist in the restoration of old buildings to advise it during the course of the study;

Second, during the course of its work the consultant firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol and the appropriate committees of the Congress; and

Third, a report containing the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm shall be submitted in 200 copies not later than 4 months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work, for the information and review of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other agencies or organizations having an historic or technical interest in structural reconstruction of the Capitol.

Further, the resolution provides that no contract shall be entered into unless the terms and conditions thereof have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the west front, last remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol Building, remains substantially unchanged from its appearance in 1825. I do not pretend that the Capitol calendar can be turned back to 1825. The only question is whether we can physically bequeath to the future a reliable representation of an original portion of the Capitol in the place where it was built.

If study shows that we can, then the Congress will know that the multimillion-dollar marble mausoleum approach to Capitol reconstruction is not the only one.

STEWART'S SONIC BOOM-DOGGLE

In 1967, a group of advisers to the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, took a stand against restoration. It was an interesting but unsubstantiated opinion, not accompanied by the facts and figures the Congress needs to make a judgment. The advisory group also contended that the present condition of the west central portion of the Capitol was nothing "but a travesty, a poor travesty, in fact," of its original architecture, and asserted:

For many years it has become divested of all of the qualities which would make it a distinguished relic. The precise relation of each part to every other part so necessary in classic architecture, is completely negated by the many thick coats of paint. Mouldings are distorted out of recognition, while all marks of handicraft and age are lost.

Mr. President, the advisory group nonetheless saw clearly the Capitol's distinguished history, for it branded "unthinkable" a proposal that Government functions connected with the legislative branch be moved to a new building of plate glass, concrete and steel, and that the abandoned Capitol become a lifeless monument to past glories.

I agree there should be no pretext of preserving original architecture exactly as it appeared so many years ago. At the same time, I think we all concur in the advisory group's view that the Capitol is historically valuable. The point, then, is whether restoration is feasible: Whether justifiable historical interest can be translated into a reliable representation of the past.

The advisory group alleged that attempting to restore the west front would require vacating interior rooms for as long as 10 years, but failed to buttress its statement with facts. I urge that we obtain them now. Only with detailed knowledge of cost, risk, and disruption factors can the Congress make a meaningful choice between restoration and extension.

Mr. President, we have been told that the shock wave from an explosion or sonic boom could cause great damage to the Capitol. So far, the only plan advanced for the preventive reconstruction envisions a costly, 88-foot extension of the west front. Unless we act now to explore alternatives, we could be stuck with a sonic boom-doggle.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 94) to provide for a professional study of the feasibility of restoring the west front of the U.S. Capitol, with particular attention to and analysis of the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 94

Whereas the West Front of the United States Capitol suffers from a structural decay that is nearing its terminal phase; and

Whereas shoring and other corrective measures bring about temporary remission of symptoms and nothing more; and

Whereas the Capitol requires structural reconstruction in the near future, and the only reconstruction scheme advanced so far entails a costly extension of the West Front; and

Whereas the West Front is the last remaining exterior portion of the original Capitol building, substantially unchanged from its appearance in 1825, and such extension

scheme would bury these vestiges beneath marble; and

Whereas the American Institute of Architects believes that the West Front can and should be restored in its present location using existing sandstone where possible or new sandstone where necessary; and

Whereas no one knows what restoration would entail, and the Congress cannot now make an effective comparison between restoration and extension; and

Whereas the Congress could choose between restoration and extension if it knew after study by an impartial structural engineer what risk, cost, and disruption factors restoration would entail; and

Whereas the precious time gained by stop-gap mending of the West Front will have been wasted unless the possibility of restoring it is professionally studied and thoroughly evaluated; and

Whereas failure to examine restoration as a means of reconstructing the West Front implies endorsement of the extension scheme, allowing it to acquire respectability by default; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the provisions of section 2 of this joint resolution, is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a contract on behalf of the United States with a consultant firm of architects-engineers of national reputation to conduct a full and complete study and analysis of the feasibility of restoring the West Front of the United States Capitol, with particular attention to the risk, cost, and disruption factors of a restoration project, said contract to be entered into not more than four months after the approval of this joint resolution. The Architect of the Capitol shall select the consultant firm from a list of qualified firms submitted to him by the Public Buildings Service of the General Services Administration and approved by the National Advisory Panel on Architectural Services of the General Services Administration. Any such contract shall contain provisions requiring that—

(1) the consultant firm enter into a contract with a recognized specialist in the restoration of old buildings to advise it during the course of the study of the feasibility of restoring the West Front;

(2) during the course of its work, the consultant firm shall maintain close liaison with the Architect of the Capitol and the appropriate committees of the Congress; and

(3) a report containing the findings and recommendations of the consultant firm shall be submitted in two hundred copies not later than four months after the firm has been notified to proceed with the work for the information and review of the Architect of the Capitol, the appropriate committees of the Congress, the National Capital Planning Commission, the National Commission of Fine Arts, and other agencies or organizations having an historic or technical interest in structural reconstruction of the United States Capitol.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, no contract shall be entered into pursuant to this resolution unless the terms and conditions thereof have been approved by the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated such amount as may be necessary for carrying out the provisions of this joint resolution.

FINANCIAL HOLDINGS OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on December 3, 1963, January 29, 1965, and

again on January 12, 1967, I submitted for the RECORD the history of my financial holdings from the time I was first elected to the Senate in August 1957 until January 1967.

In order to bring the full record up to date, I submit herewith the history of my financial holdings since January 1967.

There has been no significant change in the makeup of my assets. The bulk of my assets are still in U.S. Treasury bonds and notes, as they have been since late 1963. The value of these holdings is about \$130,000.

My other assets include ownership of my home and furnishings in Washington, on which I owe a substantial mortgage to the Perpetual Building Association of Washington, D.C.; ownership of my home and furnishings in Madison, Wis., on which I owe a mortgage to the Credit Union National Association in Madison, Wis., and from which home I receive \$200 a month rental; ownership of one 1967 automobile; ownership of checking accounts in two Washington and one Madison bank with balances of about \$2,000.

I have trust custody of a small savings account of my daughter, Elsie; and trust custody over 10 shares of stock in the Milwaukee—now Atlanta—Braves, 10 shares in American Motors, and four shares in Allis-Chalmers, all for my son, Ted; and four shares of stock in Associated Dry Goods for my daughter, Elsie.

The value of my holdings has diminished since my last report 2 years ago by about \$20,000. I estimate them to be under \$175,000.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if we are to achieve the goal of human rights for the citizens of this country, we must remember that the issue is nonpartisan. This question cannot be argued over by parties, sects, classes, or creeds. It is a basic issue.

It is becoming of increasing importance in the contemporary world. We are going to have to work together to reach the goal of human rights for all, or we may fail to secure these rights for even a few.

Presidents of the United States have declared their support for the goal of achieving human rights for all men—Presidents of all parties, of all creeds and from all classes. The luster of such names as Lincoln, the two Roosevelts, Wilson, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson serves to illuminate the bright hope of the achievement of human rights. And now, President Nixon, through his nominee to the Human Rights Commission, Mrs. Rita Hauser, has lent support to the goal of human rights for all, and to the passage of the Human Rights Conventions. Mrs. Hauser has stated her support, and is helping us in the campaign to improve human rights for all. I wish her well in her efforts, and I am glad she has joined us in urging the passage of the three most important Human Rights Conventions—on Forced Labor, Genocide, and the Political Rights of Women.

The Senate has been nonpartisan in its deliberations on the issue of human

rights. When the United Nations Charter came before us in 1965, we ratified the Charter by a vote of 89 to 2, with strong support from both sides of the aisle. In 1967 we ratified the Supplemental Convention on Slavery and in 1968 we ratified the Refugee Protocol, both by strongly bipartisan votes. I am glad to see such a record continued by the appointment of Mrs. Hauser by President Nixon. While I am proud of our record in human rights we must not stop now. We have before us three Conventions to be ratified—Conventions that are supported on both sides of the aisle. I hope we will soon come to a vote on these important questions.

THE MILK PROGRAM FOR SCHOOLCHILDREN

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last month the Nixon administration decided to eliminate the special milk program for schoolchildren by merging it with the child nutrition and special food assistance programs. Traditionally, the school milk program, which puts Federal funds to work feeding the young, has been a viable alternative to using tax dollars to buy up surplus milk for storage in powdered form. The fluid milk that this program has taken off the market for use in the schools would otherwise have been bought up for storage under the price support program.

In effect, elimination of the school milk program will mean that surplus milk will once again be going into storage sheds rather than children's stomachs. Even an increase in the school lunch program will not be enough to offset the decline in the use of milk resulting from elimination of the school milk program.

Mr. President, the National Milk Producers Federation has calculated that some 1.9 billion half-pints of milk will be denied schoolchildren if the recommended budget cuts are permitted to take effect. I ask unanimous consent that the federation's statement before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL MILK PRODUCERS FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, the National Milk Producers Federation—representing dairy farmers in 49 of our 50 states—deeply appreciates the opportunity to present its recommendations on appropriations relating to important programs in the fiscal year 1970 budget.

The Federation represents American dairy farmers and the dairy cooperative associations which they own and operate. These cooperatives range from small groups to very large federated organizations. They operate throughout the continental United States and Alaska.

Today, our nation—as we believe it should—is reviewing and reevaluating priorities in our national life. In agriculture—particularly dairying—there are several programs of great significance:

- To our dairy farmers and their cooperatives;
- To our more than 200 million consumers; and

To our agriculture and national economy. These programs, we believe, merit high priority.

Briefly, I would like to touch upon highlights of programs of special significance to dairy farmers in the FY 1970 budget, and then request that more detailed statements be incorporated at the end of my discussion.

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

The School Lunch Program, in our judgment, merits the increased support recommended at a level of \$288,541,000—an increase of \$107,250,000 over FY 1969. This program continues to be highly effective (a) in improving the diets of America's children and (b) in providing a good outlet for surplus foods acquired under the Price Support Program.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

Under the Food Stamp Plan, an estimated 3.6 million people will benefit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. Although realistic estimates of scope of malnutrition and hunger in our nation are hard to come by, we believe that the additional \$60 million recommended in the budget would make a constructive—if modest—contribution toward meeting the needs of hungry people.

PESTICIDES INDEMNITY PROGRAM

The Federal program should be continued to provide indemnity payments to dairy farmers whose milk and other dairy products have been barred from the market because it contained residues of chemicals registered and approved by the Federal Government. To insure adequate protection under the program, we recommend that \$500,000—instead of \$200,000 proposed in the budget—be approved for the next fiscal year.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

The Farmer Cooperative Service Program continues to be extremely valuable to dairy farmers in helping to develop and improve operations of their cooperatives.

The Technical Assistance to Cooperatives' feature has been an especially effective program. Because of this, we would urge the Congress to approve \$1.5 million—instead of the recommended \$741,000—for the coming year.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

The removal of surplus agricultural commodities through the use of funds appropriated from Section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935, continues to be an essential function in our agricultural programs. Again we urge, however, that these funds be utilized as directly as possible in removal of surplus agricultural commodities rather than as funding for programs which merit support separately—such as School Lunch and other programs.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Carrying forward research is essential to progress in dairying. The areas in which research is urgently needed include: nutritional value of milk and dairy products and their relationship to a proper diet; expanding market outlets; broadening utilization of dairy products; dairy economics; improving distribution techniques for milk and dairy products; promoting greater use of technology in milk production, processing and marketing; and for research in other aspects of dairying.

Of special significance, the Federation urges approval of adequate funds for eradication of communicable livestock diseases; (1) at least \$21,587,000 recommended in the budget for the brucellosis eradication program; and (2) at least \$1 million for mastitis and abnormal milk program.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN

For 15 years, the Special Milk Program for Children has proven a tremendously useful and successful program.

- (1) It has contributed substantially to im-

proving the health of America's children. During 1968, for example, about 17 million children of school age benefitted from the program.

(2) It has provided a highly beneficial outlet for milk production, with consumption in 1968-69 estimated at three billion half pints—or about 1.6 billion pounds—of milk. As a result, it has reduced the cost of the Price Support Program.

(3) By increasing milk consumption, the program has proven to be of great importance to the dairy farmer.

For your reference, we have prepared two tables. The first discloses the number of schools and institutions, and the number of children, participating in the program for fiscal years 1955 through 1968. The second table shows the amount of milk served each year and the amount of butter and nonfat dry milk represented by this volume. I request permission to have the tables incorporated in the RECORD without taking time to read them.

TABLE I.—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN—NUMBER OF SCHOOLS AND INSTITUTIONS, AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN PARTICIPATING, FISCAL YEARS 1955-68

Fiscal year	Number of schools and institutions ¹	Number of children participating (millions) ²
1955	41,094	2.5
1956	62,266	7.7
1957	71,239	9.7
1958	76,478	10.7
1959	81,587	12.1
1960	83,922	13.2
1961	86,494	13.8
1962	88,188	14.6
1963	90,486	15.4
1964	91,890	16.3
1965	92,005	16.5
1966	97,437	17.0
1967	95,139	17.0
1968	94,422	17.0

¹ Peak month nationally. Child care institutions did not participate in program during fiscal years 1955 and 1956.
² Estimated on basis of 180 schooldays per year.
 Source: Reports CFPPS, C. & M.S., USDA.

TABLE II.—SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM FOR CHILDREN
 Amount of milk served, and milk served in terms of butter and nonfat dry milk, fiscal years 1955-68

Fiscal year	Milk served	Milk served in terms of—	
		Butter	Nonfat dry milk
1955	241,773	11,182	21,166
1956	749,395	34,660	65,606
1957	942,066	43,571	82,474
1958	1,031,016	47,684	90,261
1959	1,169,685	54,098	102,401
1960	1,281,776	59,282	112,214
1961	1,331,239	61,570	116,544
1962	1,414,150	65,404	123,802
1963	1,486,487	68,750	130,135
1964	1,574,354	72,814	137,828
1965	1,594,637	73,752	139,603
1966	1,644,280	76,048	143,949
1967	1,627,123	75,256	142,447
1968	1,631,682	75,465	142,846

CURRENT STATUS

As you know, Congress appropriated funds not to exceed \$104 million for this program for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The law also provides authorization not to exceed \$120 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

BUDGET PROPOSAL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1970

To the great distress of America's dairy farmers, however, no funds were requested in the fiscal year 1970 budget for this program. As proposed, rather, the Department indicates that only \$20 million would be used to operate the program in schools without

lunch facilities. The milk program, itself, would be phased out in 1970.

As I understand it, the thinking—certainly not the wise planning—is that, by expansion of the School Lunch Program and other feeding programs, milk consumption would not decrease; rather, the milk previously served in the School Milk Program would be consumed. This thinking contradicts simple arithmetic as will be shown.

SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE HARDIN'S POSITION

In testifying before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, Secretary of Agriculture Clifford Hardin—in response to a question—stated that the Department was going along with the budget proposal.

JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM

Mr. Chairman: In our judgment, this rationale does not stand the test of reason. Why? For the following reasons:

(1) The proposed budget will seriously reduce consumption of milk. For FY 1970, the budget proposes to eliminate the Special Milk Program. Under the umbrella of "Child Nutrition Programs" would be the School Lunch, Special Assistance to Needy Schools, School Breakfast, Special Food Service Programs for Children and Nonschool Food Program. Under all these programs, however, the estimated consumption for FY 1970 will still be reduced by an estimated 1.905 billion half pints.

(2) Economically, as well as humanly, the proposed shift of emphasis would, in our judgment, be costly. By failing to provide appropriations for the School Milk Program, it could—for moderate difference in cost—literally take 1.905 billion half pints of milk out of the mouths of children and put it into the surplus stockpiles. The 1.905 billion half pints equal 10,239,375 hundredweight of milk; converted into dairy products and purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at the 1969 rate of \$5.12 per hundredweight, the cost would be \$52,425,600.

(3) Nutritionists maintain that a child should have a minimum of one quart of milk per day. Even under the present two programs—School Milk and School Lunch—the consumption of milk provides only half this recommended minimum. It would be even less under the proposed termination of the School Milk Program and the expanded School Lunch Program with only one-half pint required with each Type A lunch.

(4) Currently, the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs hearings provide evidence of malnutrition among our Nation's youth, including middle and higher income levels of our population. The availability of milk to more than 37 percent—the present level of participation—of our 51 million school children, would, in our judgment, serve the national interest.

(5) With an expanding population—and a Nation's growing concern for hunger and malnutrition—this is no time to eliminate or reduce a program which for 15 years has proved its value by improving the diet and health of the youth of this country.

(6) In terms of public expenditures the milk program is a good investment in child health; the dairy and farm economy; and the national interest.

As authorized in present law, therefore, we urgently recommend:

(1) That the program be funded as a separate program;

(2) That appropriations be approved at least at the authorized level of \$120 million for fiscal year 1970. Preferably, our judgment is that appropriation should be increased to \$125 million for fiscal year 1970 to meet the needs of expanding population, as proposed in bills S. 745 and H.R. 7996 now pending before Congress.

Mr. Chairman: In considering such legislation, we would respectfully urge that the

Congress—as in the past—would work its own will; rather than accept the recommendations of the Executive Branch as inflexible edicts making far-reaching—and, in this case, we believe unwise—changes in this program.

I respectfully request permission of this distinguished Committee to have printed at this point in the hearings additional statements by the National Milk Producers Federation supporting appropriations for other programs of significance to agricultural progress in this country.

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAM (SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM)

Over the years, the School Lunch Program has proved a highly effective and beneficial program;

For improving a good outlet for purchases of food acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Price Support Program; and

As a matter of fact, for now being in a forefront of the Nation's growing concentrated battle against malnutrition and hunger.

For fiscal year 1969, cash payments will have been made to states operating the program for 19 million children in 71,750 schools; they will have been served 3,370,000 lunches at an estimated cost of \$162 million.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget proposes to include several programs under the new title, Child Nutrition Program; these include the School Lunch, Special Assistance to Needy Schools, School Breakfast and Special Food Service Programs for Children.

The budget recommends about \$288,541,000—\$107,250,000 more than for fiscal year 1969. The comparative 1969-70 figures are as follows:

	1969	1970
School lunch.....	\$162,041,000	\$168,041,000
Special assistance to needy schools.....	10,000,000	90,000,000
School breakfast program.....	3,500,000	10,000,000
Special food service program for children.....	5,750,000	20,500,000
Total.....	181,291,000	288,541,000

In our judgment, these programs merit this level of support.

Furthermore, it is our opinion that more efficient use of agricultural commodities such as butter, cheese, and nonfat dry milk acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation are donated to the School Lunch Program when available. The Secretary of Agriculture should allocate definite quantities of these commodities to the School Lunch Program and then make such quantities available to schools from Commodity Credit Corporation inventory or, if necessary, from open market purchases. This procedure would serve to stabilize the program and allow school officials to plan on a long-term basis. It would also be of significant benefit to farmers by providing a more dependable market for their product.

FOOD STAMP PLAN

With the most productive agricultural system and the most efficient farmers in the world, we cannot tolerate malnutrition and hunger in this country. The Food Stamp Plan, in our judgment, operates as an extremely useful program in meeting dietary needs of low-income or impoverished groups.

Under the present program, an estimated 3.6 million people will benefit in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969. The cost will be an estimated \$280 million.

For fiscal year 1970, the budget requests an additional \$60 million, for a total of \$340 million, for the Food Stamp Plan. This would cover the full-year costs at the June 30, 1969, level, plus expansion in new areas in 1970.

As yet, the Department of Agriculture (which administers the program) has not

been able to develop realistic estimates on the total scope of malnutrition and hunger. For the time being, then, we would support in the United States expansion of the program to the \$340 million level.

The Federation has consistently supported the Food Stamp Plan. Unfortunately, many program participants do not properly utilize their stamps. This is because they are given too broad a range of products from which to choose. For example, instead of purchasing, at reduced prices, nature's most perfect food, the stamps are frequently exchanged for imitations of dairy products and do not provide a nutritious well-balanced meal.

Through proper nutrition education, accompanied by an increased sense of family responsibility, many lower income families could more wisely use the Food Stamp Program. Stamps should be exchangeable only for a limited list of the most highly nutritious foods.

The Federation suggests that the Congress authorize studies to be made toward making the Food Stamp Plan more adaptable to the needs of the recipients and to encourage them to become more productive members of our economy.

The Federation continues to oppose present provisions of the Food Stamp law which prohibit the present direct food distribution program in countries where a Food Stamp Plan is in effect. Distribution of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks could be combined with the Food Stamp Plan without disrupting the local commercial market and, thus, provide maximum distribution of food to low-income families.

INDEMNITY PAYMENTS TO DAIRY FARMERS

The Indemnity payments program has proven extremely valuable to dairy farmers.

In recent years, unfortunately, a limited number of farmers have had milk barred from markets because of minute traces of pesticide residue. This occurred even though the pesticides had been recommended by the Federal Government and the contamination resulted from factors outside the control of the farmer, these could include wind drift of pesticide, spray, contamination of purchased feed, etc. So long as farmers can suffer extreme economic loss even though following Government procedures, it would be inequitable to discontinue the program.

For fiscal year 1969, the budget estimates that indemnity payments will total about \$300,000.

For fiscal year 1970, however, the budget proposes only \$200,000—a reduction of \$100,000. In our judgment, this is inadequate.

To ensure protection for dairy farmers, the Federation urges approval of an appropriation of \$500,000 for the next fiscal year. If the level of pesticide contamination should increase, it is important that the farmers be able to recover indemnities. If the money is not spent, it goes back to the treasury.

The Federation also continues to urge that laboratories be established to test feeds and other agricultural commodities intended for consumption by livestock. When such contamination occurs, it often is transmitted through purchased feed for milk cows. However, the farmer has no way of knowing whether or not the purchased feed is free of pesticide residue. Therefore, it is essential that a method be established for dealing effectively with this problem. This is especially necessary since, if it occurs, regulatory agencies can step in and prohibit dairy farmers from selling their products.

If laboratory facilities were established to test feeds for pesticide residues before these were transmitted into milk, this would markedly improve capabilities for controlling such residue.

The Federation estimates that 18 testing laboratories would be needed. These would benefit not only dairy farmers but also livestock producers.

FARMER COOPERATIVE SERVICE

Over the years, the Farmers Cooperative Service has made significant contributions toward improving and advancing the cooperative system. Generally, the activities include:

Advising cooperative leaders and others on problems and operations of specific co-ops;

Encouraging further co-op development and organization;

Helping farmers get better prices for their products through reduced marketing expenses;

Enabling dairy and other farmers to better meet growing competition; and

Providing a useful resource for general guidance, counsel and technical assistance in development and improvement of cooperative organizations.

For 1969, the budget for this program totaled about \$1,414,000. For fiscal year 1970, the budget proposes an expenditure of \$1,695,000, an increase of \$281,000.

Generally, the expenditures would be proportioned as follows:

(In thousands)			
	1969*	1970	Increase
Marketing efficiency and farm income research.....	\$826	\$826	None
Community improvement research.....	33	93	\$60
Housing research.....	14	14	None
Technical assistance to cooperatives.....	541	741	200
Market supervision.....	None	21	21
Total.....	1,414	1,695	281

*Includes \$1,341,000 in 1969 appropriations plus \$73,000 in proposed 1969 supplemental appropriations to meet enacted pay costs.

According to USDA figures, the net business volume of farmers marketing and purchasing cooperatives has risen from \$9½ billion to \$18 billion within the last 15 years—89 percent. In addition, there has been an increase in the scope and complexity of operations of cooperatives. Because of these factors, the Federation strongly feels that the appropriations for Technical Assistance to Cooperatives should be substantially increased, from \$741,000 to \$1.5 million for FY 1970.

Although cooperatives are specifically organized to help their members, the benefits actually are widespread. Because cooperative associations hire employees in their plants, they provide additional jobs in the community. Cooperative services enable farmers to operate at lower costs; by so doing, they make contributions to higher farm income. Since cooperatives operate on a cost basis, they are an effective instrument in maintaining reasonable prices for consumers.

For these reasons, we believe that expanding the Technical Assistance to Cooperative Programs would serve the best interest, not only of the farmer, but also the communities in which they operate and the general economy.

SECTION 32 FUNDS

The Federation continues to support the objectives of Section 32 of Public Law 320, Seventy-Fourth Congress. We believe a greater effort should be made to fulfill one of the main purposes of Section 32, that is, the reestablishment of farmers' purchasing power in connection with the normal production of agricultural commodities. In view of this purpose, it is undesirable to end the fiscal year consistently returning unused funds to the Treasury. Such funds could be used to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In the FY 1970 budget, however, substantial Section 32 funds have been earmarked for

diversion to the School Lunch, Child Nutrition, and similar programs. Although we support these programs, we believe that they should be funded by separate appropriation.

The Federation, moreover, is deeply concerned about one recommendation under Section 32 in the FY 1970 budget relating to costs of administering marketing agreements and orders. The budget states that: "Legislation will be requested for payment of approximately \$3 million of the Federal administrative costs of this program by producers and handlers."

In the past, these costs have been borne by the Government as a justified expenditure for a public program administered in the interests of the farmer and the Nation. Presently, the parity level for dairying is only about 83 percent, evidence that the cost of labor, equipment, and other operating expenses are 17 percent below the level of dairy prices.

Obviously, transferring the burden of an additional \$3 million expenditure to producers and handlers would result in: (a) greater economic burdens on the dairy farmers already facing serious problems; or (b) higher costs to consumers.

Because of these factors—and because we believe that these are normal administrative expenditures justifiably paid by the Government—we strongly oppose any change of existing procedures that would impose an additional economic burden on the dairy farmer.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Research in dairying is essential: (1) to provide ways for finding solutions to unresolved problems; (2) to establish a foundation of new knowledge for progress.

Recognizing this, the Federation urges approval of adequate appropriations for research in dairying and agriculture.

Unfortunately the dairy farm prices have been too low for too long. Because of this situation the dairy industry needs assistance for necessary research—research by the Federal Government and authority for self-help research whereby dairy farmers and their cooperatives could utilize funds out of the Federal order milk market pool for research and other projects to improve or promote the marketing and consumption of milk and its products.

However dairying continues to be an important resource for healthful nutritional food and a major source of income for the Nation's farmers; consequently it is important that dairy research be supported at an adequate level in our Federal programs. The areas in which research is urgently needed

include: nutritional value of milk and dairy products and their relationship to a proper diet; expanding market outlets; broadening utilization of dairy products; dairy economics; improving distribution techniques for milk and dairy products; promoting greater use of technology in milk production processing and marketing; and for research in other aspects of dairying.

Of greater significance to the dairy industry also are U.S. Department of Agriculture efforts to eradicate communicable livestock diseases. Fortunately progress is being made for example in eradication of brucellosis. According to USDA all but seven states of the Nation, Louisiana, Florida, Texas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Hawaii, have achieved Modified-Certified status. A record number of counties, 3,001 in the United States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, have reached this intermediate goal in eradicating brucellosis.

A total of 1,207 counties are certified Brucellosis-Free. This total includes all counties in 14 States, Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Michigan, Wisconsin, Washington, Nevada, Utah, and the Virgin Islands. All except ten counties in the Nation, are participating in efforts to eradicate brucellosis.

For FY 1970, the Department reports that it proposes to allocate \$21,587,000—an amount similar to FY 1969—for the brucellosis eradication program. Although the Department indicates that this should be sufficient to carry out its objectives, we would urgently recommend that the Congress carefully consider whether or not the eradication program can be operated effectively at this level of expenditure; if this cannot be done, additional funds should be approved.

Mastitis also continues to be a major cause of economic loss to dairy farmers. According to USDA estimates, losses amount to \$600 million or more annually. In addition, mastitis results in shorter productive life for affected cows; and often results in culling of mastitic cows from dairy herds.

Unfortunately, research efforts have resulted in a conflict of viewpoints as to the methodology of mastitis detection, the specific causes of mastitis, and the degree and severity of a problem which may exist even if mastitis is present. Coordinated research is essential to provide a full understanding of the problem.

We would respectfully urge, therefore, that the Congress earmark at least \$1 million for dealing with the problems of mastitis and abnormal milk.

BUDGET CUT TO DECREASE MILK CONSUMPTION—1.905 BILLION HALF PINTS OF MILK WILL BE DENIED SCHOOLCHILDREN UNDER RECOMMENDED BUDGET CUTS

In the budget for fiscal 1970 the school milk program will be terminated and the school lunch and other feeding programs increased. This will decrease milk consumption by 1,905,000,000 half pints.

	Fiscal year 1969 (half pints)	Fiscal year 1970 (half pints)	1970 increase or decrease (half pints)
School milk (estimated consumption).....	3,000,000,000 (1)	581,000,000 (2)	2,419,000,000 decrease.
School lunch and other feeding programs with 1 half pint of milk each.....	3,445,000,000 (3)	3,959,000,000 (4)	514,000,000,000 increase.
Net decrease.....			1,905,000,000

Source: (1) Budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91-16) p. 131; (2) budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91-16) p. 134; (\$20,000,000 transferred from sec. 32 divided by .0344 average reimbursement rate); (3) and (4) budget 1970 (H. Doc. 91-16) p. 133. \$52,425,600 additional cost to price support program due to the decreased consumption of 1,905,000,000 half pints of milk. The 1,905,000,000 half pints equals 10,239,375 hundredweight of milk. This will be converted into dairy products and purchased by the Commodity Credit Corporation at a rate of about \$5.12 per hundredweight (1969). Result: \$52,425,600 increased cost to the Federal Government. The Federal Government will spend \$52,425,600 to deny school children 1,905,000,000 half pints of milk during fiscal year 1970.

S. 1861—INTRODUCTION OF THE CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT OF 1969

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, along with two of my distinguished colleagues, the Senator

from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), I introduced S. 30, the Organized Crime Control Act of 1969, which will strengthen the procedural aspects of Federal law enforcement ef-

forts to stamp out organized crime in the United States.

The bill which I am introducing today, the Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969, is in part a product of testimony developed in 4 days of hearings on S.30.

There is a rising awareness, in official circles and among all our people, of the depth of penetration of organized crime into the fabric of our society.

Paul J. Curran, chairman, New York State Commission of Investigation, testified before the subcommittee:

In our investigations, the Commission has found that the means used by racketeers to penetrate and to gain control of legitimate business, or simply to engage in extortion, ranged from old fashioned muscle and violence to such more sophisticated techniques as using a big underworld name as a salesman, or merely mentioning such a name as being connected with a particular company, or "borrowing" money with no intention of even repaying the "loan." Of course, many other techniques were and are utilized.

Organized crime business penetration, moreover, is not, as some would believe, a process by which the racketeers will eventually be legitimized. Criminals use racketeering methods in legitimate fields of endeavor. They corrupt others, instead of becoming legitimized. The only way in which this cancer can be removed from our economy is by direct attack, by forceable removal and prevention of return.

Mr. President, the time has come for such a frontal assault to be made on the bastions of organized crime. Our present laws are inadequate to remove criminals from legitimate-endeavor organizations. Constant references have been made to the frustration resulting when the only consequence of a conviction is that organized crime and its infiltrated organizations are run by a new leader, and the organizations which are the real threat are not affected. Attorney General John A. Mitchell has called for new ideas in this area, and I have been in contact with him in the preparation of this legislation. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) has introduced legislation which would apply certain approaches from other areas of Government activity, such as taxation and antitrust, to the problem of organized crime. He also joins me in the introduction of this bill. Congressman POFF of Virginia has also been in contact with me in reference to this bill. It is, Mr. President, bipartisan legislation.

The problem, simply stated, is that organized crime is increasingly taking over organizations in our country, presenting an intolerable increase in deterioration of our Nation's standards. Efforts to dislodge them so far have been of little avail. To aid in the pressing need to remove organized crime from legitimate organizations in our country, I have thus formulated this bill which I am introducing today, a bill entitled the "Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969." This bill is designed to attack the infiltration of legitimate business repeatedly outlined by investigations of various congressional committees and the President's Crime Commission.

The bill uses the most direct route to accomplish this result. If an organization is acquired or run by the proscribed racketeering method, then the persons involved are removed from the organization. This legislation—possibly for the first time—develops the use of other techniques and approaches as a means to remove organized crime influences from legitimate organizations.

The bill draws heavily upon the remedies developed in the field of antitrust. Nevertheless, Mr. President, I believe it necessary to make several clarifying remarks on the antitrust remedies this bill provides. The first is that the equitable remedies used in the field of antitrust always existed. Because the remedies have been effective in removing and preventing harmful behavior in the business segment of our economy, they show great promise as tools for attacking organized crime. There is, however, no intention here of importing the great complexity of antitrust law enforcement into this field. Nor is there any intention of using the antitrust laws for a purpose beyond the legislative intent at the time of their passage.

The many references to antitrust cases are necessary because the particular equitable remedies desired have been brought to their greatest development in this field, and in many instances they are the primary precedents for the remedies in this bill. Nor do I mean to limit the remedies available to those which have already been established. The ability of our chancery courts to formulate a remedy to fit the wrong is one of the great benefits of our system of justice. This ability is not hindered by the bill.

My second point is that this bill in its particular provisions is an innovating approach to the problem of organized crime. As such, it must be subjected to searching analysis in order to forge its underlying ideas into the most effective tools possible. I assume that it will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and then to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, in which event I would expect to schedule early hearings in order to expedite processing and consideration of the bill. Its provisions might well be incorporated by way of amendment into S. 30 itself.

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

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the bill creates a new chapter 95 in title 18, entitled "Racketeer Influenced Organizations," containing sections which I shall briefly highlight in order to show the response to organized crime contained in this proposed legislation.

Section 1961, definitions, in subsections (1)-(12) defines the type of activity subject to actions. These were based on the President's Crime Commission report which stated:

Control of business concerns has usually been acquired through one of four methods:

(1) investing concealed profits acquired from gambling and other illegal activities; (2) accepting business interests in payment of the owner's gambling debts; (3) foreclosing on usurious loans and (4) using various forms of extortion.

In addition, various methods of corruption used by organized crime to conduct ordinarily legitimate businesses are included.

Section 1962 sets forth the forbidden activities, which are to acquire, control or operate organizations by the use of a pattern of racketeering activity as defined in section 1961, or to acquire an organization by the collection of unlawful debt. I emphasize that this is not aimed at the isolated criminal act. I note, too, that at least one act occurring after the effective date of this legislation must be shown to make out a violation.

Section 1963 provides that any violation of section 1962 provable beyond a reasonable doubt will result in a forfeiture of the violators' interest in the organization to the United States. This is a powerful weapon, which will, I hope, effectively remove the organized crime element from a particular field of activity, as well as remove the illegal profit potential which makes certain fields so attractive today. Precedent for forfeitures, of course, runs deep in our common law heritage. It thus calls on the past to meet the problems of today.

Section 1964, civil remedies, provides for divestiture of interest and other remedies as to persons found to have violated section 1962. Ample precedent here exists in the antitrust laws, and I quote from the landmark decision *United States v. DuPont & Co.*, 366 U.S. 316, 326-27 (1961):

The key to the whole question of antitrust remedy is, of course, the discovery of measures effective to restore competition. Courts are not authorized in civil proceedings to punish antitrust violators, and relief must not be punitive. But courts are authorized, indeed required to decree relief effective to redress the violations, whatever the adverse effect of such a decree on private interests. Divestiture is itself an equitable remedy designed to protect the public interest.

If the Court concludes that other measures will not be effective to redress a violation, and that complete divestiture is a necessary element of effective relief, the Government cannot be denied the latter remedy because economic hardship, however severe, may result.

One must remember that this is a court speaking of remedying an economic concentration of power, which potentially might have an adverse effect upon our economy. This bill attacks a far more heinous offense, the use of force, threats of force, enforcement of illegal debts, and corruption in the acquisition or operation of business. If DuPont and other related companies can be forced to rid themselves of General Motors ownership, almost without regard for the economic consequences, then it most surely follows that the removal of criminal elements from the organizations of our society by divestiture is justified. The situation may be said to cry for legislation to accomplish that result. The criminal surely can lose his right to own a business or other enterprise as easily as can the essentially

honest, but potentially too powerful businessman.

This provision will, I trust, effectively remove the criminal figure from the particular corrupt organization. As used in connection with the remedy of prohibition of engaging in the same kind of business in the future, the criminal element is not only removed from an area of activity, he is also prohibited from using the knowhow acquired to start the same business again under a different name. Again the antitrust laws furnish ample precedent.

In *United States v. Grinnel Corp.*, 384 U.S. 563, 579 (1966), Judge Wyzanski, the district court judge, had decreed that one Fleming should be enjoined from working for any of the corporate defendants to an antitrust suit because of constant flouting of the antitrust laws, even though no predatory practices were found to exist. The Supreme Court, while it reversed on factual underpinning to support the legal judgment, acknowledged that the remedy itself was clearly available if appropriate facts were found:

Defendants urge and the Government concedes that the barring of Mr. Fleming from the employment of any of the defendants is unduly harsh and quite unnecessary on this record. While relief of that kind may be appropriate where the predatory conduct is conspicuous, we cannot see that any such case was made out on this record.

I submit that if predatory conduct is the basis for such a prohibition, then surely murder, extortion and other crimes are more than equal grounds for the prohibition.

Additional authority for prohibiting persons or corporations from engaging in certain types of legitimate activities may be found in *United States v. Swift & Co.*, 286 U.S. 106 (1932), and *Deveau v. Braisted*, 363 U.S. 144 (1960), as well as numerous disbarment cases.

In all of these cases, the courts have emphasized that the prohibition is not in the nature of a penalty against any individual. It is instead in the nature of protection of the public against parties engaging in certain types of businesses after they have shown that they are likely to run the organization in a manner detrimental to the public interest. In the spirit of this background, this provision is remedial rather than penal. It is based upon judgment that parties who conduct organizations affecting interstate commerce through a pattern of criminal activity are acting contrary to the public interest. To protect the public they must be prohibited from continuing to engage in this type of business in any capacity.

In the event an organization is so corrupt that divestiture does not provide an effective remedy, then the court is authorized to require dissolution. Authority for dissolution is found in *International Boxing Club of New York, Inc. v. United States*, 358 U.S. 242 (1959). Again I emphasize that the remedies are not confined to those listed.

Estoppel specifically is provided between a criminal suit won by the United States and a civil suit, but in no other instance.

Section 1965 provides broad venue and process, similar to that set out in the antitrust laws.

Section 1966 provides for expedition of actions due to the crucial nature of the actions.

Section 1967 provides for open depositions, on the theory that publicity is one of the most effective actions we have for use against the organized criminal. An immunity section similar to that of S. 30 is also in section 1967.

Section 1968, "Investigations," is patterned after the civil investigative demand used by the Department of Justice with great effect in civil antitrust investigations. In the hearings before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee concerning S. 167, which created the civil investigative demand, the Department of Justice testified that if there are both civil and criminal penalties for the same conduct, many problems occur if a civil precharge investigation is not authorized. I quote:

As this committee knows, in many cases, the grand jury cannot be used to investigate antitrust violations. The Supreme Court held, in *United States v. Proctor & Gamble*, 356 U.S. 677 (1958), that is an abuse of process to use a grand jury in an antitrust investigation where there is no intention to bring a criminal case. This decision is now being used to harass the Department in situations where grand jury investigations have led to civil, rather than criminal cases. There are many reasons why the Department may not seek an indictment in these instances. The evidence uncovered may not be strong enough to meet the strict standard of proof in criminal cases. The antitrust violations uncovered may not involve such willful disregard for the law as to warrant the imposition of criminal penalties and the stigma which attaches to those penalties. Another reason for bringing only a civil suit is that the public interest may require the prompt invocation of civil remedies such as divestiture or injunction. The bringing of a criminal case will often delay this civil relief.

Whatever the reason for proceeding only by civil case, the decision to do so now subjects the Department to great potential harassment. In *United States v. Carter Products, Inc.*, a civil case was brought in the Southern District of New York after a grand jury proceeding in which no indictment was returned. The court ordered answers to interrogatories requesting the names of all persons involved in the decision not to proceed criminally and all persons who assisted in drafting the complaint. After those names were supplied, 13 attorneys and officials of the Department of Justice, including the former Attorney General, William P. Rogers, were subpoenaed to give depositions. Similar tactics are now being tried in a number of other cases.

We must avoid an occurrence of this type activity in the area covered by the instant bill.

The bill also adds interception of communications to the weapons available to the community in combating organized crime infiltration, provides that it shall be construed so as to effectuate its broad remedial purposes, and contains a separability clause.

Mr. President, in introducing S. 30, I made it quite clear that neither the omnibus crime bill of 1968, nor S. 30, would be sufficient to remedy the crime problems facing our country. Nor will this bill completely solve the problem. But all of this legislation will be helpful in stamping out the organized crime parasites preying upon our society. We need even more imaginative legislation; we need as much money as we can find to fund the fight; we need cooperation,

not only between various governmental authorities, but also between citizens and law enforcement authority; and we need to inform the citizenry as to when and where they are pouring their funds into the coffers of organized crime, which funds are then used to destroy the society which produced them. Organized crime can and must be stamped out. This bill is, I hope, another useful tool which law enforcement desperately needs for its fight against organized crime. Organized crime must not be allowed to take over our country's economy, or any significant portion of it.

The bill (S. 1861) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the infiltration or management of legitimate organizations by racketeering activity or the proceeds of racketeering activity, where interstate or foreign commerce is affected, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1861

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 "Corrupt Organizations Act of 1969."

CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF POLICY

The Congress finds (1) that organized crime in the United States is a highly sophisticated, diversified, and nationwide illegal activity that annually drains billions of dollars from the nation's economy while operating by corruption and the illegal use of violence (2) that organized crime derives a major portion of its power through money and property obtained from such illegal endeavors as syndicated gambling, loan sharking, the theft and fencing of stolen property, the importation and distribution of narcotics and other dangerous drugs, and other forms of social exploitation; (3) that this money and power are being increasingly used to infiltrate legitimate businesses, trade organizations, labor unions, and other associations; (4) that the danger of organized crime activities in the nation threatens the domestic peace, security and stability of its economic system, harms innocent investors and competing organizations, interferes with free competition, and seriously burdens interstate and foreign commerce; and (5) that organized crime continues to grow despite efforts to deal with it, in part because of the past inadequacy of remedies designed to deal with it.

It is, therefore, the declared policy of the Congress to eradicate the baneful influence of organized crime in the United States by the enactment of remedial legislation which will, through fine, imprisonment, criminal forfeiture, and civil divestiture, dissolution, injunction and other relief, enlarge, strengthen and vitalize the tools available to arrest and reverse the growth of organized crime in the United States, its infiltration of legitimate organizations, and its interference with interstate and foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding immediately after chapter 95 thereof the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 96—RACKETEER INFLUENCED ORGANIZATIONS

"Sec.
"1961. Definitions.
"1962. Prohibited racketeering activities.
"1963. Criminal penalties.
"1964. Civil remedies.
"1965. Venue and process.

"1966. Expedition of actions.
 "1967. Evidence.
 "1968. Investigations.
 "§ 1961. Definitions

"As used in this chapter—

"(1) The term 'racketeering activity' means (A) any act involving the danger of violence to life, limb or property, indictable under State or Federal law and punishable by imprisonment for more than one year; (B) any act which is indictable under any of the following provisions of title 18, United States Code: section 201 (relating to bribery), section 224 (relating to sports bribery), sections 471, 472, and 473 (relating to counterfeiting), section 664 (relating to embezzlement from pension and welfare funds), section 659 (relating to theft from interstate shipment), sections 891-894 (relating to extortionate credit transactions), section 1084 (relating to the transmission of gambling transformation), section 1503 (relating to obstruction of justice), section 1510 (relating to obstruction of criminal investigations), section 1951 (relating to interference with commerce, robbery or extortion), section 1952 (relating to racketeering), section 1954 (relating to welfare fund bribery), sections 2314 and 2315 (relating to interstate transportation of stolen property), sections 2421-24 (relating to white slave traffic), section 501(c) of the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (relating to embezzlement from union funds), and (C) any conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

"(2) The term 'interstate commerce' means commerce within the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any possession of the United States, or between any place in a State and any place in another State, or between places in the same State through another State.

"(3) The term 'State' means each of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, the Canal Zone and American Samoa.

"(4) The term 'person' includes any individual or entity capable of holding a legal or beneficial interest in property.

"(5) The term 'enterprise' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, association, or other legal entity, and any union or group of individuals associated in fact although not a legal entity.

"(6) The term 'pattern of racketeering activity' includes at least one act occurring after the effective date of this Chapter.

"(7) The term 'unlawful debt' means a debt (A) which is unenforceable under State or Federal law in whole or in part as to principal or interest because of the laws relating to gambling or usury, and (B) which was incurred in connection with the business of gambling or the business of lending money or a thing of value at a usurious rate.

"(8) The term 'racketeering order' means any final order, decree, or judgment of any court of the United States, duly entered in any case or proceeding arising under this Chapter.

"(9) The term 'racketeering investigation' means any inquiry conducted by any racketeering investigator for the purpose of ascertaining whether any person has been engaged in any racketeering violation.

"(10) The term 'racketeering violation' means any act or omission in violation of this Chapter or any racketeering order hereunder.

"(11) The term 'racketeering investigator' means any attorney or investigator employed by the Department of Justice who is charged with the duty of enforcing or carrying into effect this Chapter.

"(12) The term 'documentary material' includes the original or any copy of any book, record, report, memorandum, paper, communication, tabulation, chart, or other document.

"§ 1962. Prohibited racketeering activities.

"(a) It shall be unlawful for any person who has knowingly received any income derived, directly or indirectly, from a pattern of racketeering activity to use or invest, directly or indirectly, any part of such income, or the proceeds of such income, in the acquisition of any interest in, or the establishment or operation of, any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.

"(b) It shall be unlawful for any person to acquire or maintain, directly or indirectly, any interest in or control of any enterprise which is engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, through a pattern of racketeering activity or through collection of unlawful debt.

"(c) It shall be unlawful for any person employed by or associated with any enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce, to conduct or participate, directly or indirectly, in the conduct of such enterprise's affairs through a pattern of racketeering activity.

"§ 1963. Criminal penalties

"(a) Whoever violates any provision of section 1962 of this Chapter shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both, and shall forfeit to the United States all interest in the enterprise engaged in, or the activities of which affect, interstate or foreign commerce.

"(b) In any action brought by the United States under this section, the district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or to take such other actions, including but not limited to, the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, in connection with property subject to forfeiture under this section, as it shall deem proper.

"(c) Upon conviction of a person under this section, the court shall authorize the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, to seize all property declared forfeited under this section upon such terms and conditions as the court shall deem proper. All provisions of law relating to the disposition of property, or the proceeds from the sale thereof, or the remission or mitigation of forfeitures for violation of the customs laws, and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to forfeitures incurred, or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this section, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof. Such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the disposition of property under the customs laws shall be performed under this Chapter by the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General.

"§ 1964. Civil remedies

"(a) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction to prevent and restrain violations of section 1962 of this Chapter by issuing appropriate orders, including, but not limited to: ordering any person to divest himself of any interests, direct or indirect, in any enterprise; prohibiting any person from engaging in the same type of business or other activity as the enterprise engaged in, the activities of which affect interstate or foreign commerce; or ordering dissolution of any such enterprise.

"(b) The Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may institute proceedings to prevent and restrain such violations. In any action brought by the United States under this section the court shall proceed as soon as may be to the hearing and determination thereof. Pending final determination thereof, the court may at any time enter such restraining orders or prohibitions, or to take such other actions, including, but

not limited to, the acceptance of satisfactory performance bonds, as it shall deem proper.

"(c) A final judgment or decree rendered in favor of the United States in any criminal proceeding brought by the United States under this Chapter shall estop the defendant from denying the essential allegations of the criminal offense in any subsequent civil proceeding brought by the United States.

"§ 1965. Venue and process

"(a) Any civil action or proceeding under this chapter against any person may be instituted in the district court of the United States for any district in which such person resides, is found, has an agent, or transacts his affairs.

"(b) In any action under section 1964(b) of this Chapter in any district court of the United States in which it is shown that the ends of justice require that other parties residing in any other district be brought before the court, the court may cause such parties to be summoned, and process for that purpose may be served in any judicial district of the United States by the marshal thereof.

"(c) In any civil criminal action or proceeding instituted by the United States under this Chapter in the district court of the United States for any judicial district, subpoenas issued by such court to compel the attendance of witnesses may be served in any other judicial district, except that in any civil action or proceeding no such subpoena shall be issued for service upon any individual who resides in another district at a place more than one hundred miles from the place at which such court is held without approval given by a judge of such court upon a showing of good cause.

"(d) All process in any action or proceeding under this chapter may be served in any judicial district in which such person is an inhabitant or is found.

"§ 1966. Expedition of actions

"In any civil action instituted by the United States in any district court of the United States under this chapter, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may file with the clerk of such court a certificate stating that in his opinion the case is of general public importance. A copy of that certificate shall be furnished immediately by such clerk to the chief judge or in his absence to the presiding district judge of the district in which such action is pending. Upon receipt of such copy, such judge shall designate immediately a judge of that district to hear and determine such action. The judge so designated shall assign such action for hearing at the earliest practicable date, participate in the hearings and determination thereof, and cause such action to be expedited in every way.

"§ 1967. Evidence

"(a) In the taking of depositions for use in any civil action instituted by the United States under this chapter, and in the hearings before any examiner or special master appointed to take testimony therein, the proceedings shall be open to the public as freely as are trials in open court, and no order excluding the public from attendance at any such proceeding shall be made or enforced.

"(b) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States, or in any civil proceedings under this chapter involving a violation of section 1962 of this chapter, is necessary to the public interest, the United States attorney, upon the approval of the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General

designated by the Attorney General, shall make application to such court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence, subject to the provisions of this section. Upon order of the court no such witness shall, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination, be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may compel him to be a witness against himself in a criminal case. Such testimony or evidence so compelled or any evidence, knowledge, or information which is come at by the exploitation of such testimony or evidence so compelled shall not be used as evidence in any criminal case against such witness except a prosecution for giving false testimony or for a failure to comply with the order.

"§ 1968. Investigations

"(a) Civil investigative demand.

"(1) Issuance.

"Whenever the Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, has reason to believe that any person or enterprise under investigation may be in possession, custody, or control of any documentary material relevant to a civil racketeering investigation, he may, prior to the institution of a civil or criminal proceeding thereon, issue in writing, and cause to be served upon such person, a civil investigative demand requiring such person to produce such material for examination.

"(2) Contents.

"Each such demand shall—

"(i) state the nature of the conduct constituting the alleged racketeering violation which is under investigation and the provision of law applicable thereto;

"(ii) describe the class or classes of documentary material to be produced thereunder with such definiteness and certainty as to permit such material to be fairly identified;

"(iii) prescribe a return date which will provide a reasonable period of time within which the material so demanded may be assembled and made available for inspection and copying or reproduction; and

"(iv) identify the custodian to whom such material shall be made available.

"(3) Reasonableness; privilege.

"No such demand shall—

"(i) contain any requirement which would be held to be unreasonable if contained in a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged racketeering violation; or

"(ii) require the production of any documentary evidence which would be privileged from disclosure if demanded by a subpoena duces tecum issued by a court of the United States in aid of a grand jury investigation of such alleged racketeering violation.

"(4) Territorial limits of service.

"Any such demand may be served by any racketeering investigator, or by any United States marshal or deputy marshal, at any place within the territorial jurisdiction of any court of the United States.

"(5) Service upon legal entity.

"Service of any such demand or any petition filed under this section may be made upon a person by—

"(1) delivering a duly executed copy thereof to any partner, executive officer, managing agent, or general agent thereof, or to any agent thereof authorized by appointment or by law to receive service of process on behalf of such person, or upon any individual person;

"(ii) delivering a duly executed copy thereof to the principal office or place of business of the person to be served; or

"(iii) depositing such copy in the United States mails, by registered or certified mail duly addressed to such person at its principal office or place of business.

"(6) Return.

"A verified return by the individual serving any such demand or petition setting forth the manner of such service shall be proof of such service. In the case of service by registered or certified mail, such return shall be accompanied by the return post office receipt of delivery of such demand.

"(7) Racketeering document custodian.

"(1) Designation; deputy custodians.

"The Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall designate a racketeering investigator to serve as racketeer document custodian, and such additional racketeering investigators as he shall determine from time to time to be necessary to serve as deputies to such officer.

"(ii) Compliance with civil investigative demand; original documentary material.

"Any person upon whom any demand issued under this section has been duly served shall make such material available for inspection and copying or reproduction to the custodian designated therein at the principal place of business of such person, or at such other place as such custodian and such person thereafter may agree and prescribe in writing or as the court may direct, pursuant to this section on the return date specified in such demand, or on such later date as such custodian may prescribe in writing. Such person may upon written agreement between such person and the custodian substitute for copies of all or any part of such material originals thereof.

"(iii) Possession of documentary material; responsibility for use and return; copies for official use; examinations.

"The custodian to whom any documentary material is so delivered shall take physical possession thereof, and shall be responsible for the use made thereof and for the return thereof pursuant to this chapter. The custodian may cause the preparation of such copies of such documentary material as may be required for official use under regulations which shall be promulgated by the Attorney General. While in the possession of the custodian, no material so produced shall be available for examination, without the consent of the person who produced such material, by any individual other than a duly authorized officer, member, or employee of the Department of Justice. Under such reasonable terms and conditions as the Attorney General shall prescribe, documentary material while in the possession of the custodian shall be available for examination by the person who produced such material or any duly authorized representatives of such person.

"(iv) Delivery of documentary material for use in presentation of case or proceeding; return to custodian of material not in control of court or grand jury.

"Whenever any attorney has been designated to appear on behalf of the United States before any court or grand jury in any case or proceeding involving any alleged violation of this chapter, the custodian may deliver to such attorney such documentary material in the possession of the custodian as such attorney determines to be required for use in the presentation of such case or proceeding on behalf of the United States. Upon the conclusion of any such case or proceeding, such attorney shall return to the custodian any documentary material so withdrawn which has not passed into the control of such court or grand jury through the introduction thereof into the record of such case or proceeding.

"(v) Return to producer of documentary material not in control of court or grand jury.

"Upon the completion of (1) the racketeering investigation for which any documentary material was produced under this chapter, and (2) any case or proceeding arising from such investigation, the cus-

todian shall return to the person who produced such material all such material other than copies thereof made by the Department of Justice pursuant to subsection (c) of this section which has not passed into the control of any court or grand jury through the introduction thereof into the record of such case or proceeding.

"(vi) Demand by producer for return of documentary material upon failure to institute case or proceeding within reasonable time after completion of examination and analysis of evidence.

"When any documentary material has been produced by any person under this chapter for use in any racketeering investigation, and no such case or proceeding arising therefrom has been instituted within a reasonable time after completion of the examination and analysis of all evidence assembled in the course of such investigation, such person shall be entitled, upon written demand made upon the Attorney General, or the Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, to the return of all documentary material other than copies thereof made by the Department of Justice pursuant to subsection (c) of this section so produced by such person.

"(vii) Successor custodian; notice to producer of documentary material; duties and responsibilities of successor.

"In the event of the death, disability, or separation from service in the Department of Justice of the custodian of any documentary material produced under any demand issued under this chapter, or the official relief of such custodian from responsibility for the custody and control of such material, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, shall promptly (1) designate another racketeering investigator to serve as custodian thereof, and (2) transmit notice in writing to the person who produced such material as to the identity and address of the successor so designated. Any successor so designated shall have with regard to such materials all duties and responsibilities imposed by this chapter upon his predecessor in office with regard thereto, except that he shall not be held responsible for any default or dereliction which occurred before his designation as custodian.

"(b) Judicial proceedings.

"(1) Petition for enforcement; venue.

"Whenever any person fails to comply with any civil investigative demand duly served upon him under this section or whenever satisfactory copying or reproduction of any such material cannot be done and such person refuses to surrender such material, the Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General designated by the Attorney General, may file, in the district court of the United States for any judicial district in which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, and serve upon such person a petition for an order of such court for the enforcement of this chapter, except that if such person transacts business in more than one such district such petition shall be filed in the district in which such person maintains his principal place of business, or in such other district in which such person transacts business as may be agreed upon by the parties to such petition.

"(2) Petition for order modifying or setting aside demand; time for petition; suspension of time allowed for compliance with demand during pendency of petition; grounds for relief.

"Within twenty days after the service of any such demand upon any person, or at any time before the return date specified in the demand, whichever period is shorter, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which such person resides, is found, or transacts business, and serve upon such custodian a petition for an order of such court modify-

ing or setting aside such demand. The time allowed for compliance with the demand in whole or in part as deemed proper and ordered by the court shall not run during the pendency of such petition in the court. Such petition shall specify each ground upon which the petitioner relies in seeking such relief, and may be based upon any failure of such demand to comply with the provisions of this chapter, or upon any constitutional or other legal right or privilege of such person.

"(3) Petition for order requiring performance by custodian of duties; venue.

"At any time during which any custodian is in custody or control of any documentary material delivered by any person in compliance with any such demand, such person may file, in the district court of the United States for the judicial district within which the office of such custodian is situated, and serve upon such custodian a petition for an order of such court requiring the performance by such custodian of any duty imposed upon him by this chapter.

"(4) Jurisdiction; appeal; contempt.

"Whenever any petition is filed in any district court of the United States under this section, such court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the matter so presented, and to enter such order or orders as may be required to carry into effect the provisions of this chapter. Any final order so entered shall be subject to appeal pursuant to section 1291 of title 28. Any disobedience of any final order entered under this section by any court may be punished as a contempt thereof.

"(5) Applicability of Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

"To the extent that such rules may have application and are not inconsistent with the provisions of this chapter, the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply to any petition under this chapter."

(b) The table of contents of Part I of such title is amended by inserting after the analysis designating chapter 95 the following: "96. Racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations. . . . 1961."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 2516(1)(C), title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting at the end thereof between the parenthesis and the comma, the following:

"section 1963 (violations with respect to racketeer influenced and corrupt organizations)"

(b) Section 2517(3), title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the word "criminal" therefrom.

Sec. 4. The provisions of this act shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate its remedial purposes.

Sec. 5. If the provisions of any part of this Act or any amendments made thereby or the application thereof to any person or circumstances be held invalid, the provisions of the other parts and their application to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE).

S. 1864—INTRODUCTION OF THE FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, as a member of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I have long been aware of the fact that there are many citizens of the United States who suffer from some degree of hunger or malnutrition.

As one who has always attempted to stay attuned to the needs and desires of

my fellow Georgians, I have also known that many of my own constituents are undernourished.

During my tenure as Governor of Georgia for two terms, State payments for public assistance increased three times over what they had been when I took office. The Talmadge administration recognized the State's obligation to the sick and the aged, to the blind and the disabled, and to abandoned and neglected children who are unfortunate victims of their environment or improvident parents.

We tried, to the best of our ability within the means available at that time, to do what we could to help people help themselves. And we have done so since coming to the Senate more than 12 years ago.

On the Agriculture Committee we have continued to show concern about the problem of poverty in the United States, not just by word but by deed, and by positive legislative action.

We helped formulate the commodity distribution program in 1959.

We helped write the food stamp program in 1964. The Senator from Georgia served on the conference committee that steered this legislation through to enactment.

We likewise worked for adoption of the Child Nutrition Act of 1965.

This is only a part of the overall picture. There has been a vast array of Federal efforts through the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Appalachia program, social security, public health and housing, and greatly increased educational expenditures for needy children.

Billions upon billions have been spent by the Federal Government and additional billions by State and local governments—not just to assuage poverty by giving people money to spend, but more important, to increase opportunities for everyone in education and job training.

I regard the latter approach as far more important than anything that can be done. We are going to see in the final analysis that only by educating more people and better training them for gainful employment are we ever going to break the poverty cycle.

I have said all this because I have been somewhat amazed by all the clamor in recent months over poverty in America. It is as though the Congress and even the American people have suddenly discovered for the first time that there are poor people in our midst.

Worst yet, public officials are accused of having been silent on the issue all these many years. Very often such accusations have come from sanctimonious critics of the American society who do a great deal of talking, but very little of anything else. And the victims of their unjust attacks are frequently those who have been doing something, who have been passing laws and appropriating huge sums for programs primarily designed to aid the poor.

I submit that the record will not support claims that poverty has suddenly been discovered as something new under the sun in the United States. Spending for Federal social programs, including education, welfare, and housing, comes to some \$60 billion a year, ranking second

only to defense as the highest budget item.

The Congress, then, has been neither silent nor inactive on this problem. And neither has the American public, which has worked hard to help pay for these programs through their taxes.

My position is well known. It has been consistent. I have favored and supported efforts to help people who are unable to help themselves because of their advanced years or physical disability. I am concerned about children caught in circumstances over which they have no control.

I have also backed programs to help people help themselves out of their predicaments by offering more educational opportunities and more of a chance to learn skills for a job.

But I do not now, and I have never favored the dole or the handout. I have no patience with anyone—man or woman—who is able but unwilling to work. I bring no brief for able-bodied people who fail, because of their own shiftlessness or lack of personal responsibility, to avail themselves of jobs that are offered, or educational and training opportunities within their reach.

It is no secret that we have such people in our midst, and I guess we will have some for all time. But I do not bleed for them. I feel no compulsion—and neither should American taxpayers—to look after their care and feeding. If they are able to look after themselves, to take whatever action necessary to improve their lot in life, then they should do so. There is no room for them on welfare rolls anywhere in any State. State and local authorities should make sure such people do not become wards of society to enjoy the fruits of other people's labor, when they have refused to do anything themselves.

There is of course room for improvement in our efforts to alleviate poverty. We can and should expand opportunities for education and training. We can do more to lift the oppressive burden of deprivation carried by the old and the infirm. We must especially see to the needs of children to whom we must look for the future of the Nation.

This is not only our humane duty. It is commonsense. For unless we help feed, clothe, and house children—who otherwise would be unfed, ragged, and ill-housed—and give them every chance to go to school and learn, we can never hope to make any meaningful progress in combating poverty and reducing the cost of welfare.

To this extent, all the current publicity about the poverty and hunger problem has served a useful purpose. It has dramatized the need and intensified public interest. The hearings before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs have also been productive. They have focused greater attention on the inconsistency and absurdity of hunger and malnutrition in a nation of great agricultural abundance and tremendous prosperity.

Publicity has been sufficient. Enough trips have been taken. We have ample evidence in hand. What we need now is less talking and more doing.

I am today introducing a bill, to be called the Food Assistance Act of 1969, to modify the food stamp program and to improve its operation in order to better serve the food needs of extremely low income families.

I want to make it clear at the outset that I do not regard food assistance programs as a panacea. This is no poverty cure-all. We cannot zero in on only a small fraction of a family's need and hope to solve this problem. I cannot over-emphasize my view that the surest way and the only way to end poverty is to provide and promote more job training for nonproductive segments of our society, and to maintain a viable economy that will continue to increase job opportunities.

Neither do I consider food assistance programs as a first step toward a national income maintenance system. I for one do not subscribe to the theory that it would be either practical or wise to establish any kind of national income maintenance program that would provide a certain standard of living for everyone whether he works or attempts to work or not.

First of all, I feel that this would destroy the individual's dignity and self-respect. And this, after all, is the most fundamental need of our welfare recipients—the need for pride and human dignity. Only a job, a satisfying productive job, and the ability to earn one's way through this world can meet this need.

Second, and not the least consideration, such a costly giveaway program would eventually virtually bankrupt our economy.

Testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs has brought vividly to my attention the importance of using food to break the poverty cycle. The human brain attains its maximum growth in the first 5 to 6 years of a child's life, and severe malnutrition in children under 2 years of age can permanently impair the brain development and lead to retardation, and ultimately dependency. And in many cases, children suffer from dietary inadequacies even before they are born.

It takes no imagination to readily see that a child who is hungry and who is retarded will have little chance of learning the skills necessary to function in today's highly technical society.

I have had an opportunity on the Agriculture Committee to work firsthand from the beginning in the development of surplus food distribution and food stamp programs.

The progress we have made in recent years has been substantial indeed. In 1960, the U.S. Department of Agriculture offered only five food items worth \$2.20 per month, per person, for distribution to families. The selection was limited to lard, rice, flour, nonfat dry milk, and cornmeal.

Only about 1,200 counties and areas distributed these commodities and average participation for that year was 3.5 million persons. The late President John F. Kennedy in his first Executive order doubled the number of commodities and the amount of food for the program.

At the present time, 22 commodities worth \$12.70 per person monthly are

offered. The program operates in 1,419 counties, cities, and administrative units.

More important, however, has been the involvement of the food stamp program. It began in 1961 with eight pilot projects and 50,000 persons participating. In 1968, the food stamp program reached almost 2½ million people at a cost to the Federal Government of \$173 million.

According to the standards of the Office of Economic Opportunity, a family of four with an income of less than \$2,200 per year is classified as hard core poor. The figures indicate that there are 12 to 15 million hard core poor in the Nation.

We must bear in mind that \$2,200 for a family of four is the upper income limit for this group of 12 to 15 million people. The average income of families with incomes under \$2,200 is about \$1,220, and the average income for 1.8 million families under \$1,000 was only \$630 per year.

I have never been one to place unreserved faith in the statistics of the Office of Economic Opportunity. However, even allowing for a certain margin of error, these statistics indicate that there are millions of citizens who need more food assistance and are not getting it.

The problem is basically one of insufficient funds.

I want to emphasize that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has done a tremendous job with the funds and resources available to it. The Department of Agriculture has waged a long and unpopular battle in trying to extend the commodity distribution program and the food stamp program.

It is most unfortunate that some critics have attempted to make the Department of Agriculture the whipping boy for all the Nation's nutrition problems. I believe that the Department of Agriculture's administrators are some of the most efficient in Government. I know that they have achieved considerable expertise through the years in administering our food programs.

It is worthy of mention that there has never been a major scandal in connection with the USDA's administration of food assistance programs. This is the case because the Department has insisted on strong supervision over its programs. Contrast this with the record of some other agencies involved in assisting the Nation's poor.

Moreover, the Department of Agriculture has never attempted to cut off Federal food assistance funds as a means of social engineering.

Here again, contrast this with the record of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, which has seen fit to cut off funds for the school lunch program in desegregation noncompliance cases. All school lunch assistance administered by the Department of Agriculture has been untouched by such controversy. Hungry and innocent children have not been penalized by Agriculture as they have by Health, Education, and Welfare.

My study of the problem of hunger and malnutrition in America indicates several flaws in the commodity distribution program. One of them is the inability

of many families without transportation to get to the distribution point and carry their food home. In many large counties, there is only one point of distribution for the entire county. A family's monthly supply of food is a very bulky parcel. This is a serious problem yet to be resolved.

Another shortcoming of the program is the inflexibility of available foods. Often the food items available are not the ones needed by persons on special diets—such as the elderly or the very young.

Not the least of the flaws of the commodity distribution program is that it is a dole, a complete giveaway. It tends to be destructive of human dignity and self-respect.

On the other hand, the food stamp program requires that every participant must pay into the program a certain percentage of his income. The food stamp program requires a person to budget his income and to make a contribution.

However, under the present food stamp system, the contribution that is required is sometimes so high that it discourages participation in the program by families in the great need of food assistance. For instance, under the present system, a family in the Southeast with an income of \$70 per month must pay \$30 in order to obtain \$64 worth of food stamps.

It is easy to see how a family in this predicament finds it extremely difficult to allocate \$30 of its income at the beginning of the month to purchase food stamps. Doing so greatly reduces the family's ability to pay for other essentials, such as rent and utilities.

Another drawback of the food stamp program as presently constituted is the inaccessibility of points of sale. As in the case of the commodity distribution program, there is often only one point where food stamps can be sold in an entire county.

Although the food stamp participant does not have the added burden of lugging home large parcels of food, it is difficult and sometimes impossible for destitute people to travel across a county to buy food stamps every month.

Before leaving office, Secretary of Agriculture Freeman said that the Department was attempting to phase out commodity distribution programs in favor of food stamp programs. This policy should be continued. However, in the interim, we should continue to allow local authorities to determine which program they prefer.

If the bill which I am now offering is enacted into law, the food stamp program will be far more attractive than the commodity distribution program. It will be less cumbersome to operate and less costly from the county administrative standpoint.

The major proposals of my legislation are: First, to improve food stamp distribution and make them more accessible; second, to lower the purchase price of food stamps and to increase the bonus to participating households; and third, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue free coupons to households with no incomes or extremely minimal incomes.

A key part of my plan is designed to resolve one of the major problems in the

food stamp program. We need to make them more readily accessible to participants, particularly those of extreme age and physical disability.

I propose to have food stamps sold at post offices throughout the Nation. I believe the post office to be the most logical agency to handle this assignment, and I know that we can rely on postal employees to do an efficient job of issuing and accounting for these coupons.

The reasoning behind my making this decision is simple. Everyone knows where his post office is located, and post offices are usually within fairly close proximity of everyone's home.

Also, in a further effort to enhance the accessibility of food stamps, my bill would give welfare recipients an option of having the cost of their food stamps deducted from their monthly welfare checks, and the coupons mailed to them along with the checks. Local welfare agencies would assume the administrative responsibility of deducting the purchase price of the coupons from the welfare checks.

I am firmly committed to this self-help principle embodied in the food stamp program. This approach provides poor families with the opportunity to convert their current food expenditures into food stamps, which in turn will buy more food than otherwise would be available and insure dietary gains.

However, current food stamp purchase requirements are so high that they prevent many needy families from participating in the program. Under the existing Food Stamp Act, households are charged an amount equivalent to their normal expenditure for food. This should be liberalized to some degree to reflect a more reasonable investment on the part of needy households, and to reduce the disproportionate bite it presently takes out of their total incomes.

Under my bill no family would be required to invest more than 25 percent of its total income for food stamps. This would not be a fixed, uniform standard. It would be a maximum level with suitable adjustments for families of various sizes and incomes.

This approach will bring increased food stamp assistance to the families and children who need it most. This is my recommended No. 1 change in the food stamp program. I hope that it will be given the highest priority.

To families with no income or with extremely minimum incomes, even a small purchase price is prohibitive of food stamp participation. My bill would authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue food stamps at no cost to such families. Households with an income of more than \$40 a month would not be eligible for free stamps.

In recent months, there have been increasing pressures to remove the administration of food programs from the Department of Agriculture and place them in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or some other agency.

I cannot imagine any action more unwarranted, or that would have a more unsettling effect on our food assistance programs. The record of the Department of Agriculture in administering food pro-

grams is a good one. The Department has done an exemplary job with the resources available to it. However, the limitations of the current Food Stamp Act and the inadequateness of appropriations have made it impossible for the Department to deal more effectively with the problem of hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

My legislation would give the Department the tools it has needed—and indeed asked for—in order to expand and improve the food stamp program, and to make more adequate nutrition available to truly needy families.

We should leave food assistance programs in the Department of Agriculture. But some additional changes are needed to insure better coordination of all the food programs. For this reason, I propose that the Secretary of Agriculture establish within his department a subagency to be known as the Federal Food Administration.

It would be the responsibility of this agency to coordinate the food stamp program, the commodity distribution program, the school lunch program, the nutritional education programs now administered by the Department of Agriculture, and any other food assistance programs of the Department.

Not all of the problem of malnutrition can be solved simply by providing more food.

We need increased education and training in the proper means of preparing nutritious food. Already the agricultural extension services of Georgia and other States are doing an excellent job in expanding the nutritional education program for low-income families throughout America. We should do more. We cannot attack this problem in a vacuum. The Department of Agriculture of course is not the only agency with an interest in seeing that more food and better nutrition are available to needy people. The Department must work with other agencies in attacking the poverty problem and all the other social ills which plague our Nation.

To strengthen the overall effort, I propose to establish an interdepartmental committee to be known as the National Nutrition Committee. This committee shall be chaired by the Secretary of Agriculture, with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development serving as members.

In addition, the Secretary may appoint such persons from various departments and agencies of the Federal Government that he determines exceptionally well qualified to contribute to the work of the committee.

The Secretary will also appoint to the committee representatives of the private sector. The Nation's food industry has much to offer the Federal Government in picking better ways to attack malnutrition.

Mr. President, I have offered a total program to insure that low-income families in the United States can obtain a diet that is more adequate and nutritious if they participate in the food stamp program.

My bill will cure many defects of the

present system by making food stamps more accessible and by bringing purchase requirements more within the means of deserving families in real need.

The food stamp program cannot completely solve the poverty problem.

In closing, I reiterate my strong conviction that the only way to make significant progress against poverty and unemployment in America is to provide more and better educational opportunities, particularly in the area of job training. Even this, of course, cannot accomplish our goals overnight.

We must continue to seek ways to improve our schools, to get more people into school, and to keep them there. We must particularly do everything possible to promote occupational training. At the same time, we must also impress upon all our people that they, too, have obligations to keep, such as a sense of individual responsibility, initiative, and above all a willingness to work and take advantage of opportunities that are available in great abundance.

In fact, it is written into my bill that the Secretary shall require the State agencies of each participating State to encourage and assist physically and mentally able adults receiving food stamps to obtain employment. The intent of this is clear. All people have the personal responsibility to make every possible effort to secure employment, if they are able to do so and if employment is available. It is incumbent upon the State agencies to see that they do so to the fullest extent possible.

As we continue to strive for the attainment of these goals, we cannot afford to neglect the nutritional needs of our citizens, the old and disabled and especially our small children who must at all costs be educated to the fullest extent possible.

The Talmadge Food Stamp bill will help meet this problem. It is a moderate plan that can be kept within reasonable but effective bonds.

I believe this bill can be enacted into law now—during this session of Congress.

The poor of this Nation have had enough promises.

They have had enough investigation. They do not need any more television coverage.

They do not need any more Senators going around the country telling them how poor they are.

What the poor and hungry of this Nation need is a practical, workable plan which will put food in their stomachs now, and give them more of an incentive to do more for themselves.

I believe that my bill meets this need.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief summary of the bill, a section-by-section analysis and the bill. I send to the desk the bill for appropriate reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and material will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1864) to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, introduced by Mr. TALMADGE, was received, read twice by its

title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1864

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 "Food Assistance Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. The second sentence of section 5(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the period and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "except that the State agency may not take into consideration income standards established for the purpose of title 19 of the Social Security Act."

SEC. 3. Section 7(b) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Households shall be charged such portion of the face value of the coupon allotment issued to them as is determined by the Secretary to represent a reasonable investment by such households, taking into consideration the number of persons in such households, the income of such households, and such other factors as the Secretary deems appropriate; but in no case shall a household be charged for a coupon allotment an amount greater than an amount equal to 25 per centum of the income of such household for a period equivalent to the period for which such allotment is issued. The Secretary may authorize the issuance of a coupon allotment without charge to any household determined to have little or no income; but a free coupon allotment may not be issued to any household with an income greater than \$40 per month."

SEC. 4. (a) The second sentence of section 10(e) of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the word "and" at the end of clause (3); by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and by adding after such clause (4) a new clause as follows: "(5) that the State agency shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, institute procedures under which any household participating in the food stamp program may, if it so elects, have the charges, if any, for its coupon allotment deducted from any grant or payment such household may be entitled to receive under a federally aided public assistance program of the State."

(b) Section 10 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(h) The Secretary shall require the State agency of each participating State to encourage and assist physically and mentally able adult members of households receiving coupon allotments under this Act to obtain employment."

SEC. 5. The third sentence of section 15(b) of the Food Stamp Act is amended by striking out everything following the semicolon in clause (2), and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(3) the direct costs incurred in the issuance of coupons to eligible households; and (4) an amount not to exceed 25 per centum of the costs computed under (1) and (2) above. The Secretary shall prescribe general guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance services to be provided by State agencies to eligible households, including, but not limited to, matters relating to the places, times, and frequency of coupon issuance services in political subdivisions approved for participation in the food stamp program. In no case shall the Secretary approve the issuance of coupons less often than twice monthly. The Secretary may withhold or deny payment under this subsection to any State agency which fails to comply with such guidelines or minimum standards."

SEC. 6. Section 15 of the Food Stamp Act of 1964 is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any local subdivision in which the food stamp program is in operation, the postmaster or other person in charge of the United States post office in such local subdivision shall, without reimbursement by the State agency, assume responsibility (1) for the acceptance, storage, and protection of coupons after the delivery thereof to such post office, (2) for the issuance of such coupons to eligible households within the local subdivision in which such post office is located, and (3) for the control and accounting for such coupons."

SEC. 7. The first sentence of section 16 (a) of the Food Stamp Act is amended by striking out everything immediately following "June 30, 1969;" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not in excess of \$525,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; not in excess of \$900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; and not in excess of such sum as may hereafter be authorized by Congress for any subsequent fiscal period."

SEC. 8. (a) The Food Stamp Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 17. (a) The Secretary shall establish within the Department of Agriculture a separate agency to be known as the 'Federal Food Administration'. The Secretary shall administer and coordinate through such agency the food stamp program provided for in this Act and other similar and related food assistance and nutritional education programs administered by the Secretary, including, but not limited to, those programs carried out under the National School Lunch Act, the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, clause (2) of section 32 of Public Law 320 of the Seventy-fourth Congress, and clause (3) of section 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949.

"(b) The Secretary shall establish an inter-departmental committee, which shall be known as the 'National Nutrition Committee,' to advise him on matters relating to the administration of this Act and other programs referred to in subsection (a) of this section. The Secretary shall appoint such persons from the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government as he determines are exceptionally well qualified by virtue of their background, training, education, and experience in matters relating to food, diet, and nutrition. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development shall serve as members of such committee. The Secretary shall also appoint to such committee one or more representatives from the food industry."

The material, presented by Mr TALMADGE, follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE TALMADGE FOOD STAMP ACT OF 1969

My bill would make three basic changes in the Food Stamp Program:

(1) Purchase price of food stamps shall be lowered so that no eligible household will have to pay more than 25% of its income for food stamps.

(2) Free food stamps will be available to families with no income or minimal income.

(3) Distribution of food stamps will be improved by: (a) Sale of food stamps in the Post Office, and, (b) Mailing of food stamps to recipients of public assistance.

PURCHASE PRICE WILL BE LOWERED

Under the present Food Stamp Program, the purchase price is too high. Many families in the greatest need of food assistance are unable to participate in the Program. For ex-

ample, under the present system, a South-eastern family of four with income of \$140 per month must pay \$48 in order to get food stamps worth \$72. Thus, getting a bonus of \$24. Under my plan, the same family would pay only \$24 for food coupons. Therefore, the bonus would be increased to \$48 per month. To use another example, a Northern family of eight persons with an income of \$75 per month must pay \$34 to receive a food stamp allotment of \$100 monthly. Under my plan, the purchase price to this family would be cut to \$16. Therefore, this needy family would receive a bonus of \$84 rather than \$66.

My plan will bring increased food stamp assistance to the families who need it most.

FREE FOOD STAMPS

For families with no income or with minimal income, even a small purchase price may be prohibitive. Therefore, my plan authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue food stamps free to families with little or no income. Households with an income of over \$40 per month would not qualify under this provision.

IMPROVED METHODS OF DISTRIBUTION

In the present program, there is often only one point of food stamp distribution in a large area. My plan would provide that the Post Office Department shall assume the responsibility for selling food stamp coupons. Everyone knows where the Post Office is and there is usually a Post Office in every community.

My bill would also give the recipients of public assistance the option of having the purchase price of food stamps deducted from their monthly check and the stamps mailed to them. This would be especially beneficial to elderly families with no means of transportation.

FEDERAL FOOD ADMINISTRATION

My amendments establish within the Department of Agriculture a Federal Food Administration to coordinate all federal food assistance programs, including the School Lunch Act and the Nutrition Education Programs of the Extension Service.

NATIONAL NUTRITION COMMITTEE

The Secretary of Agriculture would establish an inter-departmental National Nutrition Committee to coordinate the nutrition efforts of all departments of the Federal government and the efforts of the private food industry. This Committee would utilize the technical expertise and imaginative ideas of private industry in attacking the problem of hunger and malnutrition.

ESTIMATED FINANCING

Careful analysis and cost projection by experts in the Department of Agriculture indicate that \$525 million would be needed for current fiscal year 1970. This proposal takes into consideration the fact that the modified program could not be implemented before January 1970. We are assuming that by the end of fiscal year 1970, participation in the Food Stamp Program would reach 5.5 million people.

For fiscal year 1971, the estimated cost would be \$900 million. This assumes year-end participation of 6,580,000 people.

SECTION BY SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE FOOD ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1969

Section 2: Under Section 2, states will continue to set eligibility standards for participation in the Food Stamp Program. Under present law, states set the eligibility levels in conformity with the income standards used by the individual state in its Federally aided public assistance programs. I amend the present law to provide that states shall not take into consideration income standards established for the purpose of Title 19

of the Social Security Act. This provision insures that state agencies will not use standards of the Medicaid Program in setting eligibility levels for food stamp assistance. The purpose of this provision is to insure that the Food Stamp Program will never get out of reasonable bounds as the Medicaid Program has in some states.

Section 3: This section provides that no eligible household will be required to devote more than 25 percent of its income to the purchase of food stamps. The 25 percent figure will be calculated on a monthly basis. In other words, if the average monthly income of a family is \$100, this family could be charged no more than \$25 per month for food stamps. The 25 percent figure is only an upper limit. The Secretary would have discretion in setting purchase prices and would take into consideration such factors as family size and family income.

The Secretary would be authorized to issue free food stamps to households having little or no income. He would have some discretion in the issuance of these free stamps but would not be able to issue free stamps to any household having monthly income greater than \$40.

Section 4: State agencies are required to give recipients of public assistance the option of having the charges for food coupons deducted from their public assistance payments. The state agency would be responsible in sending food stamps to the recipients.

Another provision of Section 4 directs the Secretary to require state agencies to encourage and assist able adult recipients of food assistance in obtaining employment. The Secretary should use every reasonable means to insure that sufficient emphasis is placed on getting able-bodied participants off the relief rolls and into the work force.

Section 5: This section provides for additional reimbursement for the direct cost of issuing coupons to households who are not receiving public assistance. Also, it gives the Secretary additional authority to set guidelines and minimum requirements with respect to the quality of certification and issuance service. It states that in no case shall the Secretary approve the issuance of coupons less than twice monthly.

Section 6: My bill provides that the United States Post Office shall, without reimbursement, assume responsibility for issuing food stamps. The Post Office would assume this responsibility in any local subdivision where a food stamp program is in operation.

Section 7: This section authorizes \$525 million for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and \$900 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

Section 8: Under my plan, the Secretary would establish within the Department of Agriculture a sub-agency to be known as the Federal Food Administration. This sub-agency would be charged with the administration and coordination of all food assistance programs within the Department of Agriculture, including the nutrition education programs of the Extension Service of the Department.

Under this section, the Secretary would establish an inter-departmental committee known as the National Nutrition Committee, to coordinate the nutrition efforts of all departments of the Federal government and the efforts of the private food industry. The Secretary would be required to appoint Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to the Committee. However, he would have discretion in appointing the other members of the Committee including the representatives of the private food industry.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a few questions concerning his bill?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished friend the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator how and why the 25 percent maximum level he has included in the bill was determined for the purchase price of the stamps.

Mr. TALMADGE. The average family in the United States spends approximately 17 percent on their food. It was my thought and the thought of the others who were working with me on this problem in drafting the bill that the very lowest income bracket should have a greater allowance for food than the average for the Nation of 17 percent. Therefore, we thought 25 percent was a reasonable figure.

Mr. SPONG. Would the food stamps be sold whenever the Post Office was open?

Mr. TALMADGE. Under the bill they would be sold any time at the direction of the Secretary, but not less than 2 days in each month. They would have at least two opportunities in any given month to buy food stamps at the Post Office if the measure becomes law.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, under the bill, would a person still have to purchase a month's supply of stamps at one time?

Mr. TALMADGE. No; he would not. Presumably, if the Secretary made it the minimum amount, they would purchase 2 weeks' supply at a time in lieu of a month's supply. It would depend on what the Secretary determined in the matter.

Frankly, there is a feeling on the part of some of the administrators of the program—local, State, and Federal—that if they could buy the stamps anytime they wanted to, any day in the week, it might result in a lower expenditure of their food budget for food. Some improvident parents might buy food stamps and take some of the money to buy a quart of liquor.

We are trying to see that the maximum amount of the money flows into the purchase of a good diet that would be nutritious to a family.

Mr. SPONG. I was interested in the remarks of the Senator with regard to the relation between the food stamp program and the commodity food distribution program.

The Senator made the statement that the food stamp program is less expensive than the commodity distribution program from the county administration standpoint.

I assume this is from the standpoint of personnel, transportation, and storage costs.

Mr. TALMADGE. Commodities, storage cost, and all of those things. Of course, if the food stamp program is maximized, as the Senator knows, the commodities would be purchased in the normal channels of trade, and the various stores would assume the burden of warehousing the food and the commodities, the sales, and checkoff.

It would be much less costly to the local government and, in my judgment, in the long run it would be less costly to the commodity distribution program.

The commodity distribution program, as the Senator knows, is a complete dole or giveaway.

Under the food stamp program an individual would pay at least a portion of his income for stamps.

In the distribution program, the commodities are shipped all over the country. Under the food stamp program, individual grocers would assume that responsibility.

The food stamp program has many other advantages. It lets the individuals purchase food any time they want to and in any quantity they want to purchase it, and whatever item they deem they are in the greatest need of, whereas the commodity distribution program has limited flexibility.

I think that in the long run if the bill becomes law, the food stamp program would prove much more attractive than the commodity distribution program.

I point out that I do not attempt to tell the local government whether they ought to have a food stamp program or any program at all.

In my own State, we have 159 counties, and each of those counties has a food program, except one. So we have 158 food programs within the State of Georgia. They are almost evenly divided between a commodity distribution program and a food stamp program. In the areas I have visited, the people are very well satisfied with what they have—those who are handling commodities like their program, and those who are handling stamps like their program. But, in my judgment, if we make stamps more available and more accessible, with greater premiums to the people in extremely low income circumstances, we will have greater utilization of the stamp program and less utilization of the commodity program.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, how much time remains under the unanimous consent agreement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The time has expired.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the agreement be amended in order that I may proceed for an additional 12 minutes.

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

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I thank the junior Senator from Georgia for his answers to my inquiries.

The junior Senator from Georgia has rendered a service to the Senate in proposing changes in the present food stamp program. In seeking to increase the availability of the stamps and the bonus purchasing power of the stamps, he has recognized some of the major problems presented poor- and marginal-income families by the program as presently operated. Now is the time for a thorough and complete review by Congress of the food stamp program, as well as the commodity distribution program. The legislation proposed today is a vehicle for that review.

The Senator from Georgia has made references to effects of malnutrition upon the growth and development of children. Medical evidence I have received from

some of the most distinguished pediatricians in Virginia indicates that protein deficiencies experienced by a child for a period of over 6 months during preschool years will, to some degree, mark that child for life.

I commend Senator TALMADGE. I agree that an Interdepartmental National Nutrition Committee is desirable.

I believe television media can be used constructively to combat malnutrition.

I agree that educational opportunities for more of our people must be provided, but would observe that other short-range education endeavors to explain the food programs should be considered immediately.

I agree that no agency of our Government should be empowered to cut off funds for school lunch programs.

Earlier this week I filed some preliminary views on a tour I made of Virginia during the Easter recess to study food programs and the extent of hunger and malnutrition. I would like to take this opportunity to make some further observations—this time concerning three recurrent themes of that tour.

One of these was the need for education. Time and time again I heard the words, "Education is the answer." In a way, it is. But the interpretation placed upon education itself must be understood. Many times when people spoke of education, I think they envisioned education over a long period—use of the schools to teach health and nutrition, home economics and similar subjects. Certainly the schools can contribute greatly through the teaching of such subjects, and this means of education should be pursued.

But there are other, short-range educational endeavors which can be undertaken now. And, these too should be pursued.

In various sections of the State, I found a number of persons who qualified for the food stamp and commodity distribution programs, but who were unaware of their existence. There were others who had heard of the programs but did not understand them or what they meant.

However, medical evidence is slowly accumulating on the physical and mental consequences of hunger and malnutrition. This evidence suggests that if we allow hunger and malnutrition to continue, we contribute to the raising of children who are not capable of full physical and mental development. Under such circumstances, we cannot allow hunger and malnutrition to continue and we should not permit the existence of these programs to go unnoticed, when they can help rectify diet deficiencies which exist.

Likewise, for the elderly who live on pensions, social security, and other fixed incomes, and who often are incapable of working and contributing further to their own support, the knowledge of these programs can be of great importance.

To acquaint persons with these programs, advertisements might be placed in participating grocery stores as far as the food stamp program is concerned or in post offices. But an even more effective instrument for publicizing these programs would be television.

According to the 1960 census, only 12.7 percent of the Nation's households were without television. In Virginia, only 17.4 percent of the households lacked sets. Undoubtedly, this number has decreased in the time period since the census was completed. As a matter of fact, I read only yesterday that this had been reduced to about 5 percent. Indeed, television sets were in evidence in almost all the houses visited during the tour. Consequently, I believe public service spot announcements could be used to inform the public of these food programs.

Even popular network programs and commercials could include brief references to nutritional needs and problems.

But television can be employed on an even larger scale. Educational television can be used for programs to explain nutrition, proper diet, and the preparation of foods. In a number of cases where the commodity distribution and food stamp programs are in use, the foods which are available are not properly used. One story currently making the rounds in my State concerns a family whose chickens were dying. Finally, it was discovered that instant mashed potatoes were being thrown to the chickens to eat. The chickens then drank water, with unfortunate results. The story, of course, will bring smiles, just as the one where powdered milk was used for face powder. But these examples point to real problems, especially in light of the fact that a number of families are dependent upon these foods for their nutrition.

A program in nutrition education would, it seems to me, be quite adaptable for educational television. It would involve "talk" and discussion, which seem to be the format for many educational television programs. It would be fairly easy to organize. It would be relatively inexpensive to produce. Furthermore, such a program would be a true public service.

On a more sophisticated level, a similar program already exists. On a weekly basis, the French Chef, Julia Child, is presented from Boston. Why cannot a similar program be developed to explain how to prepare beans without destroying the iron content and how to use the foods which are available under the commodity distribution program? Why cannot a program be devised to demonstrate how food stamps can be used most wisely?

Furthermore, such programs themselves could be advertised at commodity distribution centers and the places where food stamps are sold.

It can, of course, be argued that direct teaching is preferable. In many ways this is true. A teacher working with a student can observe errors and correct a mistake which a television program may not anticipate. Indeed, I have been impressed by the expanded nutrition program being operated by the Virginia Polytechnic Institute with funds from the Department of Agriculture.

Under this program, home economists working for the VPI extension service select persons from low-income areas, give them an intensive course in nutrition and food preparation and send them back into their communities to help other low-income families. I believe that this

program should be extended, that funds should be made available for it in fiscal 1970 and that efforts should be made to expand it into additional low-income areas. I have written the Secretary of Agriculture concerning this.

I see no conflict between this approach and the use of television. The expanded nutrition program cannot reach as large a number of persons as television can. Where the two would overlap, it seems to me that they would supplement and complement each other.

A second theme which recurred during my travels was the lack of comprehensive surveys and information on hunger and malnutrition—their incidence, causes and consequences. People are inclined to believe these subjects have been overstudied, but they overlook the fact that most studies have been based on peripheral statistics rather than on such medical factors as laboratory tests and physical examinations.

The National Nutrition Survey underway in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is a commendable start. Its present scope is, however, limited to 10 States. The Nixon budget contemplates expansion of the study next year, and I would certainly support this.

The other information available to me concerning the anemia rates at the Headstart center at northern Virginia, at the University of Virginia's clinic and at the southwest Virginia clinic are, however, examples of the type of data which is needed to supplement the National Nutrition Survey as it currently exists and to provide the basis for local action. Since the Virginia data to which I have referred concern a limited group—that is, those in the Headstart program or those who came to the clinics—some studies should be conducted on a broader basis, to include a representative sampling of all the members of one age group in a selected locality. Because there is so little data on nutrition and because we must begin with information, I plan to introduce legislation to encourage surveys and to permit us to develop the data to indicate what action is needed to remove the problems which are found to exist.

The third recurrent theme I would like to discuss—and the Senator from Georgia has already spoken of this—is the importance of the national school lunch program. I supported an expansion of this program last year, although I did not fully appreciate the significance of it when I did. During my tour it was often repeated that the school lunch program was a "lifesaver." In many areas its benefits have been so widely recognized that funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act have been employed for school lunch purposes to supplement funds from the Agriculture Department, pilot breakfast programs have been initiated, and meals provided by Federal funds have been supplemented by efforts of private groups such as Parent-Teacher Associations.

Several teachers told me that children who participated in the programs were more alert than before they became participants. In one school where breakfast is offered, a teacher noted that she had many less discipline problems during the

morning now that breakfast was provided. In addition, a survey conducted by a clinic in southwest Virginia revealed that the anemia rate for schoolchildren was about 30 percent below that for preschool children, a drop which is at least partially attributable to the school lunch program.

A program which is as beneficial as the school lunch program should be allowed to operate unobstructed. Children, whose physical and mental development is related to diet, should not be deprived of the one nutritional meal which some of them receive during the day. The junior Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) has, however, noticed a flaw in the program. The Department of Agriculture does not terminate funds for the school lunch program for failure to comply with the Civil Rights Act. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has, however, been terminating funds over which it has jurisdiction for failure to comply—even when these funds have been used to provide free lunches for needy children. In fiscal 1969, the amount which could be terminated totaled \$32 million. The junior Senator from Georgia opposes this approach and has introduced an amendment to the National School Lunch Act to prevent the termination of these particular funds.

In Virginia, \$1,471,544 in title I ESEA funds are being used during the current fiscal year to provide school lunches over and above those provided under the Agriculture Department program. Without Senator TALMADGE's amendment, this \$1,471,544 is subject to cutoff. Although I support the basic intent of the civil rights legislation, I agree with the junior Senator from Georgia that these funds, funds which aid children—both black and white—should not be subject to termination and I will support his amendment.

By terminating these funds, the Federal Government would only be hurting children, depriving those who are often most in need. Such a move is ridiculous in light of the recently developed information concerning the medical consequences of malnutrition. It is like cutting off our noses to spite our faces. The school lunch program provides an excellent means of seeing that foods are properly utilized for the benefit of children. If we are to enable our Nation's children to make the most of their school years—to help provide them with the proper diet to give them the physical stamina and the mental alertness to learn and benefit from their educational experiences—then we should make substantial use of this program. In this way we may make some inroads in enabling these children to grow into productive, independent citizens capable of contributing to their own well-being and to the life of their community and Nation.

While there are undoubtedly cases where negligence and indolence contribute to the conditions of poverty and malnutrition, there are also cases where this is not true. And, in the case of children, we are only increasing the welfare requirements and problems of the future if we do not seek to enable these chil-

dren to participate and compete in the life of our Nation.

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

Mr. SPONG. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I wish to compliment the distinguished Senator from Virginia on the speech he has made. He has rendered a service, in my judgment, to his State and to the Nation. I particularly want to thank him for his generous personal references to me.

Mr. SPONG. I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

S. 1895—INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS NARCOTIC AND DANGEROUS DRUG CONTROL AND ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, today I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to help Federal and State law-enforcement agencies control and reduce the serious drug problem in this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and a chart of its provisions be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and chart will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the illegal traffic in narcotics and the illegal possession and abuse of drugs has skyrocketed in recent years. If we, in Congress, are going to do anything to improve the situation, to help the police, the addict, or a society beset by the problems of drug abuse, then we must see things as they are.

We must look at the vast amount of narcotics and other drugs available, even to grade-school children.

We must look at the large numbers of people victimized by drugs, the lives destroyed and the vast amount of crime visited on our communities by those who need money for their drug supply.

We must acknowledge that drug abuse has run away with our youth despite the existing laws on the books.

In truth, then, existing laws have failed to reduce or even control drug use and addiction.

They have failed, miserably, to even hold the line on the smuggling of opium, heroin, marihuana, hashish, cocaine, peyote, and other foreign products smuggled into this country.

They have failed in controlling the diversion of billions of American-made dangerous drugs, the pep pills, sleeping pills, tranquilizers, and hundreds of combinations of each that schoolchildren are "popping" into their mouths like peanuts across this country.

They have failed in treating and rehabilitating the sick addict, yielding in-

stead to know-nothing demands to throw him into overcrowded prisons and punish him instead of treat him.

We are behind the times in finding means to treat and rehabilitate addicts.

The result is that hundreds of thousands of young people have turned to the use of drugs during the last 20 years. They are discouraged by society's lackluster track record on the drug problem. They will no longer accept the old homilies, the bogeyman theories, and the emotional threats about the dangers of drug abuse repeated by rote by their elders.

Mr. President, in my day, and in the day of many of us, the drug problem was something remote. We thought it was confined to the opium dens in the slums of some city, and I guess that pretty generally it was.

During the past several years many things have changed. Today drug addiction is a new problem and a changed problem. We should see the whole problem, see the problem in all of its ramifications, and acknowledge that existing controls are obviously not working.

How has it been going with this drug problem? How bad is it? Let us take a look.

The story is the same all over the country. Let me recite a few typical examples of the problem:

In California alone juvenile arrests for drug offenses increased from 1,271 in 1961 to 14,112 in 1967.

While we have experienced substantial increases in the abuse of all drugs, we are faced with an alarming crisis with respect to marihuana. For example, of the 14,112 juvenile arrests in California during 1967, 10,987 were arrested for marihuana violations. To understand the full significance of this figure let me point out that this compares to only 408 arrests in 1961. A further shocking fact is that in this one year alone, there were over 2,000 more arrests than in the 6 previous years combined.

The Federal Bureau of Narcotics seizures of Marihuana increased from 2,928 kilograms in 1963 to 27,914 kilograms in 1967.

Let me make it clear that the problem is by no means confined to the State of California.

Marihuana is abundant in all parts of the Nation.

On January 1, 1968, police undercover work in Hialeah, Fla., resulted in the seizure of 600 pounds of marihuana. On April 15, 1968, 1,000 pounds of marihuana was seized in New York City. In July of 1968, 400 pounds were confiscated in Chicago. And in September of 1967, \$2 million worth of marihuana was confiscated in North Bergen, N.J., which was the largest seizure of this drug in U.S. history.

Last year, I conducted hearings on the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee on Drug Abuse. We sought testimony from the foremost authorities in the drug field and we obtained the most recent information on drug studies from the National Institute of Mental Health. Dr. Stanley Yolles, the Director of the Institute, reported that some 20 percent of the Nation's college students had experience with marihuana and he re-

ferred to studies showing that in some high schools as many as 75 percent of the students had used marihuana.

This means there are currently 2 million students using or experimenting with marihuana.

The problem has not subsided since last year and students themselves feel that the official estimates are low, that the true extent of drug abuse among young people is even higher. Indeed, statements prepared by the National Student Association project the possibility of nearly 1 million drug arrests of young people by 1972.

I am fully aware that some of these figures are only representative, not completely accurate. But from all of the statistics we have, we can conclude that even the most conservative data are frightening.

So it goes. We can select any place in the country and find that these figures will apply.

The truth is that we are ignorant of the full extent of drug abuse in this country. It has long been known that only a small portion of criminal and antisocial behavior comes to official attention. Like the iceberg, only a small portion of it appears above the surface.

Nowhere is this more so than in the area of drugs where the victim and the offender are often the same. In drug transactions both parties to the crime attempt to avoid the police. And the invisibility of drug crimes is accentuated today when drug abuse has spread to segments of the population whose position has traditionally isolated them from routine police surveillance. It is now in the lush suburbs and other places where police surveillance has been relatively unknown.

In recent years, both the President's Crime Commission and the Advisory Commission on Drugs have called for a reassessment of our drug laws and drug penalties.

That is one of the principal objectives of the bill I introduce today. We have been working on it for more than a year. I do not say it is letter perfect but it is the best that we can do.

In the past, there has been no firm agreement on how to control the drug menace.

What we have had on the Federal level is a combination of tradition-bound, severely punitive narcotic enforcement procedures on the one hand, and a sprinkling of more liberal new laws aimed at treatment of addicts on the other. The contradictions in the policies behind these laws resulted in confusion regarding their purpose and inconsistencies in their application.

Nowhere are the inconsistencies more glaring than in the penalty structure applicable to dangerous drug violations. And perhaps no topic has created more controversy than the penalties applicable to marihuana.

Under present law, we still impose more severe penalties for certain violations involving marihuana, which is a relatively mild drug, than we do for violations regarding LSD, which is one of the most dangerous and powerful mind-destroying drugs known.

We heard that in the hearings. I read it in the newspapers. I hear it all the time: The argument as to whether marihuana is really a dangerous drug, or a relatively harmless drug, whether it is addictive or not, or whether it is dangerous. As I said a few minutes ago, the testimony is conflicting, but under present drug laws, we impose severe penalties for certain violations involving mere possession of marihuana which is, so far as I can say, a relatively mild drug, than for a violation with respect to LSD which is one of the most dangerous and powerful mind-destroying drugs known.

A youngster or teenager found to possess a handful of marihuana cigarettes goes to prison for 2 years as a first offender. This thing is out of kilter. It is little wonder that the young people of this country have become alienated because of the absurdity of a mandatory 2-year prison sentence for possession of a handful of marihuana cigarettes, especially when the experts cannot decide among themselves whether marihuana is a truly dangerous drug or not.

Because of this controversy we are facing ideological warfare between segments of our college youth who view marihuana use on a par with human freedom itself, and police agencies whose enforcement tactics have little respect for what they regard as immature idealism and extreme philosophical positions.

This controversy will have to be resolved if we hope to control the abuse of marihuana. The growing violations with respect to this drug show that excessive penalties cannot solve the problem.

I do not know whether it is a dangerous drug or not. That is why, under my bill, I am asking the Attorney General to set up a first-class committee of experts and say to them, "Sit down and study this thing and tell us whether marihuana is harmful, relatively harmful, dangerous, or mild."

I do not see that we can reach an intelligent decision with respect to marihuana until we know that. So that is why, I say, it has to be resolved. We have got to determine the true effects of marihuana, and if we find that it is less dangerous than has been supposed, we must make the needed changes.

We must resolve the marihuana controversy. We must determine the effects of marihuana and if we find that it is less dangerous than other drugs, we must reevaluate the penalty structure for its use and possession. On the other hand, if the drug proves to be more harmful than what we know today, we must provide treatment for the young people who abuse it in growing numbers. In the meantime, pending the outcome of the study, strict controls will be maintained.

This is one of the purposes of the bill I have prepared.

After the hearings on drug abuse I conducted last year, we could only conclude that there is a basic and very serious conflict between those engaged in controlling the drug problem. On the one side, we have the law-enforcement officials who continue to request more severe penalties for drug law violations. On the other side there are the scientists, the researchers and the educators who main-

tain that harsh penalties do not and cannot reduce drug abuse. I think the extremes of these positions have to be brought together and I believe that is another objective which we will achieve with this legislation.

Among the other provisions the bill will revise the mandatory minimum penalty provisions which have restricted the treatment of thousands of drug offenders. For years progressive penologists have fought against the mandatory minimum concept.

I happen to believe that it is just outrageous. I do not see any sense in a mandatory sentence in the statutes. I do not know what we have judges for, if they are not going to take into consideration all the circumstances, the kind of individual, and so forth, but must give him a 2-year mandatory sentence. It does not make any sense to me. Human beings are not all the same, neither are the circumstances, in the field of drug addiction, or, for that matter, in any field.

This was well expressed by former Director of the Bureau of Prisons, James Bennett, testifying before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee. He said:

Mandatory penalties are universally odious to courts and judges. Why have a judge if he has no discretion? Furthermore, mandatory penalties have been shown time and again to be self-defeating. Why retain a procedure which kills all incentive, all motive to reform.

I think those were wise words.

Another provision of this bill will be to improve the eligibility requirements under the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act. As that act was passed, it denied some or all of the treatment established under this law to a large class of addicts. The present bill broadens the coverage to include those most in need of help.

Drugs make the addict lazy and indifferent, unable to hold an honest job. Without legitimate resources, he must seek money for his drugs in crime. Traditionally, his lazy indifference led him to nonviolent crime. But crime has always been the principal source of money for the addict and so most genuine addicts have a record of two or three felony convictions. Drug addicts have not been prone toward violent crime. Lately, though, there are more signs of it than before. I think it is a factual statement that, generally, they only commit crimes in order to get funds with which to supply themselves with their drug.

Nevertheless, many, many genuine addicts have a record of two or three felony convictions. Before I go further, let me say that I do not condone crime—I do not know anyone who does—and I am not soft on felons, ex-convicts, and people who have been in trouble much more than once. But we are facing a peculiar problem here. We have the case of a person who commits a crime in order to buy heroin, or whatever other drug he uses. He is not a criminally disposed person; he is an addict. The way to straighten that fellow out is to cure his addiction and keep working on it, rather than throw him into a jail or lock him up in a box and forget him.

The trapped, the cornered, the panicked sick addict historically is the one who resorts to violence. Because there are more addicts today, there are more of them involved in violent crimes.

And there is ample testimony that three prior civil commitments do not preclude an addict's ability to benefit from treatment the fourth or fifth time around.

This is an important point. Many persons say, "Why should we be concerned about this? He has had three or four chances." My view is that, even if there have been convictions three or four or five times, we should never give up, because there is always hope, as long as the addict wants to try to cure himself. The fact that he has failed three or four times is no reason for abandoning him.

Indeed, research shows that he may have benefited from the experience and stands a better chance of rehabilitation.

Addiction is a chronic disease where relapse is the expected rather than exceptional behavior. We know that every relapse may bring the addict closer to ultimate rehabilitation. And we know that with proper help addicts tend to grow out of their dependence on drugs as they get older. Even more important, since treatment program for addicts differ throughout the country, both in nature and quality, and since all such programs can be expected to improve as we gain more experience, failure under any program in the past should not deny an addict the improved treatment methods of the future.

Now that the act has been in operation, we have received increasingly more evidence that the original restrictions often exclude those very addicts who could obtain the greatest benefit from the treatment offered under this act.

Because of those early restrictions, the act has been called self-defeating and the criteria for eligibility has been termed absurd by witnesses before Congress as recently as last week. Let me emphasize this by pointing out that during the first 21 months the act has been in operation, only 74 addicts have been civilly committed under title I in lieu of prosecution.

This is the record of a law that was hailed as a "breakthrough" in our efforts to treat addicts.

I think it is a sorry record when we consider the fact that there may be as many as 100,000 addicts in the United States.

I consider the amended Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, title VIII of this bill, to be of great significance. When this act was passed, I warned of several features which I considered inimical to its success. I said on October 19, 1968, that I would try to amend this law and I think this is the appropriate time to do it.

The current legislation will also eliminate one of the major objections I had to the 1966 Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act in that it would now be possible for young marihuana users and addicts between the ages of 18 and 26 to be eligible for the progressive treatment afforded all other Federal youthful offenders under the Youthful Offender Act.

This will be done only at the discretion of the court which means that society

will still be protected from the hardened addict offender while the young offender who is more amenable to correction can receive the best treatment the country has to offer.

Finally, in amending the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act, I have called for a provision that would allow setting aside the conviction of those who successfully complete the treatment program established under the act.

It holds out some incentive, particularly to the young person who has become addicted and who successfully completes the course of treatment. Why should we not expunge his narcotic conviction? It was his only offense, and we have straightened him out.

If an individual's criminality in a specific instance is a product of his narcotic addiction, once the addiction is cured, I see no reason to saddle him with a criminal record. We have heard time and again from correctional experts that a criminal record often proves an insurmountable obstacle to the ex-addict in starting a new productive life in the community.

Surely, they are addicted, but they are not criminals. They are criminals because they are addicts.

I believe the changes contained in the bill I propose today will improve the treatment of narcotic addicts in the Nation, and we will begin to get somewhere in our efforts to solve this problem.

However, let me stress that effective treatment is only a partial solution to the drug menace. The second phase of this effort should be the effective control of the traffic in drugs, particularly of the importation of drugs across our southern border from Mexico into the United States.

We have importation of marihuana and some other drugs across the Mexican border; and to control that traffic into this country, this bill directs the Attorney General to consult with the President for the purposes of establishing through negotiation with Mexican authorities, a Joint Mexican-United States Narcotic Commission. Such a Commission would be most helpful in controlling the drug traffic between the two countries. Mexico has become by far our largest supplier of illegal marihuana and it is also the source of a substantial amount of our other drugs.

Incidentally, this effort is not new. I tried to do something about the problem some years ago. I know our friends in Mexico feel the same way. They do not want this traffic. With a joint effort between the United States and Mexico, I believe we could get somewhere in our efforts to solve it.

After extensive hearings in 1962, with broad bipartisan support, I introduced Senate Joint Resolution 65 calling for the establishment of a joint Mexican-American Commission to get at one of the prime sources of the illicit narcotics on the American market.

After extensive public hearings on the same subject in 1965, again in 1966 I introduced a similar resolution. And I followed that in April of 1966 with a meeting of Federal, State, and local officials in San Diego, Calif., to assess drug smuggling along the Mexican border.

In recent weeks I conducted personal discussions on the problem with high-ranking Mexican public officials and civil leaders.

I am convinced that nothing else than a close cooperative effort on both sides of the border will be required to suppress the vicious traffic in drugs across our southern border.

Mr. President, these are the basic goals and objectives of this legislation. In conclusion, I want to summarize for my colleagues the specific contents of the bill.

The bill vests in the Attorney General—and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs—primary jurisdiction over the implementation and enforcement of all Federal laws concerning drug abuse;

It gathers together the various present laws scattered throughout the United States Code into one comprehensive act.

It places all narcotics and dangerous drugs into three classes, with penalties corresponding to the severity of the offense.

It directs the establishment of a Joint Commission with Mexico to investigate and to provide appropriate solutions to control the illicit traffic in marihuana into the United States.

It absorbs the provisions of the Narcotic Rehabilitation Act of 1966 and amends it to: first, broaden the definition of the eligible offender; second, change the definition of an ineligible individual to include a person convicted of two or more felonies and a person who has been civilly committed because of narcotic addiction on three or more occasions; and, third, provide for setting aside the conviction of any addict who has been cured of his addiction by the programs established under the act.

Finally, the legislation implements President Johnson's Advisory Commission's task force recommendations on narcotics and drug abuse by first, calling for an increase in the enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs; second, calling for an increase in the enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Customs; third, directing the Attorney General to assist and cooperate with States in the enactment of effective drug legislation; fourth, strengthening the recordkeeping provisions regarding drugs by requiring that a person subject to this act must keep the records segregated and easily accessible to the Attorney General. In addition, every 2 years a summary must be transmitted to the Attorney General regarding drug transactions, inventories, and so forth; fifth, revising the sentencing laws by eliminating any mandatory minimum provisions and returning to the judiciary its discretion in sentencing; sixth, directing that extensive research and educational programs be conducted in order to increase our knowledge of all drugs; seventh, directing the National Institute of Mental Health to conduct an intensive 2-year study of all of the ramifications of marihuana and its effects.

Mr. President, we have seen the drug problem grow worse year after year. It affects college students, it affects children in high schools and it is even now affecting children in elementary schools.

We know that we need more manpower in law enforcement to deal with this situation.

We know that we need better control over the national and international traffic in drugs.

We know that we need more research to determine the social, physical, and psychological effects of drugs.

We know that we need to improve both the judicial and the medical treatment of addicts and drug abusers.

I think it is time to decide whether we will allow the drug problem to grow even worse or whether we are going to take effective action to solve it.

Mr. President, I believe this bill can help us—this is all it can do—reverse the trend of the last 20 years. It represents the work and the wisdom of many people. I would like to acknowledge the excellent technical advice I have received in its preparation from members of the previous and current administrations.

This legislation has broad support, Mr. President, being endorsed by several outstanding Senators, and for that reason I ask that it be given favorable consideration by Congress.

Mr. President, before I conclude I would like to record here some of the history of the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee's interest in the narcotics problem, some of the work it has done and some of the results of that work.

Since I became chairman of this subcommittee in 1961 we have conducted 21 days of public hearings on narcotics and other drugs. We have taken testimony from 106 witnesses ranging from addicts and convicts, through doctors, lawyers, attorneys general, and Governors. We have heard from experts at every step along the way.

As a direct result of that effort on July 8, 1965, Congress adopted the Drug Abuse Control Amendments of 1965, which, incidentally established the Bureau of Drug Abuse Control under the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

That Bureau was recently merged with the Federal Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department and by an Executive order of President Johnson was moved to the Justice Department as the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs. The legislation I introduced today requests a large increase in personnel for that new agency.

In 1966, I introduced S. 2152, the Narcotics Rehabilitation Act which was signed into law on November 8, 1966.

Both of these measures incidentally, are brought together as a part of the omnibus bill I introduced today.

In addition, the subcommittee played a large part in the White House Conference on Narcotics in 1961. One of the major recommendations to come out of that conference was the establishment of a Joint Mexican-American Commission on Narcotics which is also a part of the legislation I introduced today.

All of this, Mr. President, presents a very urgent problem, and I think it is a worthwhile effort to bring together and straighten out all of the very mixed-up statutes and policies with respect to these dangerous drugs.

The chart, as presented by Mr. DODD, is as follows:

TABLE OF OFFENSES AND PENALTIES UNDER SENATOR DODD'S OMNIBUS NARCOTIC AND DANGEROUS DRUG CONTROL AND ADDICT REHABILITATION ACT OF 1969

	Unlawful distribution, possession with intent to distribute, manufacture, dispensation, importation, and exportation	
	1st offense	2d offense (or subsequent)
Class I: Narcotics.....	10 yr., \$25,000	20 yr., \$50,000.
Class II: Dangerous drugs.....	5 yr., \$15,000	10 yr., \$50,000.
Class III: Drugs.....	1 yr., \$5,000	2 yr., \$10,000.
Simple possession of any narcotic or dangerous drug. ²	1 yr., \$5,000	2 yr., \$10,000.
Licensee offenses (commercial intentional or knowingly).	1 yr., \$25,000	2 yr., \$50,000 (civil fine).
Distribution of class I and II drugs (not pursuant to order form), etc.	\$25,000 (civil fine).	\$50,000 (civil fine).
Other.....	3 yrs., \$30,000	6 yrs., \$60,000.
Attempt and conspiracy.....	Any person who attempts to commit any offense is subject to up to ½ the maximum penalty as proscribed for committing the act. Any person who conspires to commit an offense is subject to the same penalty as proscribed for committing the act.	
Distribution to minors.....	The distribution of a controlled dangerous substance by a person over 18 years of age to a person under 18 is punishable by twice the sentence otherwise provided.	

¹ The district court may provide that the defendant will not be eligible for parole.

² Defendant is eligible for 1st offender treatment; i.e., probation without a judgment of guilt.

The bill (S. 1895) to reorganize and coordinate control of the narcotic and drug abuse laws under the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice, introduced by Mr. DODD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1895

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 "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS

SEC. 101. Congress finds that the widespread increase in the illicit traffic, use and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs, especially by juveniles, threatens the public health and safety, and therefore is of critical national concern.

Congress also finds that because Mexico is a primary source of marihuana within the United States it is necessary to establish a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana between the United States and Mexico.

Congress further finds that although drug control is essentially a local responsibility, which must be dealt with by State and local governments, the Federal Government must coordinate and intensify its efforts if interstate and international control is to be effective.

Congress therefore declares that there is a need for a central Federal agency to coordinate Federal control of drug abuse affecting interstate commerce through the implementation of a comprehensive Federal code and through research, education, and rehabilitation designed primarily for juveniles.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(a) "Addict" means any individual who habitually uses any narcotic drug as defined by this Act so as to endanger the public morals, health, safety, or welfare, or who is so far addicted to the use of such narcotic drugs as to have lost the power of self-control with reference to his addiction.

(b) "Administer" means to deliver, by a practitioner, in his presence, a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject by injection, inhalation, ingestion, or by other means.

(c) "Agent" means an authorized person who acts on behalf of or at the direction of a manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser and includes a common or contract carrier, public warehouseman, or employee thereof.

(d) "Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs" means the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Department of Justice.

(e) "Control" means to add, remove, or change the placement of a drug, substance, or precursor under Title IV of this Act.

(f) "Conviction" and "convicted" mean the final judgment on a verdict or finding of guilty, a plea of guilty, or a plea of nolo contendere, but do not include a final judgment which has been expunged by pardon, reversed, set aside or otherwise rendered nugatory.

(g) "Counterfeit drug" means a drug which, or the container or labeling of which, without authorization, bears the trademark, trade name, or other identifying mark, imprint, number, or device, or any likeness thereof, of a manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser other than the person or persons who in fact manufactured, distributed, or dispensed such drug and which thereby falsely purports or is represented to be the product of, or to have been distributed by, such other manufacturer, distributor, or dispenser.

(h) "Crime of violence" includes voluntary manslaughter, murder, rape, mayhem, kidnapping, robbery, extortion accompanied by threats of violence, assault with a dangerous weapon or assault with intent to commit any offense punishable by imprisonment for more than one year, arson punishable as a felony, or an attempt or conspiracy to commit any of the foregoing offenses.

(i) "Deliver" or "delivery" means the actual, constructive, or attempted transfer of a narcotic or dangerous drug whether or not there exists an agency relationship.

(j) "Department" means the United States Department of Justice.

(k) "Depressant or stimulant drug" means—

(1) a drug which contains any quantity of (A) barbituric acid or any of the salts of barbituric acid; or (B) any derivative of barbituric acid which has been designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as habit forming under section 502(d) of the "Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act" (52 Stat. 1050; 21 U.S.C. 352(d));

(2) a drug which contains any quantity of (A) amphetamine or any of its optical isomers; (B) any salt of amphetamine or any salt of an optical isomer of amphetamine; or (C) any substance which the Attorney General, after investigation, has found to be, and by regulation designated as, habit forming because of its stimulant effect on the central nervous system; or,

(3) lysergic acid diethylamide or any other drug which contains any quantity of a substance which the Attorney General, after investigation, has found to have, and by regulation designates as having, a potential for abuse because of its depressant or stimulant effect on the central nervous system or its hallucinogenic effect.

(1) "Dispense" means to deliver a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject by or pursuant to the lawful order of a practitioner, including

the packaging, labeling, or compounding necessary to prepare the drug for such delivery. "Dispenser" is a practitioner who delivers a narcotic or dangerous drug to the ultimate user or human research subject.

(m) "Distribute" means to deliver a narcotic or dangerous drug. "Distributor" means a person who delivers a narcotic or dangerous drug.

(n) "Drug" means—

(1) articles recognized in the official United States Pharmacopoeia, official Homeopathic Pharmacopoeia of the United States, or official National Formulary, or any supplement to any of them; and,

(2) articles intended for use in the diagnosis, cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease in man or other animals; and,

(3) articles (other than food) intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals; and,

(4) articles intended for use as a component of any article specified in clause (1), (2), or (3) of this paragraph; but does not include devices or their components, parts, or accessories.

(o) "Eligible individual" means any individual who is charged with an offense against the United States, but does not include—

(1) an individual charged with a crime of violence.

(2) an individual charged with unlawfully importing, selling, or conspiring to import or sell, a narcotic drug.

(3) an individual against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony, which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction of such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided*, That an individual on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

"Eligible offender" means any individual who is convicted of an offense against the United States, but does not include—

(1) an offender who is convicted of a crime of violence.

(2) an offender who is convicted of unlawfully importing or selling or conspiring to import or sell a narcotic drug, unless the court determines that such sale was for the primary purpose of enabling the offender to obtain a narcotic drug which he requires for his personal use because of his addiction to such drug.

(3) an offender against whom there is pending a prior charge of a felony which has not been finally determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction of such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served: *Provided*, That an offender on probation, parole, or mandatory release shall be included if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

(p) "Felony" includes any offense in violation of a law of the United States classified as a felony under section 1 of title 18 of the United States Code, and further includes any offense in violation of a law of any State, any possession or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Canal Zone, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, which at the time of the offense was classified as a felony by the law of the place where that offense was committed.

(q) "Hospital of the Service" means any hospital or other facility of the Public Health Service especially equipped for the accommodation of addicts, and any other appropriate public or private hospital or other facility available to the Surgeon General for the care and treatment of addicts.

(r) "Marihuana" means all parts of the plant *Cannabis sativa L.*, whether growing or not; the seeds thereof; the resin extracted

from any part of such plant; and every compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such plant, its seeds or resin; but shall not include the mature stalks of such plant, fiber produced from such stalks, oil or cake made from the seeds of such plant, any other compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, mixture, or preparation of such mature stalks (except the resin extracted therefrom), fiber, oil, or cake, or the sterilized seed of such plant which is incapable of germination.

(s) "Manufacture" means the production, preparation, propagation, compounding, or processing of a narcotic or dangerous drug, either directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of natural origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis. "Manufacturer" includes any person who packages, repackages, or labels any container of any narcotic or dangerous drug, except practitioners who dispense or compound prescription orders for delivery to the ultimate consumer.

(t) "Narcotic drug" means any of the following, whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by a combination of extraction and chemical synthesis:

(1) opium, coca leaves, and opiates;

(2) a compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or opiates;

(3) a substance (any compound, manufacture, salt, derivative, or preparation thereof) which is chemically identical with any of the substances referred to in clauses (1) and (2), except that the words "narcotic drug" as used in this Act shall not include decocainized coca leaves or extracts of coca leaves, which extracts do not contain cocaine or ecgonine.

(u) "Net disposal" means the quantity of a narcotic or dangerous drug in class I or II or any narcotic drug distributed, dispensed, used in the production of another narcotic drug for which the manufacturer is licensed, or otherwise disposed of (as such or contained in or combined with other drugs compounded by the manufacturer of such narcotic drug) by the manufacturer during a stated period, less the quantity of any narcotic or dangerous drug in classes I and II or other narcotic drug returned to the manufacturer by a customer and any quantity distributed or dispensed to another licensed manufacturer of the same narcotic drug.

(v) "Opiate" means any substance having an addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability similar to morphine or being capable of conversion into a drug having such addiction-forming or addiction-sustaining liability.

(w) "Opium poppy" means the plant of the species *Papaver somniferum L.*, except the seeds thereof.

(x) "Patient" means any person with respect to whom a petition has been filed by a United States attorney as provided under subsection (b) of section 302 of this title.

(y) "Poppy straw" means all parts, except the seeds, of the opium poppy, after mowing.

(z) "Posthospitalization program" shall mean any program providing for the treatment and supervision of a person established by the Surgeon General pursuant to section 815 of this Act.

(aa) "Practitioner" means a physician, dentist, veterinarian, scientific investigator, pharmacy, hospital, or other person licensed or otherwise permitted to distribute, dispense, conduct research with respect to, or administer a narcotic or dangerous drug in the course of professional practice or research by the United States or the jurisdiction in which he practices or does research.

(bb) "Production" includes the manufacture, planting, cultivation, growing, or harvesting of a narcotic or dangerous drug.

(cc) "Precursor" means a substance which the Attorney General has found to be and by regulation designates as being the principal compound commonly used or produced primarily for use, and which is an immediate chemical intermediary used or likely to be used in the manufacture of a narcotic or dangerous drug, the control of which is necessary to prevent, curtail, or limit such manufacture.

(dd) "Related individual" means any person with whom the alleged narcotic addict may reside or at whose house he may be, or the husband or wife, father or mother, brother or sister, or the child or the nearest available relative of the alleged narcotic addict.

(ee) "Surgeon General" means the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

(ff) "Treatment" includes confinement and treatment in an institution and under supervised aftercare in the community and includes, but is not limited to, medical, educational, social, psychological, and vocational services, corrective and preventive guidance and training, and other rehabilitative services designed to protect the public and benefit the addict by correcting his antisocial tendencies and ending his dependence on addicting drugs and his susceptibility to addiction.

(gg) "Ultimate user" means a person who lawfully possesses a narcotic or dangerous drug for his own use, for the use of a member of his household, or for administration to an animal owned by him or by a member of his household.

(hh) "United States" means any State, territory, or possession, including the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Trust Territory of the Pacific, or the Canal Zone.

TITLE II—EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

SEC. 201 (a) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to carry out educational programs, especially among juveniles, designed to prevent and deter misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs. In connection with such programs he is authorized to—

(1) promote better recognition of the problems of misuse and abuse of dangerous drugs within the regulated industry and among interested groups and organizations;

(2) assist the regulated industry and interested groups and organizations in contributing to the reduction of such misuse and abuse;

(3) consult with interested groups and organizations to aid them in solving administrative and organizational problems;

(4) evaluate procedures, projects, techniques, and controls conducted or proposed as part of educational programs on such misuse and abuse;

(5) disseminate the results of research on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs to promote a better public understanding, especially by juveniles, of the problems that exist and the means of combating such problems; and,

(6) assist in the education and training of State and local law enforcement officials in their efforts to control the misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to encourage research on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs. In connection with such research and in furtherance of the enforcement of this Act, he is authorized to—

(1) establish methods to assess accurately the effects of narcotics and dangerous drugs and to identify and characterize drugs with potential for abuse;

(2) make studies and undertake programs of research to—

a. develop new or improved approaches, techniques, systems, equipment and devices to strengthen the enforcement of this Act,

b. determine patterns of misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs and the social effects thereof, especially on juveniles;

c. improve methods for preventing, predicting, understanding and dealing with the misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs; and,

(3) enter into contracts with public agencies, institutions of higher education, and private organizations or individuals for the purpose of conducting research, demonstrations, or special projects which bear directly on misuse and abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs without performance bonds and without regard to section 5 of Title 41, United States Code.

(c) The Attorney General may authorize persons engaged in research on the use and effects of dangerous substances to withhold the names and other identifying characteristics of persons who are the subjects of such research. Persons who obtain this authorization may not be compelled in any Federal or State civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify the subjects of research for which such authorization was obtained.

(d) The Attorney General may authorize the possession and distribution of dangerous drugs by persons engaged in research. Persons who obtain this authorization shall be exempt from State or Federal prosecution for possession and distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs to the extent authorized by the Attorney General.

GOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

SEC. 202(a). The Attorney General shall cooperate with local, State and Federal agencies in discharging the national and international obligations of the United States concerning traffic in dangerous substances and in suppressing the abuse of dangerous substances. To this end, he is authorized to—

(1) arrange for the exchange of information between governmental officials concerning the use and abuse of dangerous substances;

(2) cooperate in the institution and prosecution of cases in the courts of the United States and before the licensing boards and courts of the several States;

(3) conduct training programs on dangerous drug law enforcement for local, State, and Federal personnel;

(4) maintain in the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs a unit which will accept, catalogue, file, and otherwise utilize all information and statistics, including records of dangerous drug addicts and other dangerous drug law offenders, which may be received from Federal, State, and local agencies, and make such information available for Federal, State, and local law enforcement purposes;

(5) conduct programs of eradication aimed at destroying wild or illicit growth of plant species from which dangerous drugs may be extracted;

(6) cooperate with and assist States which do not have adequate drug abuse control legislation in enacting such legislation.

(b) When requested by the Attorney General, it shall be the duty of any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government to furnish assistance, including technical advice, to him for carrying out the purposes of this Act.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE

SEC. 203. The Attorney General shall appoint a committee of experts to advise him with respect to dangerous drugs which may be subject to control under this Act, including advice with respect to whether a drug should be controlled pursuant to the criteria contained in Title IV and which classification is most appropriate for a dangerous drug in accordance with the criteria established in Title IV.

SEC. 204. The results of the research and

educational programs conducted by the Attorney General under this title shall be transmitted to Congress within a reasonable period together with proposals for legislation.

TITLE III—MARIHUANA

SEC. 301. The National Institute of Mental Health, in cooperation with the Attorney General, is authorized and directed to execute a plan of research, to be carried on both an intramural and extramural basis, covering all aspects of marihuana use.

(a) The research shall include—

(1) identification of existing gaps in our knowledge of marihuana;

(2) an intensive examination of the important medical and social aspects of marihuana use;

(3) surveys of the extent and nature of marihuana use;

(4) studies of the pharmacology and effects of marihuana;

(5) studies of the relation of marihuana use to crime and juvenile delinquency;

(6) studies of the relation between marihuana and the use of other drugs.

(b) The study shall be completed within 24 months from the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 302. The Attorney General, based upon the NIMH study, is authorized and directed to either place marihuana within one of the three classifications, in accordance with the provisions of this Act; or exclude marihuana from any classifications of this Act.

SEC. 303. Until such study is completed and the Attorney General has acted as prescribed in Sec. 302, marihuana shall be treated as a Class II Dangerous Drug for the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 304. The Attorney General is authorized and directed to consult with the President for the purpose of establishing a Joint United States-Mexican Commission to investigate and to recommend appropriate solutions concerning the flow of marihuana, narcotic drugs, and dangerous drugs between the United States and Mexico.

TITLE IV—CLASSIFICATIONS

AUTHORITY TO CONTROL

SEC. 401. (a) The Attorney General shall control all drugs enumerated in Section 402 of this Act. He may, with the advice of the committee of experts referred to in Sec. 203, pursuant to the procedures of subchapter II of Chapter 5 of Title 5 of the United States Code, add, delete, or reschedule a drug as a narcotic or dangerous drug. The Attorney General shall consider with respect to each drug hereafter controlled:

(1) its actual or relative potential for abuse;

(2) scientific evidence of its pharmacological effect if known;

(3) the state of current scientific knowledge regarding the substance;

(4) its history and current pattern of abuse;

(5) the scope, duration, and significance of abuse;

(6) what, if any, risk there is to the public health;

(7) its psychic or physiological dependence liability;

(8) controls required based on United States obligations under international treaties, conventions or protocols; and,

(9) whether the substance is a precursor of a substance already controlled under this Title.

(b) If the Attorney General designates a substance as a precursor, substances which are precursors of the controlled precursor shall not be subject to control solely because they are precursors of the controlled precursor.

CLASSIFICATIONS

SEC. 402. The following classes include the narcotics and dangerous drugs listed or to be

listed by whatever official name, common or usual name, chemical name, or trade name designated.

(a) Class I—Narcotics.

(1) Any of the following opium derivatives, their salts, isomers and salts of isomers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such salts, isomers and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation: Acetylcodeine, Benzylmorphine, Codeine methylbromide, Codeine-N-Oxide, Desomorphine, Heroin, Hydromorphanol, Methydesorphine, Methylhydromorphine, Morphine, Methylbromide, Morphine methylsulfonate, Morphine-N-Oxide, Myrophine, Nicocodeine, Nicomorphine, Normorphine, Thebacon.

(2) Any of the following substances whether produced directly or indirectly by extraction from substances of vegetable origin, or independently by means of chemical synthesis, or by combination of extraction and chemical synthesis:

a. Opium, coca leaves, and opiate;

b. Any salt, compound, derivative, or preparation of opium, coca leaves, or opiate;

c. Any salt, compound, derivative, or preparation thereof which is chemically equivalent or identical with any of the substances referred to in clauses 1 and 2, except that these substances shall not include decocainized coca leaves or extraction of coca leaves, which extractions do not contain cocaine or ecgonine; and shall not include the isoquinoline alkaloids of opium;

d. Opium poppy and poppy straw.

(3) Any of the following opiates, including their isomers, esters, ethers, salts of isomers, esters and ethers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such isomers, esters, ethers and salts is possible within the specific chemical designation: Alphaprodine, Anileridine, Bezitramide, Diphenoxylate, Fentanyl, Isomethadone, Levomethorphan, Levorphanol, Metazocine, Methadone, Methadone-Intermediate (4-cyano-2-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenyl butane) Moramide-Intermediate (2-methyl-3-morpholine-1, 1-diphenylpropane-carboxylic acid) Pethidine, Pethidine-Intermediate-A (4-cyano-1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine) Pethidine-Intermediate-B (ethyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylate) Pethidine-Intermediate-C (1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid) Phenazocine, Phencyclidine, Piminodine, Racemethorphan, Racemorphan, any substance which contains any quantity of methamphetamine, including its salts, isomers, and salts of isomers, unless specifically excluded, except those compounds, mixtures, and preparations specifically listed in other schedules.

(b) Class II—Dangerous Drugs—High potential for abuse and little or no medical use.

(1) Any of the following substances, including their isomers, esters, ethers, salts and salts of isomers, esters and ethers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the existence of such isomers, esters, ethers and salts is possible within the specific chemical designation: Acetylmethadol, allylprodine, alphactylmethadol, alphameprodine, alphamethadol, benzethidine, betacetylmethadol, betameprodine, betamethadol, betaprodine, clonitazene, dextromoramide, dextrorphan, diampromide, diethylambutene, dimenoxadol, dimepheptanol, dimethylambutene, dioxaphetylbutyrate, dipipanone, ethylmethylambutene, etonitazene, etoxerdine, furethidine, hydroxypethidine, ketobemidone, levomoramide, levophenacetyl morphan, morpheridine, noracetylmethadol, norlevorphanol, normethadone, norpipanone, phenadoxone, phenampramide, phenomorphan, phenoperidine, priritramide, proheptazine, properidine, racemoramide, trimperidine.

(2) Any material, compound, mixture or preparation which contains any quantity of the following hallucinogenic substances, their salts, isomers and salts of isomers, unless specifically excepted, whenever the exist-

ence of such salts, isomers, and salts of isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation: Bufotenine; diethyltryptamine, dimethyltryptamine, 4-methyl 1-2, 5-dimethoxyamphetamine, ibogaine, lysergic acid diethylamide, mescaline, peyote, psilocybin, psilocyn, tetrahydrocannabinol.

(3) High potential for abuse and established medical use—Any material, compound, mixture, or preparation which contains any quantity of the following substances having a potential for abuse associated with a stimulant effect on the central nervous system:

a. Amphetamine, its salts, optical isomers, and salts of its optical isomers.

b. Phenmetrazine and its salts.

c. Methamphetamine including its salts, isomers, or salts of isomers, but only when in timed release sustained release dosage form, or tablets or capsules containing not more than five milligrams of methamphetamine per one hundred milligrams of the total dosage unit.

(4) Any material, compound, mixture or preparation which contains any quantity of the following substances having a potential for abuse associated with a depressant effect on the central nervous system: Any substance which contains any quantity or a derivative of barbituric acid, or any salt of a derivative of barbituric acid, except those substances which are specifically listed in other schedules; chloral betaine, chloral hydrate, chlordiazepoxide, chlorthexadol, diazepam, ethylchloroynol, ethinamate, glutehtimide, lysergic acid, lysergic acid amide, meprobamate, methylphenidate, methypylon, pareldehyde, petrichloral, sulfon-diethylmethane, sulfonethylmethane, sulfonmethane.

(5) Nalorphine.

(6) Any material, compound, mixture, or preparation containing limited quantities of any of the following narcotic drugs, or any salts thereof:

a. Not more than 1.80 grams of codeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with an equal or greater quantity of an isoquinoline alkaloid of opium.

b. Not more than 1.80 grams of codeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

c. Not more than 300 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with a fourfold or greater quantity of an isoquinoline alkaloid of opium.

d. Not more than 300 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

e. Not more than 1.80 grams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or not more than 90 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

f. Not more than 300 milligrams of ethylmorphine per 100 milliliters or not more than 15 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

g. Not more than 500 milligrams of opium per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams, or not more than 25 milligrams per dosage unit, with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

h. Not more than 50 milligrams of morphine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams with one or more active, non-narcotic ingredients in recognized therapeutic amounts.

(7) The Attorney General may by regulation except any compound, mixture, or preparation containing any stimulant or depressant substance listed in Class II above from the application of all or any part of this Act if the compound, mixture, or prepara-

tion contains one or more active medicinal ingredients not having a stimulant or depressant effect on the central nervous system; *Provided*, That such admixtures shall be included therein in such combinations, quantity, proportion, or concentration as to vitiate the potential for abuse of the substances which do have a stimulant or depressant effect on the central nervous system.

(c) Class III—Drugs—Low potential for abuse and current accepted medical use.

(1) Any compound, mixture, or preparation containing limited quantities of any of the following narcotic drugs, which shall include one or more non-narcotic active medicinal ingredients in sufficient proportion to confer upon the compound, mixture, or preparation valuable medicinal qualities other than those possessed by the narcotic drug alone:

a. Not more than 200 milligrams of codeine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

b. Not more than 100 milligrams of dihydrocodeine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

c. Not more than 100 milligrams of ethylmorphine per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams;

d. Not more than 2.5 milligrams of diphenoxylate and not less than 25 micrograms of atropine sulfate per dosage unit;

e. Not more than 100 milligrams of opium per 100 milliliters or per 100 grams, or not more than 5 milligrams per dosage unit.

TITLE V—REGULATION OF IMPORTATION, EXPORTATION, MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, AND DISPENSATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

IMPORTATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 501(a). It is unlawful to import or land into the United States or its Territories any narcotic or dangerous drug listed in classes I and II of title IV of this Act, or any other narcotic drug listed in class III unless pursuant to such exceptions as the Attorney General may provide by regulation as being necessary for medical, scientific, or other legitimate purposes. No crude opium may be imported or brought in for the purpose of manufacturing heroin or smoking opium.

(b) Non-narcotic dangerous drugs listed in class III may be imported for medical and other legitimate uses only, pursuant to such notification requirements as the Attorney General may prescribe by regulation.

IMPORTATION OF COCA LEAVES

SEC. 502. In addition to the amount of coca leaves which may be authorized to be imported under section 501(a) of this title, the Attorney General may permit the importation of additional amounts of coca leaves provided, that, after entry into the United States, all cocaine, ecgonine, and all salts, derivatives, and preparations from which cocaine or ecgonine may be synthesized or made, contained in such additional amounts of coca leaves, shall be destroyed under the supervision of an authorized representative of the Attorney General.

EXPORTATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 503(a). No person shall export or cause to be exported from the United States or from any of its Territories, any narcotic drug listed in class I of title IV of this Act to any other country except—

(1) to a country which has become a party to the International Opium Convention of 1912 for the Suppression of the Abuses of Opium, Morphine, Cocaine, and Derivative Drugs, or to the International Opium Convention signed at Geneva on February 19, 1925; or,

(2) to a country which has become a party to the Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribu-

tion of Narcotic Drugs concluded at Geneva, July 13, 1931, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America, July 9, 1933, as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946, and the protocol bringing under international control drugs outside the scope of the convention of July 13, 1931, for limiting the manufacture and regulating the distribution of narcotic drugs (as amended by the protocol signed at Lake Success on December 11, 1946) signed at Paris, November 19, 1948, and entered into force with respect to the United States of America, September 11, 1950; or,

(3) To a country which has become a party to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, which entered into force with respect to the United States on June 24, 1967; and with respect to any such country, in subsections (1), (2), or (3) only if—

a. such country has instituted and maintains, in conformity with the conventions to which it is a party, a system for the control of imports of narcotic drugs which the Attorney General deems adequate;

b. the narcotic drug is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of the country of import;

c. substantial evidence is furnished to the Attorney General by the exporter that the narcotic drug is to be applied exclusively to medical and scientific uses within the country of import, and that there is an actual need for the narcotic drugs for medical and scientific uses within such country; and,

d. a permit to export the narcotic drug in each instance shall have been issued by the Attorney General.

(b) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, the Attorney General may authorize the exportation of any narcotic drug (including crude opium and coca leaves) to a country which has ratified and become a party to any of the international instruments mentioned in subsection (a) if the particular drug is to be applied to a special scientific purpose in the country of destination and the authorities of such country will permit the importation of the particular drug for such purpose.

(c) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall export or cause to be exported from the United States or its Territories any non-narcotic dangerous drug listed in class II of title IV of this Act to any other country unless—

(1) such country has instituted and maintains a system which the Attorney General deems adequate for the control of imports of such substances;

(2) the dangerous drug is consigned to a holder of such permits or licenses as may be required under the laws of the country of imports;

(3) substantial evidence is furnished to the Attorney General that the dangerous drug is to be applied exclusively to medical, scientific, or other legitimate uses within the country to which exported, that it will not be exported from such country, and that there is an actual need for the dangerous substance for medical, scientific, or other legitimate uses within the country; and,

(4) a permit to export the dangerous drug in each instance shall have been issued by the Attorney General.

(d) Notwithstanding the provisions of section (c) of this section, the Attorney General may authorize the exportation of any non-narcotic dangerous drug if the particular substance is to be applied to a special scientific purpose in the country of destination and the authorities of such country will permit the importation of the particular drug for such purpose.

(e) No person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall cause to be exported from the United States or from any of its Territories any dangerous drug not re-

quiring an export permit provided by this section to any other country unless the laws of the country to which the controlled dangerous substances are consigned permit the importation into the country, and then only if—

(1) there is furnished to the Attorney General prior to export documentary proof that importation is not contrary to the laws or regulations of the country of destination;

(2) a special dangerous drug invoice, in triplicate, accompanies the shipment setting forth such information as the Attorney General may prescribe to identify the parties to the shipment and the means of shipping. Two copies of the invoice shall be forwarded to the Attorney General before the dangerous drugs are exported from the United States or any of the Territories.

TRANSHIPMENT AND IN-TRANSIT SHIPMENT OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 504. No narcotic or dangerous drug listed in class I or II shall be admitted into the United States or into any of its Territories for transportation to another country, or be transferred or transhipped from one vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, to another vessel, vehicle, or aircraft, within the United States for immediate exportation or for any other purpose except for scientific, medical, or other legitimate purposes in the country of destination, and then only with the prior written approval of the Attorney General, which shall be granted or denied within 21 days of the request. No dangerous drug listed in class III may be so admitted, transferred, or transhipped except upon advance notice to the Attorney General.

RULES AND REGULATIONS REGARDING MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, AND DISPENSATION OF NARCOTICS AND DANGEROUS DRUGS

SEC. 505. The Attorney General is authorized to promulgate rules and regulations and to charge reasonable fees relating to the license and control of the manufacture, distribution, and dispensation of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

LICENSING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 506. (a) Every person who manufactures, distributes, or dispenses any narcotic or dangerous drug or who proposes to engage in the manufacture, distribution, or dispensation of any narcotic or dangerous drug, shall apply annually for a license to be issued by the Attorney General in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by him.

(b) The Attorney General may, by regulation, waive the requirement for a license of certain manufacturers, distributors, or dispensers if he finds it consistent with the public health and safety.

(c) A separate license shall be required at each principal place of business or professional practice where the applicant manufactures, distributes, or dispenses narcotics or dangerous drugs listed in the classes in title IV.

(d) The Attorney General is authorized to inspect the establishment of a licensee or applicant for a license in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by him.

LICENSING

SEC. 507. (a) The Attorney General shall grant a license to an applicant to manufacture or distribute narcotics or dangerous drugs included in class I or II of title IV of this Act if he determines that such license is consistent with the public interest and with treaty or other international obligations of the United States. In determining the public interest, the following factors shall be considered:

(1) maintenance of effective controls against diversion of particular narcotics and dangerous drugs and any class I or II drug compounded therefrom into other than legitimate medical, scientific, or industrial channels;

(2) compliance with applicable State and local law;

(3) promotion of technical advances in the art of manufacturing these drugs and the development of new drugs;

(4) prior conviction record of applicant under Federal and State laws relating to the manufacture, distribution, or dispensation of such drugs;

(5) past experience in the manufacture or distribution of narcotics and dangerous drugs, and the existence in the establishment of effective controls against diversion; and,

(6) such other factors as may be relevant to and consistent with the public health and safety.

(b) A license granted under subsection (a) of this section shall not entitle a licensee to manufacture and distribute narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I or II other than those specified in the license, or any quantity of those narcotics or dangerous drugs in excess of the quota assigned pursuant to section 510.

(c) Practitioners shall be granted a license to dispense drugs in class I, II and III if they are so authorized to dispense under the law of the State in which they practice. However, as to those drugs, which the Attorney General designates as having no accepted medical usage, practitioners shall be treated as distributors and subsection (a) of this section shall apply. An application for a license by a practitioner who wishes to conduct research with those drugs, which the Attorney General designates having no accepted medical usage shall be referred to the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for advice. The Secretary shall promptly advise the Attorney General concerning the qualifications of each practitioner applying for a license. Before giving such advice, the Secretary shall consider the qualifications of the person or persons who will conduct the research, the drugs to be used, the place where research will be performed, and the design of the research protocol. Any license granted shall be subject to revocation and suspension in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 508.

(d) The Attorney General shall permit persons to register who own or operate any establishment engaged in the manufacture, distribution, or dispensing of any narcotic or dangerous drug prior to the effective date of this Act and who are registered or licensed under section 510 of the Drug Amendments of 1962 (76 Stat. 794; 21 U.S.C. 360), section 8 of the Narcotics Manufacturing Act of 1960 (74 Stat. 62; 21 U.S.C. 506), and sections 4721, 4722, 4751, 4752, and 4753 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (68 Stat. 31; 26 U.S.C. 4721, 4722, 4751, 4752, and 4753). Such registration shall be the basis for the issuance of a license.

(e) A license granted under this Act does not relieve a licensee of any obligation imposed by the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (52 Stat. 1040, as amended, 21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.), or by any other Acts of Congress.

DENIAL, REVOCATION, OR SUSPENSION OF LICENSE

SEC. 508. (a) An application for a license or a license granted pursuant to section 507 to manufacture, distribute, or dispense a narcotic or dangerous drug, may be denied, suspended, or revoked by the Attorney General upon a finding that the licensee:

(1) has materially falsified any application filed pursuant to this Act or required by this Act;

(2) has been convicted of violating or conspiring to violate any law of the United States, or of any State, relating to any drug defined herein; or,

(3) has had his State license suspended or revoked by competent State authority and is no longer authorized by State law to en-

gage in the manufacturing, distribution, or dispensation of narcotics or dangerous drugs.

(b) The Attorney General may limit revocation or suspension of a license to the particular narcotic or dangerous drug with respect to which grounds for revocation or suspension exist.

(c) Before taking action pursuant to this section, the Attorney General shall serve upon the applicant or licensee an order to show cause why a license should not be denied, revoked or suspended. The order to show cause shall contain a statement of the basis thereof and shall call upon the applicant or licensee to appear before the Attorney General at a time and place stated in the order, but in no event less than thirty days after the date of receipt of the order. Proceedings to deny or revoke or suspend shall be conducted pursuant to this section in accordance with subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, of the United States Code. Such proceedings shall be independent of, and not in lieu of, criminal prosecutions or other proceedings under this Act or any law of the United States.

(d) The Attorney General may, in his discretion, suspend any license simultaneously with the institution of proceedings under this section, in cases where he finds that there is an imminent danger to the public health or safety. Such suspension shall continue in effect until the conclusion of such proceedings, including judicial review thereof, unless sooner withdrawn by the Attorney General or dissolved by a court of competent jurisdiction.

(e) The suspension or revocation of a license under this section shall operate to suspend or revoke any quota applicable under section 510.

(f) In the event the Attorney General suspends or revokes a license granted under section 507, all narcotics and dangerous drugs owned or possessed by the licensee pursuant to such license at the time of suspension or the effective date of the revocation order, as the case may be, may in the discretion of the Attorney General, be placed under seal. No disposition may be made of drugs under seal until the time for taking an appeal has elapsed or until all appeals have been concluded unless a court, upon application therefor, orders the sale of perishable substances and the deposit of the proceeds of the sale with the court. Upon a revocation order becoming final, all such narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be forfeited to the Government.

MARKING OF CONTAINERS

SEC. 509. Commercial containers of narcotics and dangerous drugs, where appropriate, shall be identified by a symbol in accordance with the rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General.

QUOTAS APPLICABLE TO CERTAIN DRUGS

SEC. 510. (a) The Attorney General shall determine the total quantity and establish production quotas for each drug in classes I and II to be manufactured each calendar year to provide for the estimated medical, scientific, and industrial needs of the United States, for lawful export requirements, and for the establishment and maintenance of reserve stocks.

(b) The Attorney General shall limit or reduce individual production quotas to the extent necessary to prevent the aggregate of individual quotas from exceeding the amount determined necessary each year by the Attorney General under subsection (a). The quota of each licensed manufacturer for each drug in class I or II shall be revised in the same proportion as the limitation or reduction of the aggregate of the quotas. However, if any licensee, before the issuance of a limitation or reduction in quota, has manufactured in excess of his revised quota, the amount of the excess shall be subtracted from his quota for the following year.

(c) On or before July 1 of each year, upon application therefor by a licensed manufacturer, the Attorney General shall fix a manufacturing quota for the drugs in classes I and II that the manufacturer seeks to produce. The quota shall be subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section. In fixing such quotas, the Attorney General shall determine the manufacturer's estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements for the calendar year; and, in making his determination, the Attorney General shall consider the manufacturer's current rate of disposal, the trend of the national disposal rate during the preceding calendar year, the manufacturer's production cycle and inventory position, the economic availability of raw materials, yield and stability problems, emergencies such as strikes and fires, and other factors.

(d) The Attorney General shall, upon application and subject to the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) of this section, fix a quota for drugs in class I or II for any licensee who has not manufactured that drug during one or more preceding calendar years. In fixing such quota, the Attorney General shall take into account the licensee's reasonably anticipated requirements for the current year; and, in making his determination of such requirements, shall consider such factors specified in (c) of this section as may be relevant.

(e) At any time during the year any licensee who has applied for or received a manufacturing quota for a drug in class I and II may apply for an increase in that quota to meet his estimated disposal, inventory, and other requirements during the remainder of that year. In passing upon the application the Attorney General shall take into consideration any occurrences since the filing of the licensee's initial quota application that may require an increased manufacturing rate by the licensee during the balance of the year. In passing upon the application the Attorney General may also take into account the amount, if any, by which the determination of the Attorney General under subsection (a) of this section, exceeds the aggregate of the quotas, of all licensees under this section.

(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this title, no license or quota may be required for the manufacture of such quantities of narcotics and dangerous drugs in class I and II that incidentally and necessarily result from the manufacturing process used for the manufacturing of a drug duly licensed under this title. The Attorney General may, by regulation, prescribe restrictions on the retention and disposal of such incidentally produced drugs.

RECORDS AND REPORTS OF LICENSEES

SEC. 511. (a) Upon the effective date of this Act each licensee manufacturing, distributing or dispensing narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I, II, or III shall make a complete and accurate record of all stocks of such narcotics and dangerous drugs on hand. Thereafter, a complete and accurate cumulative record of all such narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be maintained. Each 2 year period after the effective date of this Act each licensee manufacturing, distributing or dispensing narcotics and dangerous drugs shall prepare an inventory of each narcotic and dangerous drug in his possession. Records, and inventories shall contain such information as shall be provided by rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General.

(b) Records and inventories required to be prepared under this section shall be segregated or maintained in a manner to enable the records to be promptly identified and inspected. In addition, a summary of those records and inventories shall be filed periodically as shall be provided by rules and regulations promulgated by the Attorney General. This section shall not apply to prac-

tioners who lawfully prescribe or administer, but not otherwise, dispense, narcotics and dangerous drugs listed in class I, II, or III of this Act.

(c) The Attorney General may by regulation require the submission of reports necessary to conform to international obligations of the United States.

OTHER FORMS

SEC. 512. (a) Narcotics and dangerous drugs in class I and II shall be distributed only by a licensee, pursuant to an order form prescribed by the Attorney General.

(b) Nothing contained in subsection (a) shall apply.

(1) to the administering or dispensing of such drugs to a patient by a practitioner in the course of his professional practice; however, such practitioner, must comply with the requirements of section 507 of this Act;

(2) to the distribution or dispensing of such drugs by a pharmacist to an ultimate user pursuant to a written prescription issued by a practitioner authorized by State law to issue such prescription; however, such pharmacist must comply with the requirements of section 511 of this Act.

PRESCRIPTIONS

SEC. 513. Except when dispensed directly by a practitioner, other than a pharmacist, to an ultimate user, or in emergency situations as prescribed by the Attorney General by regulations, no narcotic or dangerous drug included in class I, II, or III may be dispensed without a written prescription in conformity with regulations to be promulgated by the Attorney General.

TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATIVE AND ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY

SEC. 601. The Attorney General may delegate any of his functions under this Act to any officer or employee of the Department of Justice. He may promulgate and enforce any rules, regulations and procedures which he may deem necessary and appropriate for the efficient execution of his functions under this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

SEC. 602(a). In carrying out his functions, the Attorney General may hold hearings, sign and issue subpoenas, administer oaths, examine witnesses and receive evidence at any place in the United States.

(b) Except as otherwise provided in this Act, notice shall be given and hearings shall be conducted under appropriate procedures of Subchapter II of Chapter 5, Title 5, United States Code.

POWERS OF ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

SEC. 603. Any officer or employee of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs of the Department of Justice designated by the Attorney General may:

(a) Carry firearms;

(b) Execute and serve search warrants, arrest warrants, administrative inspection warrants, subpoenas, and summonses issued under the authority of the United States;

(c) Make arrests without warrant for any offense against the United States committed in his presence, or for any felony, cognizable under the laws of the United States, if he has probable cause to believe that the person to be arrested has committed or is committing a felony;

(d) Make seizures of property pursuant to the provisions of this Act; and,

(e) Perform such other law enforcement duties as the Attorney General may designate.

INCREASE OF ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL

SEC. 604(a). The Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to conduct studies to determine whether an increase of enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and the Bureau of Customs, respectively, is necessary to effectively implement this Act;

(b) The studies shall be completed and transmitted to Congress within twelve months from the effective date of this Act;

(c) In the interim, the Attorney General and the Secretary of the Treasury are authorized and directed to increase the number of enforcement personnel of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs and Bureau of Customs, respectively, and the amounts necessary for the interim increase are also authorized.

SUBPENAS

SEC. 605 (a) In any matter relating to the control of dangerous drugs, the Attorney General is empowered to subpoena witnesses, compel their attendance and testimony, and require the production of any records (including books, papers, documents and tangible things which constitute or contain evidence) which the Attorney General finds relevant or material to the investigation. The attendance of witnesses and the production of records may be required from any place in any State or in any Territory or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States at any designated place of hearing: provided, that a witness shall not be required to appear at any hearing more than five hundred miles distant from the place where he was served with subpoena. Witnesses summoned by the Attorney General shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in the courts of the United States.

(b) A subpoena of the Attorney General may be served by any person designated in the subpoena to serve it. Service upon a natural person may be made by personal delivery of the subpoena to him. Service may be made upon a domestic or foreign corporation or upon a partnership of other unincorporated association which is subject to suit under a common name, by delivering the subpoena to an officer, a managing or general agent, or to any other agent authorized by appointment or by law to receive service or process. The affidavit of the person serving the subpoena entered on a true copy thereof by the person serving it shall be proof of service.

(c) In case of contumacy by or refusal to obey a subpoena issued to any person, the Attorney General may invoke the aid of any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the investigation is carried on or of which the subpoenaed person is an inhabitant, carries on business or may be found, to compel compliance with the subpoena of the Attorney General. The Court may issue an order requiring the subpoenaed person to appear before the Attorney General to produce records, if so ordered, or to give testimony touching the matter under investigation. Any failure to obey the order of the court may be punished by the court as a contempt thereof. All process in any such case may be served in any judicial district in which such person may be found.

SEARCH WARRANTS

SEC. 606. (a) A search warrant relating to offenses involving narcotics and dangerous drugs may be served at any time of the day or night if the judge or United States Magistrate issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that grounds exist for the warrant and for its service at such time.

(b) Any officer authorized to execute a search warrant may, without notice of his authority and purpose, break open an outer or inner door door or window of a building, or any part of the building, or anything therein, if the judge or United States Magistrate issuing the warrant is satisfied that there is probable cause to believe that if such notice were to be given the property sought in the case may be easily and quickly destroyed or disposed of, or that danger to the life or limb of the officer or another may result, and has included in the warrant a

direction that the officer executing it shall not be required to give such notice.

ADMINISTRATIVE INSPECTIONS AND WARRANTS

SEC. 607. (a) Issuance and execution of administrative inspection warrants shall be as follows:

(1) Any judge of the United States or of a State court of record, or any United States magistrate may, within his jurisdiction, and upon proper oath or affirmation showing probable cause, issue warrants for the purpose of conducting administrative inspections authorized by this Act or regulations thereunder, and seizures of property appropriate to such inspections. For the purposes of this section "probable cause" means a valid public interest in the effective enforcement of the Act or regulations sufficient to justify administrative inspection of the area, premises, building or conveyance in the circumstances specified in the application for the warrant.

(2) A warrant shall issue only upon an affidavit of an officer or employee duly designated and knowledge of the facts alleged, sworn to before the judge or magistrate and establishing the grounds for issuing the warrant. If the judge or magistrate is satisfied that grounds for the application exist or that there is probable cause to believe they exist, he shall issue a warrant identifying the area, premises, building, or conveyance to be inspected, the purpose of such inspection, and, where appropriate, the type of property to be inspected, if any. The warrant shall identify the items or types of property to be seized, if any. The warrant shall be directed to a person authorized by section 603 to execute it. The warrant shall state the grounds for its issuance and the name of the person or persons whose affidavit has been taken in support thereof. It shall command the person to whom it is directed to inspect the area, premises, building, or conveyance identified for the purpose specified, and, where appropriate, shall direct the seizure of the property specified. The warrant shall direct that it be served during normal business hours. It shall designate the judge or magistrate to whom it shall be returned.

(3) A warrant issued pursuant to this section must be executed and returned within ten days of its date. If property is seized pursuant to warrant, the person executing the warrant shall give to the person from whom or from whose premises the property was taken a copy of the warrant and a receipt for the property taken or shall leave the copy and receipt at the place from which the property was taken. The return of the warrant shall be made promptly and shall be accompanied by a written inventory of any property taken. The inventory shall be made in the presence of the person executing the warrant and of the person from whose possession or premises the property was taken, if they are present, or in the presence of at least one credible person other than the person making such inventory, and shall be verified by the person executing the warrant. The judge or magistrate upon request, shall deliver a copy of the inventory to the person from whom or from whose premises the property was taken and to the applicant for the warrant.

(4) The judge or magistrate who has issued a warrant under this section shall attach to the warrant a copy of the return and all papers filed in connection therewith and shall file them with the clerk of the district court of the United States for the judicial district in which the inspection was made.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized to make administrative inspections of certain premises in accordance with the following provisions:

- (1) The following premises are concluded:
 - a. Places where persons licensed or exempted from licensing requirements under this Act are required to keep records; and,
 - b. Places including factories, warehouses, establishments, and conveyances where per-

sons licensed or exempted from licensing requirements under this Act are permitted to hold, manufacture, compound, process, sell, deliver, or otherwise dispose of narcotics or dangerous drugs.

(2) When so authorized by an administrative inspection warrant issued pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, an officer or employee designated by the Attorney General, upon presenting the warrant and appropriate credentials to the owner, operator, or agent in charge, shall have the right to enter the premises for the purpose of conducting an administrative inspection.

(3) When so authorized by an administrative inspection warrant, an officer or employee designated by the Attorney General shall have the right—

a. To inspect and copy records required by this Act to be kept;

b. To inspect, within reasonable limits and in a reasonable manner, premises and all pertinent equipment, finished and unfinished material, containers and labeling found therein, and, except as provided in subsection (b) (5) of this section, all other things therein (including records, files, papers, processes, controls, and facilities) bearing on violation of this Act; and

c. To inventory any stock of any narcotics or dangerous drugs therein and obtain samples of any such drug.

(4) This section shall not be construed to prevent the inspection without a warrant of books and records pursuant to an administrative subpoena issued in accordance with section 605 of this Act, nor shall this section be construed to prevent entries and administrative inspections (including seizures of property) without a warrant—

a. With the consent of the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the premises;

b. In situations presenting imminent danger to health or safety;

c. In situations involving inspection of conveyances where there is reasonable cause to believe that the mobility of the conveyance makes it impracticable to obtain a warrant;

d. In any other exceptional or emergency circumstance where time or opportunity to apply for a warrant is lacking; and

e. In all other situations where a warrant is not constitutionally required.

(5) Except when the owner, operator, or agent in charge of the premises so consents in writing, no inspection authorized by this section shall extend to—

a. Financial data;

b. Sales data other than shipment data;

or

c. Pricing data.

FORFEITURES

SEC. 608. (a) The following shall be subject to forfeiture to the United States and no property right shall exist in them:

(1) All narcotics and dangerous drugs which have been manufactured, distributed, dispensed or acquired in violation of the provisions of this Act;

(2) All raw materials, products and equipment of any kind which are used, or intended for use, in manufacturing, compounding, processing, delivering, importing, or exporting any narcotic or dangerous drug in violation of the provisions of this Act;

(3) All property which is used, or intended for use, as a container for property described in subsections (1) and (2);

(4) All conveyances including aircraft, vehicles, or vessels, which are used, or intended for use, to transport, or in any manner to facilitate the transportation, sale, receipt, possession, or concealment of property described in (1) or (2) except that:

a. No conveyance used by any person as a common carrier in the transaction of business as a common carrier shall be subject to forfeiture.

b. No conveyance shall be forfeited under the provisions of this section by reason of

any act or omission established by the owner thereof to have been committed or omitted by any person other than such owner while such conveyance was unlawfully in the possession of a person other than the owner in violation of the criminal laws of the United States, or of any State; and

(5) All books, records, and research, including formulas, microfilm, tapes, and data which are used, or intended for use, in violation of this Act.

(b) Any property subject to forfeiture to the United States under this Act may be seized by the Attorney General upon process issued pursuant to the Supplemental Rules for Certain Admiralty and Maritime Claims by any district court of the United States having jurisdiction over the property except that seizure without such process may be made when—

(1) The seizure is incident to an arrest or a search under a search warrant or an inspection under an administrative inspection warrant;

(2) The property subject to seizure has been the subject of a prior judgment in favor of the United States in a criminal injunction or forfeiture proceeding under this Act;

(3) The Attorney General has probable cause to believe that the property is directly or indirectly dangerous to health or safety; or,

(4) The Attorney General has probable cause to believe that the property has been used or intended to be used in violation of this Act.

In the event of seizure pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4) of this subsection, proceedings under subsection (d) of this section shall be instituted promptly.

(c) Property taken or detained under this section shall not be retrievable, but shall be deemed to be in the custody of the Attorney General, who shall—

(1) Place the property under seal;

(2) Remove the property to a place designated by him; or,

(3) Require that the General Services Administration take custody of the property and remove it to an appropriate location for disposition in accordance with law.

(d) All provisions of law relating to the seizure, summary and judicial forfeiture, and condemnation of property for violation of the customs laws, the disposition of such property or the proceeds from the sale thereof, the remission or mitigation of such forfeitures, and the compromise of claims and the award of compensation to informers in respect of such forfeitures shall apply to seizures and forfeitures incurred or alleged to have been incurred, under the provisions of this Act, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions hereof: *Provided*, That such duties as are imposed upon the collector of customs or any other person with respect to the seizure and forfeiture of property under the customs laws shall be performed with respect to seizures and forfeitures of property under this Act by such officers, agents, or other persons as may be authorized or designated for that purpose by the Attorney General.

(e) Whenever property is forfeited under this Act the Attorney General may—

(1) Retain the property for official use;

(2) Sell any forfeited property which is not required to be destroyed by law and which is not harmful to the public, provided that the proceeds be disposed of for payment of all proper expenses of the proceedings for forfeiture and sale including expenses of seizure; maintenance of custody, advertising and court costs;

(3) Require that the General Services Administration take custody of the property and remove it for disposition in accordance with law; or

(4) Forward it to the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for disposition. Such

disposition may include delivery for medical or scientific use to any Federal or State agency under regulations of the Attorney General.

(f) All narcotics and dangerous drugs listed in class I or II which are possessed, transferred, sold, or offered for sale in violation of the provisions of this Act shall be deemed contraband and seized and summarily forfeited to the United States. Similarly, all substances listed in class I and II, which are seized or come into the possession of the Government, the owners of which are unknown, shall be deemed contraband and summarily forfeited to the United States.

(g) (1) All species of plants from which narcotics or dangerous drugs in class I or II may be derived which have been planted or cultivated in violation of this Act, or of which the owners or cultivators are unknown, or which are wild growths, may be seized and summarily forfeited to the United States.

(2) The failure, upon demand by the Attorney General, or his duly authorized agent, of the person in occupancy or in control of land or premises upon which such species of plants are growing or being stored, to produce an appropriate license, or proof that he is the holder thereof, shall constitute authority for the seizure and forfeiture.

(3) The Attorney General, or his duly authorized agent, shall have authority to enter upon any lands, or into any dwelling pursuant to a search warrant, to cut, harvest, carry off, or destroy such plants.

INJUNCTIONS

SEC. 609. (a) The district courts of the United States and all courts exercising general jurisdiction in the territories and possessions of the United States shall have jurisdiction in proceedings in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to enjoin violations of this Act.

(b) In case of an alleged violation of an injunction or restraining order issued under this section, trial shall, upon demand of the accused, be by a jury in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

ENFORCEMENT PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 610 Before any violation of this Act is reported by the Director of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to any United States Attorney for institution of a criminal proceeding, the Director may require that the person against whom such proceeding is contemplated be given appropriate notice and an opportunity to present his views, either orally or in writing, with regard to such contemplated proceeding.

IMMUNITY AND PRIVILEGE

SEC. 611. Whenever in the judgment of the United States Attorney the testimony of any witness, or the production of books, papers, or other evidence by any witness, in any case or proceeding before any grand jury or court of the United States with respect to a violation of any provision of this Act, is necessary to the public interest, he, upon the approval of the Attorney General, shall make application to the court that the witness shall be instructed to testify or produce evidence subject to the provisions of this section, and upon order of the court such witness shall not be excused from testifying or from producing books, papers, or other evidence on the grounds that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture. But no such witness shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture for or on account of any transaction, matter, or thing concerning which he is compelled, after having claimed his privilege against self-incrimination to testify or produce evidence, nor shall testimony so compelled be used as evidence in any criminal proceeding, except prosecution described in the next sentence, against him in any court. No witness

shall be exempt under this section from prosecution for perjury or contempt committed while giving testimony or producing evidence under compulsion as provided in this section.

BURDEN OF PROOF, LIABILITIES

SEC. 612. (a) It shall not be necessary for the United States to negate any exemption or exception set forth in this Act in any complaint, information, indictment or other pleading or in any trial, hearing, or other proceeding under this Act, and the burden of proof of any such exemption or exception shall be upon the person claiming its benefit.

(b) In the absence of proof that a person is the duly authorized holder of an appropriate license or order form issued under this Act, he shall be presumed not to be the holder of such license or form, and the burden of proof shall be upon him to rebut such presumption.

(c) The burden of establishing that a vehicle, vessel, or aircraft used in connection with the drugs listed in Class I or II of this Act was used in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be on the persons engaged in such use.

(d) No liability shall be imposed by virtue of this Act upon any duly authorized Federal officer engaged in the enforcement of this Act, or upon any duly authorized officer of any State, Territory, political subdivision thereof, the District of Columbia, or any possession of the United States, who shall be engaged in the enforcement of any law or municipal ordinance relating to narcotics or dangerous drugs.

PAYMENTS AND ADVANCES

SEC. 613. (a) The Attorney General is authorized to pay any person, from funds appropriated for the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, for information concerning a violation of this Act, such sum or sums of money as he may deem appropriate.

(b) Moneys expended from appropriations of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs for purchase of narcotics and dangerous drugs and subsequently recovered shall be reimbursed to the current appropriation for the Bureau.

(c) The Attorney General is authorized to direct the advance of funds by the Treasury Department in connection with the enforcement of this Act.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 614. All final determinations, findings and conclusions of the Attorney General under this Act shall be final and conclusive decisions of the matters involved, except that any person aggrieved by a final decision of the Attorney General may obtain review of the decision in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia or for the Circuit in which his principal place of business is located upon petition filed with the Court and delivered to the Attorney General within 30 days after notice of the decision. Findings of fact by the Attorney General, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive.

TITLE VII—OFFENSES AND PENALTIES

SEC. 701. (a) Except as authorized by this Act, it is unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally:

(1) to distribute, or to possess with intent to distribute, a narcotic or dangerous drug;

(2) to manufacture a narcotic or dangerous drug;

(3) to import any narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II into the United States;

(4) to export any narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II;

(5) to bring or possess on board any vessel, vehicle, or aircraft under the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II, not constituting part of the cargo entered in the manifest or

part of the official supplies of the vessel, vehicle, or aircraft.

(b) It is unlawful for any person to manufacture or to distribute a narcotic or dangerous drug in Class I or II;

(1) intending that such substance be unlawfully imported into the United States; or

(2) knowing that such substance will be unlawfully imported into the United States. This section is intended to reach acts of manufacture or distribution committed outside the territorial jurisdiction of the United States. Any person who violates this Section shall be tried in the United States District Court at the point of entry where such person enters the United States, or in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

(c) Any person who violates this Section with respect to:

(1) A narcotic drug in Class I shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or fined not more than \$25,000, or both.

(2) Any dangerous drug classified in Class II, shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than five years, or fined not more than \$15,000, or both.

(3) A drug classified in Class III shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than one year, or fined not more than \$5,000, or both.

(d) It is unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally to possess a narcotic or dangerous drug unless such substance was obtained directly, or pursuant to a valid prescription or order from a practitioner while acting in the course of his professional practice, or except as otherwise authorized by this Act. Any person who violates this Section shall be sentenced to a term of imprisonment for not more than one year, a fine of not more than \$5,000, or both. Sec. 702. (a) It is unlawful for any person:

(1) who is subject to the requirements of Title V of this Act to distribute or dispense a narcotic or dangerous drug in violation of Section 513.

(2) who is a licensee to manufacture, distribute, or dispense a narcotic or dangerous drug not authorized by his license to another licensee or other authorized person;

(3) to bring a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II into the United States or the special maritime or territorial jurisdiction of the United States for transshipment to another country, or to transfer or transship such a substance from one vessel to another within the United States for immediate exportation or for any other purpose—in violation of Section 504 of this Act;

(4) who is a licensee to omit from any container of a narcotic or dangerous drug the symbol required by Section 509 of this Act;

(5) to remove, alter, or obliterate a symbol required by Section 509 of this Act;

(6) to refuse or fail to make, keep or furnish any record, report, notification, order form, statement, invoice or information required under this Act; or

(7) to refuse any entry into any premises or inspection authorized by this Act.

(b) It is unlawful for any person who is a licensee to manufacture a narcotic or dangerous drug which is—

(1) not expressly authorized by his license and by a quota assigned to him pursuant to Section 510 of this Act; or

(2) in excess of a quota assigned to him pursuant to Section 510 of this Act.

(c) Any person who violates this Section is punishable by a fine of not more than \$25,000. Provided, that if the violation is prosecuted by an information or indictment which alleges that the violation was committed knowingly or intentionally and the trier of fact specifically finds that the violation was committed knowingly or intentionally, such person is punishable by imprisonment for not more than one year, or a fine of not more than \$25,000, or both.

Sec. 703. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly or intentionally—

(1) to distribute a narcotic or dangerous drug classified in Class I or II, except pursuant to an order form as required by Section 512 of this Act;

(2) to use in the course of the manufacture or distribution of a narcotic or dangerous drug a license number which is fictitious, revoked, suspended or issued to another person;

(3) to acquire or obtain possession of a narcotic or dangerous drug by misrepresentation, fraud, forgery, deception or subterfuge;

(4) to furnish false or fraudulent material information in, or omit any material information from, any application, report, or other document required to be kept or filed under this Act, or any record required to be kept by this Act;

(5) to use any communication facility in committing or in causing or facilitating the commission or any act or acts constituting an offense under any provision of this Act. Each separate use of a communication facility shall be a separate offense under this section. For purposes of this subsection, the term "communication facility" means any and all public and private instrumentalities used or useful in the transmission of writing, signs, signals, pictures or sounds of all kinds; it includes mail, telephone, wire, radio, and all other means of communication; and,

(6) to make, distribute, or possess any punch, die, plate, stone, or other thing designed to print, imprint, or reproduce the trademark, trade name, or other identifying mark, imprint, or device of another or any likeness of any of the foregoing upon any drug or container or labeling thereof so as to render such drug a counterfeit drug.

(b) Any person who violates this section is punishable by imprisonment for not more than three years, a fine of not more than \$30,000, or both.

ATTEMPT AND CONSPIRACY

Sec. 704. (a) Any person who attempts to commit any offense defined in this title is punishable by imprisonment and/or a fine which may not exceed $\frac{1}{2}$ the maximum punishment prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the attempt.

(b) Any person who conspires to commit any offense defined in the title is punishable by imprisonment and/or fine which may not exceed the maximum punishment prescribed for the offense, the commission of which was the object of the conspiracy.

Sec. 705. Any penalty imposed for violation of this title shall be in addition to, and not in lieu of, any civil or administrative penalty or sanction authorized by law.

DISTRIBUTION TO PERSONS UNDER AGE EIGHTEEN

Sec. 706. Any person who is at least eighteen years of age who violates subsection (a) (1) of section 701 by distributing a narcotic or dangerous drug to a person under eighteen years of age who is at least three years his junior is punishable by a term of imprisonment up to twice that authorized by subsection (c) of section 701, by the fine authorized by subsection (c) of section 701, or by both.

CONDITIONAL DISCHARGE FOR POSSESSION AS FIRST OFFENSE

Sec. 707. Whenever any person who has not previously been convicted of any offense under this Act or under any statute of the United States or of any State relating to narcotic drugs, marihuana, or stimulant, depressant, or hallucinogenic drugs, pleads guilty to or is found guilty of possession of a narcotic or dangerous drug under subsection 701(d) the court may, without entering a judgment of guilt and with the consent of such person, defer further proceedings and place him on probation upon such

reasonable terms and conditions as it may require. Upon violation of a term or condition, the court may enter an adjudication of guilt and proceed as otherwise provided. Upon fulfillment of the terms and conditions, the court shall discharge such person and dismiss the proceedings against him. Discharge and dismissal under this section shall be without court adjudication of guilt and shall not be deemed a conviction for purposes of disqualifications or disabilities imposed by law upon conviction of a crime (including the additional penalties imposed for second or subsequent convictions under section 708 of this Act). Discharge and dismissal under this section may occur only once with respect to any person.

SECOND OR SUBSEQUENT OFFENSE

Sec. 708. (a) A second or subsequent offense shall be punishable by up to double the maximum penalty provided for the particular offense. The court may, in its discretion, provide that no parole shall be granted to the second or subsequent offender.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a) of this section, an offense shall be considered a second or subsequent offense if, prior to the commission of the offense, the offender has at any time been convicted of an offense or offenses under this Act or under any statute of the United States relating to narcotic, depressant, stimulant, or hallucinogenic drugs.

(c) After conviction of any offense the penalty for which is provided in this Act (but before pronouncement of sentence), the court shall be advised by the United States Attorney whether the conviction is the offender's first or subsequent offense. If it is not a first offense, the United States Attorney shall file an information setting forth the prior convictions, and the offender shall have the opportunity in open court to affirm or deny that he is the person previously convicted. If he denies the identity, sentence shall be postponed to permit a trial before a jury on the sole issue of the offender's identity with the person previously convicted. If the offender is found by the jury to be the person previously convicted or if he acknowledges that he is such person, he shall be sentenced as prescribed in subsection (a) or (b) of this section, as the case may be.

TITLE VIII—ADDICT REHABILITATION CIVIL COMMITMENT IN LIEU OF PROSECUTION

Sec. 801. (a) If the United States district court believes that an eligible individual is an addict, the court may advise him at his first appearance or thereafter at the sole discretion of the court that the prosecution of the criminal charge will be held in abeyance if he elects to submit to an immediate examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. In offering an individual an election, the court shall advise him that if he elects to be examined, he will be confined during the examination for a period not to exceed sixty days; that if he is determined to be an addict who is likely to be rehabilitated, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from the examination or any treatment which may follow; that the treatment may last for thirty-six months; that during treatment, he will be confined in an institution and, at the discretion of the Surgeon General, he may be conditionally released for supervised aftercare treatment in the community; and that if he successfully completes treatment the charge will be dismissed, but if he does not, prosecution on the charge will be resumed. An individual upon being advised that he may elect to submit to an examination shall be permitted a maximum of five days within which to make his election. Except on a showing that a timely election could not have been made, an individual shall be barred from an election after the prescribed period. An individual who elects civil commitment

shall be placed in the custody of the Attorney General or the Surgeon General, as the court directs, for an examination by the Surgeon General during a period not to exceed thirty days. This period may, upon notice to the court and the appropriate United States attorney, be extended by the Surgeon General for an additional thirty days.

(b) The Surgeon General shall report to the court the results of the examination and recommend whether the individual should be civilly committed. A copy of the report shall be made available to the individual and the United States attorney. If the court, acting on the report and other information coming to its attention, determines that the individual is not an addict or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the individual shall be held to answer the abeyant charge. If the court determines that the individual is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall commit him to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment, except that no individual shall be committed under this chapter if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable.

(c) Whenever an individual is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this title the criminal charge against him shall be continued without final disposition and shall be dismissed if the Surgeon General certifies to the court that the individual has successfully completed the treatment program. On receipt of such certification, the court shall discharge the individual from custody and dismiss the charge against him. If prior to such certification the Surgeon General determines that the individual cannot be further treated as a medical problem, he shall advise the court. The court shall thereupon terminate the commitment, and the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

(d) An individual committed for examination or treatment shall not be released on bail or on his own recognizance.

(e) Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

Sec. 802. (a) An individual who is committed to the custody of the Surgeon General for treatment under this title shall not be conditionally released from institutional custody until the Surgeon General determines that he has made sufficient progress to warrant release to a supervisory aftercare authority. If the Surgeon General is unable to make such a determination at the expiration of twenty-four months after the commencement of institutional custody, he shall advise the court and the appropriate United States attorney whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

(b) An individual who is conditionally released from institutional custody shall, while on release, remain in the legal custody of the Surgeon General and shall report for such supervised aftercare treatment as the Surgeon General directs. He shall be subject to home visits and to such physical examination and reasonable regulation of his conduct as the supervisory aftercare authority establishes, subject to the approval of the Surgeon General. The Surgeon General may, at any time, order a conditionally released individual to return for institutional treatment. The Surgeon General's order shall be a sufficient warrant for the supervisory aftercare authority, a probation officer, or any Federal officer authorized to serve criminal process within the United States to ap-

prehend and return the individual to institutional custody as directed. If it is determined that an individual has returned to the use of narcotics, the Surgeon General shall inform the court of the conditions under which the return occurred and make a recommendation as to whether treatment should be continued. The court may affirm the commitment or terminate it and resume the pending criminal proceeding.

(c) The total period of treatment for any individual committed to the custody of the Surgeon General shall not exceed thirty-six months. If, at the expiration of such maximum period, the Surgeon General is unable to certify that the individual has successfully completed his treatment program the pending criminal proceeding shall be resumed.

(d) Whenever a pending criminal proceeding against an individual is resumed under this title, he shall receive full credit toward the service of any sentence which may be imposed for any time spent in the institutional custody of the Surgeon General or the Attorney General or any other time spent in institutional custody in connection with the matter for which sentence is imposed.

Sec. 803. The determination of narcotic addiction and the subsequent civil commitment under this title shall not be deemed a criminal conviction. The results of any tests or procedures conducted by the Surgeon General or the supervisory aftercare authority to determine narcotic addiction may only be used in a further proceeding under this title. They shall not be used against the examined individual in any criminal proceeding except that the fact that he is a narcotic addict may be elicited on his cross-examination as bearing on his credibility as a witness.

Sec. 804. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provision as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under this title by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals who elect civil commitment under this chapter.

Sec. 805. The failure of a court to offer a defendant an election under section 801(a) of this title or a determination relative to civil commitment under this title shall not be reviewable on appeal or otherwise.

SENTENCING TO COMMITMENT FOR TREATMENT

Sec. 806. If the court believes that an eligible offender is an addict, it may place him in the custody of the Attorney General for an examination to determine whether he is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. The Attorney General shall report to the court within thirty days, or any additional period granted by the court, the results of such examination and make any recommendations he deems desirable. An offender shall receive full credit toward the service of his sentence for any time spent in custody for an examination.

Sec. 807. (a) Following the examination provided for in section 806, if the court determines that an eligible offender is an addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall commit him to the custody of the Attorney General for treatment under this chapter, except that no offender shall be committed under this chapter if the Attorney General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment are unavailable. Such commitment shall be for an indeterminate period of time not to exceed ten years, but in no event shall it exceed the maximum sentence that could otherwise have been imposed.

(b) If, following the examination provided for in section 806, the court determines that an eligible offender is not an addict, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, it shall impose such other sentence as may be authorized or required by law.

Sec. 808. An offender committed under section 807(a) may not be conditionally released until he has been treated for six months following such commitment in an institution maintained or approved by the Attorney General for treatment. The Attorney General may then or at any time thereafter report to the Board of Parole whether the offender should be conditionally released under supervision. After receipt of the Attorney General's report, and certification from the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service that the offender has made sufficient progress to warrant his conditional release under supervision, the Board may in its discretion order such a release. In determining suitability for release, the Board may make any investigation it deems necessary. If the Board does not conditionally release the offender, or if a conditional release is revoked, the Board may thereafter grant a release on receipt of a further report from the Attorney General.

Sec. 809. An offender who has been conditionally released shall be under the jurisdiction of the Board as if on parole under the established rules of the Board and shall remain, while conditionally released, in the legal custody of the Attorney General. The Attorney General may contract with any appropriate public or private agency or any person for supervisory aftercare of a conditionally released offender. Upon receiving information that such an offender has violated his conditional release, the Board, or a member thereof, may issue and cause to be executed a warrant for his apprehension and return to custody. Upon return to custody, the offender shall be given an opportunity to appear before the Board, a member thereof, or an examiner designated by the Board, after which the Board may revoke the order of conditional release.

CIVIL COMMITMENT OF PERSONS NOT CHARGED WITH ANY CRIMINAL OFFENSE

Sec. 810. (a) Except as otherwise provided in section 819 of this title, whenever any narcotic addict desires to obtain treatment for his addiction, or whenever a related individual has reason to believe that any person is a narcotic addict, such addict or related individual may file a petition with the United States attorney for the district in which such addict or person resides or is found requesting that such addict or person be admitted to a hospital of the Service for treatment of his addiction. Any such petition filed by a narcotic addict shall set forth his name and address and the facts relating to his addiction. Any such petition filed by a related individual with respect to a person believed by such individual to be a narcotic addict shall set forth the name and address of the alleged narcotic addict and the facts or other data on which the petitioner bases his belief that the person with respect to whom the petition is filed is a narcotic addict.

(b) After considering such petition, the United States attorney shall, if he determines that there is reasonable cause to believe that the person named in such petition is a narcotic addict, and that appropriate State or other facilities are not available to such person, file a petition with the United States district court to commit such person to a hospital of the Service for the treatment as provided in this title. In making his determination with respect to the nonavailability of such facilities, the United States attorney shall consult with the Surgeon General, and other appropriate State or local officials.

(c) Upon the filing of any such petition by a United States attorney, the court may order the patient to appear before it for an

examination by physicians as provided under section 811 of this title and for a hearing, if required, under section 812 of this title. The court shall cause a copy of such petition and order to be served personally upon the patient by a United States marshal.

Sec. 811. The court shall immediately advise any patient appearing before it pursuant to an order issued under subsection (c) of section 810 of his right to have (1) counsel at every stage of the judicial proceedings under this title and that, if he is unable because of financial reasons to obtain counsel, the court will, at the patient's request, assign counsel to represent him; and (2) present for consultation during any examination conducted under this section, a qualified physical retained by such patient, but in no event shall such physician be entitled to participate in any such examination or in the making of any report required under this section with respect to such examination. The court shall also advise such patient that if, after an examination and hearing as provided in this title, he is found to be a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, he will be civilly committed to the Surgeon General for treatment; that he may not voluntarily withdraw from such treatment; that the treatment (including posthospitalization treatment and supervision) may last forty-two months; that during treatment he will be confined in an institution; that for a period of three years following his release from confinement he will be under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment and supervision under a posthospitalization program established by the Surgeon General; and that should he fail or refuse to cooperate in such posthospitalization program or be determined by the Surgeon General to have relapsed to the use of narcotic drugs, he may be recommitted for additional confinement in an institution followed by additional posthospitalization treatment and supervision. After so advising the patient, the court shall appoint two qualified physicians, one of whom shall be a psychiatrist, to examine the patient. For the purpose of the examination, the court may order the patient committed for such reasonable period as it shall determine, not to exceed thirty days, to the custody of the Surgeon General for confinement in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court. Each physician appointed by the court shall, within such period so determined by the court, examine the patient, and file with the court, a written report with respect to such examination. Each such report shall include a statement of the examining physician's conclusions as to whether the patient examined is a narcotic addict and is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment. Upon the filing of such reports, the patient so examined shall be returned to the court for such further proceedings as it may direct under this title. Copies of such reports shall be made available to the patient and his counsel.

Sec. 812. (a) If both examining physicians (referred to in section 811) conclude in their respective written reports that the patient is not a narcotic, or is an addict not likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall immediately enter an order discharging the patient and dismissing the proceedings under this title. If the written report of either such physician indicates that the patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, or that the physician submitting the report is unable to reach any conclusion by reason of the refusal of the patient to submit to a thorough examination, the court shall promptly set the case for hearing. The court shall cause a written notice of the time and place of such hearing to be served personally upon the patient and his attorney. Such notice shall also inform the patient that upon demand made by him within fifteen

days after he has been served, he shall be entitled to have all issues of fact with respect to his alleged narcotic addiction determined by a jury. If no timely demand for a jury is made, the court, in conducting such hearing, shall determine all issues of fact without a jury.

(b) In conducting any hearing under this title, the court shall receive and consider all relevant evidence and testimony which may be offered, including the contents of the reports referred to in section 811. Any patient with respect to whom a hearing is held under this title shall be entitled to testify and to present and cross-examine witnesses. All final orders of commitment under this title shall be subject to review in conformity with the provisions of sections 1254 and 1291 of title 28 of the United States Code.

(c) Any patient with respect to whom a hearing has been set under this title may be detained by the court for a reasonable period of time in a suitable hospital or other facility designated by the court until after such hearing has been concluded.

(d) Witnesses subpoenaed by either party under the provisions of this title shall be paid the same fees and mileage as are paid to other witnesses in the courts of the United States.

SEC. 813. If the court determines after a hearing that such patient is a narcotic addict who is likely to be rehabilitated through treatment, the court shall order him committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General for treatment in a hospital of the Service. The Surgeon General shall submit to the court written reports with respect to such patient at such times as the court may direct. Such reports shall include information as to the health and general condition of the patient, together with the recommendations of the Surgeon General concerning the continued confinement of such patient.

SEC. 814. Any patient committed to the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to section 813 of this title shall be committed for a period of six months, and shall be subject to such posthospitalization program as may be established pursuant to section 815 of this title; except that such patient may be released from confinement by the Surgeon General at any time prior to the expiration of such six-month period if the Surgeon General determines that the patient has been cured of his drug addiction and rehabilitated, or that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable.

SEC. 815. (a) Whenever any patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General pursuant to this title is to be released from confinement in accordance with the provisions thereof, the Surgeon General shall give notice of such pending release to the committing court within ten days prior thereto and shall, at the time of the patient's release, promptly return him to that court. The court, after considering the recommendations of the Surgeon General with respect to posthospitalization treatment for any such patient so returned, may place such patient under the care and custody of the Surgeon General for the three-year period immediately following the patient's release, for treatment and supervision under such posthospitalization program as the Surgeon General may direct.

(b) If, at any time during such three-year period, any patient (1) fails or refuses to comply with the directions and orders of the Surgeon General in connection with such patient's posthospitalization treatment and supervision, or (2) is determined by the Surgeon General to be again using narcotic drugs, the Surgeon General may order such patient's immediate return to the committing court which may recommit such patient to a hospital of the Service for additional treatment for a period of not to exceed

six months, and may require such patient thereafter to submit to a posthospitalization program in accordance with subsection (a) of this section.

SEC. 816. The court, upon the petition of any patient after his confinement pursuant to this title for a period in excess of three months, shall inquire into the health and general condition of the patient and as to the necessity, if any, for his continued confinement. If the court finds, with or without a hearing, that his continued confinement is no longer necessary or desirable, it shall order the patient released from confinement and returned to the court. The court may, with respect to any such patient so returned, place such patient under a posthospitalization program in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of section 815 of this title.

SEC. 817. Any determination by the court pursuant to this title that a patient is a narcotic addict shall not be deemed a criminal conviction, nor shall such patient be denominated a criminal by reason of that determination. The results of any hearing, examination, test, or procedure to determine narcotic addiction of any patient under this title shall not be used against such patient in any criminal proceeding.

SEC. 818. Any physician conducting an examination under this title shall be a competent and compellable witness at any hearing or other proceeding conducted pursuant to this title and the physician-patient privilege shall not be applicable.

SEC. 819. The provisions of this title shall not be applicable with respect to any person against whom there is pending a criminal charge, whether by indictment or by information, which has not been fully determined or who is on probation or whose sentence following conviction on such a charge, including any time on parole or mandatory release, has not been fully served, except that such provision shall be applicable to any such person on probation, parole, or mandatory release if the authority authorized to require his return to custody consents to his commitment.

SEC. 820. Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, no patient shall be committed to a hospital of the Service under this title if the Surgeon General certifies that adequate facilities or personnel for treatment of such patient are unavailable.

SEC. 821. Physicians appointed by the court to examine any person pursuant to this title and counsel assigned by the court to represent any person in judicial proceedings under this title shall be entitled to reasonable compensation, in an amount to be determined by the court, to be paid, upon order of the court, out of such funds as may be provided by law.

SEC. 822. (a) The Surgeon General may from time to time make such provisions as he deems appropriate authorizing the performance of any of his functions under that title by any other officer or employee of the Public Health Service, or with the consent of the head of the Department or Agency concerned, by any Federal or other public or private agency or officer or employee thereof.

(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to enter into arrangements with any public or private agency or any person under which appropriate facilities or services of such agency or person will be made available, on a reimbursable basis or otherwise, for the examination or treatment of individuals pursuant to the provisions of this title.

SEC. 823. Whoever escapes or attempts to escape while committed to institutional custody for examination or treatment under this title, or whoever rescues or attempts to rescue or instigates, aids, or assists the escape or attempt to escape of such a person, shall be subject to the penalties provided in sections 751 and 752 of title 18, United States Code.

SEC. 824. Any person who knowingly makes any false statement to the United

States attorney in any petition under section 810(a) of this title shall be subject to the penalty prescribed in section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

REHABILITATION AND POSTHOSPITALIZATION CARE PROGRAMS AND ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

SEC. 824. The Surgeon General is authorized to continue, as an integral part of the program of treatment for narcotic addiction authorized by section 341 of the Public Health Service Act, outpatient services to (1) provide guidance and give psychological help and supervision to patients and other individuals released from hospitals of the Service after treatment for narcotic drug addiction, utilizing all available resources of local, public and private agencies, and (2) assist States and municipalities in developing treatment programs and facilities for individuals so addicted, including posthospitalization treatment programs and facilities for the care and supervision of narcotic addicts released after confinement under this or any other Act providing for treatment of drug addiction. The Surgeon General shall take into consideration in supplying such services the extent of drug addiction in the various States and political subdivisions thereof and the willingness of such States and subdivisions to cooperate in developing a sound program for the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

SEC. 825. It is hereby authorized to be appropriated sums necessary to continue to enable the Surgeon General (1) to make grants to States and political subdivisions thereof and to private organizations and institutions (A) for the development of field testing and demonstration programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction, (B) for the development of specialized training programs or materials relating to the provision of public health services for the treatment of narcotic addiction, or the development of in-service training or short term or refresher courses with respect to the provision of such services, (C) for training personnel to operate, supervise, and administer such services, and (D) for the conducting of surveys evaluating the adequacy of the programs for the treatment of narcotic addiction within the several States with a view to determining ways and means of improving, extending, and expanding such programs; and (2) to enter into jointly financed cooperative arrangements with State and local governments and public and private organizations and institutions with a view toward the developing, constructing, operating, staffing, and maintaining of treatment centers and facilities (including posthospitalization treatment centers and facilities) for narcotic addicts within the States.

(b) Payments under this section may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Surgeon General, and shall be made on such conditions as the Surgeon General determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

(c) The Surgeon General is authorized to issue appropriate rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this title.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS

SEC. 826. The Board of Parole is hereby directed to review the sentences of any prisoner who before the effective date of this Act was made ineligible for parole by section 7237(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and (1) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to marijuana or (2) who was convicted of a violation of a law relating to narcotic drugs and had not attained his twenty-sixth birthday prior to such convictions. After conducting such review the Board of Parole may authorize the release of such prisoner on parole pursuant to section 4202 of title 18, United States Code.

If the Board of Parole finds that there are reasonable grounds to believe that such prisoner may benefit from the treatment provided under the Federal Youth Corrections Act (18 U.S.C., ch. 402), it may place such prisoner in the custody of the Youth Corrections Division of the Board of Parole for treatment and supervision pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Youth Corrections Act. Action taken by the Board of Parole under this section shall not cause any prisoner to serve a longer term than would be served under his original sentence.

REHABILITATED ADDICTS

SEC. 827. In accordance with the requirements of this title an addict committed pursuant to section 807(a) may at the expiration of twelve months from the date of his final discharge petition the district court within the jurisdiction and venue of his conviction to set aside his conviction. If the court grants the petition, the petitioner shall be deemed not convicted of a crime for any purpose including disqualification or disabilities imposed by law for the conviction of a crime, additional penalties imposed for second and subsequent convictions under Federal or State statutes. A petitioner under this section although he may apply more than once, may only have one adjudication setting aside his conviction.

SEC. 828. In considering the petition under section 827, the District Court shall review the entire record of the petitioner, including his medical record and as a condition precedent to granting a petition under this section shall find as a fact that the petitioner is no longer an addict. This procedure shall be conducted in an informal manner and the petitioner has the burden of proving by a preponderance of evidence that he is no longer an addict.

COOPERATION WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

SEC. 829. The Surgeon General and the Attorney General are authorized to give representatives of States and local subdivisions thereof the benefit of their experience in the care, treatment, and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts so that each State may be encouraged to provide adequate facilities and personnel for the care and treatment of narcotic addicts in its jurisdiction.

TITLE IX—MISCELLANEOUS

PENDING PROCEEDINGS

SEC. 901. (a) Prosecutions for any violation of law occurring prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by these repealers or amendments, or abated by reason thereof.

(b) Civil seizures or forfeitures and injunctive proceedings commenced prior to the effective date of this Act shall not be affected by these repealers or amendments, or abated by reason thereof.

(c) All administrative proceedings, except those placing drugs under control pending before the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs on the effective date of this enactment shall be continued and brought to final determination in accord with laws and regulations in effect prior to the date of this enactment.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall be applicable to violations of law seizures and forfeitures injunctive proceedings administrative proceedings and investigations which occur following its effective date.

CONTINUATION OF REGULATIONS

SEC. 902. Any orders, rules, and regulations which have been promulgated under any law affected by this Act and which are in effect on the day preceding enactment of this title shall continue in effect until modified, superseded or repealed by the Attorney General.

SEVERABILITY

SEC. 903. If a provision of this Act is held invalid all valid provisions that are severable shall remain in effect. If a provision of this

Act is held invalid in one or more of its applications the provision shall remain in effect in all its valid applications that are severable.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 904. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 905. This Act shall take effect on the one hundred and eightieth day following the date of its enactment.

REPEALERS

SEC. 906. (a) The following laws or provisions of law are hereby repealed:

(1) Sections 1 and 2 of the Act of February 23, 1887, as amended (title 21, sections 191 through 193);

(2) Act of February 9, 1909, as amended (title 21, sections 171, 173, 174 through 184, 185);

(3) Section 1 of the Act of March 28, 1928, as amended (title 31, section 529a);

(4) Section 6 of the Act of June 14, 1930 (title 21, section 173a);

(5) Sections 7 and 8 of the Act of June 14, 1930, as amended (title 21, sections 197, 198);

(6) Act of July 3, 1930 (title 21, section 199);

(7) Section 6 of the Act of August 7, 1939 (title 31, section 529g);

(8) Act of December 11, 1942, as amended (title 21, sections 188 through 188n);

(9) Sections 4701 through 4776 of title 26, United States Code;

(10) Sections 7237 and 7238 of title 26, United States Code;

(11) Section 7491 of title 26, United States Code;

(12) Sections 1 through 3 of the Act of August 11, 1955 (title 21, sections 198a through c);

(13) Section 15 of the Act of August 1, 1956 (title 48, section 1421m);

(14) Section 1 of the Act of July 18, 1956, as amended (title 21, section 184a);

(15) Act of April 22, 1960 (title 21, sections 501 through 517);

(16) Section 3 of the Act of July 15, 1965, as amended (title 21, sections 321(v), 360a);

(17) Section 5 of the Act of July 15, 1965, as amended (title 21, section 331(q));

(18) Sections 2901 through 2906 of title 28, United States Code;

(19) Sections 4251 through 4255 of title 18, United States Code;

(20) Sections 301 through 316 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966 (title 42, sections 3401 through 3426);

(21) Sections 401 and 402 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966 (title 42, sections 3441 and 3442);

(22) Section 502 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966, 80 Stat. 1449;

(23) Section 603 of the Act of Nov. 8, 1966, 80 Stat. 1449;

(24) Sections 1401 through 1407 of title 18, United States Code;

(25) Section 3616 of title 18, United States Code.

(b) However, no rights and duties which matured, penalties which were incurred and proceedings which were begun before the effective date of this Act shall be prejudiced because of the repeal of the above Acts.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 907. (1) Section 1114 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "the Bureau of Narcotics" and inserting "the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs".

(2) Section 1952 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by—

(1) inserting in subsection (b)(1) the words "dangerous drugs," immediately following the word "narcotics";

(2) striking subsection (c) and substituting the following new section:

"(c) Investigation of violations under this Section involving liquor shall be conducted under the supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury. Investigation of violations under sections involving narcotics and dangerous drugs shall be conducted under the supervision of the Attorney General."

(3) Section 4251(a) of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended," and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(4) Section 584 of the Act of June 17, 1930, as amended (title 19, section 1584), is amended by striking out the last sentence of the second paragraph and substituting the following new sentence: "The words opiate and marihuana as used in this paragraph shall have the same meaning as defined in the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(5) Section (a) of section 7 of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 333), is amended by deleting all words and marks beginning with "Provided, however . . ." after the word "fine" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

(6) Section 6(a) of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 334(a)), is amended by striking out subsections 2(A), and 2(D) and the words "of such a depressant or stimulant drug or" in subsection 2(C) and relettering (B), (C), and (E) as (A), (B), and (C).

(7) Section 6(b) of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 334(d)(3)(III)), is amended by striking out in subsection (3) (iii) the words "depressant or stimulant drugs or".

(8) Section 4 of the Act of July 15, 1965 (title 21, section 360), is amended by striking out subsections (a)(2), (b), (c), (d) and renumbering subsection (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), (a)(6), and (a)(7) as (a)(2), (a)(3), (a)(4), (a)(5), and (a)(6).

(9) Section 8 of the Act of July 15, 1965, (title 21, section 372(e)), is amended by striking out the words "to depressant or stimulant drugs or".

(10) Section 801(a) of the Act of June 25, 1938, as amended, (Title 21, section 381(a)) is amended by striking out the words "section 173 of this title" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(11) Section 4901(a) of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "4721 (narcotic drugs), or 4751 (marihuana)" and by inserting the word "or" before the number "4461".

(12) Section 4905(b) of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "narcotics, marihuana," and "4722, 4753".

(13) Section 6808 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (8) and renumbering subsections (9), (10), (11), (12), and (13), as (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12).

(14) Section 7012 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (a) and (b) and renumbering (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) as (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h).

(15) Section 7103 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (d)(3)(D) and renumbering (E) and (F) as (D) and (E).

(16) Section 7326 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsection (b) and relettering (c) as (b).

(17) Section 7607 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting all words prior to the word "officers" and by capitalizing the word "officer"; and by deleting in subsection (2) the words "section 4731" and "section 4761" and inserting in subsection (2) in lieu thereof the words "Omnibus Narcotic and

Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969."

(18) Section 7651 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by deleting the words "except as otherwise provided in this subchapter and in sections 4705(b), 4735, and 4762 (relating to taxes on narcotic drugs and marihuana)."

(19) Section 7655 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections and (4).

(20) Section 7609 of title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out subsections (a) (3) and (a) (4) and renumbering (5) and (6) as (3) and (4).

(21) Section 7641 and title 26, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "opium suitable for smoking purposes,".

(22) Section 2901(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended," and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(23) Section 3 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529d), is amended by striking out the words "or the Commissioner of Narcotics, as the case may be,".

(24) Section 4 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529e) is amended by striking out the words "or narcotics" and "or narcotic".

(25) Section 5 of the Act of August 7, 1939, (title 31, section 529f) is amended by striking out the words "or narcotics".

(26) Section 308(c) (2) of the Act of August 27, 1935 (title 40, section 304(m)) is amended by striking out the words "as defined in section 171 of title 21," and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(27) Section 302(a) of the Act of July 1, 1944 (title 42, section 242(a)) as amended by striking out the words "Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act" and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(28) Section 301(a) of the Act of November 8, 1966 (title 42, section 3411) is amended by striking out the words "section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(29) Section 1(a) of the Act of July 15, 1954 (title 46, section 239a) is amended by striking out the words "paragraph (a) of the first section of the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, as amended, 21 U.S.C., section 171(a)" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969"; and by striking out the words "section 3238(b) of the Internal Revenue Code" and substituting "the Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

(30) Section 7(d) of the Act of August 9, 1939 (title 49, section 787) is amended by striking out the words "Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act, the internal revenue laws or any amendments thereof, or the regulations issued thereunder"; and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969"; and striking out the words "Marihuana Tax Act of 1937 or the regulations issued thereunder" and substituting "Omnibus Narcotic and Dangerous Drug Control and Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1969".

U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDEAST

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the Big Four conference on the Middle East, now in progress in New York, constitutes a

very serious threat to the vital interests of America's only ally in that area, the State of Israel. I rise today to call upon the President and the Secretary of State of the United States to resist proposed "compromises" that would serve only to compromise Israel's vital interests, and with them our own.

Two of the participants in the present conference, France and the Soviet Union, are openly hostile to Israel and have repeatedly demanded that it submit itself to a return of the intolerable conditions that existed prior to the 6-day war of 1967. A third participant, Great Britain, appears eager to achieve "peace at any price" in the Middle East—but the price would have to be paid by Israel. Only the United States among the Big Four can prevent the kind of sellout that the Government and people of Israel so justifiably fear will be the bitter fruits of current negotiations. And sellout there will be if President Nixon and Secretary Rogers permit the traditional pro-Arab interests in the State Department to seize the initiative in New York.

Let us be very clear about the basic facts of the situation. First of all, as I have already stated, Israel is America's only ally in the Middle East. The Arab States are either open clients of the Soviet Union—as they were of Nazi Germany during World War II—or else they are available as clients to the highest bidder. Israel alone is fully a democracy, fully committed to the ideals of Western civilization, and unwilling to sell its birthright for a mess of armaments and oil contracts.

Second, Mr. President, Israel is the one ally we have outside Western Europe that can stand on its own feet economically and militarily in the face of threats from its own neighbors. That is an immensely sobering fact when we consider the price we have paid for such other allies as South Korea and South Vietnam. For us now to join its enemies in forcing Israel into a position where it would no longer be able to defend itself against a renewed onslaught by Soviet-armed Arab forces, would be a blunder of colossal proportions. It would be a Munich all over again. And we, like the British and French of three decades ago, would find ourselves faced with the impossible choice of either allowing a faithful ally to be overwhelmed by an aggressor or having to commit our own blood and treasure to the defense of what we ourselves had rendered indefensible.

The third basic fact we must confront is that America's own vital interests are at stake today in the Middle East. The destruction of Israel—the professed goal of the Arab States for the past 22 years—would be a disaster for America second only to the collapse of Western Europe.

To understand this fully, we need first to recognize just how dangerous the present situation really is—how close that tormented region is to a renewal of full-scale fighting. I do not say, "how close to being at war," for, of course, the Middle East is at war. Arab terrorists declared war on Israel over a year ago, and have had time and money to turn 10,000 irregulars, in four terrorist organizations, into a fighting force which actually does

make war on Israel. They have bases in Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon, they openly proclaim their deeds—even to the point of falsely but monstrosly claiming credit for the death of Israel's late, great Premier Levi Eshkol—and ceaselessly proclaim their intent "to dismember Israel as a state."

I repeat, Mr. President, they want "to dismember Israel as a state." Those are the words of the man who calls himself Abu Amar, the leader of the terrorist group, Al Fatah. He spoke them in an interview with the official Cairo newspaper El Ahram, and went on to say that Israel has a "racial character" which is "Fascist" and "must be removed."

To be sure, far more savage threats have been hurled against Israel over the years, not alone by terrorists but by the heads of Arab States. But what lends special menace to the words of terrorists is that, unlike the legitimate and politically responsible leaders of nations, such as President Nasser and King Hussein, who can never ignore the military realities that confront them, terrorist leaders can indulge in virtually any act of provocation so long as it promises at least a propaganda payoff. So, for example, when the terrorist attack on an Israeli commercial airliner in Athens was answered by a surgically clean Israel retaliatory raid against the home base of the attackers, the United Nations promptly, and hypocritically, condemned Israel, to the general applause of that portion of world public opinion which is notable more for its sanctimony than for its logic. And a subsequent terrorist attack on an Israel plane in Switzerland met with no response at all, either from the United Nations, which prefers to look the other way in such cases, or by Israel itself, which was under enormous pressure from Washington and London to "show restraint."

The point I wish to make is that while Arab government leaders can be expected to be effectively deterred from attacking Israel so long as Israel maintains its present military superiority, terrorist organizations operate under no such calculable constraints. They are free to perpetrate outrage after outrage with fear of no greater penalty than the possible loss of a few lives—a loss which, in their view, is amply repaid by the propaganda triumph it invariably brings.

But how long, Mr. President, can we expect Israel—or any other state—to tolerate the intolerable? How long can we expect this brave and vigorous nation to submit to having war waged against it and refrain from striking back in the only way that can bring the conflict to a successful and definitive conclusion? Arab governments are either unwilling or unable to halt terrorist activities within their own borders. I suspect it is more a case of inability than of unwillingness, but even if true, that is cold comfort to the beleaguered people of Israel. Sooner or later they are going to have to strike down terrorism at its source—within the protective confines of Arab State borders. And thus full-scale fighting will once again engulf the whole unhappy region.

Adding still greater menace to the sit-

uation is President Nasser's recent threat to employ regular military forces in attacks on Israel by way of retaliation for Israel's retaliatory and preemptive strikes against terrorist bases in Arab States. It takes little foresight to recognize that such an act on Nasser's part would provoke an immediate resumption of hostilities, with little or no prospect that either side would be willing to settle for yet another thoroughly unsatisfactory armistice. The world would then be faced with the grim consequences of either of two outcomes: total Israel victory over and occupation of most of its neighbors—a result absolutely unacceptable to the Soviet Union—or total Arab victory over Israel—a result equally unacceptable to the United States.

This brings me, Mr. President, to the central point I want to make on this whole matter. It is that the Arab-Israel conflict has ramifications extending far beyond the borders of the Middle East. It involves the vital interests of the Soviet Union as well as those of the United States, and therefore, quite literally, the peace of the world.

Throughout its modern history, Russia has striven to achieve a position of power and influence in the eastern Mediterranean and the Middle East generally. Given its geographical position and given the economic and military stakes involved, this was not an unreasonable ambition. At least it would be difficult to make the case that Britain, France, Germany, and now the United States have some sort of "natural rights" in that area that Russia did not or does not have. But Russian claims were successfully resisted throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries, and it was not until very recent years—barely a decade ago—that the Soviet Union finally established itself unchallengeably as a Middle East power. And that is the reality we must now confront, like it or not. Not only is the Soviet Union firmly entrenched economically, politically, and militarily in the area; it has chosen to tie its prestige and position to the fate of the Arab States. As a result, any definitive Arab defeat by Israel would inescapably entail a setback of historic dimensions to Soviet policy and position in this strategically crucial region. It would be foolhardy of us to suppose that the Russians would accept any such disaster in their own backyard.

How then are American vital interests involved in the Middle East? Let us put to one side—though without forgetting—the profound moral commitment we have to the State of Israel and to its 2½ million Jewish citizens who would face extermination or slavery in the event of a conclusive Arab victory. Let us instead, Mr. President, consider only the direct material consequences to the United States of the destruction of Israel.

Hardeyed realists among us like to point out that, in the words of one editorialist:

The Arabs have nine times the Israeli gross national product, and represent an incalculably greater amount of U.S. investment potential as well as actual.

Others are tireless in their reminders to us that, as another commentator remarked:

Economically and commercially, the Arab world is very important to the United States and vital to all of Europe.

And so it is. Not even the staunchest friends of Israel have ever denied it. But contrary to what Marxist theoreticians and certain American bankers and editorialists appear to believe, a great nation's foreign policy must take into account more than the monetary value of its investments in a given area. Especially is this true when the competitors for influence in the area, as well as the inhabitants themselves, regard economic relations as strictly secondary to other values—military security, for example, or national independence.

This is precisely the case, Mr. President, in the Middle East today, where the Soviet Union has shown itself determined to achieve not only influence but dominance, and willing to pay almost any price for it short of nuclear war. To this we must add the fact that most Arab States have demonstrated time and again a willingness to subordinate economics to ideology. Were this not the case, peace in the area would long since have been achieved, and Arabs and Israelis would today be working together in one of mankind's most fruitful partnerships. The very fact that, for more than two decades, Arab leaders have been willing to sacrifice orderly economic growth to military adventurism in their lust to destroy Israel should make even the most shortsighted among us dubious about the value and security of American investments in those nations.

This much is certain: if the Arab States, bearing Soviet arms and operating under Soviet auspices, should succeed in destroying Israel, Western influence in the Middle East will be at an end. We will have lost, as I said at the outset, the one and only dependable ally we have there—dependable not only in the sense of its commitment to the same political and spiritual ideals, but in the sense as well that it has the one thoroughly stable government and the one first-class army in the whole region. The result would be a Soviet fiefdom—a Middle East in which no Western-oriented counterbalance would exist to inhibit the deployment of Soviet military and economic power throughout the area from Algeria to Iraq. How long, in those circumstances, could we realistically expect Iran and Turkey to remain outside the Russian orbit? What possible incentive could they have for resisting the immense weight of Soviet influence that would then be brought to bear?

Plainly put, Israel is the linchpin of America's position in the Middle East. And that is why it is imperative that our negotiators at the Big Four conference in New York must resist any proposed "compromise" along the lines made so tiresomely familiar by Soviet and Arab spokesmen in the United Nations. We must not attempt to force Israel to surrender the substance of military security for the shadow of vague big power "guarantees."

In the final analysis, Mr. President, peace will come to the Middle East when, and only when, the direct parties to the

conflict sit down together and together resolve their differences. This, in turn, will come when, and only when, the Arab States are prepared to concede the most elementary point in international relations: Israel's right to exist. And that, finally, will come when, and only when, Israel's own strength and America's firmness of purpose make it finally and unequivocally clear that Israel is not going to be overwhelmed by the weight of Arab numbers and Soviet arms.

That, Mr. President, should be the message that is heard loud and clear when the Big Four meeting is over. That is the message that will bring lasting peace to the Middle East.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President (Mr. SCHWEIKER in the chair), will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARTKE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I interrupt the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana at this time to state that he has delivered a magnificent address, a very important address, one which should appeal to all Americans. I desire to associate myself with every statement that the Senator from Indiana has made.

We Americans have reason to be proud that we helped create the State of Israel. We are proud of Israel and the achievements of this great, brave people.

The Senator has rendered a real and needful public service in the Senate today, by speaking out boldly, as he has, in support of the State of Israel.

Mr. HARTKE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Ohio. To have his endorsement is to have the endorsement of one of the most fearless, hard-working, and perceptive minds in the Senate, and I treasure his comments.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I thank the Senator from my neighbor State for his comments. I desire to associate myself with every statement he has made today.

THE PROPOSED COMMUTER TAX IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Washington City Council has proposed a payroll tax on the earnings of Virginia and Maryland residents who work in the District of Columbia. This is the second time in little over a year that this "commuter tax," as it is called, has been recommended by the Council.

Such a commuter tax would be unjust. I opposed the tax when it was recommended in December of 1967. I shall oppose it again.

The citizens of Virginia and Maryland who work in Washington, like all other American taxpayers, help support the city through general Federal taxation.

The current Federal budget carries the figure of \$173 million as the outlay from Federal taxes which will be given to the District of Columbia government. Indeed, payments probably will greatly exceed this figure.

Advocates say many other cities levy a commuter tax; but they do not point out that other cities do not receive the Federal subsidy that the District of Columbia does. The money for this large subsidy comes from the pockets of all the taxpayers of the United States.

Besides paying their share of District expenses through general Federal taxes, residents of Virginia and Maryland who work in Washington pay sales taxes when they make purchases in the city.

The level of the proposed commuter tax—one-fourth of 1 percent of earnings—may seem low, but I feel that once established in principle, the tax would rise rapidly in amount.

As a matter of fact, even before the tax proposal has come before Congress, the Washington City Council is talking about raising the level to 1 percent.

This proposed tax on Virginians and Marylanders should be rejected.

S. 1897—INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I introduced today, for myself and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), a higher education bill of rights. This measure would strengthen and expand Federal programs of financial assistance to low-income students, insuring an equal opportunity for all Americans to pursue a high-quality postsecondary education. It would also strengthen colleges and universities through cost-of-education allowances and other supplementary funds.

In 1967, the Carnegie Foundation for the advancement of education created a 15-member commission on higher education. Chaired by a distinguished educator, Clark Kerr, the commission's mandate was to examine and make recommendations regarding the vital issues of higher education which we face today and for the future. In December 1968, the commission published a report entitled "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education." The report discusses the commission's findings to date with regard to the needs of higher education, and it recommends specific Federal action necessary to meet these needs.

The bill which I introduce today incorporates the major recommendations of the commission. While I do not necessarily endorse all of the specifics, I feel that their stress on greater Federal effort in education, and their basic suggestions on new directions which this effort should take, are sound and constructive. The report and the resulting legislation provide the basis for a full review of our Federal higher education programs. Congressmen OGDEN REID and JOHN BRADEMAs have introduced quite similar legislation, based on the Carnegie Commission report in the House of Representatives, and I am hopeful that both the Senate and the House will move ahead to consider these and other ideas. I plan to continue to work on issues in the field of higher education, and perhaps to submit further legislation at a later time.

The urgency is clear. Today's enrollment in higher education of 6 million students will rise to 8 million by 1976, or 9 million if the necessary programs to remove financial barriers for low-income students are carried out. And the imbalance at present is shocking: almost half of the undergraduate students in

the United States come from the Nation's highest family quartile, while only 7 percent come from the lowest income quartile.

As we look to the future, and especially when our heavy expenditures in Vietnam are reduced, our priorities must include a massive commitment to education at all levels—compensatory and higher. I support and will strongly work for such a commitment.

Finally, Mr. President, I would like to commend Dr. Kerr and the members of his commission—including two distinguished educators from my own State of Massachusetts, Dr. Nathan M. Pusey, president of Harvard University, and Dr. David Riesman, professor of social sciences at Harvard—for the impressive work they are doing in pointing the way to meet tomorrow's needs. It has been a pleasure for me to work with Dr. Kerr on this bill, and I look forward to the commission's further ideas and findings in this vital area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a brief summary of the bill, the report of the Carnegie Commission, and a copy of the bill itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, summary of the bill, and report will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1897) to remove financial barriers so that all individuals will have equal opportunity for a postsecondary education of good quality, to strengthen institutions of higher education, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY (for himself and other Senators), 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:

S. 1897

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 "Higher Education Bill of Rights."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act to assist in making it financially possible for qualified individuals from all socioeconomic backgrounds to receive the benefits of higher education and to assist institutions of higher education in assuring that quality higher education is available throughout the entire Nation.

AMENDMENTS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT PROGRAM

SEC. 3. Effective after June 30, 1970, part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out sections 401 through 407 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 401. (a) It is the purpose of this part to provide educational opportunity grants to assist in making available the benefits of higher education to qualified individuals who need financial assistance to obtain such benefits.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$900,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$1,000,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$1,100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$1,300,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; \$1,400,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975; students who receive

educational opportunity grants under this part.

"AMOUNT OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT

"SEC. 402. (a) From the funds available to carry out this part for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall make payments through institutions of higher education to students who receive educational opportunity grants under this part for each academic year during which the grant recipient is in need of financial aid to pursue a course of study at an institution of higher education, in an amount which shall not exceed \$1,000, in the case of full-time students or such lesser amount in the case of part-time students, as the Commissioner shall by regulation determine.

"(b) The Commissioner shall prescribe basic criteria and schedules for determining the eligibility of applicants for educational opportunity grants and for determining the amount which each such grant recipient shall be entitled to receive each year for the duration of the grant, subject to annual re-determination where circumstances change. In prescribing such basic criteria and schedules, the Commissioner shall take into account the objective of making aid under this part available to students whose family incomes do not exceed the level below which are the incomes of three-fifths of the families in the population of the United States, and such other factors as he may deem relevant, including the number and ages of dependents in the student's family, the number of such dependents attending an institution of higher education at the same time, total family income over the past several years and total family assets. Priority shall be given to undergraduate students, but the program shall also be available to graduate and professional students. No payment shall be made under this part to a student otherwise eligible to receive payments pursuant to an educational opportunity grant unless the amount of the payment for that academic year, as determined in accordance with this section, would be at least \$200.

"ELIGIBILITY FOR AND DURATION OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

"SEC. 403. (a) An individual shall not be eligible to receive an educational opportunity grant under this part and shall not continue to be entitled to receive payments thereunder this part unless—

"(1) that individual has been accepted for enrollment as a student at an institution of higher education or in the case of a student already attending an institution of higher education, is in good standing there, as an undergraduate student or as a graduate or professional student; and

"(2) such student is carrying at least one-half the normal full-time academic workload as determined by the institution.

An individual shall not be eligible to continue to receive payments under this part if the Commissioner determines that the recipient no longer shows evidence of academic or creative promise and capability of maintaining good standing in his course of study, or that he no longer is of exceptional financial need.

"(b) The duration of an educational opportunity grant under this part shall be the period required for completion by the recipient of his undergraduate course of study and two years of graduate or professional study, except that such period shall not exceed six academic years less any period with respect to which the recipient has previously received payments under this part pursuant to a prior educational opportunity grant.

"APPLICATION FOR EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANTS

"SEC. 404. (a) Application for a grant under this part shall be made at such time and in such manner, and shall contain or be supported by such information, as may be prescribed by the Commissioner.

"(b) (1) The Commissioner is authorized to enter into agreements with one or more public or private nonprofit agencies to carry out functions or make determinations on his behalf, prescribed in this part, and to carry out such other functions as he may deem appropriate, related to the determination of eligibility of individuals for educational opportunity grants and the amounts of payments to them. The Commissioner shall reserve the right to review, upon his own initiative or that of any interested party, any finding, determination, or other action by such agency. Each such agreement shall provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds paid to the agency under paragraph (2), and for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as may be necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this part.

"(2) The Commissioner is authorized to pay each agency with which he has entered into an agreement under paragraph (1) such amounts as the Commissioner determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient execution by such agency of its functions under this part. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to make such payments.

"(c) The Commissioner shall notify both the applicant and the institution of higher education in which he is enrolled, or has been accepted for enrollment, of the award of the educational opportunity grant and the amount thereof for each year. The Commissioner shall utilize the services of institutions of higher education for paying to students attending them the amounts to which they are entitled.

"SUPPLEMENTARY MATCHING GRANTS TO EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY GRANT RECIPIENTS

"Sec. 405. In addition to payments which educational opportunity grant recipients are entitled to receive in accordance with the preceding sections of this part for any year, the Commissioner is authorized to make a supplementary grant equal to the total amount of grant assistance made available to such recipient from non-Federal sources for study at an institution of higher education; but the amount of such supplementary grant may not exceed one-half of the total grant assistance available to the student under this part (not including this section or section 406). For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$230,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

"FEDERAL GRANTS FOR INSTITUTIONAL SCHOLARSHIP FUNDS

"Sec. 406. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make annual payments to institutions of higher education (other than proprietary institutions of higher education) in amounts equal to 10 per centum of the sum of all payments for that year pursuant to educational opportunity grants (not including supplementary grants) to students who are pursuing their courses of study at each such institution. Such payments shall be used by the institution for making scholarship grants to students whom the institution finds to be in financial need thereof (whether or not such student receives aid under other provisions of this part.)

"(b) An institution of higher education which desires to obtain funds under this section shall enter into an agreement with the Commissioner. Such agreement shall—

(1) provide that the institution, in cooperation with other institutions of higher education where appropriate, will make vigorous efforts to identify qualified youths of

exceptional financial need and to encourage them to continue their education beyond secondary school through programs and activities such as—

(A) establishing or strengthening close working relationships with secondary school principals and guidance and counseling personnel with a view toward motivating students to complete secondary school and pursue post-secondary-school educational opportunities, and

(B) making, to the extent feasible, conditional commitments for scholarship grants to qualified secondary school students with special emphasis on students enrolled in grade 11 or lower grades who show evidences of academic or creative promise;

(2) provide assurance that the institution will continue to spend in its own scholarship and student-aid program, from sources other than funds received under this part, not less than the average expenditure per year made for that purpose during the most recent period of three fiscal years preceding the effective date of the agreement;

(3) include such other provisions as may be necessary to protect the financial interest of the United States and promote the purposes of this part.

(c) For the purpose of carrying out this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$90,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$110,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$130,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$140,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975.

COST OF EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Sec. 4. (a) Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by redesignating parts E and F as parts F and G, respectively, and by inserting after part D the following new part:

"PART E.—COST-OF-EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTS TO INSTITUTIONS

"PURPOSE OF SUPPLEMENTS

"Sec. 455. The Commissioner shall pay to each institution of higher education (except a proprietary institution of higher education) at which an educational opportunity grant recipient under part A is enrolled a cost-of-education supplement that may be used for the general operating expenses of the institution, including the increased instructional costs of meeting the special educational needs of increased numbers of disadvantaged students attending the institution.

"AMOUNT OF SUPPLEMENT

"Sec. 456. (a) For each undergraduate student recipient of an educational opportunity grant under part A, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution at which each such student is enrolled an amount for each academic year equal to the sum of—

"(1) \$200, and

"(2) 60 per centum of the amount of the educational opportunity grant for that year in excess of \$200, except that, for each of the fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1972, the amount of the payment attributable to this clause shall be calculated at the rate of 50 per centum of the amount of the educational opportunity grant for that year in excess of \$200.

"(b) For each graduate or professional student recipient of an educational opportunity grant under part A, the Commissioner shall pay to the institution at which each student is enrolled such amounts as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 457. For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$1,130,000,000 for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1971; \$1,280,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$1,530,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$1,940,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$2,170,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

(b) (1) Part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is further amended by redesignating sections 408 and 409 and referring thereto as sections 407 and 408, respectively.

(2) Section 408, as redesignated by this subsection, is amended to read as follows:

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 408. As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'academic year' means an academic year or its equivalent as defined in regulations of the Commissioner;

"(2) the term 'institution of higher education' means an institution of higher education as defined in section 1201 (a) of this Act and includes a proprietary institution of higher education as defined in section 461 (b) of this Act."

(3) Section 461(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "Part C" and inserting in lieu thereof "parts A and C".

AMENDMENT TO WORK-STUDY PROGRAM

Sec. 5. Section 441(b) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by striking out "\$285,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "\$510,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$540,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$620,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$700,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$775,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE IV OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Sec. 6. (a) The first sentence of section 402 (a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended to read as follows: "The Commissioner is authorized to award fourteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; fifteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; sixteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; eighteen thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and twenty thousand fellowships during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, to be used for study in graduate programs at institutions of higher education."

(b) The last sentence of section 402(a) (2) of such Act is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "or for a period of study and research (including preparation of a doctoral thesis) not to exceed two such years".

(c) The first sentence of section 403(a) of such Act is amended to read as follows: "Of the total number of fellowships awarded during any fiscal year, (1) half shall be awarded to individuals accepted for study in graduate programs approved by the Commissioner under this section, and (2) half shall be awarded on the basis of national competition, based on such criteria as the Commissioner may prescribe. (The Commissioner may enter into agreements with public or private nonprofit agencies to assist in conducting such national competition.)"

(d) Section 403(a) of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "In approving such programs, the Commissioner shall give special consideration to expanding opportunities for graduate study in the humanities and social sciences."

(e) Section 403(c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Recipients of fellowships under this title shall be persons who are pursuing, or intend to pursue, a course of study leading to a degree of doctor of philosophy or an equivalent degree."

(f) The amendments of this section shall take effect after June 30, 1970.

AMENDMENTS TO HIGHER EDUCATION
FACILITIES ACT

SEC. 7. (a) Effective after June 30, 1970, the second sentence of section 303(c) of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 is amended to read as follows: "For the purpose of making loans under this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$530,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; \$690,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972; \$830,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973; \$880,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974; and \$890,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975:

(b) Section 306(c)(2) of such Act (relating to annual interest grants to reduce the cost of borrowing for the construction of academic facilities) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and by annual increments of \$30,000,000 for each of the next four fiscal years."

AMENDMENTS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT

SEC. 8. The Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by

(1) redesignating title XII as title XIV, and sections 1201 through 1206, and references thereto, as sections 1401 through 1406, respectively, and

(2) inserting after title XI the following new titles:

"TITLE XII—START-UP GRANTS FOR
PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND
URBAN INSTITUTIONS

"GRANTS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 1201. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants, after consultation with the appropriate State commissions for higher education, to new public community colleges, public technical institutes, and other institutions of higher education (especially institutions which are located in or serve urban areas), for the purpose of assisting in meeting planning and other nonconstruction costs associated with the establishment of such institutions (including but not limited to land acquisition, site clearance, and designs for renovation of facilities).

"CRITERIA FOR MAKING GRANTS

"SEC. 1202. The Commissioner shall prescribe such criteria as he may deem appropriate, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, concerning those institutions and activities which shall qualify for assistance under this title, taking into account the high initial cost of establishing two- and four-year institutions as an integral part of the urban community whose residents they will serve. Grants under this title may not exceed a Federal share equal to 50 per centum of the costs approved in accordance with the criteria prescribed under this section and in no case may a grant to a single institution exceed \$10,000,000.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 1203. For the purpose of carrying out this title, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$125,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next two fiscal years, and \$75,000,000 for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1974, and June 30, 1975.

"TITLE XIII—IMPROVEMENT OF UNDER-
GRADUATE TEACHING AND CURRICU-
LUMS

"PROJECT GRANTS

"SEC. 1301. (a) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, or carrying out projects or activities designed to strengthen and improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and curriculums.

"(b) Such grants may be used for the support of experimental, innovative, or interdisciplinary projects or activities such as—

"(1) the strengthening or expansion of undergraduate faculties, improving their academic or professional qualifications, or increasing the number of disciplines in which they are skilled;

"(2) the expansion or improvement of existing undergraduate programs, or the establishment of additional undergraduate programs;

"(3) the acquisition of appropriate equipment or curricular, research, or other materials required to fulfill the objectives of projects or activities meeting the purpose of this title;

"(4) the development or carrying out of cooperative arrangements among institutions in furtherance of the purposes of this title; or

"(5) the strengthening of administration of the institution.

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 1302. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated \$50,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and each of the next six fiscal years."

SUSTAINING GRANTS TO SUPPLEMENT RESEARCH
FUNDS

SEC. 9. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education in amounts equal to 10 per centum of the total amount of funds received from the Federal Government by each such institution through grants and contracts for research. These grants may be used for supporting additional research which the institutions deem to be significant as well as for any other project or activity, including teaching, selected by the institution as deserving of support. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out this section.

STUDY OF EXPANDED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAMS

SEC. 10. (a) The Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, acting jointly, shall conduct a thorough study of the most expeditious means of financing higher education in the United States. Such study shall particularly include a thorough exploration of the following:

(1) various means by which a loan fund may be established to assist students to defray the expenses of higher education;

(2) the feasibility of repayment by students of such funds through the device of an increase in Federal income tax rates during their more productive years;

(3) specific recommendations for the establishment and conduct of a pilot project for a self-sustaining national student loan bank providing for mutualization of risk.

In making such study, the committees shall consider such factors as:

(1) the cost effectiveness of alternative plans;

(2) the immediate and the longrun economic impact of alternative plans;

(3) financial and social implications to individual students participating under alternative plans;

(4) institutional implications for post-secondary education or training facilities under alternative plans;

(5) the impact of alternative plans upon tuition and fees; and

(6) the appropriate role of agencies within the Federal Government in carrying out alternative plans.

SEC. 2. (a) In making the study under this resolution, the committees shall hold such public hearings as they deem necessary.

(b) Each meeting of the committees under this resolution, whether for the purpose of holding public hearings or otherwise, shall

be held alternatively under the chairmanship of the chairman of the Committee on Finance and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare or their designee.

SEC. 3. The committees shall report the results of the study under this resolution, together with their recommendations, to the Senate at the earliest practicable date.

STUDY OF CONSOLIDATION OF HIGHER
EDUCATION PROGRAMS

SEC. 11. The Commissioner shall, not later than January 31, 1971, submit a report to the President and to the Congress making such recommendations as he shall deem appropriate concerning the desirability of legislation consolidating various categorical programs of support for higher education into broader programs of institutional support for higher education which would provide greater flexibility to such institutions to meet their most critical needs.

The material presented by Mr. KENNEDY, is as follows:

SUMMARY OF "HIGHER EDUCATION BILL OF
RIGHTS"

1. *Educational Opportunity Grants:* The Education Opportunity Grant Program under the Higher Education Act would be expanded to provide assistance to "qualified individuals who need financial assistance to obtain" the benefits of higher education. The number of participants in the program would be increased several times over, with federal scholarships available to students from families whose income is in the lower three-fifths of the family income range. The program would be extended to graduate students. Applications and grants would be processed by the Commissioner of Education, rather than by particular colleges.

2. *Institutional Scholarship Funds:* Institutions of higher education would receive funds—equal to ten percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants held by students at each institution—to be used by the institutions for scholarships to any students in need.

3. *Supplementary Matching Grants:* Recipients of Educational Opportunity Grants would receive additional matching grants, not to exceed one-half the amount of the original EOG, for funds received from non-federal sources.

4. *Work-Study Program:* The Work-Study Program is increased so that three and one-half times the present number of students can participate.

5. *Cost of Education Supplements:* Institutions of higher education would receive supplementary unrestricted funds as a function of the number and amount of Educational Opportunity Grants held by students at each institution.

6. *Graduate Fellowship Program:* The number of National Educational Defense Act Fellowships is increased from 7,500 to 14,000 in fiscal 1971 up to 20,000 in fiscal 1975. Half of the Fellowships would be awarded by national competition, and half by universities with deserving graduate programs.

7. *Academic Construction:* Authorizations for academic loans are increased from the present \$400,000,000 to \$530,000,000 in fiscal 1971 up to \$890,000,000 in fiscal 1975.

8. *Start-up Grants:* A new program of start-up grants for new public community colleges and other institutions of higher education located in or serving urban areas is established. Grants up to \$10,000,000, not to exceed 50 percent of the planning and construction of these new institutions, are authorized.

9. *Teaching and Curriculum Development:* A new project-grant program is authorized to assist institutions of higher education in planning, developing, and carrying out ac-

tivities to strengthen the quality of undergraduate teaching and curriculums.

10. *Unrestricted Research Funds:* Institutions would receive funds for unrestricted research for teaching purposes in an amount equal to ten percent of the total federal research grants at each institution.

11. *National Student Loan Bank:* The Committee on Finance and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare are directed to study various new loan programs for students, and in particular the feasibility of a self-sustaining national student loan bank with repayments tied to income tax payments after graduation.

12. *Consolidation of Higher Education Programs:* The Commissioner of Education is directed to study and make recommendations to Congress on ways to consolidate higher education programs.

QUALITY AND EQUALITY: NEW LEVELS OF FEDERAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

FOREWORD

In early 1967 the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching created a 15-member Commission on Higher Education to examine and make recommendations regarding the many vital issues facing higher education in the United States as we approach the year 2000. The Carnegie Foundation made clear to the Commission that it was not being asked to speak for higher education but rather about higher education and its needs and contributions in relation to the nation's social concerns and purposes.

The Commission then mapped out these major areas of higher education for study and investigation: structure, function, and governance; innovation and change; demand, resources, and expenditures; and efficiency in the use of resources. Research projects have already been initiated in several of these areas, and studies being conducted elsewhere are under review. The Commission will issue a final report containing its findings and recommendations at the conclusion of its activities several years from now.

Because of the urgency of some problems in the sphere of higher education and the need for early action, the Commission has decided to issue special reports on such topics as soon as data are available to indicate desirable short-run measures and the Commission has had the opportunity to clarify its views and to develop specific recommendations.

This Report, *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, is the first in the series. The Commission hopes that it will prove useful and persuasive to those members of the 1969 Congress of the United States and of the executive branch who have key responsibilities in the area of higher education.

The recommendations in this Report are supported by all the present members of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education. Although individual members differed occasionally on details and wording, there was surprising unanimity on the need for, and the general levels of, federal aid and on the broad directions of implementation.

It should be pointed out that Mr. Roy E. Larsen, Chairman of the Executive Committee of Time, Inc., and an original member of the Commission, found it necessary to resign in mid-1968 because of the pressure of other commitments. We wish to record here our deep appreciation of his valuable contributions to the early planning sessions of the Commission and to our initial considerations of the topic of federal aid to higher education.

We wish also to express our gratitude for the many helpful suggestions of those consulted during the development of our proposals.

Finally, we wish to thank the members of our staff, and particularly Miss Virginia

Smith, for their assistance in the preparation of this Report.

Ralph M. Besse, Chairman of the Board, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company.

Joseph P. Cosand, President, The Junior College District of St. Louis.

William Friday, President, University of North Carolina.

David D. Henry, President, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

Carl Kaysen, Director, Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Katharine E. McBride, President, Bryn Mawr College.

James A. Perkins, President, Cornell University.

Clifton W. Phalen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Marine Midland Banks.

Nathan M. Pusey, President, Harvard University.

David Riesman, Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University.

The Honorable William W. Scranton.

Norton Simon, Hunt Food and Industries, Inc.

Clark Kerr, Chairman.

1. THE NATION'S NEEDS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

From the beginnings of the Republic, education at various levels has played a vital role in the building of a strong democratic society. At earlier stages in the nation's development, this role was chiefly the responsibility of the primary and secondary institutions. Now, as education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has increased, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex and exacting, the responsibility has shifted increasingly to America's colleges and universities.

Today, the nation looks to our institutions of higher learning to meet many of our most important needs:

More and more Americans, with aspirations for a better life, assume the necessity of a college education.

Equality of opportunity through education, including higher education, is beginning to appear as a realistic goal for the less privileged young members of our society.

The economy is dependent upon basic research and advancing technology, and upon the higher skills needed to make that technology effective, to assure national economic growth and well-being.

More managers, teachers, and professionals of all sorts are required to serve our complex society. More health personnel are essential to staff the fastest-growing segment of the national endeavor.

The cultural contributions of higher education take on wider dimensions as rising levels of education and growing affluence and leisure make possible greater concern with the quality of life in the United States.

Above all, the nation and the world depend crucially upon rigorous and creative ideas for the solution to profoundly complex issues.

What the American nation needs and expects from higher education in the critical years just ahead can be summed up in two phrases: quality of result and equality of access. Our colleges and universities must maintain and strengthen academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary society. At the same time, the nation's campuses must act energetically and even aggressively to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

2. HIGHER EDUCATION'S POTENTIAL TO MEET NEEDS

Does American higher education have the necessary resources to meet at the same time the nation's expectations for protection of academic quality and for expansion of equality of educational opportunity? Can our col-

leges and universities find ways to encourage and accommodate growing numbers of students, many of whom will need special financial and academic assistance, while preserving essential margins of academic excellence?

In January, 1968, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges had this to say about the response of public institutions to the shortage of resources:

"To maintain quality, they have raised student charges substantially, turned away qualified students, limited enrollment, and refused requests for urgently needed public service."

Three months later the Association of American Universities issued this statement:

"American higher education is experiencing critical and widespread financial pressures. Virtually every type of college and university faces a widening gap between annual income and the level of expenditures required to undertake needed expansion and improvement—or even, in many cases, to sustain normal operation."

To evaluate the present and potential financial strength of higher education, it is necessary to examine four essential factors: growth in size, growth in functions, rising costs, and sources of funds.

Growth in size

Higher education is currently encountering pressures created in large part by its own record of accomplishments. A century ago, enrollment in higher education in the United States was only about 50,000 students. Today's enrollment is almost 6 million students on a full-time equivalent (FTE) basis. More than half of this growth took place in the decade from 1958 to 1967. Estimates indicate that enrollment will pass 8 million by 1976, and this figure may well rise to 9 million if Carnegie Commission or other proposals are adopted to remove financial barriers for students from low-income families.

These enrollment data reflect not only the growing population of the United States and the growing share of that population in the younger age bracket, but also the rapidly increasing proportions of young people who seek higher education. A century ago, 2 percent of young Americans entered college. Now the figure is over 40 percent and is still rising.

Parental expectations or hopes of children's college attendance are now widespread. A Gallup poll shows that 97 percent of all parents questioned want their children to enter college. The national trend appears to be toward extending universal education beyond high school and through at least some years of higher education.

It should be noted, however, that the proportions of young people enrolled in higher education vary considerably from one part of the country to another. Percentages are more than twice as high for the Western states of Arizona, Utah, and California, as those for the Southern states of Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama.

It is apparent that the nation's colleges and universities and those responsible for their financial support must provide new facilities for 3 million additional students by 1976-77. To fall short of this goal would be to limit the movement toward greater equality of access to higher education.

Enrollment will continue to rise after 1976-77 for about another decade, but at a slower rate, and will then level off until the year 2000. The heaviest costs of further expansion will be met in the period ending about 1980.

Growth in functions

Sheer numbers of students do not, of course, tell the entire story of institutional growth. Colleges and universities in the United States have also grown steadily in the number and complexity of functions they have assumed in response to both the

expansion of knowledge and the needs of society.

Instruction has increased in total duration, in curricular range, and in specialization. Research has burgeoned. Graduate and professional programs have multiplied. Colleges and universities are performing a wide variety of important public services directed toward meeting civic and social problems.

This trend will continue in the future as higher education responds to new public needs. Today our institutions are being asked to extend their research efforts on the problems of the cities. They are expected to train additional doctors and medical support personnel to meet the nation's expanding activities in the important field of health care. There is a growing obligation to provide post-doctoral training and continuing education in a variety of fast-developing fields.

These expanding functions have brought our institutions of higher education to a central role in the well-being of our society. But they have also added greatly to the pressures of rising numbers of students and rising costs.

Rising costs

The continuing expansion of our higher education facilities will be expensive in any case. But the financial problems are made more severe by the fact that higher education costs per student are rising rapidly. Total institutional expenditures for higher education climbed from \$5.2 billion in 1957-58 to about \$17.2 billion in 1967-68, an increase of 231 percent as compared with a 119 percent increase in enrollments for the same period. It is estimated that expenditures of higher education institutions will total about \$41 billion in 1976-77 for a projected FTE enrollment of 9 million students.

Institutional expenditures are the major costs but not the total costs of higher education. Certain government and private expenditures for higher education purposes are not reflected fully or at all in institutional spending data. Federal administrative costs for various higher education programs are not, of course, passed on to the institution. Federal student aid under the GI Bill and the Social Security Act and some forms of state student aid go directly to the student, and only a portion of that aid enters the institutional revenue-expenditure data via tuition and institutional room-and-board payments. Expenditures of GIs and other students for books, supplies, differential living expenses, and other associated higher education costs which are incurred outside the institution also do not appear in the institutional data.

Unfortunately, the determination of the total cost of higher education is difficult and, inevitably, somewhat arbitrary, and no reliable estimates of the total cost are currently available. This Report, therefore, will rely primarily on use of the fairly well-established data on institutional expenditures for higher education. It is the institutional expenditure total that the Commission estimates will rise to \$41 billion in 1976-77.

In terms of the gross national product (GNP), expenditures by higher education institutions rose from approximately 1 percent in 1957, when the GNP was \$432 billion, to slightly more than 2 percent in 1967, when the GNP was \$763 billion. Institutional expenditures will need to be about 3 percent by 1976-77, at which time the GNP will be about \$1,400 billion.

Many factors aside from the general level of inflation have contributed to rising costs per student. Faculty salaries, which had lagged for some years, have been rising faster than the general level of wages and salaries. Graduate work has increased in importance, and it is more expensive. More sophisticated and costly research and teaching tools are required.

For many other activities of society, rising costs are offset in substantial part by accom-

panying rises in productivity. Unfortunately, higher education has not and perhaps cannot offset its rising costs in this manner. Despite improvements in college management and experiments in programmed learning and other new techniques, no major ways are likely to be found in the short run which will make it possible to educate more students at the same level of expenditures without lowering academic quality. The search for techniques to improve educational productivity without endangering quality should be actively pressed forward; as was indicated in the Foreword to this Report, efficiency in the use of resources is one of the major areas of higher education mapped out for study by the Carnegie Commission. In the meantime, it is inevitable that costs per student will continue to rise.

Sources of funds

Higher education has long received some federal assistance, but the chief financing burden has been borne by state and local governments and the private sector. It is a striking testimonial to their faith in higher education that they have financed the enormous expansion to date, and that they are girding to do still more in the future. But there are limits.

Many state and local governments whose expenditures for higher education are already large would experience great difficulties in providing the additional support needed, both because of tax base limits and because of the other essential needs for public funds. Some states whose past expenditures for higher education have lagged should, of course, provide additional funds in substantial amounts. State support, however, has been a falling

share, and it is realistic to expect it to fall still more.

Private resources, initially the major support for all higher education in this country, have provided about half of the institutional funds required for higher education in recent years. With expectations of rising per capita income, and with a relatively high income elasticity for educational expenses, private resources should continue to provide half of the expanded financial support for higher education—a heavy increase in absolute dollar amounts. It would be unrealistic to assume, however, that the private share can be increased in percentage terms over the next few years. This continued heavy reliance on private sources of support for higher education will be helpful to the preservation of autonomy and diversity in American higher education.

The federal government, with revenue available from the graduated income tax, is the major source now realistically able to raise its general revenues faster than the gross national product and thus be able to offset the decline in the share borne by the states.

State, local, and private sources combined now pay about four-fifths of total higher education institutional expenditures, and the federal government pays one-fifth. While the absolute amounts paid by all sectors must continue to rise substantially, federal support levels in dollar terms will need to triple in the immediate future. The federal government's proportionate share of institutional support will need to rise from about one-fifth at present (almost \$4 billion) to about one-third (over \$13 billion) of the new total by 1976-77.

[Dollar amounts in billions]

	1957-58		1967-68		1976-77	
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
State and local.....	\$1.7	33	\$4.7	27	\$7	17
Private.....	2.8	54	9.0	52	21	51
Federal.....	.7	13	3.5	21	13	32
Total.....	5.2	100	17.2	100	41	100

Further federal support necessary to achieve goals of quality and equality

The Carnegie Commission believes a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need is so crucial for our best ideas and intellectual skills and for the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

The severity of the problem is not uniform throughout higher education. Some institutional levels, some geographical areas, some kinds of institutions face more critical financial needs than others. Overall data may disguise the serious nature of the problems for many institutions and students. Capacity not fully utilized in some areas is nevertheless inaccessible to students being turned away from overcrowded local facilities if those students lack the financial means to travel to and live in other areas. Available financial resources at one institution or system of institutions are not transferable to others. Improved resource planning on one campus does not help solve financial shortages at another whose resources are already being inventively utilized to the maximum.

Although the financial impacts have differed, most institutions have by now had to absorb so many of these pressures that formerly available margins in facilities and resources have been depleted. These institutions are now being forced to choose among the alternatives of limiting enrollments, raising tuition fees, postponing expansion and new programs, or allowing quality to deteriorate. These alternatives are already being employed in varying degrees throughout higher education.

The adverse effects upon national needs are all too clear. Enrollment limitations and higher tuition fees (unless offset by grants and loans to those with low incomes) penalize first the very group of students for whom the goal of greater equality of opportunity is intended. Postponing expansions and new programs means deferring activities that may be among the most urgently needed at the present, such as the training of additional health science personnel or research on urban problems. Sacrificing general quality weakens the vital intellectual resources of the nation.

We believe that national needs in the areas of academic quality and equality of opportunity require new levels of federal support for higher education.

3. THE FEDERAL CONCERN WITH HIGHER EDUCATION

The well-being of higher education in the United States is a concern which the federal government shares with state and local governments and private individuals and organizations charged with primary responsibility for our colleges and universities. Higher education fulfills purposes which are national as well as regional and local, and public as well as private, in their scope and impacts. College graduates and holders of advanced and professional degrees are highly mobile geographically; they are participants in what is essentially a continental market. And it is precisely this broad market which has been an important factor in the prosperity of the nation as a whole. Thus it is appropriate that federal as well as state and local support be given to the nation's institutions of higher education.

The federal government has, in fact, helped to support higher education over the years, with such federal actions as the land-grant movement of post-Civil War days, National Youth Administration programs for needy students during the Depression of the 1930's, aid for science programs during and after World War II, student aid to returning veterans through the GI Bill, and in recent years a growing range of measures to assist various aspects of higher education.

By 1967-68, federal aid given directly to institutions of higher education and to various student aid programs (not including veterans' and social security education benefits) had reached a total of almost \$4 billion and was being channeled through a variety of programs to some 2,100 colleges and universities and several hundred thousand students throughout the United States.

But the nation's needs for higher education, and thus the needs of higher education for more resources, continue to climb. In the next few years, federal support levels should be tripled if the federal government is to assist state and local governments and the private sector in expanding higher education as an essential investment in the nation's future.

In urging these support levels, the Carnegie Commission is not unmindful of the other and pressing national needs for which federal funds must be allocated. In the broad area of education alone, there are urgent calls for aid at primary and secondary levels and for vocational training. Institutions involved in these levels of education face an array of urgent problems, and we warmly support higher levels of aid, including more federal assistance, for these other segments of education. Our focus in this Special Report, however, is the financial problems of our colleges and universities. We believe that federal aid to higher education warrants a high priority among other federal programs, both because of the importance of the specific national needs which higher education serves and because intellectual resources are indispensable to the resolution of so many other high-priority national issues.

The proposed net increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education by 1976-77 is approximately \$10 billion over current federal support levels. Projected growth of federal revenue would indicate that the net increment to federal revenue (over "work load" increases in costs) will reach about \$70 billion by 1976-77. Thus the proposed increase in federal aid to institutions of higher education would require one-seventh of the expected additions to available federal revenues over the next few years for new programs. The Commission is convinced that the federal government can meet this new level of responsibility for higher education without penalty to other urgent national priorities.

Estimated obligations for higher education and related activities, 1967-68

[In billion of dollars]

Research and development (42 percent)	1.45
Construction (17 percent)57
Student aid (18 percent)62
Institutional support (13 percent)44
Other (10 percent)37
Total	3.45

(NOTE.—Federal funds of \$698 million for research centers managed by universities, \$412 million for veterans' education, \$409 million for construction loans, and \$266 million for student loans are not included.)

4. FORMS OF FEDERAL SUPPORT

The Carnegie Commission believes that federal support of higher education should be based upon the related concerns of contributions to the national welfare and to the

vitality and effectiveness of the institutions of higher education themselves.

The forms of federal aid employed should satisfy the following requirements:

Draw forth to the extent possible, rather than merely replace, state and private support;

Provide for flexibility and periodic re-evaluation to determine whether changing national needs warrant reallocations;

Assist both public and private institutions—the latter, of course, for nonsectarian purposes only;

Improve equality of educational opportunity for all able young people;

Rely heavily upon market processes through free student choice of institution and field of study;

Preserve institutional autonomy and integrity;

Encourage diversity;

Provide an incentive for innovation;

Maintain among distinguished institutions of learning a margin for excellence, a premium for quality.

Use competitive principles in the support of academic quality, through nationwide competition for graduate fellowships and for institutional proposals in various special program fields.

It is the Carnegie Commission's judgment that the best immediate means of federal aid to higher education are:

Grants and loans to individual students to move toward the nation's goal of equal educational opportunity;

Support to institutions to meet increased costs of expanding enrollment and to strengthen areas of particular national concern;

Extension of support for research, for construction, and for special programs.

Two other widely discussed approaches are considered by the Commission as far less desirable than extension of existing programs. One such approach, tax credits to parents of children in college, would not aid low-income families where the need is greatest. Another, general subsidies to the several states, would fail to provide the coordination and perspective necessary to assure expansion of programs of primary national concern.

5. FEDERAL AID PROPOSALS

The following proposals are those which the Carnegie Commission believes will best meet the most urgent financing problems associated with higher education through 1976-77. While most of the recommendations would result in expansion or augmentation of existing programs, new programs suitable for use in a short-run period are also proposed. No attempt is made here to incorporate or comment upon all existing federal aid activities relating to higher education.

Student aid and related institutional grants

The Carnegie Commission believes that one of the most urgent national priorities for higher education between now and 1976-77 is the removal of financial barriers for all youth who enroll in our diverse colleges and universities, whether in academic or occupational programs. A second important priority is support for talented graduate students who can meet the nation's needs for a wide variety of professionals, technical specialists, researchers, and college teachers.

The federal government presently provides limited amounts of student aid under a number of separate programs, some restricted to one or another major subject field, some based on need, some on ability, some channeled through the GI Bill. Today's graduating high school student often has difficulty in determining what student aid is available to him. Each program has separate requirements and applications. Often he must enroll in a college or university and then see if that institution still has funds available under particular programs. To replace these separate and limited programs (though not, of course,

the GI Bill), the Commission proposes a substantially expanded program consisting of educational opportunity grants based on need, a work-study program, student loans, a counseling and information program, a graduate talent search and development program, and doctoral fellowships based on ability.

The Commission's program of student aid is based upon these premises:

1. Student aid must be adequate to remove effectively the financial barriers which now prevent many qualified students from entering or continuing higher education.

2. Basic grants supplemented by work-study payments should be scaled to differing educational expenses in the lower division, upper division, and graduate years. With the growth of the community college movement and urban facilities, most students will be able to attend low-cost institutions near home for at least the first two years.

3. The grant program should be augmented by a loan program making possible greater flexibility in choice of college to the needy student and providing a readily available source of college financing with repayment deferred for all students regardless of need.

4. Maximum flexibility and fullest utilization of aid funds will be accomplished if the major portion of these funds is kept in one national reservoir and granted to individual students who exercise free choice of institution and disciplinary fields. If funds are allocated by institution or region or field, problems of over- and under-use will inevitably arise and require time-consuming and costly transfer procedures. The "national reservoir" approach has worked very successfully under the GI Bill. For administrative purposes, however, grant payments would be made to students by their selected institutions rather than directly by the government.

Educational Opportunity Grants

Equality of opportunity in the United States today is increasingly related to equality of access to education. And we have not yet achieved equality of access to education; financial barriers and racial barriers block the way for many potentially able young Americans. Almost half of the undergraduate college students in the United States now come from the country's highest family income quartile; only 7 percent come from the lowest income quartile.

Complete figures are not available for socioeconomic distribution of graduate enrollment, but fragmentary figures suggest that an even lower proportion of graduate students comes from the two lowest quartiles.

The proportion of Negroes in the American college population is less than half the proportion of Negroes in the population as a whole, and half the Negroes in college attend predominantly Negro colleges.

Financial barriers to higher education result in a demonstrable loss of national talent. In the highest socioeconomic quartile, 19 out of 20 students ranking in the top ability group (the highest 20 percent) enter college within five years after high school graduation; in the lowest socioeconomic quartile, only 10 out of 20 in the highest ability group enter college.

Although the federal government, in the past, has provided financial aid to college students through the GI Bill, loans, and student work programs in the Depression, it was not until the Higher Education Act of 1965 that a program of educational opportunity grants was established. Under this program 225,000 undergraduate students from low-income families received grants in 1966-67. Adoption of a clear policy to remove financial barriers should make grants available to about 1.7 million students (27 percent of total enrollment) in 1970-71 and approximately 2.9 million students (32 percent of total enrollment) in 1976-77.

Percent undergraduate students enrolled full time by size of family income, 1966-67

Approximate family income quartile:	Average family income
High (above \$10,000) (48 percent)	\$16,016
Second (\$6,000-\$10,000) (28 percent)	8,359
Third (\$3,000-\$6,000) (17 percent)	5,549
Low (below \$3,000) (7 percent)	2,321

Recommendation

The Commission recommends strengthening and expanding the present program of educational opportunity grants based on need by providing:

1. That the level of funding be increased so that all college students with demonstrated need will be assured of some financial aid to meet expenses at institutions which they select.

2. That grants based on need be available for a period not to exceed four years of undergraduate study and two years of study toward a graduate degree.

Determination of need. It will be necessary to derive a simple need formula based on such factors as total family income over the past several years, total family assets, and number and ages of children. The Commission assumes that a maximum grant would often be necessary at the lowest income quartile, that perhaps half of the maximum grant would be the average requirement at the second lowest quartile, and that only a few grants would be made to students from families on the lower borders of the upper half of the income range.

Amount of grants. Assuming full need, maximum grants would be:

(a) \$750 per year to a student during his first two years of work toward an undergraduate degree or certificate.

(b) \$1,000 per year to a student during his third and fourth years of work toward an undergraduate degree.

(c) \$1,000 per year for a maximum of two years to a student working toward a graduate degree.

No grant would be made unless the student is eligible for a grant in an amount of \$200 or more.

It should be noted that the amounts in (a) and (b) above may be augmented by supplementary matching grants and work-study payments provided in the recommendations below.

Level of funding. It is estimated that the program of educational opportunity grants set forth above would require federal funding as follows:

Year:	[In billions of dollars]
1970-71	0.9
1971-72	1.0
1972-73	1.1
1973-74	1.3
1974-75	1.4
1975-76	1.6
1976-77	1.6

Supplementary Matching Grants

Institutions are expected to seek additional funds from private, state, and local government sources for undergraduate educational opportunity grants. It is estimated that over \$600 million in student aid funds was obtained from these sources in 1966-67. It is not known what proportion of these student aid funds was used for grants to students from low-income families. To encourage commitment of more funds from these sources for such grants and to provide greater choice of selection of college for the student, the Commission proposes a program of supplementary matching grants.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that an undergraduate student holding an educational opportunity grant and receiving added grants

from nonfederal sources be given a supplementary federal grant in an amount matching the nonfederal grants but not exceeding one-half of the student's original educational opportunity grant.

An upper-division student with full need might, for example, hold a \$1,000 educational opportunity grant. If he were awarded an additional state or private grant of \$400, he would thereby become eligible for a federal supplementary matching grant of \$400, bringing his total grant level for the year to \$1,800. If a holder of a \$1,000 educational opportunity grant were to be given an added \$700 from state or private sources, he could receive a federal supplementary matching grant of \$500 (the upper limit of one-half of the amount of his original educational opportunity grant), for a total grant level of \$2,200 per year.

Level of funding. It is estimated that this program would require federal funding as follows:

Year:	[In millions of dollars]
1970-71	110
1971-72	140
1972-73	180
1973-74	230
1974-75	280
1975-76	340
1976-77	380

Federal Scholarship Grants to Institutions

The Commission recognizes that any formula for need applied on a nationwide basis may not adequately cover individual hardship cases. To provide some greater degree of flexibility in the allocation of grants to students with financial need, the Commission proposes that some additional scholarship funds be given directly to institutions where holders of educational opportunity grants are enrolled. The college or university would then allocate these funds to students as determined by the institution's own definition of student need.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that each college and university be given a scholarship fund for needy students equal to 10 percent of the total sum of educational opportunity grants (not including supplementary matching grants) held by students at that institution.

Level of funding. Federal funding requirements for this program are estimated as follows:

Year:	[In millions of dollars]
1970-71	90
1971-72	95
1973-74	120
1974-75	135
1975-76	150
1976-77	160

Work-Study Program

During the Depression, the federally funded National Youth Administration provided payment for part-time jobs to more than 10 percent of all students then enrolled in higher education. More recently, the college work-study program was established. Originally under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, it was continued as a part of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The purpose of the program is to stimulate and promote part-time employment for students—particularly those from low-income families—who need the work to stay in school. Through federal grants to institutions of higher education, the program provides work opportunities on campus and in public or private nonprofit agencies engaged in community service off campus. Students may work an average of 15 hours a week while classes are in session and not more than 40 while they are not in session.

During fiscal 1968, 310,000 students participated in this program, the federal share

costing an estimated \$112.5 million. The work-study program has generated enthusiasm among participating students, colleges and agencies, especially at the state and community college levels. Significant numbers of economically disadvantaged youths are enabled to enter and stay in college. These students perform tasks important to academic institutions and agencies serving the community. In tangible and practical ways they develop an additional framework of relationships with the academic community. Work-study is one of the most valuable forms of student aid and ought to be incorporated in any federal program to assist students.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that federal funds be provided to finance institutionally administered part-time employment for undergraduate students. Institutions should use these funds to enable students, who meet in general terms the federal need criteria, to earn up to \$500 per year. Off-campus assignments of educational importance, such as tutorial work, should be encouraged.

Because students from lower socioeconomic groups may experience educational disadvantages in their initial college years, it might be desirable to place some limits on their work-study program participation at the lower-division level. Upper-division students, and lower-division students to the extent consistent with their educational needs, should be encouraged to take part in the work-study program.

Level of funding. This program would require estimated levels of federal funding as follows:

Year:	[In millions of dollars]
1970-71	510
1971-72	540
1972-73	620
1973-74	700
1974-75	775
1975-76	850
1976-77	870

Counseling and Information Program

The National Defense Education Act of 1958 authorized establishment of a broad program throughout all levels of education for guidance, counseling, and testing of students and for identification and encouragement of able students to continue their education. One of the stated purposes of that program was to encourage students with outstanding aptitudes and ability to complete secondary school, take the necessary courses for admission to institutions of higher education, and enter such institutions. In 1959 \$7.4 million was initially appropriated for the program. The appropriation for 1967 was \$24.5 million.

The Commission believes, because of the importance of decisions made at the high school level about college attendance, that it is imperative to strengthen counseling and information programs. Students who possess the ability to go to college-level academic work should be identified, assisted in finding the right college, and advised on the availability of financial aid. Identification of these students early in their high school careers would make it possible to channel them into curricula which would better equip them for higher education. Those with other interests and qualifications who can benefit either from further development before their prospects are clear or from more vocationally oriented education should be guided into courses at the appropriate institution. But not every high school graduate should be guided toward further formal education at that time, and this decision too is an important counseling responsibility.

The federal program should include support of research activities to develop better ways to identify qualified students, particularly those from disadvantaged groups. Fed-

eral training courses should be established for high school teachers and counselors to keep them up to date on financial aid, college programs, and career possibilities. Information centers should be established in metropolitan centers so that parents and students may obtain information about career possibilities and opportunities for higher education.

Colleges and universities should be encouraged to use a portion of their work-study program funds to enable their students to work with high school and elementary school students in various tutoring and counseling programs.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the present federal aid program of guidance, counseling, and testing for identification and encouragement of able students be expanded to include the elements described above and that funding for the program be increased to \$30 million in 1970-71, rising to \$40 million in 1976-77.

Graduate Talent Search and Development Program

The nation's 2,300 institutions of higher education, vary greatly, not only in function, but also in educational effectiveness. As a result, some students have earned their bachelor's degree at institutions that have found it difficult, often because of financial pressures, to attain a desirable level of quality in their educational programs. Colleges of this type, often found in the economically depressed areas of the nation, may be the only facilities accessible to many students from low-income families and, in some sections of the country, to students from racial minorities. The developing institutions program, mentioned later in these proposals, is concerned with improving the quality of these colleges. But this improvement cannot be quickly achieved.

At the very time when the nation has growing needs for specialized personnel in health, welfare, technical, and professional fields and in elementary and secondary teaching, it is particularly unfortunate that some students who have completed their undergraduate training find that they are not adequately prepared to undertake graduate programs in these and other needed areas. It is equally unfortunate that some of these students came from the very groups of the population that need opportunities to participate more fully and at increasingly higher levels in the nation work force.

As a partial remedy to this situation, the Commission urges that a federal program be funded under which certain universities, selected on the basis of specific program proposals, undertake the task of identifying potentially able graduates who have not received undergraduate training adequate to permit immediate pursuit of graduate studies. The programs could vary considerably in nature, but each would provide up to one year of intensive work to enable program participants to undertake their graduate studies more successfully. Students selected would receive a stipend based on need for the duration of the program.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that certain universities be selected on the basis of program proposals submitted to national panels to undertake specific graduate talent search and development program, and that federal funding be made available for such programs in the amount of \$25 million in 1970-71, rising to \$100 million in 1976-77.

Doctoral Fellowship Program

For several years, various federal agencies have offered doctoral fellowships and traineeships to students selected largely on the basis of achievement. Grants of this type were made to over 30,000 doctoral students in 1967.

The Commission has recommended above that educational opportunity grants based on need should be made available to first-level graduate students for a maximum of two years during work toward a graduate degree. In addition, the Commission proposes a program of loans (see the recommendation below) to assist students at all levels of undergraduate and graduate study.

Because of the great importance of encouraging the most able of our young students to continue their graduate studies at the highest level, the Commission proposes a federally financed doctoral fellowship program based on ability for students in all fields of intellectual endeavor. This program would provide stipend to talented students working toward the Ph.D. or equivalent research doctorate degree during the intensive period of their research for the doctoral thesis.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a doctoral fellowship program with selection based upon demonstrated academic ability without reference to need, with fellowships in the amount of \$3,000 annually for a maximum of two years to graduate students advanced to candidacy for a Ph.D. or equivalent research doctorate, the total number of such first-year fellowships to equal three-fourths of the national total of earned doctorates in the previous year.

Selection. Of the total number of fellowships to be awarded annually, half would be selected by national competition. The other half would be granted on the basis of allocations to institutions for certain departments or interdepartmental major programs designated by national panels of experts, and the institutions and departments would then apply their own ability criteria for selection of recipients. Selection would be extended into the social sciences and humanities and not limited to the sciences and health professions as is largely true at present.

Teaching assistantships. A graduate student holding a doctoral fellowship would be expected to devote full time to his academic work, but could be required by the university as a part of his degree program to hold a teaching assistantship and would be permitted to receive a teaching assistantship stipend from the university.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for this program would be:

[In millions of dollars]

Year:	
1970-71	105
1971-72	110
1972-73	120
1973-74	130
1974-75	150
1975-76	160
1976-77	165

National Student Loan Bank

The Commission's opportunity grant and work-study recommendations are designed to remove financial barriers to higher education for students from low-income families. However, this is not the only kind of student assistance that is needed in a situation of rising educational costs. Grant recipients might wish to attend institutions far from their homes or with high tuitions, at costs greater than the ceilings appropriate to a grant program based on need. For many middle-income families, especially those with several children in college, the burdens of meeting the costs of higher education out of current income are large. Older students increasingly assume the role of independent adults, and continued financial dependence on their families poses significant problems. For all these reasons, a widely available student loan program in which need is not a condition to eligibility is desirable as a supplement to the programs already proposed.

Economic considerations reinforce this judgment. On the whole, members of the population who have more education enjoy

significantly higher earnings than those with less, and this correlation holds broadly over the whole educational spectrum. In one respect, therefore, higher education enhances the earning power of individuals, thus providing the economic basis for repayment of debts incurred to finance that education. In this sense such loans can be viewed as financing individuals' investments in productive though nontangible capital.

Further, the social benefits of higher education which affect the whole nation, over and above those accruing to the individuals receiving it, justify a federal government effort in this area. Additionally, higher incomes result in higher tax payments to the federal government.

The desirability of federal participation in loan programs has already been recognized in such past programs as the National Student Defense Loan program established in 1958 and the Guaranteed Loan program established in 1965. These together had outstanding loans of over a billion dollars by 1966-67.

However, the existing loan programs have important difficulties, the greatest of which is an inadequate level of funding. Others include limitations of eligibility in terms of need, 10-year repayment periods which have imposed high burdens and discouraged applicants, and ineffective attempts to make them recruiting devices for such occupations as teaching. What is needed is a much larger loan program of a quite different character.

A particular kind of loan program—namely, one with contingent repayment provisions under which the borrower contracts to pay back a fixed percentage of his income per \$1,000 of debt each year for a long period (30 to 40 years)—has a number of important additional advantages which recommend it strongly over a conventional fixed-contract type of loan.

First, such a loan program would contribute significantly to a further equalization of educational opportunity. If the loan program as a whole were on a self-sustaining basis (as defined below), those whose post-education incomes were highest would help pay for the costs of education of those whose posteducation incomes were lower. Since posteducation incomes are correlated among other things with incomes of the students' families, this would spread the cost of equalization of opportunity over both the current and the succeeding generations.

Second, the prospect of repayment would be a lesser deterrent under a contingent loan program than under a conventional fixed-contract program. This would lead to a wider use of loans since risks would be shared.

Third, the program would further emphasize the independence of the student by encouraging him to meet a larger proportion of his educational costs through a loan.

Certain difficulties which such a contingent loan proposal appears to raise are manageable. Two, in particular, have received wide attention: the possibility of adverse selection of applicants that would prejudice the solvency of the program and the so-called negative dowry of college-educated women who marry and leave the labor force. Detailed studies of the design of such a program (for example, that by Karl Shell and others) show that these difficulties can be met. Further careful study and drafting of such a program are, however, highly necessary.

The Commission recommends this loan program as a supplement to our other proposals, rather than as the basic or sole program for both student and institutional support.

Recommendations

The Commission recommends that a federal contingent loan program be created for which all students, regardless of need, would be eligible. With interest figured on the basis of federal borrowing costs, the program should be self-sustaining, except for admin-

istrative costs which would be met out of appropriations. Undergraduates would be eligible to borrow up to \$2,500 per year, and graduate students up to \$3,500 per year, for educational purposes. No student should be entitled to receive more in loans, all types of grants, and work-study payments in any year than the costs of education, including subsistence costs, as officially recognized by the institution in which he is enrolled.

The program would be administered through the institutions of higher education, which will have the relevant information on grants and work-study payments to loan applicants.

Level of funding. A loan program of this sort must be viewed as clearly experimental; it is difficult to predict the extent to which it will be used. But if loans are to be made available to students without reference to need, it will be necessary to have the initial level of funding for the loan program high enough to eliminate any requirements for setting priorities among loan applicants. The Commission suggests that funding be made available to provide student loans totaling \$2.5 billion in 1970-71, possibly increasing to as much as \$5 billion in new student loans in 1976-77.

It is also difficult to predict the level of federal expenditures which would be required by this loan program. Although designed to be self-supporting, the program would require, particularly in the initial years, annual federal appropriations amounting to perhaps 5 percent of new loans committed that year for administrative costs and contingencies. This would amount to about \$125 million in 1970-71, rising to \$250 million in 1976-77.

PART-TIME STUDENTS

Growing requirements for retraining during a person's lifetime and the probability that low-income students will have to work part-time suggest that the importance of part-time enrollment may increase in the future. All the programs recommended above are stated in terms of full-time students. The programs should, however, through the implementing legislation, be adapted to provide proportional aid to part-time students.

Cost-of-education supplements to institutions

The proposed expansion of financial aid programs to make it possible for more students to attend universities and colleges will add to the present financial problems of these institutions. The full costs of education are not met through tuition payments. Moreover, the increase in numbers of disadvantaged students will tend to raise per-student instructional costs, because many of these students will need special educational assistance such as tutoring, counseling, and perhaps remedial training in special areas. Cost considerations should not be permitted to discourage colleges and universities from effectively recruiting and assisting potentially able young people no matter what their socioeconomic background might be.

At the doctoral level, the gap between tuition levels and full instructional costs is even greater. To some extent, this problem has been recognized in the past through federal programs which provide cost-of-education supplements to institutions attended by students holding federal graduate fellowships.

The Commission believes that this concept should be continued for the doctoral fellowship program and extended to the educational opportunity grant program as well.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the federal government grant cost-of-education supplements to colleges and universities based on the numbers and levels of students holding federal grants enrolled in the institutions.

Amount of grants. Accredited colleges and universities, and institutions deemed potentially eligible for accreditation except for their recent date of establishment, would receive the following amounts for each federal grant holder enrolled:

Student level	1970-71	1976-77
Lower division.....	\$525	\$750
Upper division.....	700	1,000
First-level graduate.....	1,050	1,500
Doctoral.....	3,500	5,000

Educational assistance programs. As the student aid program brings into higher education a greater number of disadvantaged students, the problem of providing them with special educational assistance such as counseling and tutoring will become increasingly important. The Commission assumes that a portion of the cost-of-education supplement would be used by the institution to undertake programs giving special attention to the educational needs of students who, largely because of socioeconomic factors, have been under an educational disadvantage.

Cost-of-education supplements as guides to future institutional support programs. These supplements could be used by the institutions at their own discretion to meet general operating costs. Thus they would provide some useful body of experience with general federal support of institutions—experience which could be used as a basis for consideration of the many proposals now being made for such institutional grants. The cost-of-education supplement program is proposed to meet immediate short-run needs, but it will also give the Commission and others both time and valuable data for analysis of the impacts, benefits, and problems involved in proposed programs for long-range institutional support and in the particular formulas being suggested for such programs.

This experience will augment the valuable consideration and study which have already been given to broad programs of institutional support by state study groups such as that proposed for New York and by several education associations. Statements of the various education associations have been reprinted in the Carnegie Commission publication *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education*, prepared by Ronald Wolk. In addition, the American Council on Education has recently issued a comparison of several proposed formulas for institutional grants.

The Commission hopes and expects that many students with grants would be drawn into the smaller colleges across the nation, where they would receive more individual attention and have a better opportunity to participate in the life of the total campus community. Many of these colleges would have the capacity to receive more students if they were given financial support to offset, in part, their added costs. They would thus also have a greater opportunity to diversify their student bodies, as so many of them now wish to do.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for cost-of-education supplements would be:

Year:	[In billions of dollars]
1970-71	1.13
1971-72	1.28
1972-73	1.53
1973-74	1.94
1974-75	2.17
1975-76	2.51
1976-77	2.71

The Carnegie Commission hopes in the near future to make a study of and recommendations on state support to private colleges and universities.

Medical education

Medical and health services education is the one major subject area in higher education that the Carnegie Commission has singled out for specific federal aid proposals. The reasons are several: the great needs of the nation in the health field, the growing public concern with these needs as evidenced by Medicare and the many state and local health programs, the high cost of medical training facilities, the fact that new medical education facilities are needed to serve geographical regions without reference to state boundaries, and, finally, the high mobility of medical school graduates, many and even most of whom do not remain to practice within the states that provided their instruction.

It is estimated that facilities to provide spaces for about 75 percent more medical students will be required by 1976-77 to meet the nation's rapidly growing need for medical services over and above the spaces available in 1966, when Medicare came into operation. In contrast to the rapid increase of enrollments in most other fields of higher education, the supply of medical school graduates has grown relatively slowly since the 1920s, and it is apparent that vigorous new efforts must be made to provide more training facilities and to encourage more students to undertake training. At the present time, 20 percent of the new doctors starting practice in the United States each year have received their training abroad, and sometimes it is of a distinctly lower quality than that provided by medical schools in the United States. Additionally, health care is not now adequately available in many rural areas and urban ghettos.

Instructional and capital outlay costs for medical schools far outstrip the levels in other schools of professional education, including schools in which other health personnel are trained; and financing the major part of the needed expansion of such facilities from state and private resources is almost impossible.

Studies now underway give some promise that reorganization of medical education and of medical practice itself can lead to reduced costs of both medical education and medical care. Federal funds should be made available to support the development of expanded training programs for health support personnel. But these possibilities do not provide full solutions to the financing problems confronting medical education.

The federal government has been undertaking increasing levels of support for medical school construction (\$18 million in 1966-67 and \$55 million in 1967-68) and training (\$42 million in 1966-67 and \$53 million in 1967-68), but the Carnegie Commission believes higher federal levels are required.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a substantial program of federal aid for medical education and health services for the purposes of:

Stimulating expansion of capacity at existing medical schools;

Planning additional medical schools distributed on a geographical basis to provide needed service to areas not now served;

Expanding educational facilities and developing new programs for the training of medical care support personnel;

Increasing availability of health services in the community of the medical school and the quality of health care delivery.

Student aid. A student aid program for medical students should be adopted to provide grants on the basis of need in amounts up to \$3,500 per year for four years, with free choice of institution.

It should be noted that medical students also have access to loans under the expanded loan program recommended above.

Institutional payments. Payments to institutions would be equal to the sum of the following amounts:

1. The institution's enrollment of students working toward the M.D. multiplied by \$4,000;
2. That portion of the enrollment working toward the M.D. in excess of such enrollment in the fall of 1966 multiplied by \$2,000;
3. The total number of residents and interns multiplied by \$2,250, provided that no individual student shall be counted for more than four years, and provided further that the resident and intern program is conducted under the auspices of an accredited medical school either at its own or at an affiliated hospital.

The amounts in (1) and (2) above should be adjusted for medical schools with three-year programs to enable those schools to receive the same amount of institutional aid as four-year schools.

Institutions would be free to use these institutional payments for support of any program which has as its major purpose the instruction of medical students.

Construction funds. Construction funds should be made available at the level of 100 percent for creation of new places, with additional funds for renovation and replacement.

Start-up grants. Start-up grants should be made available for non-construction costs for approximately 20 new medical schools at the rate of four per year for five years, not to exceed \$10 million per school. These schools should be located in geographical areas not now adequately served by existing medical schools, with a sufficient population base to warrant a medical school, and with a university capable of providing a good environment for a medical school.

Community health service programs. Federal support should be made available for development of programs by medical schools designed to extend the availability and effectiveness of community health programs.

Training of support medical personnel. Federal funds should be made available for programs designed to increase the number of support medical personnel. Such personnel can be trained comparatively quickly and inexpensively. In some fields, such as pediatrics, they can assume a substantial share of the services now performed by M.D.s if they are given proper supervision by an M.D.

Level of funding. It is estimated that federal expenditures for the medical and health services education program outlined above would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year:		
1970-71	-----	0.33
1971-72	-----	.35
1972-73	-----	.37
1973-74	-----	.39
1974-75	-----	.42
1975-76	-----	.40
1976-77	-----	.43

Medical education today is undergoing more constructive self-examination than it has since the Flexner report of 1910 and more than is going on in any other field of higher education. This is both impressive and commendable. The new medical schools recommended here can take advantage of the new ideas being born. Expansion of existing schools can provide opportunities for the new types of training for new types of doctors and support personnel now being envisioned. The medical profession as a whole is welcoming expansion of personnel and experimentation in training of personnel and delivery of health care as never before, to its great credit and the nation's great advantage; and the medical students of today encourage these progressive tendencies.

This openness to new concepts and new horizons of service should be fully encour-

aged as the federal government extends the basic support to medical education which it has given so successfully in the past to medical research. The second great transformation of medical education and research (the Flexner report having given rise to the first) is now underway, and the United States once again will greatly benefit. The new schools of medicine can be new in program as well as in physical identity; the expanded schools can be greater in their variety and relevance to modern needs as well as greater in size. Medical schools are on the threshold of becoming as important to the quality of urban life as the colleges of agriculture under the land-grant movement have been to rural life.

New money can now be matched by new ideas. Both are important—but the new ideas are the more important. The Carnegie Commission hopes subsequently to make suggestions on the future of medical education and its financing, and fully realizes that better use of health care facilities and personnel is as important as the enlargement of facilities and personnel.

Construction

During the late 1950s and the 1960s the great surge in college enrollment led to a growing deficiency in facilities. It was in recognition of this deficiency that the Higher Education Facilities Act was passed in 1963. But the increased federal aid came late and at too low a level to close the gap. By 1967 college and university instructional facilities would have had to be expanded by 20 percent to provide fully adequate space for the new levels of enrollment. This continuing deficiency resulted, in part, from the federal budgetary stringency which led to decreasing levels of support for college construction at a time when enrollment continued to rise.

Protected levels of enrollment suggest a further increase in this deficiency unless levels of federal support under the Higher Education Facilities Act can be increased. To keep pace with expanding enrollment, while holding the existing deficiency at its 20 percent level, about \$2 billion of federal funds should be available annually for college and university construction.

At present, funds are channeled principally into new construction. We believe more attention should be directed to the use of construction grants for renovation, an approach which might provide some additional facilities more quickly and at lower costs.

During the last academic year 72 new colleges were established. Many more new campuses will be needed over the next few years, and campuses of particular types.

The advance of the junior college movement over the last decade has greatly increased the accessibility of higher education to hundreds of thousands of American youth. A further extension of the growing junior college movement will continue this significant trend.

Colleges to serve the inner-city youth are urgently required in many of our major metropolitan areas. To meet this need, it is estimated that 500 community colleges and 50 urban four-year colleges should be established by 1976.

These new colleges, particularly in urban areas where land is expensive, will have heavier than usual initial costs. The Commission's proposals for construction aid include start-up grants for these institutions.

The Commission believes that support for construction is one of the most desirable mechanisms for channeling federal aid to colleges and universities. Such support carries with it very limited opportunities for control of educational policy; it increases the real assets of the nation; and, combined with matching requirements, it stimulates rather than replaces other sources of financial support for higher education.

Recommendation

Construction grants: 1. The Commission recommends that the amount of federal grants for academic construction be increased from the present provision (two-fifths of construction costs for junior colleges and one-third for other institutions) to one-half of the total amounts required by all institutions for construction, renovation, and replacement of facilities.

2. In addition, the Commission recommends that start-up grants be provided for planning and nonconstruction costs for new junior college and urban institutions, not to exceed \$10 million per institution but averaging more nearly \$1 million per institution.

Construction loans: The Commission recommends that funding levels for the academic facilities construction loan program be increased to provide sufficient loan funds for an additional 25 percent of needed new construction costs.

It should be noted that institutions could thus finance up to 75 percent of new construction through a combination of federal grants and loans.

Level of funding: It is estimated that federal expenditures for construction grants and loan obligation levels would be:

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Grants	Loan obligations
1970-71	1.26	0.53
1971-72	1.58	.69
1972-73	1.86	.83
1973-74	1.87	.88
1974-75	1.88	.89
1975-76	1.92	.91
1976-77	1.22	.61

Funding levels will continue to decline after 1976-1977 as enrollment levels stabilize in the 1980s.

The Commission recognizes that major improvements are possible in the intensity of space utilization and assumes that some of the estimated 20 percent deficiency across the nation can be offset by improved utilization.

Loans for student housing. For several years, federal loans for student housing have constituted an important form of federal aid to higher education. The Commission believes that this support is important to the educational effectiveness of many colleges and universities and urges continuation of the student housing loan program. This Report does not, however, include any recommendations on future levels of support for housing loans. The comparative emphasis on college housing and on privately supplied housing requires careful study campus by campus. College housing is of particular importance to the private liberal arts college with a residential character.

Research

One of the most essential functions of higher education is its contribution to the advance of knowledge in the nation. In recognition of this contribution the federal government has played a substantial role in providing major support for university-based research.

Since the federal government first undertook massive support of research in the universities during World War II, research expenditures have been a very large part of total federal expenditures on higher education. In the early postwar years, nearly half of the total federal support for higher education was directed to science research, and by 1958 the proportion had risen to two-thirds. Research now accounts for about one-third of the total federal funds flowing to higher education institutions.

More significantly, federal funding has been the primary source of support for uni-

versity-based research activities. Today approximately three-quarters of all university research is federally financed. In some highly research-oriented universities, the figure is almost 90 percent.

The rate of increase of federal support to university research is thus the key element in its ability to expand. During the period from 1956 to 1962, federal support of academic research increased at a rate of about 25 percent per year, but the rate of increase has slowed sharply since 1962. Last year's increase in federal support for academic research was only 2 percent.

It is the Commission's belief that university research, and thus federal support for university research, must increase substantially over the next several years. Both the past increase (before the recent slowdown) and the proposed increase in federal support are based on several factors:

1. Enrollment of doctoral candidates has risen sharply over the last several years and will continue to rise at an average rate of 6.6 percent annually through 1975.
2. Costs of research, like costs of instruction, are rising more rapidly than the costs of the general economy.
3. The new technology, which makes considerable expansion possible in the scope, nature, and quality of research, is also adding to the cost of research.
4. Critical social problems demand greater research efforts in many areas, including the social sciences.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends that the level of federal funding for university and college research be increased over the next several years but with the annual rate of increase declining from 15 percent in 1970-71 to 10 percent in 1976-77. This rate of increase reflects expanding doctoral enrollments, use of more costly technology, and the need for expansion into new fields of research.

The Commission further recommends that a grant amounting to 10 percent of the total research grants received annually by an institution be made to that institution to be used at its discretion. The sum required for this purpose is to be included within the percentages noted immediately above.

Procedures. The present federal system for awarding research grants through multiple agencies based on review and determination of merit of each proposal seems to work relatively well; the Commission does not, therefore, recommend any basic change in the present procedure. However, it might be desirable for all granting agencies to adopt the practice now sometimes used of giving low priority to inclusion of funds for released faculty time, particularly at universities where the teaching load is relatively low; conversely, efforts should be made to increase the teaching services of research personnel, and federal policy can encourage this.

The present system does sometimes make it difficult for colleges and universities to obtain federal research funds for small projects and for planning projects, and young faculty members may be under considerable disadvantage in competing for research funds. The proposed 10 percent supplementary grant to institutions would make it possible for them to provide grants for these purposes.

Level of funding. With one modification, the current level of federal funding for research can properly be used as a base for projecting desirable future levels of support. To some extent research funds are now used to provide traineeships for candidates for research doctorates. If the Commission's proposal for research doctoral fellowships is accepted, this need will be met directly through that program. In projecting future levels of federal funding for research, the Commission has started from a base lower than the present level of support, thus eliminating

possible duplication between the present use of research funds and the proposed research doctoral fellowship program.

It is estimated that federal funds for support of research as outlined above would be:

[In billions of dollars]	
Year:	
1970-71	2.00
1971-72	2.30
1972-73	2.62
1973-74	2.96
1974-75	3.32
1975-76	3.68
1976-77	4.05

Special programs

The federal government has been both sensitive and responsive to areas of particular need in higher education and has established a number of special programs to provide federal assistance for these areas.

Recommendation

The Commission has not given consideration to all of these special programs, but does recommend increased funding for the following three programs: aid to developing institutions, library support, and international studies.

Aid to Developing Institutions

Many of the nation's existing colleges have failed to reach their full capability because of limitations of resources. If expanded educational opportunity is to be provided in the United States, these colleges must become full participants in the academic community. Since 1965, the Office of Education, through its developing-college program, has given some financial aid to such colleges, starting with \$5 million in 1966 and increasing to \$30 million in 1967. In too many instances the level of aid to institutions has not been sufficient to enable significant development, but only to tide them over for another year. Through this program some of these colleges might well be encouraged to combine with each other or with neighboring institutions. This program in its entirety can be of particular value to areas which are deficient in educational opportunity. The Commission recommends that funding for the developing college program be increased from its present level of \$20 million to \$100 million.

Library Support

A basic tool of any college or university is its library. The current expansion of knowledge, with the resultant massive explosion in literature in all fields, has sharply increased the cost of even the minimal library for an undergraduate college. Major universities with their heavy emphasis on graduate education and research, face even greater increases in their annual library expenditures. The higher education law does provide support for college and research libraries, but the level of funding has been low. In 1966, although \$50 million was authorized, only \$10 million was appropriated. In 1967 and 1968 the appropriation was increased to \$25 million. The Commission recommends that the full authorization of \$50 million be made available in 1970-71 and be increased to \$100 million by 1976, and that libraries which serve a regional need be given a high priority for grants under this program.

International Studies

The years since World War II have witnessed an unprecedented growth in the number of new and independent nations in the world. The problems of their economic and political development and of their accommodation into the international sphere have accentuated the need for stronger university-based programs of international studies. The International Education Act of 1966 authorized some grant programs in this area, but no funds have yet been appropriated. More centers for comprehensive train-

ing and research both on specific geographical areas and on particular fields or issues in world affairs should be encouraged. The Commission recommends that the \$90 million authorized for this program be appropriated in 1970-71 and that funding be increased to \$100 million by 1976-77.

Level of funding. The National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education would be initiating new special programs which, after their developmental phases, would be transferred to appropriate federal agencies.

Total funding for these special programs described above and for the others now in prospect might require \$800 million by 1976-77.

National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education

Research and graduate instruction in the nation's universities have been greatly strengthened over the past two decades, in large part because of substantial research support by the federal government. Parallel gains of this magnitude have not been made in other areas of higher education, such as undergraduate curriculum development, instructional techniques, utilization of resources, and new program areas.

The Commission believes that the federal government can play an extremely valuable role in encouraging developmental programs in higher education by providing initial funds for such undertakings. The continuing rise in the costs of higher education makes it particularly important to develop existing facilities to their greatest potential and to try out new methods and techniques in order to improve operational efficiency and quality. But many institutions find that they do not have a margin of funds for such undertakings.

The Commission proposes the establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education to provide encouragement, advice, review, and financial support for institutional programs designed to provide new directions in curricula, strengthening of essential areas that have fallen behind or that have never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and development of programs to improve educational processes and techniques. The Foundation would be a governmental agency operating under the direction of a board and organized along the lines of the National Science Foundation.

It is intended that all programs funded through the Foundation would be short-run or developmental in character. Programs once experimented with, developed, and proved successful under the National Foundation would be transferred into the special programs category mentioned earlier and administered on a permanent basis by other agencies of the federal government, usually the Office of Education.

Examples of developmental programs which might be funded by the Foundation are the following:

Improvement of Undergraduate Education

Criticism of the quality of undergraduate education has become widespread during the past few years. The recent focus of national attention on research needs and associated graduate instruction has undoubtedly occasioned some neglect of the undergraduate area. In addition, many undergraduate students across the nation have evinced new interest in undergraduate programs which minimize the fragmenting effects of specialization and which emphasize relevance to the current problems of our society. A healthy mood of reform is evident on many campuses and could be encouraged through the National Foundation.

Services to Elementary and Secondary Education

The quality of education at the primary and secondary levels has an obvious bearing

on the number and quality of students who enter our colleges and universities, and it is particularly important in assuring greater equality of access to higher education. In recent years, institutions of higher education have begun to assume more responsibility for assistance to the earlier levels in the educational process, providing supplementary training programs for teachers, help in curriculum design, consultation in connection with school problems such as integration, and other similar services. The federal government has given support to these programs in particular areas. In 1967-68, for example, the National Science Foundation awarded grants of \$46 million for teacher training programs in the sciences, and the Office of Education provided over \$12 million for a program of experienced-teacher fellowships. The National Foundation could review new service programs, which through improving the quality of education at the primary and secondary levels would have valuable consequences for higher education as well.

Regional Liberal Arts Centers

Many undergraduate liberal arts colleges have formed consortia to permit them to use more effectively the resources available to each institution. This development could be encouraged through the National Foundation. The Commission urges that federal funds be made available to regional liberal arts centers which would be established by groups of colleges for the purpose of increasing quality, scope, and diversity in undergraduate education, of stimulating more economical and effective use of administrative and teaching personnel, and of sharing library and computer facilities.

The New Technology

The newly created program of Networks for Knowledge and on-going programs providing financial assistance for computer use at universities and colleges should be continued. The National Foundation could be particularly helpful, however, in evaluating proposals for experimental or pilot programs designed to determine the effectiveness of new educational uses of the whole range of modern technology.

Urban-Grant Activities

The land-grant college movement had a significant effect on the nature of the public and, to some extent, the private university. Today, the pressing problems of the city are calling for a new evaluation of the university's relationship to the city.

If universities and colleges are to aid in the solutions of the complex problems of the inner city, they will have to develop new curricular programs and new concepts of public service. Such developmental programs, during their early phases, could be funded under the National Foundation.

Recommendation

The Commission recommends establishment of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education whose functions would be to encourage, advise, review, and provide financial support for institutional programs designed to give new directions in curricula, to strengthen essential areas that have fallen behind or never been adequately developed because of inadequate funding, and to develop programs for improvement of educational processes and techniques.

Level of funding. The Commission suggests that the Foundation for the Development of Higher Education be funded at a level of approximately \$100 million in 1970-71, rising to \$200 million in 1976-77.

CONCLUSION

The Carnegie Commission has undertaken an independent analysis of the needs of higher education and the needs of the nation as related to the services of higher education. Our analysis has led to the conclusion that

federal aid to higher education, beyond the needed expansion of existing programs, should be directed toward the meeting of two urgent national priorities.

One of these priorities is to achieve greater equality of opportunity for all able young people, both for their own benefit and for the benefit of the nation. Today, young persons whose families are in the top half of the income range have a three times greater chance of entering college than those whose families are in the lower half. We believe it is a realistic goal to improve this ratio of two to one by 1976, the two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, with its promise of equality. Our proposals would draw 1 million additional students into college attendance through what might be called a "Civilian Bill of Educational Rights" for qualified youth without adequate financial means.

The second priority is a substantial expansion of health service personnel. Specifically we recommend federal support to increase medical school places for the training of doctors by three-quarters by 1976 and to develop programs for training new types of medical support personnel. This will require the enlargement of existing medical centers and the creation of as many as 20 new centers.

We also propose the continuation and expansion of a number of existing programs: for construction—including start-up grants for 500 new two-year community colleges and 50 four-year urban colleges; for research—including substantial extension of support beyond the sciences; for the training of Ph. D.s in all academic areas rather than primarily in the sciences; and for new endeavors to strengthen the system of higher education—including the creation of a National Foundation for the Development of Higher Education, which will encourage experimental programs such as those for the improvement of undergraduate instruction and for urban-grant activities.

These new priorities and the expansion of existing programs will cost approximately \$10 billion per year by 1976, or about one-seventh of the \$70 billion in additional federal revenues prospectively available by that year for new national priorities. We recognize the many other valuable purposes for which this increment will be needed, but we consider that a one-seventh share for higher education is warranted.

Our proposals envision keeping the share of private funds for the support of institutions of higher education at their present level of one-half. We feel that this level of private support is important for the autonomy and diversity of higher education. To assure that federal support is given in forms compatible with this private emphasis, we recommend an expanded student aid program giving the student freedom of choice among institutions, a feature which proved so effective under the GI Bill of Rights. This freedom of choice would be further broadened through a proposed student loan bank.

The total governmental share would remain at one-half, with the federal portion rising and the state portion falling, as has been true for the past decade. The federal government has the greater ability to increase its contribution. Also the new emphasis on equality of opportunity, the increase in health care personnel, the training of Ph.D.s for employment throughout the nation, the support of scientific discovery, and the strengthening of the whole system of higher education as a great national resource all reflect increasing national concern and responsibilities.

The Commission's proposals anticipate that the percentage of the GNP spent through institutions of higher education will rise by one-half from 2 to 3 percent. In the past decade the percentage doubled, from 1 to 2 percent, as enrollments doubled, and it now seems reasonable that the percentage

should rise by one-half in the period to 1976, when enrollments will rise by one-half. Throughout this period the forms of service to society are taking on new dimensions in response to changing needs of society. There have been and there will be more knowledge, more training, and more service as higher education provides the intellectual sources of technical and social advance.

The prospects beyond 1976 are not clear. But, as enrollments stabilize, it would seem likely that subsequent support will rise roughly with the rise in GNP and will not require a significantly higher percentage of the GNP. The period from 1956 to 1976 will be viewed as the great period of expansion for higher education—the period in which the tidal wave of students was accommodated, and adjustment was made to the impact of greatly augmented scientific research.

We believe that the nation has a great stake in a dynamic, healthy, and flexible system of higher education, and our recommendations are intended to add to the strength and the progress of the system as well as to make possible greater service to society. The major aims of the proposals are:

To provide student aid in sufficient amounts to assure that no qualified student must forgo or cut short his pursuit of higher education because of financial barriers;

To assist institutions of higher education with funds for expansion of physician facilities and for added instructional costs to assure the necessary places for all qualified students;

To encourage graduate training of professional personnel, with particular emphasis on medical education, to fill critical national needs for practitioners in the health sciences;

To support the most talented Ph.D. candidates and the institutions that train them at levels which will preserve and enhance the highest academic quality;

To continue support of university research, a function which has already contributed so greatly to the national welfare and which holds the best promise of solutions to new problems of vital public concern;

To provide special aid for new directions in curricula, for important areas that have fallen behind through inadequate funding, and for programs to improve educational processes and techniques.

The total cost of the various federal aid programs recommended in this Report would be almost \$7 billion in 1970-71 and would rise to almost \$13 billion in 1976-77. The current cost of comparable federal aid programs is about \$3.5 billion. The federal share of the funding of higher education institutions would rise from 21 to 32 percent, and the state share would fall from 27 to 17 percent. The private share would remain at approximately 50 percent.

Even with the levels of federal support proposed here, state and private sources will find the financial burden of basic support of higher education extremely heavy over the decade ahead. Institutions of higher education for their part will find it absolutely essential to make the most efficient and economical use of their available resources, to exercise the utmost restraint and care in the provision of new programs and facilities, and to reexamine their budgetary standards and practices. The Commission believes that quality can be maintained during a difficult fiscal period by scrupulous evaluation of all current and proposed educational programs.

Federal policy toward higher education and support of higher education require constant and careful overall review. We recommend the establishment of a Council of Advisers on Higher Education attached to the White House to undertake studies and recommend policy on the model of the Council of Economic Advisers.

American higher education is today a basic national resource. It affects the hopes and aspirations of the total population.

ESTIMATED FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FOR COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

[In billions of dollars]

	1970-71	1976-77
Student aid programs.....	1.91	3.56
Educational opportunity grants.....	1.10	2.14
Basic student grants.....	.90	1.60
Supplementary matching grants.....	.11	.38
Institutional scholarship funds.....	.09	.16
Work-study program.....	.51	.87
Counseling program.....	.03	.04
Graduate talent search.....	.03	.10
Doctoral fellowships.....	.11	.16
Loan program.....	.13	.25
Cost-of-education supplements.....	1.13	2.71
Medical education program.....	.33	.43
Student aid.....	.03	.04
General support grants.....	.23	.35
Construction.....	.07	.04
Construction.....	1.26	1.22
Research.....	2.00	4.05
Foundation for the Development of Higher Education.....	.10	.20
Special programs.....	.30	.80
Total.....	7.03	12.97

ESTIMATED FEDERAL LOAN COMMITMENTS UNDER COMMISSION PROPOSALS, 1970-71 AND 1976-77

[In billions of dollars]

	1970-71	1976-77
Construction.....	0.53	0.61
Student loans.....	2.50	5.00

As education through high school has become almost universal, as knowledge has expanded, as the professional and intellectual demands of modern society have become ever more complex, and demanding, the nation has looked increasingly to America's colleges and universities to meet many of our most important national needs:

- For furtherance of individual aspirations;
- For equality of educational and thus economic and social opportunity;
- For scientific and technological advances to stimulate economic growth;
- For highly trained personnel to serve a complex society;
- For cultural enrichment of the quality of life;
- And for the ideas so crucial to solution of profoundly complex issues.

[In billions]

	1967-68	1976-77
Research and development.....	\$1.45	\$4.05
Student aid.....	0.62	3.60
Institutional support cost of education supplements.....	0.44	3.06
Construction.....	0.57	1.26
Other.....	0.37	1.25
Total.....	3.45	13.22

Note: The total of \$13,022,000,000 for 1976-77 includes Federal expenditures for Commission proposals and an estimated \$250,000,000 for certain programs of Federal support to higher education institutions not covered in Commission proposals but expected to be continued. The 1967-68 institutional support figure includes an estimated amount for fellowship and traineeship program expenditures through institutions of higher education which are retained by institutions to defray partially the costs of the training programs.

What the American nation now needs from higher education can be summed up in two words: quality and equality. Our colleges and universities must preserve academic quality if our intellectual resources are to prove equal to the challenges of contemporary life. And the campuses must act boldly to open new channels to equality of educational opportunity.

But these essential national needs will not be fully met unless the federal government assumes new levels of responsibility for higher education. The Carnegie Commission believes that a much greater federal investment is now essential if the growth of higher education is not to be curbed at the very time that the national need demands our best ideas and intellectual skills and the broadest possible extension of equality of opportunity.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today I join with Senators KENNEDY and JAVITS in sponsoring a higher education bill incorporating many of the proposals set forth in the recent Carnegie Commission Report. This bill represents an effort on the part of the three of us to make some suggestions as to the types and magnitude of programs needed in order to equalize educational opportunity at the college and university level. Our purpose in introducing the bill at this time is to acquaint the members of Congress with the severe financial needs of our college-age students and the universities which will be educating them. In no sense should the bill be viewed as a finished product, but hopefully, it will act as a catalytic agent to encourage discussion and debate in the Senate and will result in the passage of financially feasible and realistic legislation which will accomplish the purpose of making a higher education available to all qualified Americans who desire it.

AUTHORITY FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE AND REFER MESSAGES AND FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, April 21, 1969, during the adjournment of the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and from the House of Representatives, and that they may be appropriately referred. I also ask unanimous consent that on that day all committees may file reports, including minority, individual, and additional views.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1969

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

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR FULBRIGHT AT DENISON UNIVERSITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Senator J. W. Fulbright, is to deliver an address tonight at Denison University in Granville, Ohio, on the subject of militarism and American democracy.

This is a subject which has been of increasing interest to the Senate and members of the American public over the past

few months and I hope that Members will read Senator Fulbright's careful and thoughtful remarks with care.

I think the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is to be commended for making such a significant statement at this time. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the RECORD.

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

MILITARISM AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY
(Statement by Senator J. W. Fulbright, chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, Owens-Corning Lecture, Denison University, Granville, Ohio, April 18, 1969, 8:15 p.m.)

Perhaps the hardest thing for the older generation to understand about the student generation is the intensity with which it perceives the cruelty and insanity of our modern world. One might have thought that, having grown up in quieter times, the men who now run this country would be more appalled by the dangers of the present than the young who never knew anything else. But that seems not to be the case: time and continuing turmoil seem to dull the capacity for feeling shock and, with it, moral indignation. Perhaps also, having known quieter times, we old folks find it possible to believe that the current crisis is temporary and transitional, and that, if only we will forebear and endure, life will return to a kind of normalcy.

I suspect that experience is a bad teacher in this case. As Margaret Mead pointed out recently, "All of us who grew up before the war are immigrants in time, immigrants from an earlier world living in an age essentially different from anything we knew before."¹ It is the native born of the atomic age who seem to be its more perceptive diagnosticians. "It is you of the student generation who seem to have recognized that Vietnam and the nuclear balance of terror are not just an aberration but part of a profound and irreversible upheaval in human affairs, to which the old methods of politics have become grotesquely irrelevant. Perhaps that is because you never knew the world in which the old ways made some sense. Or perhaps, as Professor George Wald of Harvard put it in a memorable speech, it is because you are a generation that is by no means sure that it has a future."² I would like to reassure you but I cannot. I don't know either whether there is going to be a future, because the invention of nuclear weapons has given an entirely new meaning to death. From the time man appeared upon the earth to the middle of the twentieth century coming to terms with death was an individual matter. Now death has become a prospect not just for the individual but for the human species. With varying degrees of insight into its revolutionary meaning every one of us carries the knowledge that it is possible—technologically and politically possible—that at any moment our civilization may be all but annihilated. It is this knowledge which constitutes the revolution of our time; and it is the sensitivity of its meaning which separates the generations—dividing those who grew up with it from those who grew up before it by a chasm of outlook and attitude.

I. THE ABM: POWER POLITICS AS USUAL
The recent and continuing debate over the anti-ballistic missile provides a striking example of the survival of outmoded attitudes into an era in which they are not only meaningless but extravagantly dangerous.

Footnotes at end of article.

Sitting as I have in recent weeks through long hours of Committee hearings and debate on the ABM, I was struck again and again by the thought: we are talking about the possible destruction of entire societies, including our own, as if this were a hazard not fundamentally different, except in scale, from more familiar misfortunes such as earthquakes or fires or an epidemic of Asian flu; and we are talking about the death of fifty or so million people—give or take ten million; it doesn't matter much when you are talking about "megadeaths"—as if this would mean no more than a temporary dislocation in our affairs. It's not that we have become insensate monsters. It's more as though we didn't really believe our own words. We are talking about these things—these fifty million deaths—as if they were unreal; we are talking about them in the abstract, and in the abstract they are unreal. We are acknowledging possibilities that we do not really feel to be possibilities because they are so far outside anything we have ever experienced. Even a word like "megadeath" has an antiseptic sound. It doesn't sound like blood and pain and burns and mutilations.

Listening to the Senate debate on the ABM, I have been filled with this sense of unreality. I don't think it is very hard to show the unsoundness of the arguments made by the proponents of the ABM: what I do find unfathomable is their apparently sincere belief that we can seek security from a nuclear weapons system in the same way that, before the nuclear age, we sought security from our fleet or from our air force. Allow me, very briefly, to review the main arguments made for the ABM:

It is said that a "thin"—that is to say, a \$9 billion—ABM system would deter an attack by China. But, as one expert witness told the Disarmament Subcommittee, an attack by China with the modest forces at its disposal would be wildly irrational in any case because it would certainly provoke a retaliatory blow which would destroy China. Should the Chinese be so irrational as to attack the United States anyway, they would not be deterred by so "rational" a deterrent as the ABM—which, in any case, they would probably be capable of penetrating.³

The Secretary of Defense professes to believe—although he has since qualified the assertion—that, with their powerful new SS9 missile, the Russians are committed to a strategy of first-strike, which is to say, a preemptive attack to destroy our retaliatory capacity. How Mr. Laird knows this is not made clear; he just says he does. But his own Administration seems not to share this alarming assessment of Soviet strategy. Secretary of State Rogers told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on March 27 that the Nixon Administration would be "delighted" to negotiate a mutual dismantlement of defensive missiles with the Russians—a position the Administration could hardly take if it were convinced the Russians had adopted a first-strike strategy. Indeed, in his press conference of March 14, President Nixon made it very clear that he was not persuaded of a Soviet first-strike strategy. The Russians, he said, "have always thought in defensive terms, and if you read not only their political leaders, but their military leaders, the emphasis is on defense."

Even if the Russians were engaged in an effort to build a force capable of destroying our retaliatory power in a first strike, it is most unlikely that they could do so. Our strategic forces are now capable of delivering over four thousand nuclear warheads, less than one-tenth of which, according to former Secretary of Defense McNamara, could destroy over 75 percent of the industry of the Soviet Union and kill over 30 percent of the

population. As one expert witness told the Disarmament Subcommittee, "I would not claim that the development by the Soviet Union of such a first-strike capability is impossible, but it is at worst a distant prospect."⁴

Finally, it is urged that the ABM will be a useful bargaining lever in disarmament negotiations with the Russians. All previous experience shows that, far from facilitating agreement, the introduction of a new weapons system by one side invariably provokes the other side into matching or exceeding it. It was indeed our own apprehension about Soviet anti-ballistic missile capacity that gave us the idea of a missile with several warheads on it, an idea which has blossomed into the glorious new invention known as MIRV—the multiple independent reentry vehicle—which is now being readied, at great cost, for our Minuteman missiles and Polaris submarines. Each side tends to assume the worst, planning for what has come to be known as the greater-than-expected threat. When you acquire a new weapons system, you must assume that it may not work as planned while your adversary must assume that it will. The result is the stepping up of the arms race, with mounting danger, skyrocketing costs, and rapidly diminishing security. As a bargaining lever for disarmament, the ABM is likely to be as effective as gasoline shot through a fire hose.

All these arguments for the ABM are made in the vocabulary of the old power politics. Lost to view is any kind of awareness that we have passed through a revolution in the conditions of life and politics upon the earth, as a result of which the old methods will no longer serve us. They had indeed ceased to serve us before the nuclear age began, having collapsed in the carnage of the two world wars. Now the ancient techniques of the power politics are not only discredited but intolerably dangerous, but we do not seem able to part with them, much less devise new forms appropriate to the times. Our public rhetoric is full of assertions about a "new age" and "uncharted seas," about world community and the importance of disarmament. We say these things but we say them without conviction, without urgency and commitment, without the sincerity that could only be demonstrated by acting on them. We have spoken so much about disarmament and community and the brotherhood of man that they all now seem like clichés; we have grown weary of the words without ever having really grasped their meaning.

The old, discredited methods still dominate our thinking and behavior. We still study and still practice nineteenth century power politics as if its techniques were tried and tested and proven, as if the two world wars had never happened. We commend these disastrous anachronisms to ourselves as guidelines to prudence and "realism." Perhaps this is because of the difficulty people have in grasping the enormity of the changes brought by the nuclear age and the enormity of the disaster with which we are threatened. We are hobbled in our thinking by a failure of imagination, the inability to conceive of the disaster of thermonuclear war—and of tens of millions of dead; of burned, maimed and radiation-poisoned survivors; of the collapse of public services and the breakdown of economic life; of disease and epidemics; of a furious struggle for life by tortured and debilitated people.

The ability to contemplate these horrors with equanimity is properly credited not to strong nerves but to a weak mind. We are indeed afloat upon uncharted seas and we must learn somehow not just to say it but to know it and to act upon it. We must learn somehow that the old "realism" has become a dangerous delusion. As Professor Wald put

it: "We have to get rid of those nuclear weapons. There is nothing worth having that can be obtained by nuclear war; nothing material or ideological, no tradition that it can defend. It is utterly self-defeating."⁵

II. "MERCHANTS OF DEATH"

There are some less arcane reasons for our stubborn adherence to the old methods. Dangerous though it may be, the arms race is also exceedingly profitable. It is profitable not only to the "Strangeloves of the military-industrial complex," as I. F. Stone calls them,⁶ but to millions of honest, decent Americans whose primary concern is with nothing more than earning a decent living for their families. The industries and businesses which fill military orders have become the largest single producer of goods and services in the United States, pouring some \$45 billion a year into over five thousand communities where more than eight million Americans, including members of the armed forces, and comprising 10 percent of the labor force, earn their living from defense spending.

Violence has become the nation's leading industry. We are now spending about \$80 billion a year on the military, which is more than the profits of all American business, or, to make another comparison, is almost as much as the total spending of federal, state, and local governments for health, education, old age and retirement benefits, housing and agriculture. Drawing their income from the \$80 billion military budget, the defense industry forms what amounts to a giant concentration of socialism in our nominally free enterprise economy. As one writer who has made a study of the political and economic effects of defense spending has noted, the federal budget has become a dominant "growth industry" and "... it is defense expenditures and not welfare programs that have so greatly enlarged the federal government's role in the economy."⁷

It is not an enthusiasm for war but simple economic self-interest that has drawn millions of workers, their labor unions and their elected representatives into the military-industrial complex. For all of them the anti-ballistic missile means prosperity not war. For the industrialist it means higher profits not war; for the worker new jobs and the prospect of higher wages; for the politician a new installation or defense order with which to ingratiate himself with his constituents. These benefits, once obtained, are not easily parted with. Every new weapons system or military installation soon acquires a constituency—a process which is aided and abetted by the perspicacity with which Pentagon officials award lucrative contracts and establish new plants and installations in the districts of influential Members of Congress. I have not the slightest doubt that, if the anti-ballistic missile is deployed, "thick" or "thin," it will soon acquire its own powerful constituency, whereupon we will be saddled with it—for reasons wholly independent of its ostensible military utility.

The defense industry and the military establishment are coming under a kind of interlocking directorate. According to a survey made for the Subcommittee on Economy and Government of the Joint Economic Committee under the chairmanship of Senator Proxmire of Wisconsin, the one hundred biggest defense contractors now employ 2,072 former high-ranking military officers. Among these the ten largest companies, which received \$11.6 billion in defense contracts last year, now employ 1,065 former high-ranking officers. The nine major producers of the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile, as initiated by the Johnson Administration, employ 465 former military officers. All this, as Senator Proxmire said in something of an understatement, points to "the increasing influence of the big

Footnotes at end of article.

contractors with the military and the military with the big contractors."⁷

Spawned by our global military involvements, the military-industrial complex has become a powerful force for the perpetuation of those involvements. Millions of Americans have acquired a vested interest in the expensive weapons systems which provide their livelihood and, indirectly therefore, in a foreign policy that has plunged the United States into a spiraling arms race with the Soviet Union; made us the world's major salesman of armaments; and committed us to the defense of "freedom"—very loosely defined—in almost fifty countries, including Vietnam, Spain and Greece with their "freedom-loving" regimes.

I would not equate the vested interest of the Pentagon generals and the leaders of the aerospace industry with that of the ordinary wage-earner but, lest we become too sanctimonious about the fat-cats, it is well to remember that, in armaments as in other lines of work, it is not the price received but the service rendered that gives a profession its name. And that brings me to the role of the universities in the military-industrial complex.

A university in the classic sense is an idealistic rather than a "pragmatic" institution, primarily committed to moral rather than expedient purposes, to the pursuit of truth and meaning rather than the sale of goods and services. In recognition of this special status, universities are generously supported by tax exemptions and both public and private contributions. The university in turn has a responsibility to protect its status as an "idealistic" institution, not to the point of remoteness or irrelevance to the problems of society, but by maintaining a sufficient degree of detachment from political authorities to make certain that it does not become a "pragmatic" institution, a paid producer of goods and services, a hireling of the state.

It is difficult to say exactly where the line should be drawn in practical application but the general principle seems clear: a university maintains its integrity only insofar as its preponderant resources are committed to the education of its students and the disinterested pursuit of knowledge—not only that knowledge which contributes to the solution of technical and social problems but the whole range of nonutilitarian scholarship which contributes to man's understanding of himself. Other activities—including the performance of specific services to the state—are appropriate only insofar as they are subordinate in scale and compatible in character with the university's primary responsibilities.

To a far greater extent than its European counterparts the American university has always had a penchant, in Alfred North Whitehead's phrase, for "mating itself with action," and this has contributed both to the welfare of the country and the vitality of the university. But, coupled with an unprecedented need for funds in the years since World War II, the penchant for action has also turned out to be a serious weakness of our universities. Tempted by lucrative government contracts, many universities—especially the big and famous ones—have become neglectful of their paramount responsibilities and have gone dangerously far toward becoming servants of the state. Because the major source by far of government contract funds is the military establishment, the universities have been drawn primarily into military, or militarily useful, research in the physical and social sciences, becoming in the process card-carrying members of the military-industrial complex.

The government by and large has been well-satisfied with the contributions of academic experts—although my Committee has come across more than a few instances in which it seemed to us that the government

had been defrauded. And, in the irreverent words of a report written by two professors from Michigan State for the United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, the government's delight "has been matched by squeals of joy in the academy." The attractions, say the two professors, are profit, prestige, and "opportunities to orbit deans around the world."⁸

Even more irreverently, Dean Don K. Price of the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard offered a limerick apropos of the universities' response to government blandishments:

"There was a young lady from Kent,
Who said that she knew what it meant,
When men took her to dine
Gave her cocktails and wine
She knew what it meant—but she went."

What it has meant is the wholesale neglect of students by prominent faculty members, the wholesale neglect of unsalable forms of scholarship, the distortion of curriculum and research toward merchantable activities, and the taking into camp of leading academics by the military-industrial complex. No one of course requires this of the universities; it comes about not as a result of direct federal control but simply from the influence purchased by lavish government funds. Lacking a use for philosophy and poetry, the Defense Department and the Central Intelligence Agency offer no funds for these disciplines; the government is a patron only of the more lethal arts.

The University of California at Berkeley, according to a student publication, receives almost 90 percent of its research grants in the physical sciences and almost 70 percent of its research grants in the social sciences from the federal government. Berkeley, as you know, is also one of the centers of student rebellion. I think there is a relationship. I also think there is a relationship between student dissent and the fact that the Naval Biological Laboratory administered by Berkeley's School of Public Health is engaged in research for the Navy in biological warfare. With the participation of faculty members of the School of Public Health, research is conducted in the field of "aerobiology," which has to do with the transmission of communicable diseases.

Research in chemical and biological warfare is not one of those activities than can be regarded as appropriate to an "idealistic" institution. Nor is Pentagon-sponsored field research in counterinsurgency an appropriate activity for social scientists who ought to be acting as independent and critical commentators on their government's policies. Far from being victims of anti-intellectualism as some of these scholars complain when their activities are criticized, they themselves are perpetrating a virulent form of anti-intellectualism. They do so by contributing to the corruption of their universities, the militarization of American society, and that persistent degradation of values which goes by the polite name of "credibility gap."

III. AMERICAN MILITARISM

In a society whose leading industry is violence, one of the leading professions, inevitably, is soldiering. Chronically at war, or threatening war, or being threatened with war, with a million and a half American military people stationed outside of our own borders, with a huge and costly military establishment and a gigantic defense industry, "America," as former Marine Corps Commandant David M. Shoup recently wrote, "has become a militaristic and aggressive nation."⁹

Militarism is new to America. Prior to World War II we never maintained more than a token peacetime army; even in 1940, on the eve of World War II, there were less than half a million men in the armed forces. In those days the military had little prestige

or influence. "For in my youth," Walter Lippmann once recalled, "we all assumed that the money spent on battleships would better be spent on schoolhouses, and that war was an affair that 'militarists' talked about and not something that seriously-minded progressive democrats paid any attention to."¹⁰ Nor, in those years, was there anything resembling the military-industrial complex which looms so large in our affairs today. Allegations made in the thirties to the effect that the United States had been maneuvered into World War I by munitions makers, by the "merchants of death" as they were called, turned out to be unfounded.

World War II gave birth to American militarism, and the cold war, the Korean War and the Vietnamese war nourished it into the giant force of today. These wars conferred upon military leaders the power and prestige which previously they had been denied. Military leaders, as General Shoup points out, became not only popular heroes but respected opinion makers.

In addition we have become a nation of veterans—over twenty-three million as of 1968. This means that one-fifth of our adult population have been subjected to some degree of indoctrination in military values and attitudes. The great veterans organizations, with over four million members, have grown into one of the most powerful lobbies in Washington primarily working for veterans' benefits but, often too, lobbying for chauvinist and belligerent foreign policies.

There is much that is valuable in military experience: it encourages loyalty, honor and courage. But it also fosters less wholesome attitudes—conformism, elitism, authoritarianism, and a certain romanticism about war. As time passes, memories are revised, and the veteran is likely to remember the comradeship and excitement while forgetting the killing and the fear; he may remember the music and pageantry while forgetting how hot and smelly and boring it is in a column of marching men. Most of all, as nostalgia sets in, the veteran is likely to remember the thrill of adventure while forgetting its lethal purpose. As General Shoup puts it: "Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experience the blood, terror, and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game, and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime."¹¹

At the core of the new American militarism is the professional officers' corps made up of a few thousand high-ranking officers of unusual ability and energy. Marked as men of talent by their rise to the highest ranks through the rigorous competitiveness of the military services, they bring to bear a strength of conviction and near unanimity of outlook that gives them an influence on public policy disproportionate to their numbers. Disciplined and loyal to their respective services, with added prestige in the case of many of them deriving from heroic combat records, they operate with an efficiency and effectiveness not often found among civilian officials. In addition, as General Shoup points out, they always have a plan in an emergency, and that can be very beguiling to anxious politicians and frightened people.

The danger arises from the narrowness of outlook of so many professional soldiers, an outlook amounting to an inveterate preference for the use of force. As one social psychologist, Professor Ralph K. White of George Washington University, points out, every profession tends to overvalue its own stock in trade and it is only natural that soldiers lay great stress on theirs, which happens to be weapons.¹² To the "professional" soldier it is axiomatic that, if you make enemy "hurt" enough, he will eventually give in. If, as in Vietnam, the enemy does not give in to superior power, that is attributed to an insufficiency of force and can be remedied

Footnotes at end of article.

by applying more force. To this military prototype, there is "no substitute for victory" and the failure to apply the necessary force to achieve it is taken as the result of a failure of will, a lack of courage, and even a deficiency of virility. Excluded from serious consideration is the possibility that force may fail, as in Vietnam, not because you didn't use enough of it, but because it was the wrong thing to use in the first place.

The critical deficiency in the soldier's outlook, Professor White suggests, is a lack of empathy with the enemy, and a consequent lack of ability to predict the enemy's behavior.¹³ Assuming a perfect inverse relationship between the amount of force you apply and the enemy's will to resist, the military planner takes grossly insufficient account of psychological factors. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor was a brilliant strategic success; it virtually destroyed the American Pacific fleet, but the Japanese totally failed to foresee how the attack would unify the American people and galvanize the enormous resources and energies which were to bring ruin to the Japanese Empire. In similar fashion, the think-tank strategists and Pentagon planners failed to gauge the psychological effects of our military intervention in South Vietnam and our bombing of North Vietnam, and, in the wake of this failure, their pseudo-scientific theories of limited war and "graduated escalation" have gone hopelessly awry. Fighting in their own homeland against an enemy whom they regard as a foreign invader, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese have failed inexplicably to respond to scientifically inflicted punishment with scientific displays of pain.

Our greatest military miscalculation was not as to the enemy's behavior but our own. It was not foreseen that the American people would not indefinitely sustain a war against a small, distant and backward country, a war without valid or attainable purpose, a war in which success is measured not by the attainment of positive objectives but by the barbarous standard of "kill ratios." What no one foresaw—neither the military nor the rest of us—was that we would become trapped in a conflict matching the enemy's willingness to die against our willingness to kill. For us the choice has become one between victory and decency—an awkward choice indeed, suggesting that somewhere along the line there was a failure in our military planning.

Just as force is the professional soldier's stock in trade, war is his best opportunity for advancement. I do not think that military professionals consciously seek or yearn for war, but they can hardly be blamed if they do not abhor it as civilians do. Peacetime duty is dull. An army in peacetime is like Congress during adjournment—without the same opportunities for travel. Combat provides a soldier with the opportunity for distinction, advancement and command. General Shoup takes note of this tendency,¹⁴ and so indeed did that most perceptive observer of America, Alexis de Tocqueville, who took note over a hundred years ago of the special dangers and susceptibilities of military establishments in democracies. In aristocracies, Tocqueville points out, the nobility become officers as a matter of duty and their ranks are foreclosed by birth, but, "In democratic armies all the soldiers may become officers, and that fact makes desire for promotion general and opens almost infinite doors to military ambition.

"Desire for promotion is almost universal in democratic armies," Tocqueville continues, "it is eager, tenacious, and continual. All other desires serve to feed it, and it is only quenched with life itself. It is therefore easy to see that promotion in times of peace must be slower in democratic armies than in any other armies in the world.

"Therefore all the ambitious minds in a democratic army ardently long for war, because war makes vacancies available and at last allows violations of the rule of seniority, which is the one privilege natural to a democracy.

"We thus arrive at the strange conclusion that of all armies those which long for war most ardently are the democratic ones, but that of all peoples those most deeply attached to peace are the democratic nations. And the most extraordinary thing about the whole matter is that it is equality which is responsible for both these contradictory results."¹⁵

The military have become ardent and dangerous competitors for power in American society. The services compete with each other for funds, for the control of new weapons systems, and for the privilege of being "first to fight." Constantly improving their techniques for rapid deployment, they not only yearn to try them out but actively seek opportunities by pressing their proposals on political authorities, who all too often are tempted by the seemingly quick, "surgical" courses of action proposed by the military in preference to the endless, wearisome methods of diplomacy. For a variety of reasons—to test new plans and equipment, to try out the techniques of counterinsurgency, and, in the case of the Marines, says General Shoup, just to avoid the disgrace of being left out¹⁶—all of the military services were enthusiastic about the initial involvement in Vietnam. By now they should have had their fill, but they still seem game to go on, trying out new weapons and strategies, although up to now the only military principle which has been vindicated in Vietnam is Tocqueville's maxim that, "There are two things that will always be very difficult for a democratic nation: to start a war and to end it."¹⁷

Even though there is probably not a single top-ranking officer in any of the armed services who would consider an attempt to overturn constitutional government in the way of *Seven Days in May*, militarism poses a distinct threat to our democracy. At the very minimum it represents a dangerously constricted and highly influential point of view toward our foreign relations—a viewpoint which takes little account of political complexities, even less of social and economic factors, and just about none of human and psychological considerations.

But the military is more than a benign repository of parochial political views. It has become a vigorous partisan in our politics, exerting great influence on the executive, on the military committees of Congress, on the "think-tanks" and universities to which it parcels out lucrative research contracts, and on public opinion. A few weeks ago it came to my attention that the Department of the Army was planning a national publicity campaign, involving exhibits and planted magazine articles to be solicited from tame civilian scientists, in order to sell the ABM to the American public and to counteract the criticisms of Congressmen and the scientific community.

Only very rarely does a general invoke the higher loyalty of patriotism—his own concept of it, that is—over loyalty to civilian political authority, as General MacArthur did in his defiance of President Truman. But if, as time goes on, the country continues to be chronically at war, continues to sustain a huge, largely autonomous military establishment, and continues to neglect its domestic problems, militarism will surely increase, and even if the military does not take over the government directly, it could come to acquire power comparable to that of the German General Staff in the years before World War I. It may not seem likely now, but it is by no means so inconceivable that we need not warn against it and act to prevent it.

The root cause of militarism is war, and as long as we have the one, we will be menaced

by the other. Tocqueville expressed it as follows:

"War does not always give democratic societies over to military government, but it must invariably and immeasurably increase the power of civil government; it must almost automatically concentrate the direction of all men and the control of all things in the hands of the government. If that does not lead to despotism by sudden violence, it leads men gently in that direction by their habits.

"All those who seek to destroy the freedom of the democratic nations must know that war is the surest and shortest means to accomplish this. That is the very first axiom of their science."¹⁸

IV. DEFENDING AMERICAN DEMOCRACY

The best defense against militarism is peace; the next best is the vigorous practice of democracy. We are not having much success in making peace, but we are practicing democracy. The dissent against Vietnam, the opposition to the ABM, and the growing willingness of Congress to look into the hitherto sacrosanct military budget are all encouraging.

I have indeed been gratified—and frankly somewhat surprised—by the change in the Senate's attitude on military matters. A new Foreign Relations subcommittee under Senator Symington is beginning a general inquiry into military influences on our foreign policy. And Senator Gore's Disarmament Subcommittee has held public, televised hearings on the anti-ballistic missile. Four Republican Senators recently issued a statement protesting the ABM and other wasteful military projects.¹⁹ And Senator Ellender of Louisiana, who is not usually regarded as an apostle of the New Left, said recently that

"... For almost 20 years now, many of us in the Congress have more or less blindly followed our military spokesmen. Some have become captives of the military. We are on the verge of turning into a militaristic nation. . . . We have forgotten many of the traditions and values which made this country great, and we have flung men, arms, and material almost heedlessly about the world."²⁰

Congressional concern with militarism reflects a mounting concern in the country as a whole. The drift into militarism and imperialism has elicited a powerful reaction from millions of our citizens, especially our youth, and I am much inclined to the view that, no matter how radical they regard themselves, our youth—except for a very few—have become the defenders of traditional American values. Having believed in the principles they were brought up to believe in—such as Jefferson's idea of liberty, Lincoln's idea of equality, and Wilson's idea of a peaceful community of nations—the present generation of young Americans have seen these ideas betrayed, and they are protesting against it.

They do so with a motivation that older people lack—even if they share the insight—because it is you of the student generation who are called upon to fight your country's battles. I have some awareness of the anguish that Vietnam and the draft impose upon so many of you. And while I wish that you did not have to bear this unfair burden, I must admit that I take a certain hope for the future from the moral sensibilities that underlie your anguish.

In his notable decision voiding the conviction of a non-religious conscientious objector, Judge Wyzanski of Boston may have eased the prospect for some young people who will be faced with the draft and with Vietnam, and I hope that will be the case. At the very least he has enunciated a civilized democratic principle in asserting the right of selective conscientious objection, because, unless it is believed that all wars are equally just or unjust, and unless it is believed that only organized religions provide valid bases for moral conviction, the rule overturned

Footnotes at end of article.

by Judge Wyzanski makes neither sense nor justice. As Judge Wyzanski put it, "Indeed a selective conscientious objector might reflect a more discriminating study of the problem, a more sensitive conscience, and a deeper spiritual understanding."

In the courts, in the universities and in Congress democracy is reasserting itself. It is engaged in a holding action against the new militarism. But as long as we remain at war, it can only be a holding action, because—if I may adapt an old military axiom—in a democracy there is no substitute for peace.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Quoted in *The New York Times*, March 16, 1969.

² Speech delivered at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, March 4, 1969, sponsored by the March 4 Movement protesting the misuses of science. *The Washington Post*, March 30, 1969, p. B3.

³ Statement of Dr. George Kistiakowsky, March 11, 1969, *Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of the ABM Systems*. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations, U.S. Senate, 91st Cong., 2nd Sess., (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969).

⁴ Statement by Dr. George Rathjens, March 28, 1969, *Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of the ABM Systems*.

⁵ I. F. Stone's *Weekly*, March 24, 1969, p. 7.

⁶ Julius Duschka, *Arms, Money and Politics* (New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1965), p. 62.

⁷ Bernard D. Nossiter, "Arms Makers Offer Haven for Ex-Pentagon Brass," *The Washington Post*, March 23, 1969, p. A2.

⁸ Walter Adams and Adrian Jaffe, *Government, The Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity*, Special Report Prepared for the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, 90th Cong., 1st Sess., House Doc. No. 120 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1967), p. 10.

⁹ "The New American Militarism," *The Atlantic*, April 1969, p. 51.

¹⁰ *United States Foreign Policy: Shield of the Republic*, (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1943), p. xi.

¹¹ "The New American Militarism," p. 53.

¹² Ralph K. White, *Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars* (Garden City: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1968), p. 221.

¹³ *Ibid.*, pp. 219-221.

¹⁴ "The New American Militarism," p. 54.

¹⁵ Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America* (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1966), Vol. II, ch. 22, pp. 622-623.

¹⁶ "The New American Militarism," p. 55.

¹⁷ *Democracy in America*, p. 624.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 625.

¹⁹ Senators Goodell, Cook, Hatfield and Saxbe, in a statement issued by Senators Goodell and Cook at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, April 3, 1969.

²⁰ *Congressional Record*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess., April 1, 1969, p. 8298.

THE NAVY RECONNAISSANCE PLANE INCIDENT IN THE SEA OF JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the fact that the administration and other countries are making every effort through search missions to locate possible wreckage and to save, if possible, the lives of any survivors of the Navy reconnaissance plane which was shot down off North Korea. I commend the President for his cool and deliberate approach to this crisis.

The incident, however, raises several questions in my mind. First, let me say that it is my belief that this particular

intelligence operation was carried on without the personal knowledge of President Nixon even as the incident of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was carried on without the personal knowledge of President Johnson. The questions I have in my mind are: First, why was this trip necessary; and, second, why are relatively unarmed ships like the *Pueblo*, and unarmed planes, like this one, sent into areas where the risk of incidents of this kind is very high?

It appears to me that what has happened has resulted from a carryover of an intelligence policy and procedure which had been in existence for some years and which has been continued automatically into the present, in the absence of orders to the contrary from the new administration.

The President and the Nation require protection from that sort of situation. We need to make certain that the activities of the diverse intelligence agencies are in accord with present need, as determined by the responsible elected leadership and that the agencies do not work at times at cross purposes. They must be brought under the control of the President of the United States. I would suggest that serious consideration be given, therefore, to the creation of a headquarters element within the White House. It could evaluate the numerous continuing intelligence programs of the agencies and departments so that the responsible elected administration will know what intelligence activities are being carried on by whom, where, and for what purpose. This information should be at the disposal of the President if he chooses to have it or at the disposal of someone directly responsible to him on a daily basis so that the elected administration will be fully aware of what is happening throughout the world and would not be placed in the difficult position of its predecessors as in the cases of the U-2 incident and the *Pueblo*.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER— RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF MAINE

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD* a joint resolution of the Legislature of Maine in memoriam of Gen. Dwight David Eisenhower, 34th President of the United States of America.

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

IN MEMORIAM

Whereas, we are deeply grieved by the death of General Dwight David Eisenhower the thirty-fourth President of the United States of America and truly a great American; and

Whereas, the spirit of his firm but compassionate leadership shall forever remain in the hearts of all peace-loving people throughout the world; and

Whereas, his every act reflected an inspiring sense of enduring devotion to duty, to honor and to country long to be cherished by all free men; and

Whereas, in his passing, not only the people of this State, but a nation of states and

a world of nations, have suffered, as history will record, an irreparable loss; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the House of Representatives concurring, that the Legislature stand and tender a moment of silent prayer and upon adjourning this day, it do so out of respect to the memory of our beloved General Dwight D. Eisenhower; and be it further

Resolved, that a copy of this joint resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the family of the deceased.

In Senate Chamber, read and adopted, ordered sent forthwith, April 1, 1969.

Sent Down For Concurrence.

JERROLD B. SPEERS,

Secretary.

House of Representatives, read and adopted, April 1, 1969.

In concurrence.

BERTHA W. JOHNSON,

Clerk.

SHARING OF TAXES WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations recently adopted a resolution requesting Congress to adopt a program providing for a sharing of taxes with State and local governments. So that Senators may be aware of the views expressed by the legislature of my State, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly be printed in the *RECORD*.

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

RESOLUTION H. 1418

Resolution memorializing Congress to institute a tax-sharing program with State and local governments

Resolved, That the general assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to institute a tax-sharing program with state and local governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state be and he hereby is authorized to transmit a duly certified copy of this resolution to each senator and representative from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States in the hope that they will use every effort to institute and expedite such a program.

Attest:

AUGUST P. LAFRANCE,

Secretary of State.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, "Dwight David Eisenhower": The name evokes the title "President" and rank of "general" and at once something more, something simpler. For to his time and his people, he was simply "Ike," in a word, a most likable man.

We marched with "the general" across North Africa, then on to Sicily and Italy. We embarked with him on the "great crusade" that began on the beaches of Normandy and ended in that schoolhouse in Rheims.

We followed him eagerly, for he was a brilliant strategist and something more. He had that ability to weld together the greatest alliance of armies the world has ever seen. He was able to sustain victory with modesty, extend a hand and grin to the troops. "My name's Eisenhower" was all he said.

After the war, Sir Winston Churchill was to call him "the great and humble soldier." Great he was, and more. He was an authentic hero, and the Nation embraced him while he shunned heroics.

He was able to evade the early "Draft Ike" boomlets that sprung up around the country, but a large body of Americans were persistent—they wanted "Ike."

In the winter of 1952, I joined with a number of Republican colleagues in the House of Representatives in urging General Eisenhower to return from Europe and seek our party's nomination for the Presidency. As a freshman Representative, I was flattered to be included in this entreaty.

Ike answered our urgings in a letter dated March 10, 1952. I shall never forget his reply. It showed the two characteristics that were the mark of his greatness: candor and humility. At once he pointed to what he considered to be the lack of a popular call for his candidacy and his obligations to SHAPE; but he qualified this latter point humbly:

Of course, I am not indispensable to the success of NATO and SHAPE—even if at one time many may have thought me so. If I were, then I should actually be to some extent a failure, for one of my primary objectives here has been the development of an organization that can carry on despite any loss of personnel—from the Supreme Commander through all the levels of the staff. With the help of devoted and able associates, that sort of organization has been perfected. I firmly believe that, should I walk out of this headquarters tomorrow, the mission would be carried on by competent hands—carried on successfully.

I admired General Eisenhower's modesty and sense of duty, but I disagreed with his conclusion. He humbly overlooked his irreplaceable contribution which was his extraordinary ability to understand others' viewpoints, to work in harmony with them, and to bring their divergent opinions together.

As his unparalleled cohesive talents were needed in wartime, they were needed during the early cold war years in Europe. Likewise and perhaps to an even greater extent, they were needed at home.

He reexamined his March 10 position and returned, and what we now refer to as "the Eisenhower years" began.

He was a soldier, yet he dedicated his Presidency to seeing, in his words, "people in my profession permanently put out of a job." He ended the war in Korea and waged peace for the 8 years of his incumbency.

"The Eisenhower years" are only a decade past, yet they seem even further removed. Now they seem a simple time, yet our nostalgia is deceptive.

It is now fashionable to dismiss "the Eisenhower years" as merely a period of consolidation, but this ignores the crises and conflicts, programs, and progress which marked the era.

What we seem to remember most at this time is the fact that the challenges of those years were met with the reassurance that President Eisenhower brought to the Nation, the feeling that Eisenhower was in the White House and all was well with the world.

We placed our faith in him and he

sustained it, and the world seemed so much simpler as long as he was with us.

Now, therefore, the parting is difficult, because what he was is as important as what he did.

Farewell, General; goodbye, Mr. President. You served us well and gave us much, and we asked so much of you.

THE MARIHUANA MENACE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of Senators an excellent article entitled "Beware of the Marihuana Menace," published in the April 1969, issue of the FBI Law Enforcement Bulletin.

The article, written by John G. McNamara, Chief of Police in Cheshire, Conn., is concerned primarily with narcotics abuses in his community. Nevertheless, its message is valuable for all of us and for all communities throughout the country.

The primary thrust of the article is the fact that although there is serious and widespread drug usage among our youth, too many communities are unaware that the situation exists in their very midst.

But as the article illustrates, in the present day, no area and no socioeconomic class is immune to youthful drug addiction, and the sooner we accept the reality of this situation, the sooner we can take constructive steps toward its solution.

As Chief McNamara points out, there is a great need for full community cooperation in coping with the marihuana menace. Efforts by law enforcement agents alone are insufficient for handling a crisis of such magnitude, for the drug problem is an issue which involves the family, the school, the church, and other organizations in the community at large.

I commend Chief McNamara and the citizens of Cheshire for their timely and wholehearted efforts, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of Chief McNamara's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

BEWARE OF THE MARIHUANA MENACE

(By John G. McNamara, Chief of Police, Cheshire, Conn.)

"Alcohol is out; marihuana is in!"

This response to a question asked at our drug and narcotics symposium held in Cheshire, Conn., on January 22, 1968, became the headline in the three major newspapers serving our community.

That a chief of police would make this statement at a public meeting of adults and teenagers made our community aware of the police department's dilemma. The threat of widespread use of drugs and narcotics came upon us almost unnoticed, and, truthfully, we were not prepared to cope with the threat.

This situation came to our attention when we received requests for medical assistance. One youngster seemed to be intoxicated, but we took the necessary precautions and had the boy examined at a hospital for possible drug overdose. The youth later admitted taking a drink made of milk and a nonprescription medicinal preparation for individuals suffering from asthma. Up to this point the problem centered around drug abuse.

Suddenly, word came to our department that marihuana was being sold in Cheshire.

Cheshire is a small residential town, inhabited by more than 16,000 people and situated between the heavily populated cities of New Haven and Waterbury in southern Connecticut. Bordering Cheshire are the communities of Hamden, Wallingford, and Meriden.

Marihuana could be carried in from any of the surrounding towns. Our problem was to locate the source of this marihuana inflow, but we felt we were not prepared to handle this problem because we knew too little about drugs and narcotics.

ACQUIRING LITERATURE

As chief, it was my responsibility to see that my 18 men became familiar with drugs and narcotics, the terminology or nicknames given them by users, and the apparatus used by addicts. My first step was to contact drug companies and ask for literature describing the various drugs used for "getting high" and the symptoms and effects associated with their misuse. Then, turning to other law enforcement agencies, I acquired extensive literature on narcotics, together with addresses of companies selling teacher's kits which illustrated and described the more popular narcotics.

TEACH OFFICERS

I gave each sergeant literature, pictures, and plastic replicas of narcotic-producing plants with the request that he teach each man under his command what to look for, what to listen for, and, particularly, how to distinguish the odor of marihuana.

Later, we surveyed the physicians in our town and found that between 90 and 100 people had been treated recently after taking an unprescribed drug or narcotic.

We had a dilemma: We knew we had drug users. We knew marihuana was being used, but we did not know that so many people were involved.

In looking for a plan to protect the townspeople from the harm of drug and narcotic use, I asked our detective sergeant for his ideas.

The sergeant said, "Chief, the best place to control this problem is in the homes. Let us tell the parents the dangers of marihuana and drug abuse and how widespread the problem has become."

Certainly the idea was sound, and we began drafting a plan to help educate our residents. After discussing the plan with our first selectman, who gave us his full support, we decided to bring people knowledgeable in the narcotics field to Cheshire and have them conduct a symposium for the townspeople. Fortunately, we were able to obtain the services of the following: The chief of the Narcotics Control Section of the Connecticut State Department of Health, the head of the Connecticut State Police Narcotics Squad, the head of the Hartford City Police Narcotics Division, and the Chief Prosecutor of Connecticut's Seventh Circuit Court.

We next appealed to our local service and fraternal organizations to help create an interest in the symposium we were sponsoring. Without hesitation the clubs helped publicize the town meeting through advertisements and personal contact. Each group, in its own way, displayed readiness to back its police in conducting the attempt to unite the community against the growing threat of drug abuse.

When we announced the panel members for our planned symposium, the regional and local newspapers, as well as radio and television stations, gave wide coverage to our conference. Our only concern was whether the townspeople would attend.

On the scheduled evening, the adults and teenagers did indeed come. While the people were filing into the auditorium, a few officers passed out literature describing the types and effects of the drugs and narcotics that were to be discussed. The 800-seat high school auditorium was completely filled.

SYMPOSIUM FORMAT

We began the symposium by showing the film, "Narcotics—Pit of Despair." The movie depicted a young student-athlete who began smoking marihuana which led to his using the addictive drug, heroin. Following a scene showing the youth suffering from withdrawal pains, the movie concluded with the "cured" young man revisiting his buddies, the "pushers," which suggested the never-ending cycle of narcotic addiction.

Following this, the chief of our State Health Department's Narcotics Control Section described the various categories of drugs and chemicals. The expert told of narcotics, sedatives, depressants, stimulants, tranquilizers, hallucinogenic substances, and organic volatile solvents. After giving the common trade names and nicknames of the compounds that compose each category, the officer described the dangers of abusive use of the materials and concluded his talk by telling of a 16-year-old boy who died from excessive inhalation of cleaning fluid fumes.

Next, the State trooper presented statistics concerning the number of crimes committed by drug addicts. He mentioned such violations as car thefts, shoplifting, and rape, and suddenly he was interrupted by loud applause that followed his telling of 145 pushers arrested in the act of selling narcotics to his undercovermen.

The Hartford police narcotics expert described the changes to watch for in addicted young people: a loss of weight, a change in the texture of the skin, and an inability to cope with normal, everyday matters. The detective shocked the audience with the statement that, of the 18 people in the Greater Hartford area who died of drug abuse, 13 took overdoses, three developed chronic hepatitis, and two committed suicide.

The chief prosecutor concluded the formal portion of the symposium by suggesting reasons why teenagers turn to drugs. He said they cannot cope with pressures; they protest against the hypocrisy of adults; they attempt to avoid the difficulties of impending adult life. Therefore they seek security and self-esteem from using drugs or narcotics.

The prosecutor described the almost unbelievable actions of boys who had taken a mixture of milk and a patent medicine. He said the boys had to be forcibly removed from the police station and taken to a hospital.

QUESTIONS ASKED

When I, as moderator, asked for questions after the talks, the concern of those present was obvious by the response received. Set forth below are some questions which arose during the discussion and are typical of those which officials should be prepared to answer before becoming involved in a program of this nature.

"If 'pot' is available in Cheshire, how can the pusher be exposed?"

"Can an arrest be made by an officer if he merely hears of someone who is using a narcotic, such as pot or 'speed,' or does the individual have to have the drug on his person?"

"You have stated that marihuana is the start of something more dangerous, but do you have any conclusive evidence that pot, smoked occasionally, is harmful to the human system?"

"What is meant by a psychotic condition?"

"Is not alcoholism a greater problem in Cheshire?"

"Although alcohol is sometimes misused and can be physically more harmful than marihuana, the use of alcohol is permitted. Is not this a contradiction?"

"When you use the words, 'controlled drugs,' do you mean only narcotics, or drugs that require prescriptions?"

"Is it being a bit rash to conclude that the use of heroin results from marihuana? Is there any evidence of this? Cite the facts."

"Is it true that much of the reaction against marihuana is the result of a middle

class prejudice against a drug that was largely used in the past by lower income groups?"

"How do you draw the line between simple sleeping pills and pain relievers that might lead to addiction to other drugs?"

"Do many of the people who are dependent on drugs have records of previous psychiatric help?"

"One assumes that none of the panelists tonight have taken any of the drugs just discussed. In this sense, how do you know what it is like to be high on pot, except from observations? Some authorities claim that in controlled dosage it is not harmful for an individual who can restrain himself."

"How does it feel to take a 'trip'?"

"Would someone on the panel outline the possible long-term effects of lysergic acid?"

"Has there been an increase in homegrown psilocybin?"

The scope of ideas presented by the panel and the serious concern shown by the audience made this conference a valuable evening for all. This was only the beginning of a community action program designed to protect young people from the dangers of drugs and narcotics.

SERIES OF MEETINGS

In the days that followed our symposium, the headmaster of a local private school began in his office a series of meetings with concerned residents in an attempt to search for answers. A priest, a minister, a nurse, a teacher, a reformatory guard, and interested adults and teenagers joined in the exploratory meetings to exchange ideas about marihuana control.

High school students who attended the symposium and the meetings at the private school conducted a survey within their school. As a result of their survey, they and their principal asked the board of education to incorporate educational programs on drugs into biology courses.

The finest response to our educational symposium was the cooperation of our townspeople. They came to our station to ask questions. They called us when they suspected the use of marihuana. The assistance they gave was far beyond our expectations. This cooperation resulted in the arrest of two young people possessing marihuana and one "mainliner," a term for an individual who uses a syringe to administer drugs to himself.

We continue to tell our townspeople that we are not interested in simply arresting teenagers, but however, our aim is primarily to prevent them from harming themselves.

Today, in Connecticut, addiction is considered an illness, and the arrested addicts are not jailed if they prove dependency on narcotics and that they sought medical help. Why arrest an addict possessing narcotics if with parental cooperation you can prevent a youngster from reaching the addictive stage?

Fortunately, our townspeople believe in our sincerity and many do not hesitate to openly discuss their suspicions concerning the possible use of narcotics or drugs by their youngsters. This open communication between parents, teenagers, and policemen has been a most important result.

Following the symposium, our detective sergeant received invitations to speak before the high school student body, the students of a private school, discussion groups, and some service and fraternal clubs in Cheshire. His message is basic: The police are aware of the drug and narcotic activity occurring in public places, but it is up to the parents to become aware of the activity taking place within the home.

Just recently, on two separate occasions, a parent approached our desk sergeant, handed over an envelope, and asked, "What is it?" In both instances the sergeant replied, "Looks like marihuana." In both instances the sergeant was correct.

The drug and narcotics problem still per-

sists, but the problem is diminishing in Cheshire because it is being attacked by both the police and concerned citizens.

POWER OUTAGE IN CENTRAL MONTANA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a very serious power outage occurred in central Montana on April 4 due to a malfunction of the Montana Power Co. system. Many areas were without electricity for 2 hours or more. The total impact of the outage has not yet been evaluated. But there is no doubt of the damage to civilian and military activities in the State. Minuteman missile complexes have auxiliary power units, but despite this, one missile complex was incapacitated for an 8-hour period, the Air Force informs me.

This was only one missile complex in a system of 180, but in the event of a national emergency a single missile could conceivably be pivotal.

President Nixon has presented his revisions of the fiscal 1970 budget, and I learn that he has slashed nearly \$4 million from the earlier proposed budget for Lower Snake River transmission for the Bonneville Power Administration, reducing the total of that transmission budget to \$10 million. This is the most false kind of economy measure, as I shall show.

The reduction in the budget will delay the construction of the Asotin-Umatilla 500,000-volt transmission line on the Washington-Idaho border approximately 1 year from the presently scheduled date of April 1972. This delay will cause an extremely serious power supply condition in northeastern Washington, northern Idaho and western Montana. Without this new line, a fault on another line, the Lower Monumental-Little Goose 500,000-volt line, could cause cascading outages of interconnected lines and systems. After 1973, when the Lower Snake plants will feed 800,000 kilowatts into the system, the loss of this line could cause an electrical disaster on a huge scale.

In the event of such an outage, a large surge of power will flow eastward into western Montana. Because the systems in western Montana cannot possibly accommodate this load, the result will be a massive breaking apart of the systems there and in eastern Washington and northern Idaho. Engineers estimate that there could be a loss of 2,750,000 kilowatts and a blackout of the total area.

Mr. President, we already have very serious problems with the Montana Power Co. system in Montana, as evidenced by the April 4 outage. I am asking the Federal Power Commission to do all within its power to require the company to remedy the deficiencies within its system which caused the outage.

But if the Bonneville Power Administration, a utility operation far more responsible than Montana Power Co. and far more responsive to public need, should be denied the funds necessary to build urgently needed facilities, the results could be disastrous, especially if they are compounded by the inadequacies of the power company system.

The Bonneville Power Administration is wholly dependent upon the Adminis-

tration and Congress to provide the funds it needs. BPA has an extremely serious responsibility to maintain the integrity of its systems in the northwest, and BPA personnel are willing and able to meet this responsibility—if we meet our responsibility to provide this agency with the funds it needs.

Thus, it seems to me that the budget cut by President Nixon is arbitrary, capricious and thoughtless. A utility system is not a toy; it has grave duties to the people it serves. Facilities for this service must be provided.

President Nixon also slashed \$3,040,000 from the BPA budget for construction of an urgently needed 500,000-kilowatt line which would provide for exchanges of power with Canada and to supply the 400,000-kilowatt Intalco Aluminum Co. load in the event of an outage on another line. Loss of its power could have extremely severe consequences to the aluminum company, resulting in costly damage to its equipment. Without this new line, firm power cannot be provided to Intalco as per contractual agreements, and the Government will be in danger of violating the contract and incurring large liabilities.

Thus, I urgently request the administration to restore these two items to the Bonneville Power Administration budget.

Mr. President, I have received a statement from the Bonneville Power Administration, released earlier at a press conference, which describes in detail the impact on electric reliability of the budget cuts. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

BONNEVILLE POWER ADMINISTRATION

B.I. 117 Lower Snake Transmission:

1970 budget	\$14,060,000
Reduction	3,960,000
Revised budget	10,100,000

A reduction of \$3,960,000 in FY 1970 will delay the Asotin-Umatilla 500-kv line one year from the presently scheduled date of April 1972. This delay will create an extremely serious transmission and power supply condition in Northeastern Washington, Northern Idaho and Western Montana. Without this line, a fault on the Lower Monumental-Little Goose 500-kv line creates a system condition with resultant loss of generation and cascading outages of interconnected lines and systems.

In January 1973, the Lower Snake River plants feed 800,000 kw into the Lower Columbia River area. Frequency disturbance by loss of this generation can cause the opening of ties with Canada, California, and the East. The loss of power supply to the main grid would be the result of the Lower Monumental-Little Goose line opening due to a fault. Simultaneously, a large surge of power would be forced into the Western Montana system. This tendency of the generation to overspeed would cause the systems in Western Montana, Northern Idaho, and Northeastern Washington to break apart as well as create interconnected system disturbances. System oscillation would result in the loss of generation at Little Goose, Dworshak, Hungry Horse, Noxon, Cabinet Gorge, Boundary, Thompson Falls, and Kerr generating plants—a total of approximately 2,750,000 kw. Until the plants could be brought back on the line, the area would be blacked out.

B.I. 142 Monroe-Custer:

1970 budget	\$3,440,000
Reduction	3,040,000
Revised budget	400,000

This line has already been delayed one year because of reductions in the 1969 appropriations. With another year's delay, the increasing load growth of the Bellingham area could not be adequately served over the existing system.

This facility also provides transmission capacity for exchanges of power with the Canadian systems. An extended outage on the existing 500-kv system would require instantaneous dropping of the 400,000 kw Intalco Aluminum Company load and a prolonged reduction of 200,000 kw of company load. An outage of two hours or more could result in freeze-ups of one or more potlines with loss to the Company of \$375,000 for chipping out and reactivation and \$1,000,000 in loss of production per potline. Without this facility, firm transmission capacity will not be furnished Intalco in accordance with contractual agreements.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?—
THE OUTLOOK FOR 1969 AS SEEN
IN A SERIES OF ARTICLES IN THE
HEARST NEWSPAPERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, in December of last year the Hearst newspapers published a series of articles by outside contributors concerning America's problems and potentials for the year 1969. Mayor Joseph Alioto, of San Francisco, discusses the problems of the cities; Gov. Daniel J. Evans, of Washington, writes of the outlook for the States; Prof. Paul McCracken, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, reports on the national economy; Mayor Carl B. Stokes, of Cleveland, writes on race relations; Mr. Robert E. Thompson, national editor of the Hearst newspapers, discusses the 1960's as a time of transition; the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), discusses the involvement of youth in national affairs. I was pleased to be given an opportunity to present an article concerning my views on future trends in foreign affairs.

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

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

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

We are passing through a strange, turbulent period in our history—riots in our cities, crime in our streets, revolt among our young and a tragic war far from our shores.

More Americans are concerned about the future of their country than at any time in this century. But I, for one, am not pessimistic about our future.

I do not share the view of some that this Republic, which has achieved so much in less than 200 years, is either doomed or damned.

The American people and their leaders always have been able to rise above adversity, to solve their problems, defeat their enemies and move on to greater accomplishments.

In my lifetime, we have conquered diseases that forced previous generations to live in fear and danger. We have made important—if long overdue—strides toward guaranteeing equality of opportunity and justice to all citizens, regardless of race, religion or ethnic background.

Four times in this century, we have sent American boys abroad to fight aggression and in the last 20 years we have channeled our resources of manpower and money into the rehabilitation of nations in Europe, Asia, Africa and Latin America.

We have led the world in the fight against poverty illiteracy, disease and hunger.

Yet, much remains to be done and I think we would be deluding ourselves if we sat back complacently and counted our achievements without recognizing our shortcomings and our problems.

It no longer is sufficient to report that we are the most powerful and affluent nation in the world, with a gross national product approaching the trillion dollar mark.

We must determine how better to utilize our affluence and productivity to correct the wrongs that exist within our society and to promote peace in the world.

We cannot be satisfied with a society from which the young, the black, the American Indian, the Spanish-speaking and the poor feel alienated. Nor can we be satisfied with a world in which war, hunger and poverty are constant threats to life.

Because this is such a time of searching, the Hearst Newspapers asked a group of outstanding citizens to explore the problems that confront us and project "where we go from here."

I am proud to offer this series of articles to Americans everywhere in the hope that the ideas propounded by the contributors will help us move toward tomorrow with greater enlightenment.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, JR.,
Editor-in-Chief, The Hearst Newspapers.

DECEMBER 1968.

PROBLEM OF THE CITIES

(By Joseph Alioto, Mayor of San Francisco)

(NOTE.—Last year San Francisco made political news. A Democratic challenger for the city's mayoralty scored a surprise victory over a well-known Republican opponent. The winner was Joseph Alioto, son of a Sicilian immigrant who once made his living as a fisherman. Alioto, 52, is San Francisco's thirty-third mayor. He attended St. Mary's College, Berkeley, and later earned a law degree at Catholic University, Washington, D.C. Joining the United States Attorney's office in San Francisco, he swiftly acquired a reputation for energetic enforcement of antitrust statutes. During World War II Alioto served on the Board of Economic Warfare, helping to pinpoint targets in Italy, Germany and Japan. Last August he delivered the nominating speech for Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey at the Democratic National Convention.)

The destiny of our nation is shaping in our cities.

Whether the United States continues to be a great and prospering democracy is being determined in the crowded streets of New York, Boston, Chicago, Dallas, Los Angeles, San Francisco and other major cities.

Right now, historic currents are on the move which will determine whether the nation divides irrevocably into hostile racial camps, whether the nation's young withdraw into the twilight world of drugs or into the bloody one of street rebellion.

Monumental decisions are taking form this very minute, and no American can avoid their implications to him personally.

The nation's cities burst with problems—and with hope—and the call is clear for action on many fronts.

Cities alone can't cope with the problems that, if unchecked, can burn them down, and with them the dreams and aspirations of the whole nation.

State and federal governments are removed from the firecracker string of exploding crises that daily rattle in city halls. Yet state

and the federal governments rake off more than 85 percent of the taxes raised in the cities, leaving cities in second class citizenship to deal with their needs. City revenues are inadequate for police and fire protection, garbage collection, street repair and other traditional services, let alone the urgent social programs for better housing, expanded education, and the rest.

The problems of the cities are not the exclusive concern of government. There must be total community mobilization. Business must recruit and train ghetto residents. Churches must crusade for social justice. Civic groups must champion constructive change in tax laws so that the weight of urban change does not fall increasingly on homeowners.

Suburbia must be enlisted in the battle to save the cities—regional taxes or commuter payroll taxes will contribute toward vital big city services.

Above all, cities must involve all their residents in an adventurous coalition for achievement and excellence. This should have special appeal to youth.

The Peace Corps and other volunteer programs have demonstrated the constructive dynamism of the nation's young, and this force increasingly must be brought to bear on the problems that threaten our cities. The vote should be given to 18-year-olds.

Militants who seek change through non-violence should be brought into the chain of decision-making, and not isolated and forced into alliance with the lawless and anarchic. The strutting militarism of the Black Panther and other movements has little appeal if genuine progress is being made toward social justice.

Always, city government as a central and unifying agency, should reach out and open lines of communication and participation to all possible groups. City Hall must never be the isolated citadel of a smug establishment, but should be one of many places where city officials can meet with concerned citizens. Neighborhood halls, churches and schools can be just as forceful a fulcrum for decision.

The problems on which the fate of cities hang are many, but the following burn with incredible urgency:

Maintaining a social equilibrium of a city. Middle-income families are moving in increasing numbers to suburbia where housing is cheaper and more attractive. Cities are left to the poor and the rich. This tide must be stemmed by inventive housing programs, by equitable taxes that will relieve the homeowner, by providing the most in modern education.

Law and Order. Crime soars, symptomatic of the deep unrest in the cities. Law and order comes not from repression, but depends on three inseparable pillars—vigorous enforcement, enlightened community relations, and an unrelenting war on the social evils that breed crime.

Police are doing a heroic job in the face of enormous provocation. They must be given pay and training commensurate with their duties. They must receive modern computers and communication equipment so they can deploy more swiftly and effectively in high-crime areas. And, above all, they must receive the backing of all citizens.

There are two areas of law enforcement that require special attention:

1. Drug abuse. Too many young people are indulging themselves in the indolence of narcotics. A national commission should be set up—either by the President or the Surgeon General—to study why youth turn to drugs and how they are affected physically and psychologically. Furthermore, medical and community service organizations must be mobilized to treat persons who have plunged into the world of drugs.

2. Civil disorder. Dissent must be protected, but violence must be quickly con-

trolled with whatever force is needed. Public officials must make clear the distinct line between forceful advocacy and raw force. The principle is impregnable: anyone can say what he wants, no matter how unpopular, when he wants. But no one has the right to block a street, seize a college administration building, or disrupt a meeting.

Freedom to Act. Cities must be free to enact legislation for their own well-being and protection. They should not be deterred from acting on their own problems—whether they relate to weapons control, taxes, civil disorder, pornography or other matters peculiar to cities—on the theory that state or federal legislation is preemptive.

Tax reform. The property tax no longer can continue to support the increased costs of local government. Distinction must be made between income property and non-income residential property, and taxes must be developed that are more equitably related to ability to pay.

Urban funds. Local taxes alone aren't sufficient to meet city needs, and will require massive federal, state and especially private assistance to accelerate needed programs particularly in low and moderate priced housing. Furthermore, the federal and state governments must share large portions of their revenues with cities. Revenue should be shared directly with cities based on a per capita formula adjusted to recognize the tax effort and revenue needs of individual cities.

Social action. Truly monumental programs, of the scope undertaken when the nation is in great peril, must be mounted against bad housing, inadequate employment and inferior education. These are evils that deny equality of opportunity.

Heritage of Beauty. Cities must preserve their beauty and that sophisticated climate of culture that attracts the artists, the creative men and the man with ideas. Historic buildings must be retained, and parks must be allowed to flower and should not be sacrificed to freeways. At least that's the attitude in San Francisco where the views and vistas are the inalienable birthright of all their residents.

The list of priorities may be endless, but no city will make progress against her problems unless she can count on two overriding and paramount factors—vital economic growth that opens jobs and opportunities and orderly government that allows all to speak and no one to obstruct.

The goals stand beyond narrow partisanship, and the pressure for their achievement builds forcefully in every city—and applies equally on whomever sits in the White House. President Nixon will have to confront them just as vigorously and as conscientiously as has President Johnson.

There is a dream in the cities as old as this nation. It is this—to give every American an equal opportunity to achieve the best of the human experience, in accordance with his or her capacity in an urban environment that is at once peaceful, harmonious, beautiful and healthful.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

(By JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, Senate Foreign Relations Committee)

(NOTE.—An outstanding American public servant for more than two decades, Senator John Sherman Cooper (R-Ky.) was born 67 years ago in Somerset, Ky. An alumnus of Yale University and Harvard law school, he began his political career as a member of the Kentucky legislature, and then served as a county and circuit court judge. His role in national affairs developed when, on three occasions—in 1946, 1952 and 1956—he filled out the unexpired terms of other United States senators from Kentucky. He was elected to the Senate in 1960 and 1966 with record pluralities. Although a Republican, he was a close friend and associate of the late Presi-

dent John F. Kennedy. Senator Cooper was appointed as a member of the United States mission to the United Nations in 1949, and holds a similar post this year. He is also a member of the U.S. delegation to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). In 1955 and 1956 he was ambassador to India and Nepal. He is a senior member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. The Senator is a veteran of World War II and a holder of the bronze star.)

In suggesting the immediate tasks and future trends of American foreign policy, one must take into account the fact that President-elect Richard Nixon will make the decisions upon issues as they arise—at times in consultation with the Congress—and that he will set out long-term policies and goals for our country.

Nevertheless, it is important that private citizens and members of Congress give their views, for our foreign policy must express the will and have the support of the people. Although my views cannot be comprehensive, I would like to emphasize three urgent talks: First, and of critical importance, is the settlement of several dangerous situations in the world which continuously threaten war, with the possibility of an American confrontation with the Soviet Union, and nuclear catastrophe.

The second task is to examine means to avoid future military engagements throughout the world, unless it is determined by both branches of our government to be clearly in our national interest and within the scope of our national resources.

Third is the imperative task of reducing the arms race, and of fostering peaceful associations throughout the world, if we are to have any reasonable and positive hope of a stable and peaceful world.

Since World War II, the United States has grappled with situations of danger all around the world. They remain unsettled—the war in divided Vietnam, the potentially explosive situation in the Middle East, the problems of a divided Korea and China, and the security of Western Europe and the United States under the NATO shield. It may be argued that as the United States has maintained a constant and fairly successful policy toward these problems, no radical changes are required. But new developments have occurred in all of these situations in the past year. There are new necessities, and new opportunities to deal with them now in a more radical and effective way than in the past.

The war in Vietnam remains the most troubling issue. Great credit is due President Johnson for his unselfish initiative, in ceasing the bombing, as many of us advocated in order to bring about talks in Paris, and we hope that progress will be made during the remainder of his term. Advances have been made, and if North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will discuss with the United States and South Vietnam matters of substance, and if the level of fighting is reduced by the North Vietnamese, true negotiations and a settlement may be reached.

If progress is not made in Paris and the heavy fighting continues, I would urge, as I have in the past, that the United States take the initiative in proposing that the Vietnam question be referred to a reconvened Geneva Conference.

Such an initiative would determine whether the Soviet Union is genuinely interested in a settlement, and whether Communist China's recent statement about co-existence has any substance. A reconvened conference should include all the Southeast Asian countries and the National Liberation Front, and would provide an opportunity for a settlement of the problems of the entire area as well as Vietnam. The participation of the United States, the Soviet Union, Communist China and, I would hope, France, would give authority for the establishment of an effective international body, backed by these

powers, to supervise and to assist in implementing the terms of any settlement.

But whether from the Paris meetings, or a reconvened Geneva Conference, a final agreement emerges for free and adequately supervised elections in South Vietnam, I would consider that the United States had performed its full duty, that the securing for South Vietnam the right of self-determination of its form of government and institutions, and that our country could then honorably withdraw its forces.

We know that President-elect Nixon will support strongly negotiations for an honorable political settlement. As he is not committed to any particular formulation for a settlement, or to the support of any personality in South Vietnam, he enjoys the freedom to lead in the formulation of a settlement through which the processes of self-determination may be commenced.

The second obvious area of danger is in Europe. The deployment by the Soviet Union of ten divisions in Eastern Europe during and before its invasion of Czechoslovakia, increasing its forces to 32 divisions, upset any assumed balance of power between the NATO and Warsaw Pact forces.

Implications of the invasion were made more ominous by the statements of Soviet leaders and Pravda, claiming the right to intervene in the affairs of nations within the "socialist commonwealth" in the name of the "class struggle," whenever the Soviet Union determines to do so. It is a declaration of policy unknown in any concept of international law. It raises serious questions about the stability of Soviet leadership, and their intentions toward the areas protected by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and the nearby states of Rumania and Yugoslavia.

The purpose of NATO is essentially defensive. Its objectives are to maintain forces sufficient to deter military aggression by the Soviet bloc and to meet and restrain an attack if it comes. But its purpose also is to provide the security necessary to seek detente with the Soviet bloc and the eventual settlement of the issues left from World War II.

The immediate and urgent task of the United States and its NATO partners is to restore the credibility of the NATO mission.

I have obtained an estimate from our Defense Department, and I believe it is the first made public of the cost of maintaining our forces in Europe, including the Sixth Fleet, and backup forces in the United States. It is in the neighborhood of \$12 billion annually.

Despite this vast expenditure the United States must continue to improve the quality of its ground forces, but the test of NATO's future lies with our allies who have never met their military requirements. Mr. Nixon has indicated that he will insist strongly that our NATO allies, who for the most part are quite prosperous, take the required steps to increase their strength, manpower, training, equipment, and reserve forces. Unless our NATO allies take these steps, I foresee opposition in the United States to the continued presence of our forces in Europe.

To prevent future involvements such as Vietnam, the Executive and the Congress should examine critically the multi-lateral and bilateral security agreements to which the United States has become a party since World War II—the essential party, since its major allies, Great Britain and France, are disengaging themselves from many burdens of responsibility.

I do not propose that the U.S. abandon constitutional agreements essential to our security, but I do propose that we find out to what degree—whether by treaty of executive agreement—the United States has committed itself to provide assistance, and particularly troops, to the defense of other countries. We should know if these agree-

ments are constitutional, are in the interest of our national security, and within the capabilities of our resources.

Generally, the agreements require that in the event of an armed attack upon a party to the treaty, the other signatories will assist in meeting the danger "in accordance with its constitutional processes." The term "constitutional processes" is not defined, but it should mean congressional approval.

The deployment of large American forces on the territory of another country, even in peacetime, increases the danger of an American engagement, for if they are fired upon they must be defended and our national honor becomes an issue. This is the lesson of Vietnam. The manpower of the United States should not be committed to the territory of another country without the approval of the Congress.

These suggestions do not restrict the constitutional powers of the President—his authority to dispatch forces to protect American lives and property, to defend our troops, and to defend our country. But my proposal would provide to the Executive and the Congress and the people the opportunity to determine, in advance, under what conditions we should commit our military forces.

I believe that my suggestions are in accord with the statements of the President-elect. For if one reads Mr. Nixon's statements closely and in connection with his plans to "review our commitments," he makes a distinction between the defense of the United States and the defense of a region, such as the NATO area and the western hemisphere, on one hand, and becoming involved militarily in other areas which are not in the scope of our security interests or within the capability of our resources.

A further step should be taken to reduce tensions and the chance of war between the divided countries. The time is near when we should support the admittance of North and South Korea, North and South Vietnam, and of Communist China to the United Nations, while continuing our support of the membership of Nationalist China.

The United States has discharged faithfully its obligations to South Korea on behalf of the United Nations, and its obligations to Nationalist China and to South Vietnam. It is time to transfer at least part of our vast responsibilities to the world community represented in the United Nations. The United Nations could bring to bear on these divided states a considerable influence toward the settlement of their problems, the protection of their integrity as states, and without prejudice to their ultimate reunification.

These immediate tasks and long-range policies which our country must examine and undertake do not suggest any return to isolationism. The United States will look more closely at its capabilities and the purpose of its foreign policy and this, I believe, will bring a larger involvement and appreciation of our people in the development of a more realistic and constructive foreign policy.

They include our commitment to assist our Latin American neighbors through the Alliance For Progress; the strengthening of our ties with Western Europe through support of the Common Market and the establishment of a workable international monetary system; the return of Okinawa to Japan and the strengthening of our naval and merchant marine fleets to deter hostile pressures in Asia as well as Europe.

OUTLOOK FOR THE STATES

(By Daniel J. Evans, Governor of Washington)

(NOTE.—Much of the young and energy of the nation's northwest seems to be personified in Gov. Dan Evans of Washington. He was elected to his second term by the largest margin given to an incumbent chief executive in the state in more than 30 years. Dan Evans was a civil engineer for 13 years before

he turned to politics. He began his public career as a state representative in 1956 and served in the legislature until elected governor in 1964. His leadership qualities drew early recognition and he is now chairman of the Western Governors' Conference. He served as keynoter at the Republican National Convention which nominated Richard M. Nixon for President in Miami Beach last August. Born in 1925, Evans holds a master's degree in civil engineering from the University of Washington. He served in the United States Naval Reserve from 1943 through 1946, and was recalled to active duty from 1951 through 1958 during the Korean War.)

The year 1969 promises to be one of great challenge and great opportunity for a re-balancing of the federal system. Ever since the days of the Great Depression, the role of the states in the governmental process has been in a period of decline.

In most cases, this occurred not so much because of a deliberate design by the Federal Government to assume state functions as by the seeming unwillingness and in some instances the inability of the states to solve the problems within their own borders.

A feeling grew up, particularly in the big cities, that any help would be forthcoming not from the states but rather from the Federal Government. Thus, for many years, a close relationship has developed between Washington, D.C., and local governments to the exclusion of any participation by the states.

Although this federal-local relationship along with the vastly increased power exercised by the Federal Government, has been the most significant development in the federal system over the past 35 years, it is now apparent to even the most casual observer that to eliminate the role of the states is shortsighted and a grave error.

Even the current national Administration has come to realize that the states have an important role to play and that they provide a unit of government which is both large enough to do an effective job yet small enough to be close to the people it serves and responsible to their needs.

There has been an increasing willingness on the part of federal officials to listen to state officials and, of equal importance, state officials are taking the time to make their views known. As a consequence of this new approach, the most vital and active part of the federal system can be at the level of state government.

None of this means we should hoist the tired and tattered banner of "states' rights." Usually those who promote this phrase are more interested in inactivity on the part of state government than in asserting any rights of the states. It does mean, however, that if the federal system is to survive and if government is to serve the people, all governmental resources must be applied to the solution of the problems of our country.

Although there are many areas in which great opportunities exist for the states to play a more important role in the federal system, I believe the most significant are in the area of federal-state financing; urban problems and local government; and the unique opportunity we now have for states to become truly innovative and flexible so as to be capable of responding to the particular priorities of individual states.

The present system of federal revenue sharing with the states is through single-purpose categorical grants which go only to specific programs. These grants are generally hedged in by federal restrictions and regulations and many times are not responsive to a state's needs.

I believe it is essential that we develop a better way of sharing federal revenues and revenue sources. This can be accomplished both through the Federal Government giving up some of its tax sources so they can be assumed by the states and by returning a portion of the federal income tax to the states in

the form of block grants rather than categorical grants.

Funds which would come to the states in block grants for broad, general purposes—such as health, education, public welfare—would allow the individual states to make the decisions as to how the money should best be spent.

By using block grants and by giving states the direct use of some federal tax sources, we not only allow a better use of resources by the states but also avoid the danger of federal rules which search for the lowest common denominator in their application, which often tend to stifle state initiative, and which do not allow state solutions that may be an improvement on the federal standards.

I believe states must exercise greater concern for urban problems and improve their relationship with local governments. For too long, the states have forced local governments to seek federal aid, primarily because of the default of states to help with local problems. As a consequence, many local governments have built up a distrust of the ability of states to function adequately in helping to solve their problems.

I believe with the sizable preponderance of Republican governors, that there will be an increasing drive on the part of states to work both directly with local communities in helping solve their problems and to see to it that both state financial aid and legislation to authorize local sources of financing is made available.

Their position between the Federal Government and local governments allows the states to perform a unique function. Because of their size, they are far better able to coordinate activities at the local level, yet at the same time they are large enough to work together and with the Federal Government to help manage national goals.

With specific reference to urban affairs, states can assume leadership so that together with the private sector and citizen volunteers it can work to solve the serious social problems which come with urban growth.

Perhaps as important as any specific action that can be taken by the states is the role they can play as 50 laboratories in the art of government. Although many of our problems are nationwide in scope, their solutions are in most instances more readily susceptible to a state and local rather than a federal solution.

Until the advent of the New Deal, the states had been consistently in the forefront of developing new ideas for the solution of social and governmental problems.

I believe this innovative tradition can be recaptured and that in the next four years we will see each of the states working as a full partner with the Federal Government in developing solutions responsive to state and local needs which will be far superior to static and inflexible federal programs and directives which do not take account of local conditions.

But none of this can be done easily nor can it be done without a price.

In my "State of the State" message to the Washington Legislature in 1967, I said:

"If we are not willing to pay the price, if we cannot change where change is required, if we cannot prepare and carry out the programs so necessary to the conduct of expanding state affairs—if these things are not possible then we have only one remaining recourse, and that is to prepare for an orderly transfer of our remaining responsibilities to the Federal Government."

This is the challenge to the states: To meet the demands of orderly change within a vital and growing society. With the new Nixon Administration, with an increased recognition both as to the need for action and an increased regard for its ability to perform, I believe state government will seize the opportunity to become a full partner with the Federal Government, with local govern-

ment, with the private sector and with citizen volunteers to develop the solutions to the problems facing the people of this nation.

The next four years can show the rebirth of the federal system with the states leading the way.

INVOLVEMENT OF YOUTH

(By EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Senator from Massachusetts)

(NOTE.—In the nation and the Congress, the name of Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, 36, evokes deep emotion and respect. He is the sole surviving son of ailing Joseph P. Kennedy, former Ambassador to Britain, following the assassination of his brothers, President John F. Kennedy and Sen. Robert F. Kennedy. A former brother, Joseph Jr., was killed in World War II. The senior senator from Massachusetts, Edward Kennedy, was elected in 1962 to finish out the last two years of his brother's term when JFK became president. He was re-elected in 1964 with a 75.6 per cent majority after a campaign that was conducted by friends while the young senator lay in bed with a broken back suffered as result of a plane crash. Sen. Kennedy has become an expert on the Vietnamese refugee problem and is outspoken in the cause of civil rights. He played only a minor role in the 1968 presidential campaign following the death of RFK early in June, and declined to try for either the presidential or vice presidential nominations. However, he is considered a strong possibility for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1972 or thereafter.)

On a mild spring evening in Indianapolis, during the primary election campaign this year, 22 young Americans sat down to talk.

After riding many hours in buses and sleeping on benches in campaign headquarters, they had spent a grueling Saturday on the sidewalks of the city taking the issues to the people. Now it was time to take stock.

They talked of Republicans who refused to hear them out, of Democrats who would not budget on Vietnam, of black children flocking to pass out campaign buttons, of whites in streets as grubby as any Negro ghetto showing quiet pleasure that an educated visitor wanted to hear what they thought.

The canvassers for Robert Kennedy that I met with that night were engaged in the kind of active political work by young people that characterized this year's primary elections. When they started that morning they had been novices. The next morning they would return to the sidewalks older by more than a day.

At about the same time last spring, another group of young people was pursuing a different course at Columbia University. The issues they held up to the university—construction of a college gymnasium in a Negro neighborhood, Columbia's affiliation with a Defense Department research organization—reflected beneath their surface real questions about the right of students to a share in the governing of their school.

The Columbia protest added up to the occupation of five campus buildings, the ransacking of administrative offices, and a bloody confrontation with police with more than 100 seriously injured and nearly 700 arrests.

It would be comfortable to conclude that the young folks in Indiana were working responsibly within the established system while those at Columbia were working irresponsibly against it.

It is more important to realize that both were working for what they believed in. One group hoped positive efforts would be effective; the other had concluded that they wouldn't.

The distance between confidence and faculty is growing small with American youth today. Some believe our society will always

work, and some believe it will never work again. Most, I suspect, are in the middle.

Today's young people don't share the historic guideposts of their elders. They did not know the mobilization of resources and patriotism brought on by the two world wars. They did not feel the comradeship of disaster created by the Great Depression. They were too young to grasp the national fear of global communism in the early 1950s.

They are spared the emotions of the past. They come to us with fresh vision. And with all the right questions.

They want to know why the war to preserve the freedom of South Vietnam kills or injures more than 200,000 civilians of that country each year.

They want to know why, with the United Nations more than 23 years old, the world is stockpiling nuclear weapons, enough to destroy civilization several times over.

They want to know why Negroes can fight in America's wars but often can't live in America's suburban neighborhoods.

They want to know why, in the wealthiest and most highly educated society in history, the poor are expected to break out of the ghettos with no money and no education.

The young are told, "It's much better than it used to be." And they reply, "But why is it still as bad as it is?"

They are not only asking disturbing questions. They are also suggesting to America that the legacy they will inherit is worth saving, but not by much.

To say that the younger generation is going to the dogs is not only foolish but futile. For one thing, whatever the young choose to be is a reflection of what their elders have taught to be, by direction or by neglect. For another, writing off the young is like saying that our nation will come to a noble but sad end in 30 or 40 years.

The way to appeal to the young is not to deplore them, but to put faith in them. The Peace Corps put faith in them, and they responded. VISTA put faith in them and they responded. The Teacher Corps put faith in them, and they responded.

For there is no question that the young people of today are a remarkable generation.

They are independent and skeptical and confident. They look at the world with the characteristic honesty of the young, and what they find does not inspire them.

This year they put their remarkable abilities into politics. They worked for their candidates from New Hampshire to California. They took their civics lessons at face value, believing that a democracy could function only if everyone participated. And they brought to the political process far more energy and dedication than most of their elders ever had.

In Chicago, they felt, their hopes had turned to ashes. Outside the convention hall the young demonstrators were being battered and beaten. Inside, the mandate for change that they fought for and won in every primary election was being voted down in the platform committee and on the floor.

But although the young people in their urgency thought the battle had been lost, on measure it had largely been won.

Their conviction had helped bring the nation face to face with the tragic nature of the Vietnam war.

Their hard work had helped demonstrate that politics really can work at the grass-roots level.

Their skills had helped convince the Democratic convention to institute reforms which will open party processes to the young in the future.

And their example had helped persuade the White House and both presidential candidates that the young have a definite and valuable role in government.

Americans who have always preached the virtues of democracy without practicing them should take note. Americans who have never

rung a doorbell for a candidate or given an hour's time for an issue should think again. Their children evidently believe what they have learned about participation and individual responsibility and the ability of one person to influence society.

Early this year, before a college audience, Sen. Robert Kennedy characterized the spirit of youth:

"It does not accept the failures of today as a reason for the cruelties of tomorrow. It believes that one man can make a difference—and that men of good will, working together, can grasp the future and mold it to our will."

It is apparent that the young people of today believe they can grasp and mold the future.

So the question is not, "Where are our young people going?" But rather, "Can we keep up with them?"

THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

(By Prof. Paul McCracken, appointed to be Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers)

(NOTE.—Paul Winston McCracken, 52, who has been named to head the President's Council of Economic Advisers in the Nixon Administration, is considered one of the nation's top fiscal experts. He currently is chairman of 19 task forces Mr. Nixon has appointed to assist in the formulation of national policies and programs. A professor of economics at the University of Michigan, Dr. McCracken received his Ph. D. at Harvard University in 1948. He is a native of Richland, Iowa, served as a government economist in World War II, and was a member of the Economic Advisory Council in the Eisenhower Administration. Dr. McCracken is the author of numerous books and a member of several leading economic organizations here and abroad.)

The performance of the U.S. economy in the decade ahead must come close to matching the best of this century, if it is to be an era of reasonably full employment. That was decreed early in the postwar period when those now of the "middle generation" decided to have that large crop of postwar babies.

The figures are impressive. In the last decade (the 1950's) the labor force was increasing by 740,000 per year. In the 1970's, on whose threshold we are now standing, the nation's work force will be growing by close to 1.5 million each year. Clearly the job-creating capacity of the economy must perform far more vigorously than during most of the postwar period, or during our history going back for about a century.

If we succeed, the dividends will be substantial. By the end of the 1970's the average family's income, in terms of today's prices, will approach \$1000 per month, and our gross national product will be in the \$1,500 billion zone, compared with \$860 billion for 1968.

There will be no lack of demand for this enlarged output. As levels of living rise, levels of aspiration also rise. With each rise in purchasing power, new things come within our horizon that we had never considered seriously before. To the newlyweds, their aspiration may be owning a home in the suburbs. Once the home is bought, other things come into view—a second car, a cottage at the lake, a trip abroad.

A few (usually quite affluent) social philosophers may worry about what will happen when people's wants are all satiated. This never worries the consumer whose list of things to buy next never seems to get much shorter.

Can we realize this promise in the years ahead? It will all depend on how we handle three major problems of economic policy.

First, we must cool down the recent inflation without producing a large and sustained rise in unemployment. Since 1964 the consumer price index has been rising at a rate which would cut the purchasing power

of the dollar 50 percent every 18 years. And during the first half of this year the price level was rising at a 5.7 percent per year rate, a rate that would double the price level every 12½ years.

This cannot be allowed to continue. It is de-stabilizing because mounting inflation-mindedness distorts orderly business decisions. It also is inequitable because it shifts wealth and net worth from the people of moderate means to the wealthy.

Yet a policy of disinflation must be administered delicately to avoid a substantial and persistent rise in unemployment (whose victims are, of course, also those of modest means).

The 1958-64 period proved that we could have price-level stability, but the unemployment rate was unacceptably high. In recent years we have had lower unemployment, but inflation has been unacceptably rapid. Neither was sustainable. The task is to ease the economy over the path of a more stable price level and reasonably full employment.

Whether the technology of economic policy is up to this delicate task is as yet not demonstrated, but this is the problem we face. It is a problem made far more difficult because of over three years of large increases in our price-cost level.

Second, the 1970's could easily become an era of international economic and financial warfare. This must not be allowed to happen. At the end of World War II we set about to build a system that would facilitate the expansion of international trade. This made economic sense. As world incomes grew, products and services available to consumers could also include increasingly those produced abroad. And each nation could more nearly concentrate on what it could produce best. Production became thereby more efficient, and patterns of consumption became richer and more varied. The policy succeeded. During most of this period world trade expanded even more rapidly than world incomes.

In recent years things have not worked out so well. To preserve the formalities of the system, the U.S. has imposed direct controls limiting the outflow of capital to a capital-short world. It has worked out quotas to limit certain imports. It has threatened to curtail foreign travel—just when, to the great advantage of Americans, English was becoming a world language.

There have been recurring monetary crises that have already involved the pound, the dollar, the franc, and the Deutschmark (whose undervaluation has made a major contribution to international financial disorder).

Each nation, to defend its own position, has responded with internal deflation. Yet these must be managed carefully to avoid a round of international deflation, economic stagnation and unemployment.

The international financial disorder of the 1930's made its contribution to the world disarray that erupted into World War II. The nations of the world must not start down that road again.

Finally, we must give specific attention to policies that will assure an ever-widening diffusion of the fruits of progress to all people. There is an essential morality to an economy where the route to success is through performance. Yet we must realize that people begin the game unevenly positioned around the starting line. Some, through inherited wealth or simply from a favorable home environment, begin the race considerably ahead of the starting line. Others—through circumstances that they had no part in choosing—begin so far behind the line that it would be monstrous to talk about equal availability of opportunity. The 1970's must be a decade in which we make a major break-through toward giving all people full

access to the social and economic mainstream of our national policy.

Thus the years ahead constitute an era of great economic promise. Whether we realize this potential depends on the ingenuity and candor that we can bring to bear on some formidable problems of national policy.

There is this reassurance. In our nation the optimists have been the realists.

RACE RELATIONS

(By Carl B. Stokes, mayor of Cleveland)

(NOTE.—When Carl B. Stokes, 41, was elected mayor of Cleveland last year a milestone was achieved in the American Negro's march toward full participation in American life. The election made Stokes the first Negro mayor of a large American city. He launched a massive program—"Cleveland Now!"—designed to eliminate the city's pressing problems and vitalize its urban life over the next 10 years. He was elected three times to the Ohio state legislature and once, in 1965, ran unsuccessfully for the mayoralty office he now holds.)

Toward more progress in eradicating poverty and meeting the challenge of the urban crisis—that is the direction America should go in race relations.

On the federal level, the necessary and desirable legislative steps have been taken in the civil rights area. The speeches have been made, the goals clearly set. But full citizenship is still denied a great many Americans because of the color of their skin.

In my own city of Cleveland, there are 50,000 substandard housing units, many of them occupied by Negroes. The unemployment rate in the Cleveland metropolitan area is less than three percent, but in ghetto areas—both black and white—the jobless rate is as high as 15.6 percent, and one recalls that President Kennedy called a "disaster area" any section of the country where unemployment reached six percent.

In my own city, there are children, many of them black, who go to bed hungry. School attendance rates in the inner-city are poor because families are poor and, as a consequence, their children lack adequate clothing to venture from house to school.

What kind of race relations can we expect when there are large pockets of poverty and misery in Cleveland and other large cities? Compassion and understanding are important, but, like rhetoric, they will not serve themselves to elevate race relations.

In the words of the Kerner Commission Report we must turn to "the major unfinished business of this nation—making good the promise of American democracy to all citizens—urban and rural, white and black, Spanish-surname, American Indian, and every minority group."

Progress in race relations is inextricably interwoven with progress toward eradicating poverty. The dignity and pride that only a job with upward mobility and a decent house in which to live can provide are essential to improving race relations, although, for a time, the struggle for dignity and pride may seem to widen the gulf between black and white.

In the cities generally, black citizens are demanding the things they deem necessary to dignity and pride—representation on city councils, representation in Congress, representation on every level of government, economic power so that the Negro benefits directly from the growing Negro market, Negro history in the school curriculum, entrance into the building trades, opportunity in the professions and in business management.

Thus, the confrontations, the bitterness, often open hostility between black and white. Integration has become a dirty word to some militant blacks, and the sociologists talk about the increased "polarization" of the black and white communities.

Sometimes I am accused of being an incurable optimist, but I do not believe the

confrontations, no matter how angry and hostile they may be, mean that race relations are deteriorating and that we should desperately seek some magic formula for avoiding such encounters and for quieting the angry statements.

Instead, I view the encounters, the confrontations, as injecting a necessary note of honesty and realism into an area where heretofore there has been much lip service to brotherly love and knowing your neighbor but insufficient genuine attention to implementing the democratic principles of equal opportunity and equal protection of the law.

Implementing these principles—"making good the promises of American democracy"—will do more for constructive race relations in this country than a century of Brotherhood Weeks, sermons, conferences, and seminars.

We have to demonstrate that the American system—economic, political and social—is viable, flexible and strong, and this can be demonstrated only by substantive progress toward solution of the basic problems of the poor, the disenfranchised and the disadvantaged.

The poor black, like the poor white, wants the opportunity to earn the respect, dignity and pride that come with the opportunity to win the good things of life. And if, given the opportunity, he fails, the failure must be his, not society's.

That is why we in Cleveland, for instance, have established a Department of Human Resources and Economic Development. It will coordinate and assist more than 20 job-placement programs and work to expand and retain business and industry.

We are establishing a network of neighborhood based day care centers where mothers can leave their children while they pursue gainful employment. In the absence of such facilities, these mothers really lack the opportunity to work and are involuntarily on welfare rolls. Four such centers have received "Cleveland Now!" funds; the goal is 10 and we will reach it.

The Cleveland community relations board checks firms bidding for city business to make sure they are equal opportunity employers, and the city is continuing to put its own house in order with respect to hiring and promotion practices so that we ask nothing of private firms that we are not doing ourselves.

A problem providing money and know-how to expand small business is well under way in Cleveland with unprecedented assistance from many sectors of our community. We have furnished the Greater Cleveland Growth Corporation with \$500,000 of "Cleveland Now!" funds so that small businessmen, black and white, can obtain loans or loan guarantees that otherwise might be denied them.

"Cleveland Now!" perhaps it should be explained, is a comprehensive program announced early in 1968, addressed to the city's immediate pressing needs in the areas of jobs, housing, neighborhood improvement, health care, economic revitalization and city planning. The first 18-month phase envisions the expenditure of \$165 million in federal, state and local government funds and more than \$11 million from the private sector. Individuals—from school children who contributed nickels and dimes to a wealthy couple who contributed \$1 million—and corporations are ahead of schedule with subscriptions from the private sector.

Small businesses already assisted by the Greater Cleveland Growth Corporation include a soap company, aiming initially at a substantial share of the black market, a furniture store, and electronic parts and service enterprise, and a decal manufacturer.

Technical assistance is furnished by businessmen volunteers, including members of the Harvard Business School Club, and Cleve-

land banks and the Federal Small Business Administration are cooperating fully with the Growth Corporation.

The 40-member board of trustees is made up of representatives of city and county government, of bankers and businessmen, attorneys and accountants, black and white, so that the two races are working together in the vital task of expanding small business enterprise throughout Cleveland, thereby strengthening the city's economic base and providing additional employment opportunities.

In the housing field, at this writing, we are just about to announce a Community Housing Corporation with a board, also black and white, that will include representatives of the non-profit housing groups already formed with church, union, foundation and business sponsorship. The Community Housing Corporation is to receive a \$1.2 million "Cleveland Now!" commitment for its first year and \$1.4 million annually for three years thereafter. It will use the funds as seed money to accelerate housing development for low and middle income families.

Toward broadening of opportunities, toward programs assisting the disadvantaged to make use of opportunity, toward dignity and pride for our Negro citizens—this is the direction America should go, not only to improve race relations but also to preserve, strengthen and enrich the fabric of American life.

A TIME OF TRANSITION

(By Robert E. Thompson, national editor, Hearst newspapers)

(NOTE.—Robert E. Thompson, 47, has covered all major Capital personalities and news stories since 1952 when he joined the Washington Bureau of International News Service. Seven years later he shifted to the N.Y. News Washington Bureau and in 1962 to the Los Angeles Times, as White House Correspondent. In 1966 he was named Chief of the Hearst Newspapers Washington Bureau. In 1961-62 he was chairman of the Standing Committee of Correspondents of the House and Senate and in 1966-67 was president of the White House Correspondents Association. Thompson has covered all political conventions and traveled with the major candidates on their cross country campaigns. He has traveled abroad with Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and witnessed the Lee Harvey Oswald shooting from a range of 20 feet. Thompson was named National Editor of the Hearst Newspapers in 1968.)

The tide of change that has swept across this land in the 1960's will continue to swell and heave into the 1970's—slashing at the old ways of life and destroying some of the orthodox patterns of the past.

When it finally ebbs, and that may not occur until well into the next decade, American society will be as drastically transformed as it was after the Civil War, after the Industrial Revolution, and after the flamboyant Prohibition era.

Those who voted for Richard M. Nixon with the expectation that he could—or would—stem this turbulent tide will not find their hopes fulfilled. Those who voted against Nixon because they feared he would seek to stifle change will not see their anxieties realized.

For President Nixon, even if he so desired, could not stop the dynamic forces of transition that have come into play in this nation in recent years.

The best option open to him—and it is indeed an illusive option—is to keep the momentum of this epic transition within the limits of orderly progress.

Mr. Nixon and the American people may be able to slow the movement of change. But they cannot stop it. Above all, they cannot turn the clock back.

To do so would require mass repression of young people; magical overnight transformation of our cities; return of the Negro

to a condition of bondage; rejection of the economic lessons of the last decade, and a blotting of the Vietnamese War from the American conscience.

None of these is possible.

Therefore, the American people and their leaders must accept the fact that the transformations within our society in the recent past form but a prologue to further transformation in the future.

Millions of citizens will be aghast at the prospect that the old traditions and customs—some good, some bad—will suffer further erosion in the days ahead.

Yet, they must understand, first of all, that a sizeable bloc of intelligent, active young people deeply desire change. And, those young people have age and energy on their side.

They want an end to war and the draft. They want the fruits of American progress and productivity to be extended with equality to citizens of all races and ethnic backgrounds. They want to have a voice in the decisions made by their country.

One of the great challenges facing Mr. Nixon is to establish rapport with these young people, to make them feel that they are full-fledged participants in their society.

But whether or not Mr. Nixon is able to achieve this breakthrough, the young, with their own special values and modern concepts, eventually will prevail—simply because they are young and because the United States one day must be theirs.

Civil strife will continue and possibly even increase in urban areas unless drastic action is taken to improve the way of life for city dwellers.

President Johnson set in motion more important programs to benefit the cities than any of his predecessors. Yet, because of rising expectations in a period of unparalleled affluence, the Johnson programs could not keep pace with the demand for dramatic change.

Mr. Johnson sought to do more. And Mr. Nixon may seek to do more. But, despite their lofty objectives, presidents are captives of a Congress that continues to hold the purse strings.

Many members of Congress find it far more popular with their constituencies to support legislation to control the activities of troubled citizens than to support legislation that gets at the root causes of despair and deprivation.

If the transition within our cities is to be made more tranquil, it therefore is up to Congress and to the resources made available by the private sector—business, industry, labor, the foundations, churches.

Congress and the new President also are challenged to bold action on the economic front. They must reduce the inflationary trend within the nation. But, if they seek to return to economic policies practiced prior to the "new economics" of the Kennedy-Johnson era, they could find themselves enmeshed in a new recession—a recession that would further inflame tempers in the ghetto.

For, in this period of violent transition, the poor who dwell in the cities—and who suffer most in times of high unemployment—are not likely to accept a recession with old-fashioned equilibrium.

The problem confronting Mr. Nixon in dealing with young people, Negroes, and the underprivileged is to provide enough hope and incentive to prevent rabid militants from capturing the leadership of these groups.

Not many young Americans are now aligned with the radical elements nor are many Negroes affiliated with the Black Panthers. But if dreams and promises are not fulfilled, the militants will become more powerful.

Finally, there is the change involving America's position abroad. The Vietnam conflict has demonstrated that the people as a whole

lack the patience to fight a small, limited war far from their shores.

Since there is a renewed birth of nationalism elsewhere in the world, it seems certain that nationalism—and its corollary, isolationism—will tighten its hold on the United States.

Although Mr. Nixon is an internationalist who will attempt to carry forward the basic foreign policy concepts of the Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson administrations, he will find Congress and the public drawing away from international commitments, both military and economic.

Liberals will argue that money designated for projects abroad can be spent better at home. Conservatives will argue that aid to other nations is a waste of taxpayers' dollars.

Many influential voices already are urging a retreat to protectionism in trade and further diminution of the foreign aid program. It will require both statesmanship and leadership for Mr. Nixon to attempt to reverse this tide, for there may be short-run political advantage to be gained if he were to swim with it rather than against it.

So, the next four years will not be easy—for Mr. Nixon or for the nation he seeks to guide. At all levels of American society, drastic changes are in progress. The great task is to keep those changes within manageable bounds.

THE MIDDLE EAST—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TYDINGS

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, on March 21, 1969, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS) spoke before the American-Israel Society in Baltimore.

The topic of his speech was the Middle East. His concern—which all of us share—is for a just settlement of the many problems in this troubled area of the world and a lasting peace.

Mr. President, this is an important speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE MIDDLE EAST

The accession of a new administration in Washington provides a particularly appropriate time for reexamining the state of affairs in the Middle East and reviewing U.S. policy in that part of the world. For the Arab-Israeli conflict, like the war in Vietnam, represents a volatile and terribly dangerous international problem which has shown few signs of significant improvement over the past year.

Based on briefings I received from State Department officials on Wednesday and a careful reading of the President's public remarks on the matter, I detect little difference to date between the Nixon administration's Middle East policy and that pursued by President Johnson. The overriding U.S. objectives continue to be the prevention of hostilities that might lead to a confrontation between the U.S. and the Soviet Union and the maintenance of American influence in the area.

As the land bridge spanning three continents with the richest oil deposits in the world, it is not difficult to understand the intense political, strategic, and economic interest the great powers have shown in the Middle East. If any one power were to dominate the region the global balance of power would shift sharply in its favor.

Thus when the British began their steady withdrawal of troops and ships from the Mideast after World War II, it was inevitable that the U.S. and the Soviets would seek to fill the resulting strategic power vacuum. It

is this cold war competition which has given the current Arab-Israeli conflict its additional dangerous dimension—the possibility of direct U.S.-Soviet confrontation and the triggering of a nuclear war.

Since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, the U.S. has sought to implement a two-pronged policy in the Middle East: We have supported Israel in her fight to survive, while seeking to maintain our influence with the Arab governments. Obviously, these two aspects of our policy have conflicted more often than not.

When circumstances forced us to decide between them—with the exception of President Eisenhower's decision in the Suez crisis in 1956—we have always chosen to stand behind Israel.

We have done so for two principal reasons. First, the U.S. is morally committed to the preservation of Israel as a Jewish homeland. History has made tragically clear the necessity for a place to which Jews may turn in the face of the persecution which has continued to infect western history. The spectacle of Jews vainly seeking a haven from Hitler's death camps must never be repeated. No man of conscience can believe otherwise.

Second, it has been our position that the best deterrent to open conflict in the Middle East is an Israel strong enough to maintain a regional balance of power vis-a-vis her Arab neighbors. The decision of the Johnson administration to sell fifty F-4 fighter planes to Israel is further evidence of our commitment to ensure Israel the means to defend herself successfully.

Israel's extraordinary six-day victory in 1967 shattered what remained of our two-pronged strategy. Egypt, Syria, and a number of other Arab governments broke off diplomatic relations with the U.S. and turned increasingly to Moscow for aid and advice.

Therefore, to return the balance to our Middle East policy which American security requires, it is increasingly imperative that we secure a settlement that assures Israel's freedom and survival while enabling the U.S. to reestablish diplomatic relations with the Arabs.

It is toward this end that the keystone of our current Middle East policy remained in support of the United Nations mission of Ambassador Jarring and his effort to implement the U.N. resolution of November 22, 1967. For that resolution represents the only guideline for a settlement of the 1967 war that has been endorsed in principle by all parties involved.

I would like briefly to examine the provisions of that resolution with you, offering some personal interpretations and recommendations for their implementation.

The first two steps towards a settlement prescribed by the resolution are the recognition of the right of all nations in the region to exist in peace, and the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied territories. However, a major obstacle to their realization has been chronology.

For good reason, Israel is hesitant to yield occupied territories without first receiving assurances that the Arabs concede Israel's right to exist peacefully and have abandoned the illusion of someday driving the Jews into the sea.

Likewise, internal political pressures make it difficult for President Nasser and King Hussein to make or ever entertain such concessions without the prior certainty that at least part of their occupied lands will be returned. Thus, one of the major tasks facing the Jarring mission—perhaps with the support of the big four powers—is to engineer the simultaneous execution of these two steps.

As for the question of which occupied territories Israel should yield, former Ambassador Goldberg has pointed out that the UN resolution simply calls for the "withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from occupied terri-

tories." The word "all" before occupied territories was purposely omitted.

Clearly, Israel intends to make and should make her borders more defensible than they were prior to June of 1967. The U.S., Britain, and France have publicly acknowledged that Israel may justly insist on retaining certain strategic conquered areas like the Golan Heights and parts of Gaza. However, parts of the West Bank and Sinai which are not vital to Israel's defense will have to be returned to Jordan and Egypt respectively.

The third principle for settlement set forth in the resolution is the freedom of navigation. Israel must be assured free passage of the Suez Canal and the Straits of Tiran. After Nasser's pledge to permit Israeli use of the Suez in 1956 was so flagrantly broken, it is difficult to expect Israel to accept new Arab promises. It may well fall to the big four powers—whose role I shall discuss shortly—to serve as the guarantors of any agreement.

The fourth principle is the just settlement of the refugee problem. With the June war, their number has swollen to 1.7 million. Humanitarian considerations demand action be taken immediately. For the vast majority live in conditions of the worst imaginable squalor and disease not to mention political agitation.

Obviously, Israel cannot absorb all or even most of these refugees and remain a Jewish state. Therefore, Tel Aviv will have to help compensate these people for the loss of their property and participate in a program to resettle them throughout the Middle East.

Territorial inviolability is the final settlement principle laid down in the November 22 resolution. To rely on trust and good will to preserve the peace in the Middle East is naive. Hate and suspicion still dominate Arab-Israeli relations.

Therefore, I am urging the President to propose that any Mideast settlement must provide for demilitarized zones along the Arab-Israeli frontiers to be actively and continuously patrolled by U.N. peacekeeping forces. In this way the border clashes and terrorist incursions that keep tensions high in the area may be reduced or eliminated.

Let me now turn briefly to the question of the big four powers—U.S., Britain, France, and the Soviet Union—in a Middle East settlement. I am convinced the major powers can play a constructive part in the search for peace providing we recognize the limitations inherent in their role.

The four powers cannot—I repeat cannot—impose the terms of a peace settlement on Israel or the Arabs. They possess neither the right nor, in reality, the influence to do so.

We and the other powerful nations of the world must work to create the environment which can lead to a peaceful settlement. The U.S. and the Soviet Union, in particular, must urge the parties to be flexible in their approach. The Soviets must influence the Arabs to talk, to adopt no rigid views on procedures. In addition, the big four powers may guarantee the compliance of all parties with the terms of the final settlement.

The proposed four power conference also is important as an opportunity for us to work out with the Russians then necessary understandings to avoid a direct military confrontation and to limit the arms buildup in the area.

I wish I could predict an imminent settlement of all outstanding issues in the Middle East and the onset of a just and permanent peace. Unfortunately, I cannot. The hates and hostilities still run too deeply.

The best we can hope for in the coming decade is a policy which prevents the outbreak of a fourth round in the Arab-Israeli war and which buys more time. Time to heal the bitterness and salve hurt pride. Time for dialogue and communication. Time for the mutual trust and understanding to take root which are the foundations of lasting peace.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED PRESS FOMENTS RACE HATRED

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, since President Nixon submitted his domestic proposals in general outline form to Congress several days ago, a great hue and cry has arisen that he is cutting essential programs that are vital to the interests of particular groups.

There have been some not-so-veiled threats that "the cities may explode" if a particular program is not extended. It would appear from these critics that every dollar must have been spent with the utmost wisdom and judiciousness and that there is absolutely no room for improvement except to "send more money."

Mr. President, I think the taxpayers are tired of this whining plea. They have sent more money, but they are now demanding that these programs be improved and that those who have the capability to help themselves begin to do so. That is not to say that there is no poverty in the United States. There is, and I know of no one who is not in favor of eliminating it. So the question should be switched from "Who is for poverty and who is against it?" to "Which are the best methods for eliminating poverty to the degree we can, and how may we do it most efficiently?"

Mr. President, I have before me an example of the way in which poverty funds have been misspent. Not only have these funds been misdirected from the purpose to which they were originally intended by the Congress, but they have actually been used for purposes inimical to the original intent.

I am quoting from a front page story in the March-April 1968 issue of the *Spokesman*, a publication produced with the encouragement and financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity in San Francisco:

Black people wake up; we are all in prison; we are all Huey Newtons. He may be doing time in jail but we are doing it in the ghetto . . . If you want action, come join me in my fight for identity, equality, not civil rights but human rights.

The article is signed by Adam Rogers.

The same paper, the *Spokesman*, has accused the Nation's cities of arming to carry out plans of genocide against black people, and said the United States is preparing concentration camps for blacks. It also quotes the executive director of the OEO's San Francisco Family Service Agency as making the statement:

A civil war is almost inevitable unless the powers of white America face up to the fact that they have a responsibility to see that all children have some guarantee—decent economic income, housing, education and health assurances that exist for their own children.

Mr. President, these attempts to foment racial strife and unrest are being carried on at the taxpayers expense. The OEO is specifically prohibited from publishing newspapers, but these tabloid size papers apparently get by under the technical designation of "newsletters." Whatever their specific or generic designation, Mr. President, they are not a proper use of tax money.

This kind of activity is particularly indicative of the tangled mess that has been allowed to grow in the name of the vast majority of American's genuine compassion for the less fortunate. However, the generosity and genuine concern of most Americans is not without its limit. While I think no nation has ever attempted to do so much for so many, and while I believe Americans to be the most generous people in the world, I will say this: That while their compassion and generosity is unexcelled, it is not unlimited.

When we have obvious cases of well-educated people, people who are capable of contributing to their own support, "demanding" that the taxpaying citizen take on more and more of their burden, then we are coming to an end. Add to this the realization that people are being taxed to provide their own scourges, so to speak, and the situation becomes intolerable.

Mr. President, most Americans have just undergone the traumatic experience of putting out a tremendous slice of their income for the support of governments at the Federal, State, and local levels. A taxpayer looks at that total figure he is contributing to the Government and begins to wonder what he is getting for his money. In this instance, he is apparently paying somebody to "cuss" him. It reminds me of the newspaper editor who fired a reporter after establishing that the reporter was—to use his term—"bad mouthing" the paper all over town. Said the editor:

Cussin' I get for free—no need to pay somebody to do it.

Mr. President, I think I may properly say that is the burgeoning attitude of the American taxpayer. There is absolutely no need for the U.S. Government to subsidize this kind of activity. I am absolute in my determination that the freedom of the press in America shall not be restricted. By the same token, I agree with my esteemed colleague, the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), who has said:

When the press is supported or subsidized by federal funds, it is disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by enslavement of the people.

Mr. President, I shall continue to support the President in his efforts to see that the money to help the poverty stricken goes to the purpose for which it is intended, not to fatten bureaucrats or subsidize hatred.

I ask unanimous consent that an article written by Mrs. Shirley Scheibla and published in *Barron's* weekly for April 14, detailing these monetary abuses, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SUBSIDIZED PRESS: THE POVERTY PROGRAM IS BUILDING ITS OWN PROPAGANDA MACHINE

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., Democrat, of North Carolina: "When the press is supported or subsidized by federal funds, it is

disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by enslavement of the people."

(By Shirley Scheibla)

WASHINGTON.—Commenting on the violence-ridden strike at San Francisco State College, a leading story in a San Francisco newspaper in February ran as follows: "The only reason the strike was called was as a last resort to bring out into the open their (the students') grievances and the present injustices and irrelevances on the campus of a school which belongs to this community. . . . The basic truth of the strike is the freedom of self-determination of students in their education versus the present misuse of the schools by irrelevant and outside political forces such as the office of the governor, state superintendent of schools and the like in trustees and such boards of directors who are totally alien to the needs and desires of Black and Third World students. The activities and grievances of the students deserve the sympathy of the local community."

CIVIL DISRUPTION

The publication which featured the story is *The Spokesman*, one of a growing number of newspapers published with the encouragement and financial support of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Issued by community action groups all over the country, many of the newspapers are promoting black militancy, racial hatred, civil disruption, the cry of police brutality, community control of schools and colleges, and, not least, the war on poverty and all its works.

Congress has prohibited the use of federal anti-poverty funds for establishing or operating general coverage newspapers. However, OEO claims that the publications really are "newsletters," aimed at bridging "the communication gap often existing between the community action program and the people it serves."

According to a Public Affairs Handbook, *The Printed Word*, published by OEO last year and distributed to community action agencies, a publication is a "newsletter" if it "has a specific information objective and a limited audience," is not sold for profit, carries no paid advertising and is run by the local anti-poverty program. "Grantees," the Handbook declares, "are encouraged to publish newsletters or house organs which assist local anti-poverty efforts. These publications are generally financed under the administrative budget of the local agency."

Pictured in the Handbook, to illustrate what OEO means, is the front page of a "newsletter" called *The Crusader*, a product of the United Community Corp., top community action agency of Newark, N.J., which says it is "a free city-wide community newspaper for the promotion of community action." Looking remarkably like a tabloid newspaper, the page carries a story about Newark citizens marching in front of the White House. In another issue, *The Crusader* called the McClellan Committee's investigation of the role of anti-poverty workers in Newark's riots, "a witch hunt and a shocking misuse of public funds."

The OEO Handbook also includes elementary instructions for publishing "newsletters." With OEO funding, the Community Action Training Institute at Trenton, N.J., has gone a step further by publishing *The CATI News Man*, which the subheading identifies as "A Manual—In Newspaper Form—On How To Produce A Community Action Newspaper." The essentials, it says, are community problems, angry people and publishing facilities. A good community action newspaper, it declares, "makes people mad."

Enlarging on the Handbook's idea of not selling the newspapers for profit, the manual advises soliciting donations. "Be sure you don't ask people to buy a subscription to your paper, since this will cause difficulties with income tax and licensing laws," it explains.

The Office of Economic Opportunity is so pleased with the work of CATI that it has asked the Institute to provide assistance to community action training centers all over the country, at federal expense, of course. (There are 10 training centers to serve over 1,000 community action centers.) While the exact number and circulation of community action newspapers in existence are unknown, it is abundantly clear that they constitute a vast propaganda network.

Specifically, anti-poverty newsletters churn out vast quantities of propaganda for the war on poverty. For instance, the TEOC News, published by the Tampa (Fla.) Economic Opportunity Council, Inc., recently declared that an independent OEO is an absolute necessity.

CHRISTMAS ISSUE

Referring to OEO, Community Action News, a monthly publication of the Knox County Economic Opportunity Council at Barbourville, Ky., said in its Christmas issue: "Our country cannot afford to risk an interruption of a program experiment which is the last link of communication between the poor and non-poor." An offer to fund the 1969 anti-poverty programs of Wayne County, Mich., at the same level as 1968 is unacceptable, according to a front page story in the Wayne County OEO Newsletter, a slick, printed publication of the Economic Opportunity Committee of Eloise, Mich.

"Do not panic with the coming of the Nixon Administration," said a recent Community Action Newsletter published by the Ninth District Opportunity, Inc., of Gainesville, Ga. "America," it declared, "is a country of compassionate people, and humanitarian programs will not be stopped by any administration."

Publications which have lavished praise on OEO projects include With the People, issued by half-a-dozen community action agencies in Chicago; the Neighborhood Journal, by Community Progress, Inc. of New Haven, Conn.; STOP Newsletter, by the Southeastern Tidewater Opportunity Project of Norfolk, Va., and The Advisor, by the Charleston County Economic Opportunity Commission at Charleston, S.C.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, HUEY

Black power and race hatred are also favorite themes of OEO-subsidized journalism. On this score, the story on the San Francisco State College strike was not the only one worthy of notice in the February issue of The Spokesman. It also carried an announcement of a birthday celebration in honor of Black Panther leader Huey P. Newton, now jailed for allegedly killing a man in California.

Scheduled as a speaker at the Black Panther celebration was Kathleen Cleaver, wife of Black Panther Eldridge Cleaver. (Mr. Cleaver was jailed in 1958 after conviction for assault with intent to commit murder. He was paroled in 1966, but had his parole revoked in connection with a gun battle with Oakland police officers. Subsequently he was released by a judge who ruled Mr. Cleaver was "a political prisoner." This action subsequently was overruled; both California and federal authorities have been seeking Mr. Cleaver since December 27, 1968.)

According to The Spokesman, tickets for the affair were available at Black Panther Party Headquarters at 1419 Fillmore and More's Books, 1435 Fillmore, and for \$2.50 at the door. It added that part of the proceeds would be used for the Newton-Cleaver Defense Committee and the Eldridge Cleaver Ball Fund.

The same issue sought contributions to the Malcolm X Educational Center, advised its readers to write or call the Black Draft Counseling Union and join the Welfare Rights Movement. In addition, it announced a community meeting to "amend the city charter to forbid the creation of para-military squads (by the San Francisco police) . . ."

Such inflammatory contents are nothing new for The Spokesman. In 1968, the February-March issue decried the jailing of Huey Newton for alleged murder and reported "some very significant ideas" of the Black Panthers, which included freeing Mr. Newton or bringing about "retribution," freeing of imprisoned black men not tried by their peers and exempting all Negroes from military service.

(The latest word on the Black Panthers came on April 2, when a New York grand jury indicted 21 members for conspiring to bomb five department stores, a police station and a railroad.)

A front-page story in the March-April 1968 issue of The Spokesman said, "Black people wake up; we are all in prison; we are all Huey Newtons. He may not be doing time in jail but we are doing it in the ghetto." Signed by Adam Rogers, it declared, "If you want action, come join me in my fight for identity, equality, not civil rights, but human rights."

The Spokesman has accused the nation's cities of arming to carry out plans of genocide against black people, and said the U.S. is preparing concentration camps for blacks. It also quoted Richard Roberts, executive director of the San Francisco Family Service Agency, as saying, "A civil war is almost inevitable unless the powers of white America face up to the fact that they have a responsibility to see that all children have some guarantee—decent economic income, housing, education and health assurances that exist for their own children."

Copies of all the aforementioned issues of The Spokesman are in the files at OEO headquarters.

In the same vein, the August 15, 1968, issue of the Marin City (Calif.) Memo, published by the Marin City Economic Opportunity Council, printed an editorial by Area Director James W. Coleman, who, after visits to Chicago, Detroit and Cleveland, found: "The social revolution continues to move across this nation. . . . There must be drastic social changes in the society now. . . . I talked to many black youths who still had anger and revenge for the white power structure." The same issue quoted black activist Dick Gregory as saying, "Riots are nothing new. They're just a ghetto version of a fire sale."

NEED POWER

"Power is the essential for the poor," according to the tabloid newspaper, The New Day, published by the Human Development Corp. of St. Louis. "If you want to beat the small store cheating you. If you want to keep 'the man' off your back. If you want to get a job. If you want to get decent housing out of the slum lord. You have to have Power," proclaimed the March 1968 issue of The New Day.

From a sister publication in Elizabeth, N.J., comes a similar theme. The May 1968 Community Action News, published by Community Action for Economic Opportunity, Inc., carried a letter to the editor signed by Josephine Nieves, acting director of the Northeast Regional Office of OEO in New York, which said, "Jobs alone will not necessarily solve the problems of the poor in America since it is to a large extent a question of power."

The same issue featured a story which said that a teenage community action group had petitioned the city to incorporate black history into the regular school curriculum. Another story said, "The Black Power Confer-

ence held July 20 through July 23 was an inspirational and educational gathering." Among the proposals reported were "developing Liberation Schools, setting up a Black Teachers Union—Separate From The White Summer Camps for Blacks only, development of Black Political Power. . . ." The Washington Evening Star called that same conference "a festival of hate."

The tabloid newspaper, The Neighborhood Journal, states in its masthead that it is owned and operated by the five Denver community action councils and "funded by a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity." The September 20, 1968, issue devotes half a page to the views of "resident participants" in the Model Cities program. It charges that minority persons are abused when arrested, charged, jailed and sentenced, and calls for "greater protection from unjust police and judicial action" to command top priority after planning in the Model Cities program.

WASHINGTON DOESN'T KNOW

No one in Washington seems to know how many anti-poverty "newsletters" are being published, or how many more will be launched in response to OEO's Handbook. Besides those mentioned, others have come out of Long Beach, Calif.; Bridgeport, Conn.; Miami and Pensacola, Fla.; New York; Columbus, Ohio, and many Indian reservations. OEO headquarters have three filing cabinet drawers packed with samples of the newsletters.

Almost unbelievably, they are being distributed in slums all over the country without the knowledge of Congress. That body thought it had made its intent amply clear when it set up the Small Business Administration. Congress banned SBA loans to newspapers to avoid government interference with the press. In 1967 an amendment to the second supplemental appropriation act said flatly: "None of the federal government anti-poverty funds may be used for establishing or operating a general coverage newspaper, magazine, radio station or television station."

When he introduced the amendment, Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. (D., Va.) stated: "I am unalterably opposed to government ownership or control of newspapers because it leads inevitably to government control of the news. I believe we have too much government management of the news already without this additional weapon being put into the hands of federal officials."

Enactment followed disclosure that WAMY-Community Action, Inc., of Boone, N.C., proposed to establish a newspaper and radio station with \$179,000 from OEO in response to OEO pressure to emphasize communications instead of job training. At the time, Senator Ervin commented that the proposal was wholly "incompatible with the free enterprise system and a free press."

Senator Strom Thurmond (R., S.C.) declared: "If every poverty agency were to get a 100% subsidy for the publication of its own propaganda—freed from the responsibility of business losses and restrictions—then a medium would be created to promote social unrest and dissatisfaction on a nationwide scale."

As noted, OEO maintains that the publications it now subsidizes are "newsletters" which do not engage in "general coverage," cited in the wording of the 1967 ban on subsidized newspapers. Newsletters or newspapers, the publications are only one segment of a vast OEO-subsidized propaganda network—encompassing television, radio, films and even speakers' bureaus—now in operation and growing daily.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Dwight D. Eisenhower was a great man. The

very mention of his name evokes emotions in the heart of every American. Men who were in the European Theater in World War II remember him as the commander in chief who led the Allied forces to victory. Those who are especially identified with the years from 1953 to 1961 remember him as a distinguished President of the United States. There are those who identify with his earlier years, or with his presidency of Columbia University. But everyone who thinks of Dwight D. Eisenhower thinks of a man of humility, yet a man of stature, a great leader but not a demagogue, a man who was a peer in his own time, yet a man who was a friend of all.

I was fortunate in being a part of the organization in London that General Eisenhower led while preparing for the Normandy invasion. As a very junior officer I knew of the admiration and respect he elicited from all ranks. His ability to mediate between the prima donnas of his command and his ability to obtain the utmost from his associates were facets of his character that made all ranks his friend.

I came to Congress in the first year of President Eisenhower's administration and was a part of the legislative branch while he led the executive department. He was always understanding, ever considerate. He brought to the civilian administration the feeling that he had for his troops under his military command. He wanted to improve the status of the people he governed; while he recognized that they were going to be subjected to risks and dangers, he wanted to minimize those risks and dangers.

He was a great general, a distinguished president, an admirable citizen; but more, he was a mighty American in all the connotations of that term. The world will miss him and all of us who were associated with him regret his death, but even after our memory is faded and gone this man will be remembered as a statesman of grandeur and dignity.

THE WAY WE GO TO WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the question uppermost in the minds of Americans today is how we are going to end the war in Vietnam. This question supersedes the related question, asked earlier, which is why we went to war in the first place. But a third question is posed by the war in Vietnam, a question that is of fundamental importance for the future of our country, and that question is how we went to war.

Merlo J. Pusey, an associate editor of the Washington Post and author of a Pulitzer Prize-winning biography of Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes, addresses himself to this question in a lucid book entitled "The Way We Go To War," which is scheduled to be published in mid-April. Having read the galley proofs, I recommend that every Senator examine the book carefully. After examining the way we have gone to war in the past, and the way we went to war in Vietnam, Mr. Pusey concludes that while the Founding Fathers did leave the President the authority to repel sudden attacks on the

United States, its forces and its people, "to extend that authority so as to allow the Commander in Chief to send American troops to the defense of other countries half way around the globe, because the President believes that their security is related to our own, is to rip this section of the Constitution into meaningless shreds."

Mr. Pusey goes on to state his belief that the new doctrine that seems to have arisen under which the President can commit the Nation to war without the approval of Congress "is a far greater peril to the future of American democracy than the Vietnam war itself."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from chapter I of "The Way We Go To War," written by Merlo J. Pusey, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WAY WE GO TO WAR

(By Merlo J. Pusey)

Can the United States be committed to war without action by Congress? In 1787 the Founding Fathers resolved that it could not be, and the country held to that principle with little deviation for a century and a half. In recent years, however, the President has been exercising the power to make war with alarming consistency. One-man decisions involving the lives of citizens and the fate of the nation have become the rule at a time when the President has at his command more power than any other human being has ever had.

The facts about this momentous transition in American government are scarcely open to challenge. The President sends American troops to any part of the world—whenever he thinks they may be needed in the national interest. Three times in the last quarter century one man in the White House has taken the United States into war—once in advance of congressional action, once without any congressional action, and once with only a casual nod from Congress. In defense of these historic acts the executive branch has laid claim to "inherent powers" broad enough to determine the fate of the nation in any future crisis.

Several years of war in Vietnam brought the country an acute awareness of the problem. Deeply troubled by the war, people belatedly woke up to the fact that it had never really been authorized by Congress, although Congress in 1964 went through the motions of supporting the President in whatever action he might decide to take. Later some of the legislators who sponsored the Tonkin Gulf resolution almost tore their hair in chagrin over the fact that they had let the war power slip through their fingers. The result is an executive-legislative clash which may evolve into the most important constitutional contest of this century.

The President has always been the key figure in any national crisis since the federal government came into being, and he doubtless always will be. Under the specific terms of the Constitution, he is Commander in Chief of the armed forces in addition to being the Chief Executive, the director of foreign policy, the leader of his party in all spheres of policy-making, and the chief molder of public opinion. His sway over the country is especially great in times of emergency or public danger. And with the emergence of nuclear fission, science has thrust into the President's hands power to destroy the world.

All this has come about through industrial, scientific, and political evolution. The flowering of technology has brought with it an almost inevitable centralization of power. Pru-

dence suggests that such a trend in a democratic country should have been accompanied by a tighter safeguards against abuses of power. Instead, the accretion of power in the White House has encouraged the President and his associates to develop a cult designed to justify any use he may make of the country's armed forces. Under the new doctrine now openly reached he may bring the might of America to bear upon any other country without seeking authority from Congress—without the restraints of what was once supposed to be a government of checks and balances.

The President thus tends, as Shakespeare said of Caesar, to "bestride the narrow world like a Colossus." He enters into foreign commitments or, at his discretion, enlarges the commitments made by treaty with the advice and consent of the Senate. He determines when the country shall go to war, how the war shall be carried on, and whether it shall be extended to other countries. Of course he also exercises enormous influence over what the people at home must do to support the war. An egotistical and stubborn President could lead the country into a series of self-defeating wars in remote corners of the globe in an effort to enhance his own prestige or to cover failures in his domestic policies. Under the practices that have come to prevail, Congress would have little prospect of stopping such ventures. And what is there to prevent a President obsessed by the righteousness of his own cause from holding down the accelerator until a nuclear holocaust would be unavoidable?

The basic question is not the good intentions of the President. We may assume that any Chief Executive elected by the people will be guided by what he deems to be the best interests of the country. But Presidents, even more than other men, are likely to be caught in rushing streams of circumstances, and even if they could always be trusted to make wise decisions, our system rests on the assumption that many minds are more trustworthy than one on matters of war and peace.

Not all the extravagant claims to Presidential power and not all the abuses of that power have been concentrated in recent decades, as we shall see. But until World War II the deviations from constitutional doctrine could be looked upon as aberrations. Under several recent Presidents, both theory and practice have sought to make presidential commitments to war the norm instead of highly dubious exceptions. It now seems clear that useless (sic) some drastic shift can be brought about, in attitudes and in the law of the land, our country will be as much at the mercy of one man for the maintenance of peace as were the ancient kingdoms and empires before the dawn of democratic government.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S REVIEW OF THE 1970 BUDGET

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to commend President Nixon for his review of the fiscal year 1970 budget, which he released on April 15. His summary is a responsible effort to restrain inflation in the economy and at the same time to provide the funds necessary to meet our urgent domestic social needs.

To slow down inflation, Federal fiscal restraint is vitally important. This the President recognizes by proposing to reduce fiscal year 1970 outlays by \$4 billion from the corrected estimates submitted by the outgoing administration. Budget outlays will be reduced from \$196.9 billion to \$192.9 billion.

The President proposes to reduce budget authority for fiscal year 1970 by

\$5.5 billion, from \$211.4 billion to \$205.9 billion. Of the \$5.5 billion, over \$3 billion is in military programs.

The President has been unable to reduce fiscal year 1969 outlays significantly as he came to office after 7 months of the fiscal year had already gone by. I strongly applaud his efforts though to pare what he can from 1969 outlays as well.

Even with the cuts from the budget left behind by the previous administration, President Nixon fully recognizes the many urgent needs of our society. Proposed outlays of \$192.9 billion in fiscal year 1970 will be \$8 billion higher than those for fiscal year 1969. Selected necessary and vital domestic programs will have their funds increased.

It is essential to the growth and welfare of this Nation that the Federal Government put its money where its goals and priorities are. Our first priorities in these difficult days are to meet the human needs of our people—poverty, hunger, education, and cultural deprivation, poor housing and the lack of employment skills. This present administration has taken important steps toward insuring that Federal spending programs express and meet the Nation's needs in its proposals regarding the fiscal 1970 budget.

In its review of the 1970 budget, the administration proposes to hold the increase in total outlays to 4.3 percent over that estimated for fiscal 1969. Yet this does not mean it intends to have all programs and departments grow at this rate. Programs to improve our human resources and aid our poor will increase 10 percent, or more than twice the average. It is proposed that the Department of Labor spend over 5 percent more in fiscal 1970 than it did in fiscal 1969, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 9 percent more, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development, 40 percent more.

At the same time, many programs of lesser priority are slated to reduce their outlays in fiscal 1970. Spending by the Department of Defense and NASA face significant reductions. Spending by the Department of Agriculture will decline over 14 percent, and Corps of Engineers and General Services Administration outlays will also drop.

To my mind, this is a significant indication that this administration intends to reorient the Federal budget to meet the human needs of the people of this country. The fact that it is being done within the context of budget restraint makes it all the more admirable.

The following table shows percentage changes in agency spending in fiscal 1970 over fiscal 1969:

Review of the 1970 budget—Changes in agency spending in fiscal 1970 over fiscal 1969

Agency	Percent Change
Agriculture	-14.4
CCC	-18.4
Commerce	+23.7
Defense-military and military assistance	-.6
Corps of Engineers	-2.8
Health, Education, and Welfare	+9.3
Trust funds	+7.1
Housing and Urban Development	+40.0

Review of the 1970 budget—Changes in agency spending in fiscal 1970 over fiscal 1969—Continued

Agency	Percent Change
Interior	-6.7
Justice	+41.2
Labor	+5.3
Unemployment trust funds	+4.3
Post Office	-55.7
State	-1.4
Transportation	+8.7
Treasury	+5.8
Interest on public debt	+6.1
Atomic Energy Commission	+2.2
General Services Administration	-1.5
NASA	-8.2
Veterans' Administration	-2.1
All other:	
Foreign economic assistance	-8.6
Office of Economic Opportunity	-.4
Other agencies	+27.3
Undistributed intragovernmental transactions	+12.5
Total	+4.3

The President has acted responsibly in his proposals to meet the country's needs. Now it is up to Congress. As the President points out, almost 85 percent of the recommended budget changes require congressional concurrence, either as new legislation or revised appropriations.

Will Congress have the courage, the wisdom, and the political nerve to follow through on these proposals? I believe we must follow in the path laid out by the President to restrain inflation yet meet our urgent domestic needs.

I commend the President and now say that we, in Congress, must do our part.

THE TAX-DODGE FARMING BILL

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, just the other day one of my constituents sent me some materials he had received in the mail concerning my tax-dodge farming bill, S. 500.

The material consisted in part of a form letter from the American Hereford Association. The association also provided him with a list of 11 supposed adverse effects which the bill would have on my constituent. The suggestion was made that several arguments should be selected from the list and incorporated into letters to the members of the Montana delegation. Finally, instructions were provided detailing how to write letters and the need to "concentrate on House delegates now; particularly members of the House Ways and Means Committee."

In its form letter, the American Hereford Association stated that it was speaking not only for itself but for the National Livestock Tax Committee and the American National Cattlemen's Association, as well. I am certain that the concerted efforts of these three groups will doubtless result in an influx of mail. I want other Senators to be able to say they saw a preview of coming attractions in the RECORD first.

I ask unanimous consent that the form letter and attachments be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter from the American Hereford Association and attachments were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

THE AMERICAN HEREFORD ASSOCIATION,
April 9, 1969.

DEAR FRIEND: The next thirty days are critical to all our Hereford operations! You have doubtless read or heard about legislation currently being considered by the House Ways and Means Committee regarding the offsetting of farm losses against other income. (Metcalf Bill and Treasury proposals.)

The National Livestock Committee, of which your Association is a member, and the American National Cattlemen's Assn., are vigorously opposing this legislation because its present form could potentially damage everyone in farming. Your AHA, the Tax Committee, and the ANCA are each on record in Washington as being in favor of *singling out* and *discouraging* a small minority who enter the livestock field primarily for the purpose of tax avoidance. The Tax Committee has made specific proposals to both House Ways and Means and Treasury officials to tax livestock investors at ordinary income rates instead of capital gains rates on excessive depreciation, and to lengthen the holding period to qualify cattle for capital gains treatment to two years.

Right now, we need your help. Attached, you will find two sheets. The first lists your state delegations to the Senate and the House. The second sheet lists several reasons why the legislation now being considered would be detrimental to the great majority of our breeders. We strongly urge you, if any of these arguments appeal to you, to select from that list several that you can incorporate into letters to your delegations. Also, if you so incline, the Tax Committee would appreciate your voicing your support of their proposals.

Of immediate priority is your House delegation, which could have legislation reported out to it by the House Ways and Means Committee this month. Within the House, members of the Ways and Means Committee should have your first attention, by remember, they *all* have to vote eventually!

The Tax Committee and your Associations can do just so much, but all they can do pales by comparison with the force you can exert! Please, if this legislation is of vital concern to you and your Hereford business, take these tools we have furnished you and translate them into expressions which will guide your elected representatives!

Sincerely yours,

WAYNE NAUGLE,
President.
W. T. BERRY, Jr.,
Secretary.

ADVERSE EFFECTS OF METCALF BILL AND TREASURY PROPOSALS

1. While the legislation proposed so far seeks to eliminate an acknowledged minority who invest primarily to avoid tax, its method is so sweeping that it threatens the business of all ranchers and farmers, large and small.
2. The need is for legislation that will single out the undesirable practices and eliminate them with a minimum of disturbance to the rest of the farm economy. The solution may lie in striking specifically at planned "short-term" investors, as opposed to more stable operators.
3. The Metcalf-type legislation has the effect of forcing those with outside income over \$15,000 to an accrual system of accounting, from the rancher's traditional cash basis. Impractical from the standpoint of true inventory values and too complicated for the average farmer, it would place yet another undue hardship on him.
4. The decision not to permit the off-setting of farm losses against other income seems discriminatory against farming itself, in that no such restriction is proposed against the comparable practice of other individuals deducting business and professional losses.
5. The arbitrary selection of \$15,000, a figure below the outside incomes of many

family farmers (who are actually being encouraged by the government to diversify their incomes) appears discriminatory and calculated to cut into a major segment of solid farm producers. \$15,000 is also far below the outside incomes reported by most of those purported to be abusing the tax laws.

6. The few special tax incentives provided by law to farmers and ranchers, by reason of the nature of their business, accord them no more than tax equity. To deprive the farmer of these would be to place him in a position of inequity, at a time when his industry is in dire need of stimulation.

7. A side effect of the Metcalf-type legislation would be to actually block the successful farmer from being able to diversify into non-farming businesses producing outside income, for fear of losing his right to deduct farm losses, thus effectively isolating the farmer from the balance of the industrial economy.

8. To discourage the flow of outside capital into farming in the hope that it will protect existing small farmers seems a poor risk, in that all farmers depend on this free flow of capital into agriculture to build it into a competitive industry.

9. Proponents of the legislation suggest that preventing outsiders from investing will tend to lower farm land prices. Is this wise, when ranchers are borrowing to pay for land, and when many small farmers depend on appreciation as the only source of profit in farming?

10. Much of the research which has so vastly improved the technology of agriculture was accomplished by investors with enough outside income to bear the expense of such research. To discourage these investors will strike a blow to agriculture in another vital sector.

11. The Metcalf-type legislation examines the man and how much money he has, resulting inevitably in discriminatory legislation. When the legislation abandons this trend and examines the potential of the enterprise itself, it will be on the right track.

CONGRESSMEN FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA

Address your letter as follows:

For Senators: Address: The Honorable (name), Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510. Salutation: Dear Senator (name).

For Representatives: The Honorable (name), The House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515. Dear Congressman (name).

SENATE

Democrat: Mike Mansfield, Lee Metcalf.

HOUSE

Democrat: Arnold Olsen.

Republican: James F. Battin.*

NOTE.—Concentrate on House delegates now; particularly members of House Ways and Means Committee.

THE ABM DISPUTE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. David S. Broder has written an interesting article on the ABM system, which was published in the Washington Post of April 15, 1969. Because I think it is worthy of the attention of all Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ABM DISPUTE BEARS ECHOES OF FIGHT THAT DESTROYED L. B. J.

(By David S. Broder)

Like the Vietnam war before it, the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system has proved

* Indicates member of House Ways and Means Committee.

to be too important an issue to be left to the generals and the military experts. It has now become a test of strength between the President and the coalition of critics who are challenging the economic and political assumptions of our present national security policy.

There is a stunning similarity between the arguments now being voiced by Republicans opposed to President Nixon's decision to begin deployment of the ABM and the warnings anti-Vietnam Democrats were giving President Johnson, say, two years ago.

Now, just as then, the fellow-partisans of the incumbent President are pleading with him not to pursue what seems to them a mistaken policy and not to make adherence to that policy the prime test of party loyalty.

It would be foolish to predict at this juncture that the ABM fight will prove as costly to Mr. Nixon as Vietnam did to his predecessor. But it might be equally mistaken to assume that the opposition cannot prevail.

Many of us believed two years ago that a party would never repudiate an incumbent President on a basic issue of foreign policy or national security. That assumption proved wrong. The revulsion in the Democratic Party against the expansion of the Vietnam war proved so strong that Lyndon B. Johnson could no longer contemplate continuing either as President or party leader.

Mr. Nixon, obviously, is a long way from that point. Conventional wisdom suggests that his advisers are right when they assert that—in a murky technical argument—the public will look to and trust the President's good judgment.

They are right, too, when they say that in the crunch, conscientious Senators—particularly Republicans—will find it hard to repudiate the President. His popularity is high, his term has barely begun, he must speak for a united country if arms negotiations with the Soviets and the peace talks in Paris are to succeed. Balking a President at such a moment as this is no casual act.

And yet . . . and yet . . . one is struck by the passionate conviction with which Republicans opposed to ABM argue (as did the anti-Vietnam Democrats two years ago) that they are ahead of their President and party and party leader in recognizing that the voters will refuse to support decisions that are so costly and that return so few visible dividends as fighting in Vietnam or building the ABM.

In the case of the ABM, thank God, we are talking only about the commitment of dollars, not of lives. But even in this case, costs have major political consequences.

Opposition to the Vietnam war suddenly spread from the left wing of the Democratic Party to the breadth of the political spectrum when Mr. Johnson in 1967 was finally forced to ask for a tax increase to finance its costs.

Now, Mr. Nixon has asked to keep the Johnson surtax in effect for another year—partly to finance the war, partly to curb the inflationary pressures it unleashed, and partly because he has not been able to bring the military budget, symbolized by ABM, under control.

The campaign against ABM is not simply a high-minded liberal effort to rethink the Cold War or to redefine national priorities. It also has strong elements of an old-fashioned, conservative tax rebellion.

And that is one more reason why the conventional wisdom about who will win this fight may prove to be wrong.

DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONAL PARKS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, last year I made a speech on the Senate floor in which I discussed the need to open up our national parks to a greater extent than has been done, while at the same time maintaining protection of their

most precious values. At that time I stated:

We are forgetting, I believe, that our national parks are for people, and that a vast majority of Americans see most of our natural wonders, and the greatest part of our magnificent scenery, from the window seats of their automobiles, or after a short hike from a visitor's use area. They come into our national parks, not with a pack on the back, but with a row of children, and perhaps grandma or grandpa as well, in the back seats of their cars. They are much more interested in getting an unobstructed view of Old Faithful than finding a remote camping site in Kings Canyon.

Three questions which I asked at that time remain highly relevant today:

Are we overemphasizing wilderness and underemphasizing people?

Are we forgetting the majority of our people? Those who seek refreshment and revitalization from an outdoor experience but who keep near graded roads and manmade shelter. And are we favoring the minority who have the time and the money to seek nature in its pristine state far from roads and manmade camps?

In 1968, the National Park System was host to just over 151 million visitations, a truly phenomenal total, representing a strikingly high rate of increase. Visitations exceeded the predicted totals by 5 million. There is no reason to believe that this trend will reverse itself. I, for one, am much pleased that more and more Americans are getting out to experience these priceless natural wonders, and to breathe the fresh, invigorating air which characterizes our national parks.

I continue to believe, as I stated last year, that we must achieve a greater development of our national parks in order to serve all Americans—in order that we can, in Director Hartzog's words:

Extend more broadly to all Americans the many values and opportunities represented in their national park system.

Because of my views, I am particularly pleased to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of the chairman of the House Subcommittee on National Parks and Recreation, Congressman ROY TAYLOR. Recently Mr. TAYLOR chaired a hearing of his subcommittee, before which appeared the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Dr. Leslie Glasgow, and the Director of the National Park Service, Mr. George Hartzog. In the discussion at that time, Representative TAYLOR stated that he was very disappointed over the inadequate development of the existing national parks and recreation facilities. Chairman TAYLOR said:

Our park areas should be developed to meet the needs of all visitors—those who come to study nature through car windows as well as the rugged ones.

He lamented the inability of the Park Service to provide needed developed facilities at Assateague Island National Seashore and other units of the National Park System.

Mr. President, the visitation increase which we are experiencing in our national parks and recreation areas must be met by the provision of more developed facilities. Certainly we must provide more roads in the parks in order that the vast majority of our people, who come to the parks by car and rely upon their automo-

biles to carry them to the pieces of picturesque landscape, may be better served.

I was much pleased, in this connection, to hear that the Park Service will surface slightly more than 16 miles of road leading into Canyonlands National Park this summer. Their action will serve to provide access for the public to the spectacular scenery of that park, and will also attract the tourist trade in that region which was expected at the time the park was established.

I am gratified by the words of Representative TAYLOR at the House subcommittee hearing, and heartened by the support which I have received in my efforts to achieve a park system which will serve the interests of the using public. As I said a year ago:

... we must keep part of our national parks and monuments in their natural state. Certainly, we should encourage our citizens to pack into these unique areas and enjoy them to the fullest. For those whose "inner receiver" needs solitude and miles between them and anyone else we should provide the place and the means.

But, we cannot ignore the interest of the majority of our citizens, the majority which gets their enjoyment out of the wilderness by seeing it from the road, and their refreshment from nature by eating and sleeping under big trees.

What they want is more roads—hard-tops, or low-grade scenic roads, as conditions dictate—but more access to our parks, and more campgrounds to stay there

Without this greater development, our efforts to provide the outdoor scenic experience we sought for our people will have failed.

DENIAL OF EDUCATIONAL FUNDS TO A RURAL GEORGIA COUNTY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, the Associated Press made a study of the effect of the cutoff of educational funds to a rural Georgia county by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The report finds that those who are hurt the most by the punitive action of HEW "were hundreds of disadvantaged schoolchildren, most of them poor and Negro."

The funds were denied because local officials and HEW officials disagreed on integration plans.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in various newspapers throughout the Nation on April 16, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

DENIAL OF FUNDS TO A RURAL GEORGIA COUNTY

VIENNA, GA.—Refusal to accept integration guidelines cost rural Dooly County \$359,000 a year in federal funds, a figure equal to 40 per cent of the school budget, and crippled enrichment programs at Negro schools.

The cutoff helped force a tax raise. But hurt worst were hundreds of disadvantaged school children, most of them poor and Negro.

Losers were not the five school board members who rejected an integration plan of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare—HEW—two years ago.

The losers were school children: those needing special preschool help and remedial training but now without a program.

And sick children, who lost a school nurse.

Hungry children, who were getting hot lunches free.

"My biggest problem? Not being able to feed the children," said Negro Principal Frank E. Williams at Paul Vance School in Dooly County.

Dooly, the state's top cotton-growing county located in south Georgia, and Jones County, a sparsely populated pulpwood area near Macon, show the pattern of what results from cutting off federal funds for schools.

Most of the money went to Negro schools since they have by far the most low-income families, a key qualification for the larger grants. Withdrawal of funds was felt sharply in these schools, while the situation in predominantly white schools was not significantly changed.

That has been the main effect in Georgia systems, which authorities say are losing upwards of \$7.5 million a year. Some Georgians argue that HEW's cutoff of funds penalizes children because of actions of school boards.

But an HEW official says the school authorities must take the blame for not complying with "the law of the land."

Regardless of blame, the effects are the same.

Dooly County, 50 miles south of Macon, is bisected by Interstate 75, the major north-south tourist route. The county's 11,000 population is 60 per cent Negro, as is the school enrollment of 3,100.

School Supt. W. F. Stone gave this breakdown of the federal funds it received before termination in 1967:

Remedial-enrichment programs—under Title I of 1964 Civil Rights Act—\$278,000.
Antipoverty—Head Start, others—\$40,000.
"Impact area" funds based on the number of military dependents in schools, \$26,000.
Vocational education, \$15,000.

The total of \$359,000 is equal to nearly 40 per cent of the 1967 school budget of \$904,876. But since the bulk of the federal funds were for added, enrichment programs, the county had to make up only about \$50,000 in its budget, Stone said.

This was done by raising property taxes \$4 per \$1,000 valuation last year, producing about \$85,000 for schools.

A pressing problem was that of hot lunches for many Negro pupils, farm children whose families fall below the poverty level of \$3,000 a year income and often must be trained to like milk because they have none at home, Stone said.

Principal Williams and his teachers at Vance elementary have taken it on themselves to raise money in their community. A pilot program of special state aid has helped.

"Sometimes we have only 19 children out of 404 at this school who can pay for lunch," Williams said. "The majority still eat free."

Stone said that with federal funds 733 meals per day had been provided free. Local efforts have kept the free lunch program going, but on a curtailed basis.

Lost with the federal money also:

A special reading teacher, a physical education teacher and six teacher assistants, a nurse, a band instructor, three lunchroom workers and two janitors—all for the Negro schools.

Dooly County's school board balked two years ago when HEW's formula demanded 150 pupils and 14 teachers cross the color line, Stone said.

Under a freedom of choice plan, about 35 Negroes had transferred to white schools. "You just don't change overnight," Stone said, arguing that HEW had asked too much.

There now are nine Negroes in two otherwise white schools, he said, though the system has dropped its integration plan altogether.

No public battle has resulted from the loss of funds and the recession in integration. But the Department of Justice notified the school board four months ago that a Negro parent had complained of discrimination.

The school board, in reply, adopted a resolution calling for compliance requirements to be "established by judiciary directives." Under federal law, the Justice Department may go into federal court to force compliance.

Jones County, which lies immediately northeast of Macon, has 3,000 school children, with a slight white majority. There are seven schools, four of them all-Negro. About 65 Negroes attended predominantly white schools.

Federal aid totaling more than \$150,000 was cut off in October 1966 when the school board rejected HEW's proposal to abolish the dual school system. Included in the loss, state records show, were \$111,836 in enrichment funds and \$21,677 in funds for military dependents in schools.

"Actually it seems like it brought things to a standstill," said Negro Principal Charles Adams of Bradley Elementary, also plagued with hunger problems. He said classroom equipment, such as reading machines and projectors, were still in use but there were no maintenance funds, no new filmstrips.

"Actually some of the machines are idle," he said.

Schools in Jones County are crowded and the critical need is more room, said Supt. Linton Jordan.

What was the effect of cutting off federal funds?

"The difference is in things we might have done," he said.

"We're operating like we always operated before we got the funds."

Jordan said \$50,000 was spent in a reading program for Negro schools. Other federal money went into science equipment, textbooks, physical plan, lunches, a band with instruments costing \$6,000, record players and four pianos.

All this went to Negro schools. And there were ambitious plans for more programs before the money was cut off, said Marie H. Collins, a Negro teacher who coordinated the federal programs.

Principal Jerome Guy of Maggie Califf High School said Negro schools, like this, were "definitely retarded" academically by the termination of funds.

He said if he had to make a choice he would rather have improved education than school integration.

A federal official defended the cutoff of funds.

"The theory of cutting off funds was that the federal government in such situations was in the position of subsidizing segregation," said Paul Rilling, regional civil rights director for HEW in Atlanta.

The theory that federal aid might be used to "encourage" compliance was involved also Rilling said. This has worked in many instances, he said, citing the fact that most school systems have complied with the law.

"There has been substantial progress in the Deep South," said Rilling. In the 11 Southern states in 1964, he said, integrated schools had only 2 per cent Negro pupils, but now the figure is 20 per cent.

MARTIN LUTHER KING AND AMERICAN TRADITIONS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, 1 year ago, the eloquent voice of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.—raised in the cause of human justice and peace for a decade and a half—was forever stilled.

In memory of this great man, another distinguished black American, Dr. John Hope Franklin, head of the history department at the University of Chicago, spoke at a memorial service held at the Department of Labor on the anniversary of Dr. King's death. Said Dr. Franklin:

A young nation, once the hope of the old

world and the new, grows old and weary before its time. It seems unable to cope with the forces that propel it toward its own demise. . . . A nation cannot be profligate and incontinent in its regard for its own people without draining itself of its own vitality as well as its own humanity. Perhaps it can recover but not without some strong resolve—stronger than anything we have yet witnessed—to become the vessel in which the lives and hopes of all its people can flourish and thereby bring about the restoration of its own vitality.

And then he asked:

Is this requiring too much?

Dr. Franklin's moving speech should cause all who read it to pause to reflect on the nature of the issues which face our Nation today.

I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Franklin's address be printed in the RECORD.

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

MARTIN LUTHER KING AND AMERICAN TRADITIONS

(By John Hope Franklin)

Some years ago, when the Congress of the United States was considering a civil rights bill, a young black man—not yet thirty years of age—spoke out vigorously and eloquently in support of the bill. Referring to the numerous forms of injustice and discrimination from which his people suffered, he said, "If this unjust discrimination is to be longer tolerated by the American people . . . then I can only say with sorrow and regret that our boasted civilization is a fraud; our republican institutions a failure; our social system a disgrace; and our religion a complete hypocrisy." The speaker was John R. Lynch, a member of the House of Representatives from Mississippi; and he was urging his colleagues in 1875 to put an end to racial discrimination in the public schools, on the railroads, and in other places of public accommodation.

Congress passed the act after five years of debate and after deleting the provision covering the public schools. A few years later the Supreme Court struck down the law, with the neat but unconvincing remark that the law to protect the civil rights of all people had not been authorized by the Constitution. The decision was hailed throughout the land as a just decision. Whites in the South praised the "fairmindedness" of the Court in striking down the work of a "set of political fanatics." A New York newspaper advised Negroes to "act wisely" and "accept the result with patience." Only Negro Americans and a very few white Americans deplored the decision. T. Thomas Fortune said that his fellow blacks felt as if they had been "baptized in ice water." Frederick Douglass, commenting on the ultimate indivisibility of justice, observed that under the circumstances the wife of the Chief Justice was protected "not by law, but solely by the accident of her color . . . The lesson of all the ages on this point is that a wrong done to one man is a wrong done to all men. It may not be felt at the moment . . . but . . . the harvest of evil will come."

Thus began the third century of racial injustice in the New World utopia. Those earlier years—from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries—had been marked not merely by the barbarism of slavery but also by the denial of equal rights to those blacks who were already free. Those earlier years had witnessed the struggle of white Americans to win their political independence and their simultaneous determination to deny even the rudiments of freedom to their black compatriots who had also fought to make the country strong and free. Long before the

great numbers of Europeans had poured into the American cities, white America had developed the fine art of ghettoizing the American urban community by placing beyond the pale those Negroes who lived in eighteenth century Boston, New York, and Philadelphia. And when, in the ripeness of time, the United States found it necessary to fight to save its own life, it faltered time and again between 1861 and 1865 on the fundamental questions of human freedom and the dignity of all men.

But it was in this third century—these last hundred years—that this country, through its laws and its practices, would formalize, institutionalize, and even intellectualize its racial doctrines. It would segregate its labor force on the basis of race. Race would dictate the separation of the armed forces into white and black outfits that would fight separately to save the world for democracy. The etiquette of race relations would require separate housing, separate entrances and exits in buildings, separate public parks, separate schools, separate churches, separate toilets, separate Bibles on which to take the oath in courts of law, separate telephone booths, separate drinking fountains, and separate warehouses for the storing of school books of white and black children. Segregation would encourage and justify discrimination. Discrimination would facilitate the brutalizing and dehumanizing of an entire race. The doctrine of racial inferiority, deeply imbedded in the very ethos of white America by three centuries of preaching, would rationalize every act of bestiality perpetrated against black men by white Americans.

By the time that Martin Luther King appeared on the American scene in the middle of the twentieth century, American attitudes toward race had hardened into a firm doctrine of racism that pervaded every aspect of American life. It had itself become a powerful American tradition, even if it was not a good American tradition. It must have been a painful sight for a man such as Martin Luther King, deeply committed to a life of love, to view a society so committed to the denial of equality. Even though he admonished his followers to love their enemies—"and let them know that you love them," he would say—he was doubtless hurt by the regular and persistent reciprocation of hate. But this was an old American tradition, this blind hatred, with a basis so ephemeral as color and employing violence whenever necessary to preserve the tradition and Martin Luther King knew his history as well as his theology. He knew how far back race hatred went, how deeply it was embedded, how pervasive it was. He would confront this tradition, and he would give his entire life to its obliteration.

There were other powerful American traditions on which King could rely as he fought the tradition of racism in all its forms. One was the tradition of protest—to be sure, not always as peaceful in the past as King would have liked, but sanctified by the Constitutional provision guaranteeing the "right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." If Patrick Henry could cry "Give me liberty or give me death," when England imposed a stamp tax, surely King could protest the indignities heaped on his people by forcing them to enter a bus by a rear door. If Henry David Thoreau could denounce the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for enacting laws that interfered with his complete freedom, surely King could protest the failure of the federal government to protect black citizens against the dogs, fire hoses, and bull whips of the racist keepers of the peace. If women could protest in every conceivable way the inequalities of the sexes, surely King could protest the discriminations in employment, housing, voting, and education.

And so Martin Luther King embraced the great American tradition of protest, rejecting that portion of it that countenanced violence. For his efforts he was jailed, an eventuality that he invited and expected in order to test what he viewed as unjust and unconstitutional laws. For his efforts he was denounced as "communistic" by a Southern newspaper and was called "the most notorious liar in the country" by the Director of the F.B.I. This, too, he accepted with equanimity, realizing that in the heat of the battle for justice, men become desperate when their defenses become weak. But he could not and would not accept the violence and barbarity of his adversaries who could bomb scores of churches where defenseless Negroes met to protest injustices, who could murder men and women whose only crime as they worked in the field of civil rights was their search for decency, who could murder little children whose only offense was that they attended Sunday School. His adversaries had taken that part of the American tradition that he had rejected and with it they had defamed and defiled a cause that was worthy and just.

He was not daunted, however, for his optimism was boundless; and his faith in the ultimate triumph of his cause was unshakable. Long before the President's Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders made its report, King knew and had said that racism was deeply imbedded in the vital organs of American life; but he believed that it could be uprooted. He had seen hatred, and he had seen violence; but he believed that there was enough decency left that could be aroused and used to dispel those forces that were on the verge of destroying the country. He believed that a combination of Christian militancy and the American concept of equality could strengthen each other and, in the process, could indeed overcome the forces of evil. He had said as much in his "Letter from a Birmingham Jail." He was to say it again in his book, *Why We Can't Wait*.

There was yet another American tradition on which Martin Luther King counted and of which he became a part. It was the tradition of the Negro American serving as the corrective to the one-sided, myopic view of justice so often manifested by white Americans, even in their finest hour. When they were fighting for independence against England, it was the Negroes of Massachusetts who reminded them of their inconsistency if not their hypocrisy in keeping black men in bondage while espousing the cause of freedom. It was a voteless black man, Paul Cuffe, who refused to pay his taxes and went to jail in 1780 in order to point up the shallow speciousness of the claim of the patriots that "taxation without representation is tyranny." It was Frederick Douglass who reminded President Lincoln that the cause of Union was tenuous and uncertain so long as slavery, the cause of the Civil War, was permitted to exist. It was a company of black Union soldiers who, in 1865, told President Andrew Johnson that it was strange that former Confederates, returning from doing battle against the Union for four years, were allowed to vote while Negro soldiers who had fought to save the Union were denied the vote, presumably because they did not possess the qualities of mind and the powers of discrimination to understand the problems of the society.

This was, indeed, a great American tradition; and one wonders how the country could have retained its sanity or its soul without it. It sustained a country virtually gone mad, at the turn of the century, as it glorified segregation, discrimination, lynchings, and rioting. A T. Thomas Fortune, a Monroe Trotter, and a W. E. B. Du Bois spoke gently to the conscience of the nation and reminded it that it was supposed to be a civilized society and should act like one. When this country embarked on a war to save the world for democracy and

sent a racially segregated army overseas to fight that war, only Negro Americans pointed out the awkwardness and the incongruity of such a posture. It was Negro Americans who first suggested that the disingenuous doctrine of separate but equal not only insulted the Constitution but blasphemed the human spirit as well. It was a difficult task always to be pointing out inconsistencies, pleading for an end to hypocrisy, calling on the great democratic nation to correct its own weaknesses, but they faced the task and tried to discharge it not merely for their own sake but for the sake of their country.

And now, in the middle of the twentieth century, it was the task of young Martin Luther King to reach back through the years and join with young John R. Lynch, who fought for civil rights in 1875, and to join with the countless Negro Americans who, for centuries, had kept alive the tradition of trying to endow this nation with a soul. It was a rich tradition and a formidable task from which King did not shrink. For almost fifteen years, his voice was the world's most eloquent voice to speak for all mankind. And he worked as hard as he spoke: for an end to suffering in Nigeria, for the eradication of slums in urban America, for equal justice under law, for equality in employment, housing, and educational opportunities, for decency in all human relations, for peace at home and in the world.

Then, in the midst of his efforts—and before this nation could fully understand the meaning of his life and work—he had fallen. In death he was the victim of one of America's strongest and most enduring traditions, that of violence. The sniper, in a very real way, symbolized the mood of the nation: an unwillingness and a lack of courage to face the problems that Martin Luther King worked so hard to solve. The murderer was too cowardly to confront King and argue against his program of justice and brotherhood; and so he resorted to violence, the easy way out. For three centuries this nation had lacked the courage to face up to its racial problems. Instead of facing them in King's time, it sought to rationalize, justify, and even defend its own derelictions. Those who sought fair employment were branded as dupes of the communist conspiracy, while the victims of discrimination in employment continued to go hungry. Those who sought better schools in the ghetto were being used, so the argument went, by the anarchists and others who did not care for the American way. As a nation we have been too cowardly to face the issues; it has been much easier to snipe at the advocates of change.

At the time of King's death a year ago, a great deal was said about the meaning of his life and the possible impact of his death on the causes for which he fought. It was even suggested that perhaps he achieved in his martyrdom what he could not achieve in life: a national sense of outrage against violence as well as injustice, and a national commitment, at long last, to attack the race problem with resources as well as resolution. This was, of course, a misreading of the national mood. Some mourned his death; others were elated. Some children in an Alabama town were taught to rejoice in his death. In a score of cities across the land even many of his own despairing followers forgot the teachings of their leader and vented their outrage in a thousand senseless acts of violence. In a Chicago suburb a white family was hounded out of town because they flew their flag at half-mast on the day of King's funeral.

The nation's flags were officially at half-mast, but there was yet no indication that the dream of Martin Luther King would be fulfilled or that there was a national resolve to work at it. It was a simple dream—that men shall dwell in peace and mutual respect. The dream would not come true simply be-

cause a few of the wealthy spent the Monday following his death washing windows in the ghetto and then retreated into their own gilded ghetto, satisfied with the penance they had done. It would not come true so long as the nation expended more of its resources and energies on the shot to the moon than on hunger and disease in American communities. It would not come true so long as companies that select their employees on the irrelevant basis of race receive favors and contracts from the government that is supposed to be the government of all the people. The dream of Martin Luther King would not come true so long as the nation drained its resources and offered the flower of its manhood in a war that few people fully countenanced or understood. And his dream turns into a nightmare with the realization that in Germany, Korea, Viet Nam, and elsewhere, white American soldiers and black American soldiers do battle with one another and contribute to that polarization of the races of which King despaired.

And surely the dream of Martin Luther King would not come true if the trial of his accused assassin were permitted to sink into a mockery of the administration of justice. With good reason Negro Americans have always believed that justice in the United States was neither even-handed nor color blind. They had early fallen victims of two sets of laws—one for whites and one for blacks. Then they had seen the highest courts of the land sanction laws that made racial distinctions. They had seen the courts turn their backs on discrimination in so sacred an exercise of citizenship as voting. They were, thus, fully prepared to believe, on the basis of their long, agonizing experience with law and justice, that King's murderer would not come to trial and be judged on the basis of the evidence. How were they to know that he would be tried, convicted, sentenced, and imprisoned—all within twenty-four hours—with a thousand unanswered questions including the one raised by the prisoner himself that clearly implied the existence of a conspiracy. It was enough to shake the faith of any American. It was too much to ask black Americans to have faith in this bizarre administration of American justice where so little faith already existed.

On the first anniversary of the death of Martin Luther King, it is fitting that we search for some meaning for us of his life and death. It is no easy task. We lack perspective; our emotions betray us. A few things seem clear, however. What national anguish his death brought was shortlived, if indeed it existed at all. We do not seem to have moved significantly toward the goals he sought or even in the direction of those goals. There has been no large enlistment of Americans in the causes for which he gave his life, no great national resolve to finish the task of creating a decent social order.

But his death can be viewed as a warning that the time is running out when we can solve any of our major problems peacefully. The violent death of a man of peace triggered a period of convulsive and tragic violence. It provided yet another example of America's living and dying by the sword. The strain on our legal and political institutions of the murder of a President, and then a great national leader, and then a United States Senator is incalculable. It pushes us closer to the brink of anarchy; and the alarming deterioration of the rule of law is surely related to these violent and untimely deaths.

A young nation, once the hope of the old world and the new, grows old and weary before its time. It seems unable to cope with the forces that propel it toward its own demise. It is the nature of its own life that has done this to it. A nation cannot be profligate and incontinent in its regard for its own people without draining itself of its own vitality as well as its own humanity.

Perhaps it can recover, but not without some strong resolve—stronger than anything we have yet witnessed—to become the vessel in which the lives and hopes of all its people can flourish and thereby bring about the restoration of its own vitality. Is this requiring too much?

When a young poet of another nation learned of the death of Martin Luther King he wrote:

"That bullet killed him,
But by that bullet I was reborn,
And I was reborn a Negro."

No one requires that of any nation, surely not this nation; but those lines may contain the key to our salvation. If the death of Martin Luther King can, somehow, mean that the nation will experience a rebirth of simple humanity, then it can save itself and all of his dreams can then come true.

RESIGNATION OF EDWARD CRAFTS AS DIRECTOR OF BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on March 7, I expressed some concern that Secretary of the Interior Hickel was so slow in naming his Assistant Secretaries and Department heads that we might lose some of the dedicated conservationists who have devoted their lives to the public interest.

I singled out Mr. Edward Crafts, the immensely capable director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. He stuck around for a while without an Assistant Secretary who could define Department policy, then resigned in frustration to take a more lucrative and challenging position.

For the RECORD, I have the letter of resignation that Mr. Crafts wrote members of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and to Secretary Hickel. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., February 24, 1969.
TO MEMBERS OF THE SENATE INTERIOR AND
INSULAR AFFAIRS COMMITTEE.

DEAR SENATOR METCALF: This is a letter of special thanks and appreciation to my many friends on the Senate Interior Committee with whom I have worked for so many years. It has been about 25 years since I first testified before your Committee. Working in harmony with my Congressional friends on both sides of the aisle on so many matters of mutual interest has been the richest reward of 36 years of government service.

I am resigning from my position as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation at the end of February. Enclosed is a copy of my letter of resignation to Secretary Hickel.

It has always been a pleasure to appear before the Senate Committee and I have always been treated courteously. Somehow I had hoped that the Committee would hold a briefing hearing on the activities of the Department agencies before the end of this month. This would have given me an opportunity to personally thank all of you for what you have done in the interests of conservation and the good of the country over the past years.

I hope not to retire, but to continue work in conservation in the Washington area. With good fortune, possibly I may be appearing before you again in another capacity.

Sincerely yours,
EDWARD C. CRAFTS,
Director.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF OUTDOOR RECREATION,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1969.

HON. WALTER J. HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This is to advise that I am resigning from my position as Director of the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation effective the end of the month.

I believe this action automatically carries with it resignation from my other positions as Executive Director of the President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty chaired by the Vice President, and as Executive Officer of the Lewis and Clark Trail Commission. Accordingly, copies of this letter are going to the Chairmen of those two organizations.

On February 8, Under Secretary Train told me that he had checked with you and you wished to have "your own man" as Director of this Bureau. He could give me no indication as to when my dismissal would be effective. At the time of my dismissal, I had not seen nor met you.

On February 7, following a *New York Times* report of this discussion, you called me to your office, said you were not familiar with the circumstances and had no recollection of telling the Under Secretary to dismiss me. You asked what I wanted to do and told me that if I wished I could stay until May 31, a possible retirement date. You did not express your own desire, but pressed for a decision. I said I would probably stay for a few months hoping I could perform a useful service during the transition period.

My other reasons at the time were two-fold. First, I hoped this incident might help to stabilize the status of professional conservation career officials in such agencies as the Forest Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, Bureau of Land Management, and my own Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. Conservation in the Federal Government and the Congress has been traditionally bi-partisan and non-political.

Second was my fervent wish that the first change in Directorship of this Bureau would not be nearly simultaneous with a change of Administration. Dismissal at this time might be construed as precedent-setting action that would make a political football of this young conservation agency consisting of dedicated professional career personnel. It is especially important that the \$200 million a year grant-in-aid Land and Water Conservation Fund continue to be administered with the States in a non-partisan, non-political, non-pork barrel manner.

For these reasons I earnestly hope my successor may be a distinguished professional.

Upon further reflection on the way the matter was handled, including the abrupt action and differing discussions with you and the Under Secretary, I can only conclude that I do not have your confidence and thus could be of little value to you or the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation between now and May 31. Furthermore, although every Secretary for whom I have worked has had my loyalty, I can appreciate your desire to have a man of your own choice and have no wish to stand in your way.

There is one item of unfinished business that deserves mention. Secretary Udall designated me as the sole negotiator for the Department of the Interior with the four major redwood companies whose lands were taken by creation of the Redwood National Park. About ninety million dollars are involved plus allocation of the Northern Redwood Purchase Unit of the Forest Service. Negotiations are complex and well under way. If I can be of further assistance in this matter, I am available at your wish.

My direct connections with the Department of the Interior and the other Federal organizations that I serve in an official capacity are severed with deep regret. It is my

hope and intention to continue working in the fields of outdoor recreation, environmental quality, conservation, and forestry if the opportunity offers in either public or private service. This has been my life work for 36 years, 29 with the Forest Service and 7 with this Department. I believe the furtherance of these goals is of utmost importance to the United States.

Much has been accomplished in conservation in recent years. Much more remains to be done. May you administer well the tremendous natural resources of this Department that are entrusted to your care.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD C. CRAFTS,
Director.

ALASKA NATIVE LAND CLAIMS SETTLEMENT

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I speak today of a problem that has its roots deep in Alaskan history. This problem is the native land claim settlement, and its resolution is of the highest priority for Alaska.

I am very grateful to be a cosponsor of legislation—S. 1830—with the Senator from Washington, Mr. JACKSON, that will resolve this long-standing conflict. I hope that this year, in contrast to past years, the legislation proliferation problem has been solved. Too often in the past the issue has been confused and obfuscated by conflicting pieces of legislation pressed by various groups. Many, many people have worked long and hard drafting the provisions of this bill. Native leaders, State officials, personnel of the Department of the Interior, and Members of the House and Senate have worked together to acquire a bill that will not only be acceptable to all concerned, but also a just and fair settlement of the claims. It is my earnest hope that Congress will act quickly on the proposed legislation that is so vital to Alaska and her people. All Alaskans are indebted to Senator JACKSON for scheduling hearings on the bill, to commence on April 29, 1969.

Let me make one point clear: I believe all concerned with the bill have an open mind. We are not wedded to any particular settlement. What we seek is a fair, honorable, and just settlement. And the more generous this settlement is, the better chance our Alaskan native population will have to catch up with our national standard of living.

My recent trip home to Alaska with the Subcommittee on Indian Education dramatically underscored the tremendous lack of facilities for Alaska's rural native population. Over 70 percent of our native population live in the rural areas of the State, existing on a food-gathering economy. The only cash income to these areas is through seasonal employment and welfare increments. Thus, they depend for their very lives on the land on which they live. If the caribou do not migrate properly, some people are near starvation. If the salmon run is light, some people are near starvation. There is not enough cash in the economy of these villages to support them if the land itself cannot. The sanitary conditions in the villages are deplorable. Sewage facilities and drinking water are usually linked by a common source. Currently, only 8 percent of the

native homes in Alaska, representing only 3,260 people have adequate sanitation facilities—running water and water-carried sewage.

What are the results of this lack of sanitary facilities, coupled with the previously mentioned lack of proper nutrition? For one, a death rate that is almost three times higher than that of white America. Further, debilitating diseases such as pneumonia, bronchitis, influenza, and other respiratory diseases are rampant. Infectious and parasitic disease infect numerous natives, shortening the native Alaskan's expected life-span to only 34 years, less than half that of other Americans. The death rate for influenza and pneumonia are 10 times that of white Alaskans, and the suicide rate is twice that of white Alaskans.

These people are my people. They are incredibly poor, undernourished, and diseased. What chance for the future do these people have—what chance to escape this cycle of poverty and disease? At present, the answer is none. Much has been made in the national press concerning the "poverty cycle." But nowhere in the Nation is that cycle so nearly circular and so nearly inescapable as it is in Alaska. The unemployment rate among Alaska native adults is 50 to 60 percent in the spring and fall, in winter well over 80 percent, and only in the summer fishing season does it go as low as 25 percent. This is contrasted with an unemployment rate of 5 to 11 percent among white Alaskans during these same times of the year. Per capita income among natives is between \$500 and \$600, while for white Alaskans it is \$3,629 per capita. Natives receive the lion's share of the public assistance programs: 65 percent of aid to the disabled, 71 percent of the old-age assistance, 80 percent of the aid to dependent children, and 90 percent of the aid to the blind.

Further, the educational levels of Alaska's natives are abysmally low. The median level of education for Alaska natives is eighth grade. White Alaskans have a median figure of 12.4 years of education. Forty-six percent of the native population have completed the fourth grade or less. Only 9 percent have completed high school. And, even for those with high school diplomas, the achievement levels are alarmingly low: the quality of native education is simply far below that of the rest of Alaska and the country.

The factors involved in the native poverty cycle are complex, taking in all of the above situations. Perhaps a hypothetical example may serve to integrate the statistics into something more immediately meaningful. Let us take the example of a young Eskimo boy whom we will call Joe. He lives in a small village in Alaska with about 150 inhabitants. His father and mother have little or no education; he has three younger brothers and sisters who are attending the Bureau of Indian Affairs school in the village. Joe's father fishes in the summer, earning a few hundred dollars for his catch; in good years he may make as much as a thousand dollars. But on the average, and even in good years, he does not make nearly enough money to provide food and

clothing for his family. Consequently, the family depends heavily on hunting and fishing to provide food and the material for clothing. If the hunting and fishing are good, then the family can count on a good diet of protein and carbohydrates. However, many vitamins provided by vegetables and fruit are missing. In the event that the hunting and fishing are poor, then it is often a question of quasi-starvation for the winter months. Only welfare payments keep them alive in such times. The cost of purchased food in the village is over 100 percent higher than in Alaska's cities because of transportation, handling, and storage costs.

The BIA school in the village goes through the eighth or ninth grade. If any of the children wish higher education, they must leave the village for one of the regional high schools or the BIA boarding schools in Oregon and Oklahoma. Joe has been attending the village school for 9 years. His achievement levels are very low. One reason is that he suffers from otitis media—an ear disease that affects numerous native children and causes substantial hearing loss. Incidence of otitis media in villages like Joe's is 16 times higher than the rest of America. Further, Joe has missed a great deal of school in his 9 years of education. When hunting season or fishing season comes, he must help the family. If he does not, the family cannot survive. For Joe and others like him, education is a sometime luxury that can only be afforded when the pressures of a hostile environment permit. And, finally, Joe has had 9 years of education consisting of standard textbooks and teaching methods. When he learned to read, he learned such things as: "Dick and Jane's daddy went to the office every morning." Joe has never seen an office and no one has told him what one is. Even if they had, he has no frame of reference with which to assimilate it. Dick and Jane have a dog named Spot, whom they pet and feed, even though Spot does not work and does not pull a sled. And when Dick and Jane go to school, they always talk to a policeman who stands on a street corner and directs traffic. It is not surprising that Joe's grasp of his educational material is limited: it was not designed for him, nor has any effort been made to help him understand the world that produced it.

Joe and his other classmates are "underachievers." Joe has gained the idea through his education that he is somehow not as good as other Americans. His pride has suffered because of his lack of scholastic achievement. Further, he feels he cannot leave the village because he is becoming a man, and his family cannot spare him from the food-gathering activities. So Joe does not continue his education. He stays in the village and eventually raises a family of his own. Joe, despite his 9 years of education, will be little better off than his father. There are no jobs in the village, save seasonal fishing, and Joe has neither the training nor the self-confidence to move away from the village and attempt to make it in the outside world. Joe's children will be in the same situation as he was at a comparable age: undereducated, ill-pre-

pared for the outside world and suffering from a variety of physical deficiencies.

This is Alaska's poverty cycle. It is brutal and harsh and practically incapable. The people not only find it difficult to get out of it, they lack any comprehensive understanding of what is happening to them. This is the problem we face, and it is one we must solve.

This is the situation that S. 1830 is designed to solve. The large amount of money involved, properly invested by the corporations envisioned, will free the native population from the dependence on welfare which destroys pride and self-respect. It will also free them from their complete dependence on the land and the subsistence mode of existence. Then, with proper educational and medical care, we can expect the poverty cycle to be broken. Once this occurs, the native population will have the necessary economic mobility to become viable contributors to Alaska's and the Nation's economy.

We have made many grievous errors in our dealings with America's Indian population. The conditions of the American Indian in many parts of America are a source of national shame. It is my firm resolve, and the purpose of this legislation, that the same thing shall not happen to Alaska's natives. Passage of this bill will be a just and equitable settlement of a long-standing dispute: its rapid passage will mean that the Alaskan native will have the leverage to propel him into the 20th century. Never have we had so great an opportunity not only to help a poor and helpless people but also to do what is right and good. We are impelled to rapid action, not only because of the present injustice of the situation, but because every day, every hour that we delay will mean further hardship for a group of Americans.

Mr. President, Alaska's native population has stood faithfully by America through a hundred years of neglect and ignorance. They have rallied to America's defense in four wars, while their families went hungry at home. We, in America's name, can surely repay this faith by acting as quickly as possible to settle the native land claims, once and forever.

MR. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, is known to most Members of Congress, Representatives as well as Senators.

Because of the high regard in which Mr. Hartzog is held by all who know him, I ask unanimous consent than an unusually fine article, entitled "Mr. National Park Service," written by Edward W. O'Brien, of the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, and published in that newspaper in its weekend edition of April 12-13, be printed in the RECORD.

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

MR. NATIONAL PARK SERVICE
(By Edward W. O'Brien)

WASHINGTON.—To most Americans the National Park Service means Yellowstone Park, friendly grizzlies, and Old Faithful.

But in fact the park service has been changing with breath-taking speed as it assumed a mission going far beyond preservation of scenic grandeur.

In a recent speech, Park Service Director George B. Hartzog Jr. expressed the new philosophy reflecting both his own thinking and a number of congressional mandates.

"The search for a better world must begin with man himself," Hartzog said.

"It is he, primarily, who has made the mess, and it is he who will have to live with whatever else he makes of it.

"Essentially, then, what we pursue is a man-centered environmental ethic. Whether we call it that or a national policy for the environment or something yet unthought of, makes little difference.

"From the concerned rooms of the national legislature to the backyards of concerned suburbanites, the search boils down to making the earth an attractive, meaningful, habitable home for man.

"What we are everywhere seeking is survival of the human spirit, a sense of 'being at home' and 'at peace' with the world."

It is one thing to speak eloquently, and it can be something else to transform government policy into action. Hartzog, a tirelessly dynamic man with a rare capacity for leading and inspiring others, has succeeded in doing so.

In testifying the other day before a Senate committee, Hartzog used Yellowstone, the world's first national park, as an example of the new method.

Formerly, park interpretive programs for visitors dealt separately with wildflowers, wildlife, geology and the like.

"We are now taking an environmental approach. Our theme is the ecology of the Yellowstone River," he said.

"This enables us to bring into meaningful harmony the geology and formation of the river, the wildlife which lives along the river, and the aquatic life in the river, the human history along the river of the Indians, the explorers, the fur traders—all elements relating to one another.

"We seek to encourage our visitors to become more vitally aware of the environment in which they live, and to participate in programs whose goal is to help man live in better harmony with his environment."

Another example: In the service's historical areas, a new kind of national park, Hartzog wants to make history come alive, so that visitors can appreciate their heritage and thus advance in what he calls "soul conservation."

Last year Hartzog's agency converted four historical farm areas, which had been static monuments, into actual functioning farms with crops and animals. In all, 41 parks participated in "living history" programs of various kinds.

Though he was born 48 years ago in a small South Carolina village and loves open spaces, it has not escaped Hartzog that ours is an increasingly urbanized nation, and that the park service has serious responsibilities to millions who have little chance of ever backpacking in the wilderness of the Grand Tetons, or another of the magnificent natural parks in his domain.

With the backing of Congress, Hartzog has pushed creation of many more recreation areas, a third park category which combines natural conservation of seashores, riverways and other resources with outdoor fun—all within easy driving distance of large population centers.

Hartzog also has worked to bring parks into the life of the inner city. Last year, with a special appropriation, he inaugurated an urban park concept in and around this city called "summer in the parks."

By every standard the program was a smash hit. In three months, some 250,000 adults and children took part in events from puppet shows and pottery making to movies and dances.

One community park which previously had little use was graced by a local family's wedding reception.

These achievements and his many others require immense effort by Hartzog.

A career park service employee who started as an attorney and served for three years as head of St. Louis Jefferson Memorial, Hartzog scorns the government's regular working hours. His normal work day is from 7 in the morning to 8 or 9 in the evening, six days a week. His office pace is non-stop.

In 1957 he was chosen to attend a management training program in New York City. He has been applying the lessons ever since.

After he became director in 1964, the park service for the first time charted its long-term objectives and each year's goals. On any day he can tell his superiors in the Interior Department exactly where each of the 270 national parks stands on the way to its planned development and utilization.

Since 1964, 52 areas—a record—have been added to the national park system because of the public's awakened interest in conservation and environment and also to the confidence of Republican and Democratic congressmen in Hartzog as an exceptionally talented and dedicated steward of public interest and manager of the public domain.

The number of visitors to the park system has soared from 103 million in 1963 to 151 million last year. Despite inflation, the park service's expenditure for physical maintenance and operation dropped from 31 cents per visit a decade ago to 20 cents in 1968.

Hartzog was saddened last fall when, despite his money-saving management, he had to announce curtailment in the operations of most parks because of still further budget tightening. But for this summer all the parks will be back in full operation with the help of temporary employes, and no one is happier than George Hartzog.

In Hartzog's judgment the officials on the firing line are not those in the park service's Washington headquarters but the superintendents out in the field.

"I know them all," he says. "They are the key to the quality of our services to the public."

Hartzog spends much time meeting in the field with his superintendents "in small groups so we can communicate," as he puts it.

Unlike most government meetings, there is no agenda.

"I won't allow it," he explains. "The whole purpose is to talk over their problems—not mine. I want to learn from them and help them."

Any superintendent can see him privately, and he meets also with the wives, whom he regards as equal partners with the men in maintaining the quality of park services.

Six months from now the park service will have an especially notable accession—the lovely farm of the late President Eisenhower at Gettysburg, Pa.

In 1967 Hartzog assisted with the arrangements for the late president to deed the farm to the government as a gift. The deed specifies that the farm will be administered as a part of the National Park Service beginning six months after the General's death.

On the basis of Hartzog's administration of the National Park Service and his extremely high standing among conservationists, the Eisenhower memorial could not be in better hands.

A year ago, Hartzog was selected by the Blue-ribbon American Scenic and Historic Preservation Society for its gold medal as an outstanding conservationist.

Hartzog had become head of the park service at "a most critical time" and "his impact upon the national park system and upon national conservation programs was immediate, substantial and beneficial," the society declared.

"Mr. Hartzog brought to this position a unique talent for imaginative planning, an

infinite capacity for hard work, and a remarkable ability to move people to action.

"He has brilliantly directed the affairs of the National Park Service through the most difficult years of its history, and has earned the high regard and confidence of all with whom he is associated."

If Hartzog has a favorite park, he won't admit it. "I like whatever one I'm in," he says.

But he does confess to a certain fondness for a small park an hour's drive in Virginia. On a rare spring day away from work, he likes most of all to slip off with his six-year-old son, Edward, and watch the boy fish for brim and bass.

"The thrill of being six is going fishing," says Hartzog.

CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the Bonneville unit of the central Utah project is not just an irrigation project; it is a multipurpose project which is planned to provide an essential supply of municipal and industrial water to a rapidly growing area on the Wasatch front in Utah and Salt Lake Counties.

If the 1970 fiscal-year budget figure is adopted, Utah's economy will suffer a serious setback; since appropriations for the Bonneville unit have already been shortchanged from previous appropriations. In order to assure that the unit is completed on a realistic, progressive, and economic schedule, a minimum construction program will require at least \$15 million.

The board of directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District has transmitted to me a resolution on the need for increased funding of the Bonneville unit. So that Senators may be more fully informed on the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION

Whereas the capability for growth in the State of Utah is directly related to its ability to provide a water supply to meet its municipal and industrial needs, with the key to progress being Utah's ability to utilize its legal entitlements to Colorado River water; and,

Whereas to meet the municipal water requirements of the expanding population in Salt Lake and Utah Counties, a need for delivery of Colorado River water through the authorized Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project is required and has been programmed by the Central Utah Water Conservancy District for 1972 with water demands to increase thereafter; and,

Whereas the funds previously appropriated and utilized for construction on this vital water-resource project have not permitted a progressive or economic construction program; and, if continued will result in a delay in meeting essential water needs with a reduction in economic growth to the State of Utah, an increase in total project costs, and a resulting increase in the District's repayment obligation to the Federal Government; and,

Whereas the reimbursable costs of this project, which represent more than 90% of its total costs, will be repaid to the Federal Treasury with funds from the Central Utah Water Conservancy District in compliance with a contract between it and the Federal Government, from power revenues from the Bonneville Unit Power Complex, and from

a portion of Utah's share of Colorado River Storage Project power revenues; and,

Whereas the President's Budget recommended only an \$8 million construction program for fiscal year 1970, which is unreasonably low, and represents a reduction from the \$11.444 million construction program recommended for fiscal year 1969, and an \$11.145 million construction program for fiscal year 1968; and

Whereas the Colorado River Basin Project Act (PL 90-537) directs that the planning report for the Ute Indian Unit of the Central Utah Project shall be completed on or before December 31, 1974 to enable the United States to meet the commitments heretofore made to the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Indian Reservation under the agreement dated September 20, 1965: Now, therefore be it

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, does hereby unanimously request that funds appropriated by the Congress of the United States for construction on the Bonneville Unit of the Central Utah Project for fiscal year 1970 be increased to a minimum of \$15 million; be it further

Resolved, That the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District, again requests that the Congress of the United States, the President, and the Department of the Interior accelerate the construction of the authorized units of the Central Utah Project so that they may be completed on a realistic, progressive, and economic schedule, and to schedule and provide funds so that the planning report for the Ute Indian Unit be completed in compliance with the Colorado River Basin Project Act (Public Law 90-537); be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be delivered to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Secretary of the Interior, Commissioner of Reclamation, Members of the Congressional Appropriations Committees, Governor of the State of Utah, Utah's Congressional Delegation, Executive Director of the Utah Department of Natural Resources, Director of the Upper Colorado River Commission, Director of the Utah Division of Water Resources, Ute Indian Tribe, and other interested parties.

CERTIFICATE

I certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of Directors of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District on February 14, 1969.

LYNN S. LUDLOW,
Secretary.

BREAKDOWN OF NORMAL SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, more and more, we are aware of the possible consequences of man's attack on the environment. Water and air pollution, disfiguration of the beauty of nature, seem to be a way of life. It even appears that man might well have allowed himself to become an endangered species.

Just as important as the biological effect of the degradation of the environment by a rapidly growing population is the breakdown of normal social relationships—more difficult to analyze—caused by the density of the population.

Because of our increasing awareness of these problems—and none too soon, I think—I ask unanimous consent that a paper written by Dr. Durward L. Allen, professor of wildlife ecology at Purdue University, be printed in the RECORD. "Population, Resources, and the Great Complexity," a pessimistic view of what we have done and what we face unless

preventive action is taken, was presented by Dr. Allen at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington last month.

As chairman of the new Commerce Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and Environment, I found the article timely and thought provoking.

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

POPULATION, RESOURCES, AND THE GREAT COMPLEXITY¹

(By Durward L. Allen, professor of wildlife ecology, Department of Forestry and Conservation, Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind.)

Over the past quarter-century, an increasing body of scientific leadership has been concerned with the accelerating increase of world population. Since the early forties it is evident that major advances in the control of infant mortality and epidemic disease (see Newman, 1965), as well as aid to areas of food shortage, have reduced death rates in many tropical countries by about half. Humanity as a whole is in a logarithmic phase of the population curve. The 3.5 billion people now inhabiting this globe are on the way to doubling by the end of the century. Unless strenuous counter measures are taken, in the United States our 200 million citizens will be more than 300 million in the same period.

In 1968 approximately 70 million people were added to this earthly habitat. The rate of addition is increasing, and it is reasonably certain that there will be a billion more people to support in another decade. It is a looming threat that already more than half the world's people are underfed, and there is literally nothing to spare for those upcoming millions. A great volume of recent literature has treated the subjects of world food supply and population. Notable summaries are Borgstrom's book, "The hungry planet," (1965), the President's Science Advisory Committee report, "The world food problem," (1967), and "Famine 1975" by William and Paul Paddock.

Although food production technology has made important recent gains and food scientists are making every effort to rescue mankind from major disaster, there appear to be few authorities who expect such efforts to overtake the corruption of human numbers. There is, instead, a growing consensus that the chance of avoiding a demographic reckoning in the so-called "developing" countries is small, and within twenty years hundreds of millions will be faced with a debacle of starvation and its associated ills.

This is the context in which we must consider our policies and programs in North America. Many have pointed out that we are inextricably entangled in affairs of the world, and that the amplified scale of human misfortune is our doing—through acts of beneficence to nations who could not control their birth rates, especially without the help we were unwilling to give.

We are deeply involved at present in food shipments to the needy, and technology is being exported at an increasing rate. Fortunately, there is growing appreciation that population limitation is essential and inevitable in this nation and elsewhere. The United Nations has finally become active in the field, and commendable progress has been made in our own Congress and in the executive branch of the government. This is in contrast to the apathy that long blocked action while the problem grew to proportions that could not be denied.

¹ Presented at the 34th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1969.

It is still a fact of life that our leadership is not in depth. It is a leadership of informed and concerned individuals, diluted by the attitudes of the many who, with an ear to the political ground, do not yet hear the tramp of approaching millions. As this situation changes, we may expect to see greater appropriations for bio-medical and social studies of population control. There will be demographic aid to other nations on a scale demanded by the world crisis. Intimately involved with these approaches must be further enlightened consideration of the environmental problems that appear on every side.

BIOLOGICAL ANALOGIES

Although some sociologists and economists will not agree, I postulate that the problems of human welfare are biological, behavioral, and economic—in that order. There are no interfaces where one leaves off and another begins. The whole gamut of conditions and variables is something new in the way of an ecological complex. Understanding and solutions require the detailed knowledge of specialists and also the broad appraisal of the generalist. Such a generalist usually is a biologist who has extended his interests into the problems of human society enough to communicate with the specialists. The time is not far ahead when generalists will be appointed to high government commissions and committees.

My present purpose is to suggest relationships that can help understand the nature of the vast array of issues and problems that plague mankind increasingly with each passing year. It may be that we do not fully grasp what is happening to us and that a re-examination of primordial adjustments will be profitable. It can be assumed that long before the human line became human there were millions of years of evolution in which the ancestral stock occupied its functional niche in the ecosystems in which it was found. Probably we pay penalties when the primitive inner man is outraged too far, and there could well be clues to rights and wrongs in the social and habitat adaptations of common animals. A few of these characteristics are so nearly universal they are worth reviewing.

In our latitude, the young most species are born in spring and summer, and they develop to a "subadult" stage in late summer and fall. These adolescents commonly wander widely in a "fall shuffle," evidently seeking a place to live. The farther such individuals move in strange country, the higher their mortality rate. They are at every kind of disadvantage, including the need to invade desirable space already occupied by their own kind.

When the wanderer finds a location where food cover and other requisites are in useful combination, it settles down into a "home range." This is a unit of habitat where the animal becomes familiar with the terrain, develops its routes of travel, knows the location of every necessity, and is best able to escape from enemies. Seasonally, at least, it does not leave the security of its home range. Here it has relationships of tolerance with other individuals of the same species whose ranges overlap. A high quality home range is a small one, where daily needs can be fulfilled with a minimum of movement. Both economic security and behavioral ease are found by the animal in its own familiar surroundings. Residents tend to display antagonistic behavior toward strangers.

Let us now consider a human analogy—the resident of a small town in rural America, perhaps in the more simple times of 40 years ago. Obviously, this selection of a scene is for the purpose of drawing useful contrasts and parallels. The person in question has a high degree of self-sufficiency. He has a garden and a cellar stocked with food. He has a well, his own outdoor plumbing, and his supply of fuel

for heat and lighting. He disposes of his own trash and garbage.

His home range is small; he commonly gets to his work or wherever else he needs to go by walking. He has recognition relationships with most of the people of his community. Here he has feelings of security and comfort. There is, he says, no place like home. The high degree of independence of this individual becomes particularly evident under "emergency" conditions. He can ride out a winter blizzard with composure, and most of the dislocations that affect him can be met with his own efforts. He needs a minimum of public service.

I think we can make a further suggestive comparison with the situation of a dweller in one of our large cities. Passing over the social and economic enclaves that produce something akin to small-town conditions, I select an individual who probably is more representative. Wherever he lives, he is dependent on a wide range of public services. His food, water, fuel, and power are brought to him, and his wastes of every kind are taken away. His work is likely to be many miles removed. To fulfill a specialized function in his community, he must meet a rigid transportation schedule in getting to the place of employment and returning home daily. Likely enough, he passes through territory that is largely unexplored and unfamiliar, and he has continual contacts with individuals with whom he is unacquainted. He has lurking anxieties in dealing with a wide range of unpredictable situations. He may develop the social callouses and aggressive behavior frequently observed in the residents of large cities. In a measure, the city dweller has lost his identity in a social melange that is diffuse and uncertain.

This individual is dependent for many things. He is vulnerable to every kind of public emergency. A drought or power failure, a strike or riot, a heavy snow that ties up traffic, can immobilize him and jeopardize his security. In this aggregation of largely strange humanity, he finds many of his activities organized and regulated. In turn, he needs protection from his fellow men. In concentrations of people it is evident that aberrant and anti-social behavior must be dealt with. There are health hazards to be guarded against. It exemplifies the unusual adaptability of the human being that many can tolerate these essentially unnatural conditions reasonably well.

THE DENSITY DETERMINANT

Since all "higher" animals are socialized in some degree, a measure of association between individuals is beneficial. It follows that with the increase of numbers an optimum density is reached in terms of behavioral needs and available habitat resources. At still higher concentrations we see the development of competition for space and other necessities and the breakdown of normal social relationships.

The behavioral and logistic attrition that builds up can be described conveniently by the term "stress." Eco-social stress is an elusive phenomenon—difficult to define, analyze, and quantify. For good reasons, scientists have largely avoided this baffling universe of inquiry in their investigations of population mechanics and animal relationships, although the physiology of stress is somewhat better understood (see review by Thiessen, 1964). The physical and psychic well-being of the individual is tied closely to environmental conditions.

To appraise the nature of high-density stress in human society, we may review, for want of more appropriate terms, some of the findings of Alfred Korzybski, known for his innovations, several decades ago, in the field of general semantics. In a paper of 1943, largely drawn from three earlier sources, Korzybski explored the increase in complexity of functional relationships or problems as

individuals are added to a managerial system. He cited the work of V. A. Graicunas, who calculated the growth of problems faced by a supervisor as assistants with related work were added to his responsibilities. Deriving an appropriate formula, Graicunas solved for the increasing relationships as follows:

Number of assistants or functions:	Number of possible relationships
1	1
2	6
3	18
4	44
5	100
6	222
7	490
8	1,080
9	2,376
10	5,210

We need go no further than 10 in the series, since it illustrates beyond question that the addition of individuals or functions in this relatively simple organization gives rise to an exponential increase in relationships. "At the root of the problem," said Korzybski, "lies the significant fundamental difference in the rate of growth between arithmetical progression, which grows by addition, for example, 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, etc., and geometrical progression, which grows by multiplication, for example, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc." He stated further, "My whole life work, and particularly since 1921, has been based on the life implications of this neglect to differentiate between the laws of growth of arithmetical and of geometrical progressions." In effect, he despaired that those who govern could find the wisdom and means to meet their proliferating managerial tasks satisfactorily.

It seems evident that concentrations of people and, more generally, the growth of nations, produce a vast complexity that expands out of proportion to the build-up of population density. If, for example, our present world of 3.5 billions doubles by the year 2000, it might be supposed that the problems of government and social affairs would be twice as great. This would indeed be sufficient unto the day, but such a concept probably falls far short of reality. If we use the scale of the Korzybski example, which seems a conservative comparison, we might assume that the complexity of relations among one billion people is represented by an index of one; then the figure for three billions would potentially be 18 and for 6 billions 222!

The build-up of stress undoubtedly takes place correspondingly. This phenomenon has not been measured or even dealt with theoretically. It is the resolution of many density-dependent tensions, competitions, stimulations, and interactions. It is a plexus of curves that rise exponentially with every increase in population. Potentially, the computer is ideally fitted to reveal how these many variables synergize, but programming anything but a simple model using highly "psychic" estimates is beyond present technology in the field.

THE ELUSIVE OPTIMUM

Americans are accustomed to thinking of mass production as a means of attaining efficiency and lowering the cost per unit. This clearly does not apply to human beings. As people multiply and concentrate, they require more protection and service of every kind, and they are correspondingly more costly.

Which raises significant questions about our present population level and the issues that spring up on every side. Is this great and burgeoning complexity related to our always-increasing costs of government, our deficits, our inadequacies in dealing with social problems—especially the rising rates of

mental and psychosomatic disease and crime? Does it help to explain why municipalities and state governments find it progressively more difficult to collect enough taxes to carry out their commitments to education and other multiplying functions? *Adding more land to the tax base does not solve problems where it adds enough people to create a disproportionate demand for public expenditures.*

We may reflect also that the labor force is growing with the population—at a time of increasing industrial automation. We are committed to a policy of full employment, and surplus labor must be added to private and government payrolls. This contributes to the tax burden and the cost of goods and degrades the effects of technology as a means of raising living standards.

If population growth beyond an optimum begets problems that increase more rapidly than human numbers, it might be assumed that this only bespeaks the immaturity of our social and economic science—that in due time man and his computers will handle the problem and produce a high living standard despite the difficulties. To an extent, this undoubtedly is true. But whether management skills can overtake a problem that is growing geometrically, and especially whether it can be done in a degree and in time to be a relief to this generation and those immediately ahead is highly questionable.

It is evident that many of the high-density problems of humanity pertain especially to cities. Some 70 percent of the American people now live in cities of more than 50,000 and the proportion is increasing. This has relevance also to the common outlook for help to the "underdeveloped" two-thirds of the world. It is a common economic view that rural populations of these countries must be gathered into cities and their land given over to large-scale mechanized agriculture. It is assumed that industrialization in our image will bring them the blessings of modernity.

Even assuming a drastic Malthusian reduction of population in the next 20 years, as seems inevitable, one wonders whether governments of the countries in question can achieve a sophistication that could make such a change of life possible for their remaining citizens. In an important degree, we ourselves have fallen short in dealing with the challenge of complexity. The President's Council on Recreation and Natural Beauty remarked (1968) that "No major urban center in the world has yet demonstrated satisfactory ways to accommodate growth. In many areas expanding population is outrunning the readily available supply of food, water, and other basic resources and threatens to aggravate beyond solution the staggering problems of the new urban society."

The concept that industrialization can be the salvation of over-populated and impoverished peoples seems also to neglect the fact that our own system is based on an abundance of native and imported wealth. The inhabitants of North America—only 7 percent of humanity—are using about half the world's yield of basic resources. Sociologist Philip M. Hauser (1960) has stated that, at our standard of living, the total products of the world would support about half a billion people. This seems a dim outlook for the 3.5 billions now alive and those yet to come.

At a cost, Americans have shown little understanding or respect for the cultures of other peoples. It might become us, and avoid responsibility for further great errors in dealing with the "developing" nations, if we proceed slowly in overhauling their social and economic systems.

There appears to be unmistakable evidence that the world at large has passed the optimum level of population. It has been widely

assumed that this does not apply to the United States; but the foregoing considerations seem to indicate that we should be diminishing our problems at the source rather than always trying to outrun them. As Hardin (1968) emphasizes, the population problem has no technical solution.

The technological "explosion"—terminology that suggests a consciousness of some of the exponentials involved—has been accompanied by a corresponding re-working of the face of the land. The widespread pollution of water and air, and the despoliation of natural beauty need no particular documentation here. The solid wastes to be disposed of now aggregate 4.5 pounds per person per day. Thermal modification of natural waters as a result of power production is doubling in 10 years. There is ample evidence that in North America we have exceeded the capacity of the biosphere to degrade and assimilate our wastes. Not only should we be making strenuous efforts to avoid further population increases, but real and rapid progress toward better standards of life in America probably must await the attaining of a negative birth rate.

OUR GROWTH OBSESSION

Nowhere in the state of nature do we find animals prospering so well, surviving in such large numbers, living so long, and reproducing so abundantly as when a population is expanding to fill a vacant environment. Of course, this is what happened in North America during the past 300 years. The white man displaced the Indian and took over his resources for use at a "higher" cultural level that could support many more people. It is perhaps understandable that modern Americans have developed an expansionist euphoria that attributes collective weal to the growth process itself, rather than to the availability of resources on which growth can take place. The "expanding economy" idea has passed from the stage of useful realism to one of economic dogma.

Two of the "easy" approaches to success in business and industry have become routine. First, we have assumed the right to pollute air, water, and land or to mutilate the scenery as a valid part of the profit-taking process. Secondly, and because we have always had it this way, it is assumed that every enterprise has the "right" to expand through continuous increases in customers—which takes place through additions to the population. The view that this process goes on indefinitely and that it holds the key to the "American dream" is behind the huge promotion now under way to "attract new industry" and build population in practically every community that can support more people through private or public development.

It needs to be understood clearly that human numbers do not grow in thin air. They are a response to the broadening of the resource base and the opening of vacant or sparsely occupied areas through developments that support new communities. This is one way in which population can be manipulated—by creating more centers of build-up or, in the other direction, by deliberately preserving our open spaces for less intensive uses. It seems evident that we have no public incentive to increase population, yet our planning is consistently in that direction.

One who reads the transactions of the Western Resources Conferences will learn that as of 1960 there were 22 billion dollars' worth of water development projects for seventeen states in the files of the Bureau of Reclamation—plans that engineers considered "feasible." These are planned for construction by the year 2000 (see McGee, 1960; Schad, 1960). It is assumed that every river system must come under complete control, with the total water supply utilized to establish new agriculture, new industry, and more people (estimated at 25 million) in all of the

"undeveloped" open space that can be found. There are enthusiastic promoters of this program in the Congress and, needless to say, in the local electorates involved. Plans for more "economic development" for other sections of the country are going forward accordingly.

I do not imply that all such enterprises are not in the public interest, but to make these far-reaching resource decisions, our representatives in the Congress must have access to every kind of information. They are frequently reminded that they represent the construction beneficiaries who move the earth and pour the concrete. But they likewise represent every taxpayer who supports the great works, with their wonderful and baffling cost-benefit ratios. The harried Congressman must be the dependence of the people at large who make use of space, scenic, and recreational features of this land—people who have little concept of what is happening. They know only that we are dedicated to "progress." Where that progress leads, or what kind of world is being contrived, they are never told. Has someone decided for them that we are to have no hinterland? Are there to be smokestacks in every wilderness, a smog over every countryside, the threat of extinction over every flowing stream?

There is another concept of resource management that sees our continent as a composite of environmental types, each with its own character and its particular contribution to the national scene. The latter presupposes that there are many and diverse ways to achieve a pleasant life and that various regions have much to offer in their existing features and natural assets.

The wild creatures of this earth have survived because each performs a useful function in a reasonably stable ecosystem. Any living thing that is too successful destroys the sources of its livelihood and disappears with the community on which it depends.

The 1968 report of Congressman Daddario and his Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development observed that "... the population explosion is fundamental to the requirement for environmental management. Population must come under control and be stabilized at some number which civilization can agree upon. Otherwise, the best use of natural resources will be inadequate and the apocalyptic forces of disease and famine will dominate the earth."

Stability and an "agreed-upon" population level are indeed worthy objectives in realistic planning for the future. This can not be a cookbook approach with flat rules and precise standards. Conditions in both space and time are too uncertain and variable. But in ecological perspective it is possible to appraise the direction of trends and influences. For now, a curb on birth rate by every acceptable means and a major reduction of the government-sponsored environmental onslaught are two requisites of the greatest urgency. It is heartening to see signs that these are getting attention in the Congress.

DEMANDS OF CRISIS

We have come to a threshold in world and national affairs where there is immediate need to apply sophisticated, up-to-date thinking if we are to mitigate, rather than augment, the growing miseries of mankind. Around the earth, much that needs to be done is blocked by a mass of ignorance. However, it certainly is true that the wars of history have made greater personal demands on men of many countries than what must be asked of the world's people in the years ahead. The population issue does not brutalize the masses and inflict hardship on the innocent. It calls for an appeal to reason backed by all the skills social science can muster. In our own nation public acceptance of new ideas is of such great urgency that real resources need to be applied in bringing it about. Many of our old traditions, assump-

tions, and slogans need a searching review with open-minded willingness to innovate.

Most of us are all too aware of the unrest of the new generation of our citizenry. I make no case for those who march and protest with no real effort at problem solving. But we probably can ascribe some of their social malaise to the frustrating complexity of the world in which they find themselves—a world in which there is no reassuring guidance toward recognizable goals, no convincing reasons to assume that the individual has a defensible purpose in being.

There is, to be sure, an "establishment" devoted to high-sounding maxims that are supposed to be worthy and venerable by definition, but which seem to confuse rather than simplify our human problems. In the sum-total of their ecological malpractice, the elders are heading humanity toward the damnation of the lemmings. If youth does not see this at once, there are good reasons; for no one has given them any rational concept of man's relationship to the earth or any basic ethos of human respectability. In our overgrown institutions of higher education the husbandry of their intellects is monitored by humanists who are not biologists and biologists who are not humanists. They learn how to do great things but the why of nothing.

This is to identify one of our overshadowing difficulties. In this time of television, moon exploration, and the imminent availability of nearly unlimited sources of energy, it is obvious that accomplishments in engineering and its supporting sciences are awe-inspiring testimony to the capacity of the human mind.

Attending all our technical triumphs, however, is a growing realization that we have a critical area of weakness. While we know how to do fantastic things, we frequently do not know when and where—nor indeed why—to do them. The problem transfers itself from physical science in the development and use of hardware to another sphere in which we are less competent—that of the biology and ecology of man.

The nature and proportions of this problem actually bespeak the relative complexity of the systems of nature. Even though the physical characteristics of matter and energy are inconceivably involved, they are far less so than the limitless intricacies of the world of living things. Biological systems include all the variables of physical science plus the endless elaborations of more than two billion years of organic evolution. To the structure and physiology of the living organism are added the organization of ecosystems and the behavioral adaptations that are essential to survival. In these dimensions were the origins of man, and now his culture has taken over to reorient his own speciation and vastly modify the habitat in which he developed. If, with the tools now at his disposal, he blunders unaware into the throes of overpopulation and environmental ruin, he could in a tick of the geological time clock be carried away to oblivion by the mechanical monster he has created.

Pessimism always has a hollow ring. But where so much is at stake there is more safety in planning for the worst rather than always hoping for the best. The truth is that today's greatest problems will not be solved. We are too late, and we failed for lack of foresight. Only tomorrow's problems can be solved, and only if we of today agree to be responsible for tomorrow.

REFORM OF WELFARE SYSTEM

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, on Monday, President Nixon, in his message to Congress concerning his proposals and policies, called for "a complete reappraisal and redirection" of our present welfare system, and said he would be

submitting a program for our consideration which would reform the system.

The welfare system, which has continued relatively unchanged for a number of years, is a classic example of a program which has been found in practice to be not achieving its goals. I share the President's concern for making Government programs effective, and I look forward to his proposals and his leadership in bringing about meaningful reforms.

At the present time the President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs is conducting hearings around the country on welfare reform. They are going into the areas where the welfare system operates directly, and hearing the opinions of the men and women who administer the programs, and who receive the benefits. There is no better way to find out how welfare works, in my opinion, and I commend the Commission for this initiative and look forward to its report.

During the recent recess, while I was in Pennsylvania, the President's Commission held hearings in Philadelphia, and I was privileged to appear before them and present my views.

I basically feel that we must change the welfare system so that it operates to help the poor, in both urban and rural areas, to achieve levels of self-dependency, both economically and psychologically. I also feel that the welfare program can work hand-in-hand with other programs, both private and public, to attack the problems of poverty in a broad attack.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony before the Commission on April 11, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER, REPUBLICAN OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE PRESIDENT'S COMMISSION ON INCOME MAINTENANCE PROGRAMS, PUBLIC HEARINGS, APRIL 11, 1969, PHILADELPHIA, PA.

It is a pleasure for me to testify today before this important Commission. I congratulate the President for appointing a distinguished Commission to study our welfare system, and I congratulate you for conducting your hearings in the communities where these systems operate. I look forward to a significant report.

It is clear that the American welfare system is not working.

Essentially, I think our welfare system has been an abysmal failure in two major areas:

First, it does not encourage welfare recipients to move upward on the economic ladder. Rather than bringing about self-dependency, it results in dependency on the welfare system.

Secondly, it reaches only one-fourth of the over 32 million poor people in America who are below the poverty income standard of \$3,000 a year for a family of four.

There are other problems as well:

Often heads of welfare families are actually encouraged to not take paying jobs because every dollar earned is deducted from the welfare payments.

In some states, husbands in welfare families must live apart from their wives and children because this is the only way they can collect welfare payments.

Unequal welfare policies in different states create unnecessary pressures. For instance, Pennsylvania, which has high payments,

receives people driven out by other states where the level of payments is cruelly low.

One particular failure has been the "Aid to Families with Dependent Children" program, the largest welfare program. For instance, in many states, outside income must be deducted from the welfare check. This amounts to a 100% tax on what a poor family tries to earn on its own. In addition, many states refuse aid if the father lives in the home, or in some cases, if he even visits the home. These are examples of stringent "bureaucratic" policies which operate to defeat the aim of eliminating poverty, and result instead in the perpetuation of poverty.

I would like to briefly make four specific recommendations:

(1) I propose that the Federal Government eliminate the tortuous requirements to qualify for AFDC, and replace them with a simple test of "need," established by a family's affidavit. This would give poor people more dignity and self-respect, and allow social workers to spend their time helping families, and not policing their qualifications. New York City, incidentally, instituted such a program, and out of 4,000 welfare applicants in the first three months, only two cases of suspected fraud were turned up.

(2) I propose that families on welfare be allowed to keep outside earnings of up to \$85 a month plus 30% of the remainder of their earnings, without deductions from their welfare checks. The 1969 Federal Standard allows retention of the first \$30 earned in a month, plus one-third of the rest, but the formula I propose will provide an even greater incentive for welfare recipients to earn outside income and become self-dependent.

(3) I propose that minimum national standards of welfare benefits be established so that all states carry their fair share of the load, and so that no state escapes its responsibilities in this area.

(4) I propose the institution of a crash program for adequate child day-care facilities in low income neighborhoods to allow welfare mothers to take jobs to supplement their family income.

Of course, welfare reform is not the only way to combat the urgent problems of urban poverty. We need to make greater progress in creating more schools, more jobs and better housing. We need more efforts to combat crime, which drains poor people of their meager resources.

But progress in these areas takes time, and poverty does not wait for government or private programs. In fact, poverty often wipes out the effects of gains before they are felt. However, we can take immediate action to reform the welfare system. Implementing the four Federal reforms I have outlined would, I believe, be a major first step in modernizing our welfare system. By reforming welfare, we can turn it into a positive force which directly tackles the problems of poverty, and which at the same time, works to the direct end of making poor people self-sufficient.

FCC COMMISSIONER JOHNSON— AN EFFECTIVE MEMBER

Mr. MCINTYRE. Mr. President, vigorous proponents of the public interest who sit on regulatory agencies often come under attack by the industries which they regulate. The sharpness of the attack is usually in direct proportion to the effectiveness of the agency member in challenging complacent industry attitudes.

Commissioner Nicholas Johnson, of the Federal Communications Commission, is an effective member. He has been a potent force on the FCC in urging it to fulfill its congressional mandate to see that the public is the beneficiary of private use of the mass media. He has

been especially effective in urging the Commission to examine the growing concentration of control of mass media.

The Commission is presently planning hearings on newspaper-owned broadcast licenses in Minneapolis and San Francisco and in Cheyenne, Wyo. It has designated newspaper applications for new broadcast facilities for hearings in a number of markets and is studying the issue of conglomerate control.

I welcome these studies and applaud the Commission for pursuing this important concern. I am distressed, however, by the virulence of attacks by some industry publications against members of the Commission, particularly Mr. Johnson.

The harshness of the trade press language has provoked comments in other publications. The Saturday Review recently published a story by Robert Lewis Shayon criticizing the vitriolic statements of Broadcasting, the industry trade magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the April 12 article entitled, "FCC's Teenybopper Under Fire," be printed in the RECORD.

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

NICHOLAS JOHNSON VERSUS BROADCASTING: FCC'S "TEENYBOPPER" UNDER FIRE

(By Robert Lewis Shayon)

In June 1966, President Lyndon Johnson appointed Nicholas Johnson (no relation) to the seven-man Federal Communications Commission for a seven-year term. Commissioner Johnson's tenure to date has been marked by an activist regulatory philosophy. The main thrust of the work by this former professor of law at the University of California (he was also national maritime administrator, and prior to that a law clerk serving Associate Justice of the Supreme Court Hugo L. Black) has been directed at the achievement of a healthier level of competition in the communications industry, particularly broadcasting. He has been a vigorous dissenter, often alone, against majority FCC decisions that sustained multiple-ownership media practices, and he has objected to conglomerates that merge broadcasting structures with other corporate interests.

It was Commissioner Johnson who wrote the majority opinion in the Carter Phone Case, as a result of which independent companies have been permitted to attach their gear to the AT&T switching network. With other commissioners, he has helped to stimulate the development of public broadcasting as another option for viewers and listeners. The promotion of diversity through the greater use of UHF channels has been among his objectives. He has supported the general principle that citizen groups ought to know of their right to compete, at license renewal time, for franchises that are granted to station owners—privileges heretofore renewed largely *pro forma* by the rubber-stamp Broadcast Bureau of the FCC.

Currently, he is at the center of a pattern of intense regulatory activity at the Commission, along with his colleagues, particularly Kenneth A. Cox and Robert T. Bartley, but the FCC has known activist phases before. Other so-called rebel commissioners, such as Fly, Durr, Henneck, Minow, and Henry, have come and gone. Nicholas Johnson may not have helped to achieve significant competition in broadcasting by 1973, when his term expires, but he will have contributed to the general recognition among broadcasters and communications lawyers that the industry badly needs a new trade journal to compete with *Broadcasting*, the

magazine that now dominates the press of this important field. Published since 1931, *Broadcasting* provides the most complete coverage available of the FCC. Vital industry statistics may be more quickly found in *Broadcasting's* annual review issues than in the Commission's files, but in a deeper sense, the magazine is out of touch with the complex realities of today's rapidly changing communications world. It feeds its subscribers, especially in its editorials, a mix of images compounded of fantasy and propaganda. Its highly selective packages of information may support the biases and self-fulfilling prophecies of its readers, but these serve more to gratify the reader's emotions than to render them real service by independent, tough-minded analysis.

Such a performance is generally the rule in any trade press, and this fact is not overlooked in evaluating *Broadcasting*. Successful trade media mute the obvious nature of their role with acceptable rhetorical manners that are temperate in tone and accent. Generally speaking, this has been true in the past, even of *Broadcasting*, but the magazine, in its treatment of Commissioner Johnson, has dropped its mask of good manners and revealed an *ad hominem* stridency that grows ever more shrill, to the uneasiness of more thoughtful broadcasters. This situation has come about because Johnson has refused to quit the agency despite the barrage of attacks leveled at him by the magazine. He hasn't been bought off by a better job. *Broadcasting* suggested this in an editorial in its March 17, 1969 issue: "To remove a commissioner appointed for a specific term without substantial cause . . . is a sticky business. Perhaps the offer of another position in government or on the bench, paying as well, would do it, and that prospect, it's hoped, will be pursued."

A look at the record is instructive—thirty pieces of news and editorials (the two are often hard to separate), beginning December 5, 1966, and ending March 17, 1969. They reveal a pattern that emphasizes slogan and invective rather than the serious debate of issues on their merits. The pattern begins with scorn and disdain, and escalates to almost pre-emptory commands to President Nixon to fulfill his campaign promises to rein in the Government's regulatory agencies. In 1966, the magazine took early editorial notice of Commissioner Johnson in connection with his objections to the aborted ABC-ITT merger. Although the editorial answered briefly a point about a conflict of interests between the conglomerate and the network, it made three irrelevant thrusts. It said that both Johnson and Commissioner Cox "seem to dote on" publicity; it noted that Johnson was Mr. Cox's "thirty-two-year-old disciple"; and it warned them that "the Administration wouldn't relish action that would frustrate more aggressive competition among the three major networks." The magazine generally kept its cool in future editorials and news briefs, when dealing with Johnson, but its tone grew increasingly sharp, as the Commissioner, often with Cox and Bartley, challenged routine license renewals, fought against concentration of media control, and wrote and spoke out publicly about program surveillance by the Commission.

Broadcasting warned the Commissioner that he was "not winning friends"; it called him a "teenybopper" and "the shrill and frequent critic of the actions of his elders." It rebuked the National Association of Broadcasters, the major trade group, for providing "a platform for an FCC member who makes a practice of beating his captive audiences over the head." It charged unethical conduct by Johnson in several situations, and printed replies by him and others that counter-charged misinformation and inaccurate quotation. In the summer of 1968, *Broadcasting* abandoned any efforts to deal with the merits of the positions taken by Commissioners

Johnson and Cox. An editorial in the June 10 issue looked with favor on "various proposals for riper legislation [which] would enable the President to appoint a new commission, eliminating those who want only to attack and destroy." Commissioner Cox was accused of "espousing rigid control of program and business affairs, in defiance of the law—a sort of socialism." It said of Mr. Johnson, "his number should be up."

In its issue of February 17, 1969, the magazine asserted that "an erstwhile reasonably safe majority [at the FCC] had lost control to a makeshift radical minority." The article continued:

"It is shameful that at the root of most of the trouble-making is Nick Johnson, who, in his two-and-one-half years as a commissioner, has made a fetish of throwing sand in the FCC machinery. . . . This brash, thirty-four-year-old self-anointed savior, who was removed from his last job as maritime administrator, jams the FCC processing lines with his dissents, automatically opposes routine renewals, personally woos reporters, editors, and pundit-columnists with his double-space documents [SOP is single-spacing to save paper and money], maintains a private mailing list at government expense, and stands accused of brow-beating FCC personnel."

Interest in *Broadcasting's* treatment of Johnson is heightened when one considers the credibility of the magazine's past cantankerousness. The trade journal said in its first editorial (1931): "Broadcasting in the U.S. today stands in grave jeopardy. Politically powerful and efficiently organized groups, actuated by selfishness and with a mania for power, are now busily at work plotting the complete destruction of the industry we have pioneered and developed." Somehow the plotters were foiled, and the AM-FM-television broadcasting industry went on to achieve an annual revenue of \$3.2 billion in 1967. Nevertheless, in the June 10, 1968, editorial cited earlier, the apocalyptic strain surfaced again: "The nation is witnessing the most audacious and unethical assault upon broadcasters ever contrived. It could spell the end of American-Plan 'free' broadcasting."

As of March 17, 1969, the situation was still at emergency level. "The regulation of communications—particularly broadcasting—has reached a critical point, and is threatened with a breakdown. When the FCC takes actions that encourage reckless applications for occupied facilities worth millions, anarchy lies ahead unless remedial measures are invoked."

The truth or falsity of pictures in our heads may be tested against reality; we must ask whether or not they correspond with the pictures in other peoples' heads. *Television Age*, an advertising trade journal, commenting on Johnson in its January 2, 1967 issue, wrote:

"He has kept out of the public glare, spending his time instead devouring information on communications, talking to industry leaders, and observing his FCC colleagues in action. Even his detractors agree that he has strong assets: he's intellectually curious, and he is intellectually honest."

Newsweek, on April 20, 1967, reported: "He professes to prefer the role of a young communications don, working monkishly over his long opinions, and returning each evening to his wife and three children in quiet suburban Maryland." The *Christian Science Monitor* noted in an interview, on June 12, 1967: "Nearly 95 percent of the time he has voted with the Commission majority, for whose chairman he has great respect and affection." The National Association of Television and Radio Announcers in August 1968, gave Johnson an award with this citation: "A bold, fearless, and humane man who has made the industry aware of its legal and moral obligation to serve the communities of America, making them cognizant that

broadcasting is a privilege and not a right." The U.S. Jaycee voted him one of its Ten Outstanding Young Men for 1967, noting that he had "consistently worked to achieve a more coherent communications policy in the best interests of the general public. Within a short time, he has injected life and imagination into the workings of a crucial government agency."

Broadcasting has responded by harking back to the good old days when the magazine's editors, linked importantly with major corporate interests in broadcasting, gave marching orders to a complacent Commission that knew its place. Participatory democracy is in the air; the people want in, even in broadcasting, and the magazine cannot grasp the change.

In the context of a democracy, there is nothing wrong with the phenomenon of strong views in real conflict—even views that cannot be reconciled in agreement or consensus. It is entirely in order for a trade journal to present the views of its constituents as vigorously as it can, and to attack the views of its opponents, but the times demand reason in the trade press. Broadcasters help shape our images of the world with the pictures and words they package on TV and radio, but the images of the world that the broadcasters have in their minds are shaped in large measure by their sources of information. The purity of their wells of information are of grave import to the public at large.

Station owners who have read *Broadcasting's* attacks on Johnson are surprised to find, when they meet him at conferences and discuss industry problems with him, that he is as reasonable as the next fellow, intent on seeking out, with them, rational policies for an astonishingly complex communications world.

The dissonance gives them pause, and has set some to doubting whether their major trade journal adequately meets their needs. Even prophets are necessary in our society to proclaim their passionately held private truths, but we desperately need ground rules for the process of opposition as we confront change. *Broadcasting* seems unable to tolerate opposing views without hostility; it demands that its truth alone must prevail.

A responsible trade press should maintain a creative sense of confrontation, channeling opposition, rather than allowing it to engulf all other values and all other parties. Should *Broadcasting* succeed in "dumping" Commissioners Johnson, Cox, and Bartley, the issues will not disappear. Even President Nixon cannot exercise the very real challenges that beset the industry. Total control is an obsession: it can destroy not only the opposition but the would-be controller. What the broadcasters and the public need is not "an enemy," but better data about the issues at stake, about the estimated costs and possible effects of alternative courses of action. Conscience ought to be persuaded, not manipulated or coerced. If *Broadcasting's* treatment of Nicholas Johnson of the FCC has brought about even a glimpse of this truth, and if a competitive responsible trade journal is the result, then whatever else he may accomplish before 1973, an enduring contribution will have been left behind to the broadcasting industry by the embattled, young "teenybopper" commissioner.

THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF HAWAII STATEHOOD

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Hawaii's campaign to win statehood, the President of the United States wrote to Senator FONG.

I ask unanimous consent that President Nixon's letter and his statement to the people of Hawaii be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 16, 1969.

HON. HIRAM L. FONG,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HIRAM: During this tenth anniversary of Hawaii's successful campaign to win Statehood, one man in particular deserves our special recognition and his people's thanks. That man, Hiram, is you.

As senior Senator from Hawaii, you have tirelessly sought to translate the expectations shared by its citizens ten years ago into the reality of progress they have now attained.

You have spoken well for them. And you have merited their confidence. You have given them a strong voice in national affairs, and consistently sought to bring them the fullness of the prosperity we enjoy.

I can certainly understand why the people of Hawaii have returned you to Washington. And I am confident that they will do so again.

Please extend my warmest good wishes to them on this milestone, and commend them for the good judgment that has earned them the gratitude of the countless fellow citizens who respect your leadership and admire your ability to get things done.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, April 16, 1969.

To the People of Hawaii.

My warmest greetings go out to my fellow citizens in Hawaii as you celebrate your tenth anniversary of Statehood.

I know that I am not alone in my good wishes. I am joined by millions of Americans who are grateful for the contributions of our fiftieth State, and proud of the splendid example you set by your devotion to social justice and true human brotherhood.

The harmony in your daily lives, the hard work, high ideals and cooperative spirit which have been hallmarks of your progress—all of these are sources of deepest satisfaction to us all.

Within a decade you have made your State a showcase of the best of America. And you have expressed in fullness the founding principles on which this nation's greatness rests.

No task could be more pleasant or bring me greater pride than that of wishing you continuing success as you carry forward Hawaii's role in the life of our Republic.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of the legislation which provided statehood for Hawaii, it gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to be able to call this material to the attention of the Senate. Moreover, as a colleague and great admirer of the Senator from Hawaii, I wish to point to some of the highlights of his very distinguished career.

He was Vice President of the Hawaii Constitutional Convention in 1950.

As speaker of the Hawaii Territorial House of Representatives, HIRAM FONG led the legislative delegation to Congress to press for early enactment of statehood.

He was always a strong advocate for statehood for Hawaii and spent his time and energies on all occasions to win congressional and Presidential support for statehood.

In his time, he amassed an outstanding record of public service and achievements in the world of commerce.

He served 14 years in the Legislature of Hawaii before statehood. This includes 4 years as vice speaker and 6 years as speaker of the house.

HIRAM FONG is a Harvard Law School graduate, a World War II veteran, and is at present a retired colonel of the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

He is an indefatigable worker for community betterment, a member of numerous civic and charitable organizations. He is a vociferous backer of the underprivileged and is one of the most active supporters in Hawaii of candidates of the Republican Party. His support of loyal party members is legendary.

He has twice been a favorite son candidate at national conventions.

HIRAM FONG is today among Hawaii's most successful businessmen. He holds the distinction of being founder, president, and board chairman of a family of companies, namely Finance Factors, Grand Pacific Life Insurance Co., Finance Realty, Finance Home Builders, Finance Investment, Highway Construction, Market City, and others.

He is very proud to point out that he is the founder of the cosmopolitan law firm of Fong—Chinese, Miho—Japanese, Choy—Korean, & Robison—Caucasian-Hawaiian.

But I believe the people of Hawaii should realize in what great esteem he is held by the rest of the Nation. HIRAM FONG looms large in the U.S. Senate, and we in the Senate turn to him often for counsel and advice, especially in the areas of his expertise on the Judiciary and Appropriations Committees and in his capacity as highest ranking minority member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

As minority whip of the Senate, it is a high honor for me to speak these words of tribute to the great Senator from Hawaii.

IOWA PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the fine work being done by Iowa citizens in the Partners of the Alliance program was recognized in a recent editorial published in the Des Moines Register.

Since 1965, Iowa and Yucatan, Mexico, have been joined in this unique program in which private citizens are working together on mutually beneficial projects involving an exchange of students and teachers; also in the fields of agriculture, health, business, and culture.

The Partners of the Alliance program now operates in 37 of our States and 37 areas of 16 Latin American countries. Literally thousands of people representing business and professional organizations, associations, labor, civic and service groups, as well as students, are giving time and talent to develop close personal working relationships throughout the hemisphere.

I wish to commend these people for their voluntary efforts and initiative in helping to promote friendship, understanding, and greater cooperation among all the peoples of the Americas. Their unselfish work clearly reflects their concern for the well-being of others.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial entitled "Iowa Foreign Aid Agency," published in the Des Moines Register of March 28, 1969.

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

IOWA FOREIGN AID AGENCY

A bill introduced in the Iowa Senate gives the Legislature an opportunity to put itself on record in support of international cooperation.

The bill, co-sponsored by Senators John M. Walsh (Rep., Dubuque) and James A. Potgeter (Rep., Steamboat Rock), would create a 10-member "Iowa Lends-a-Hand Agency" to co-ordinate activities of Iowa organizations that provide aid for people of underdeveloped countries or of countries stricken by natural disasters.

The lieutenant governor would serve as chairman of the agency, and its nine other members would be appointed by the governor on a "nonpartisan basis."

The agency would be empowered to appoint an executive secretary who "may be the employe of another agency of state government." It would be authorized to receive "gifts, grants or donations," but no state tax funds could be used to support it.

Among the agency's functions would be to "organize and co-ordinate procedures for the transportation and distribution of materials and aid to other countries" and to determine foreign countries which can be benefited by a variety of items "that are manufactured, grown or available in Iowa."

Since Iowa Partners of the Alliance was organized in the fall of 1965, many Iowans have participated in a people-to-people program with the Mexican state of Yucatan. The state's universities have participated in programs abroad under the Agency for International Development, and many Iowa business firms have contacts overseas.

The new agency proposed in the Walsh-Potgeter bill could facilitate the work of these groups and direct the concerns of other Iowans to areas with the greatest needs.

Walsh and Potgeter have offered the Legislature an excellent chance to foster good will and understanding between the people of Iowa and their neighbors abroad. But if this is a good idea, as we think it is, why not a small state appropriation to support it?

A FORMIDABLE MICHIGAN ATTORNEY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, in our legal tradition, attorneys rarely wear robes, but today I wish to invite the attention of the Senate to a formidable Michigan attorney who never appears in court without one.

She is a Dominican nun, Sister Ann Joachim, O.P., aptly described by the Detroit Free Press as a "tall, slender woman with the demeanor of a grandmother and the mind of a Clarence Darrow."

She is currently engaged in a legal battle to prevent the Norfolk & Western Railroad from discontinuing a passenger train, the Wabash Cannonball, that runs between St. Louis and Detroit.

Both the Detroit Free Press and the Detroit News recently printed delightful articles about Sister Ann Joachim and her crusade. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Detroit Free Press, Apr. 8, 1969]
GENTLE NUN LEADS CHARGE AT BATTLE OF THE CANNONBALL

(By Barbara Stanton)

A gentle Dominican nun of 70-some years tangled with a \$2.5-billion railway corporation Monday, and the corporation emerged a bit dented.

Sister Ann Joachim, O.P., a tall, slender woman with the demeanor of a grandmother and the mind of a Clarence Darrow, wants to keep the Wabash Cannonball running. The Norfolk & Western Railway wants to close it down.

The two sides clashed head-on at an Interstate Commerce Commission hearing on the railroad's petition to discontinue the Detroit-St. Louis train as of July 4.

Spokesmen for the railway contend that the Cannonball, the last namesake of the historic train that traveled the Midwestern plains in the 19th century, is unprofitable and underpatronized. They said the Cannonballs carried fewer than 40 passengers each way daily, and lost \$570,000 in 1968.

But Sister Ann Joachim, attorney for the Dominican Motherhouse at Adrian, Mich., a community served by the train, called a stream of witnesses to testify that the only thing wrong with the Cannonball is that Norfolk & Western wants to get rid of it.

Mrs. Carrie Sponhauer of Detroit, a frequent rider and a stockholder in N&W, quoted from the company's own annual report to argue that passenger service was profitable. She cited figures showing revenue from "passengers, mail and express" went up from \$10 million in 1967 to \$22 million in 1968.

[From the Detroit News]

THE LADIES EXPLODE OVER CANNONBALL

(By Al Stark)

The ladies, led by a lawyer-nun, socked it to the Norfolk & Western Railway yesterday in an effort to save the Wabash Cannonball, a train which runs between Detroit and St. Louis.

There is one Cannonball each way, each day. It travels 497 miles through towns like Adrian; Montpelier, Ohio, Fort Wayne and Peru, Ind.; Danville and Granite City, Ill.

The Norfolk & Western which says it lost \$467,000 on the Cannonball in 1967 and \$570,000 in 1968, has petitioned the Interstate Commerce Commission (ICC) for permission to eliminate the passenger run. The final hearing was held yesterday in Federal Court in Detroit and the ladies were there early.

They rallied behind Sister Ann Joachim, O.P., of Siena Heights College in Adrian, an attorney at law, who admits she is old enough for medicare, but who once won trophies in tennis, basketball and swimming and was even a stunt pilot.

Sister Ann, who refers to herself as "a teacher of the truths of history, economics, political science and the law," called a series of witnesses. To the railroad's contention that its passenger load has dropped so low that even heavier losses are inevitable, the ladies to a man answered that they need the Cannonball to get where they're going.

Mrs. Kenneth Groom, 71, of Roseville, said, "Look, with me it's personal, I just want a way to get to Decatur, Ill., to see my daughter."

"Greyhound has no bus there. And when I called Trailways I got some flip young guy who said I could go by Toledo and Chicago. I felt like spanking him."

Mrs. Carrie Sponhauer, 62, of Detroit, complimented the Norfolk & Western on a couple of things, then pulled from a pile of papers on her lap the company's 1968 annual report and proceeded to read the black figures to the railroad's attorney, George Saunders, of Chicago.

When Mrs. Sponhauer, who rides the Cannonball to her farm in Fort Wayne practically every weekend from spring until Christmas, got to the part that reveals that Norfolk & Western is top-rated for investors, she as much as told Saunders, "Why the fuss over this train that we all need?"

Sister Pauline Marie, another Dominican nun from Adrian, testified that she rides the Cannonball once a month to Fort Wayne to visit her aged parents (her father an old trainman.)

Asked by Sister Ann what service is like on the Cannonball, she brought a smile from Saunders when she said she couldn't say enough for the railroad personnel on the train.

His smile faded a moment later when she said, however, that all too often there were no paper towels in the ladies room at the station in Fort Wayne.

Just before testimony resumed in the afternoon, Sister Ann leaned across the counsel table and lectured the 37-year-old Saunders about smiling at the statements of witnesses "and opposing counsel."

She said, "I think it is discourteous and unethical."

Saunders, summing up the railroad's position, said that the Cannonball, which leaves Detroit for St. Louis every morning at 7:15 a.m., has shown growing losses for four years.

He said that market studies indicated that this was a trend that would continue, and that there was little the railroad could do to reverse it.

He said there is an "inherent decline in demand" for what the railroad offers.

The ICC will announce their decision before July 3.

THE ABM OR THE RISK OF WAR?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, syndicated columnist Joseph Alsop places in perspective the President's decision on the ABM system concerning the necessity of taking a step to protect our future security.

In calling attention to Mr. Alsop's column, I would like to add that I, too, like many other Senators, wish it were possible for our Nation to begin disarmament and a reduction in weaponry without waiting for corresponding action from the Soviet Union.

Perhaps those who believe we should proceed with unilateral disarmament are correct—that if we take the first step, and scrap the ABM, the Soviet Union will then do likewise. But what if they are wrong?

Unfortunately, we need more than public statements, educated guesses, and wishful thinking as a basis on which to make determinations involving our national security. Until we have more than this, until we have the type of successful negotiations with the Soviet Union that President Nixon is earnestly trying to obtain, we may, by scrapping the ABM without reciprocal action, be walking a very precarious path with respect to protecting our people and our Nation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Alsop's column be printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON HAS GOOD ARGUMENTS TO BACK UP DECISION ON ABM

(By Joseph Alsop)

Before very long, his opponents will discover they have figured out the President

quite wrongly. The role they expect him to play is quite clear from the developing pattern of the very first test, which is the debate about the ABM.

The whole character and thrust of the senatorial attack on the ABM system rather clearly reveal an unspoken but confident expectation of continued presidential passivity. Since the inauguration, Richard M. Nixon has seemed like a very hard-working Cheshire cat, laborious but far above the dust of battle; and more of the same is obviously being counted upon.

This is obvious in turn, simply because of the character of the battleground the President's opponents have chosen. With a President who truly leads, nothing is harder or more dangerous to argue about than a question involving the future security of the Nation. On this particular battleground, it is even difficult to attack a President for doing too little, as the Eisenhower years showed.

But attacking a President for doing too much—for being too careful of the Nation's security—is something else again. Such an attack, which is now going on, actually invites the kind of response from the White House to which there is almost no possible answer, as follows:

"I am the President; I have to judge the risks; and if the event shows that I have judged wrongly, the whole blame for the resulting disaster will fall upon me. In the present case, as far as mere politics go, I had everything to gain and nothing at all to lose by shoving the whole ABM project to the back of the stove.

"The truth is, I had hoped that I would be able to do just that. I have no hankering to make needless additions to the defense budget. I have been desperately trying to cut that budget. I have no liking, either, for the kind of controversy that is now going on. All my interests and preferences were on the side of doing nothing about the ABM.

"The only trouble was that all the facts were on the other side, as far as I could ascertain those facts after I came to the White House. I do not doubt the good faith of those who deny the Soviets are now trying to build a first-strike capability. But I have come to the opposite conclusion after the most careful review of all the data—including much data very recently acquired, which is perhaps not understood by the opponents of ABM deployment.

"We are talking here, please remember, about a potential Soviet capability to destroy this Nation at a single stroke. I do not think the present Soviet government has the actual intention of using that capability, if and when they are permitted to attain it. But I can give no guarantee, and no one else can possibly give any guarantee to me against a very different sort of Soviet government coming to power within the next four years.

"With the present Soviet government, I hope to negotiate this whole field of problems at a fairly early date. But meanwhile I would be derelict in my duty—criminally derelict, in truth—if I stood idly by, leaving undone the things that can easily be done, while a potentially hostile power acquired the future capability of destroying our country in one stroke."

Coming from the President himself, these are arguments that cannot easily be answered, except perhaps to the satisfaction of the SDS. And the point is that these are just the sort of things President Nixon can now be expected to say, with maximum publicity and probably on nationwide television, before the ABM debate reaches its climax.

Just which line of attack the President will choose, is of course a White House secret. But two things are not secret. The NATO foreign ministers included nearly the same proportion of doubters of the ABM as the U.S. Senate. The President's long, informal meeting with the foreign ministers was mainly concerned with this topic, and his explanation of his ABM decision was gener-

ally accepted as outstandingly lucid and wholly persuasive.

So the first thing that is known is that the President can make a powerful case for his ABM decision, whenever he chooses to do so. And the second thing known is that he has already made that choice. The question at the White House now is not whether the President will intervene in the ABM debate; the question, rather, is when to intervene.

For the future, moreover, this is a matter of very great importance. As a leader, President Johnson's great weakness was that he always left his opponents to take the offensive, whereas putting the opposition on the defensive is one of the Presidency's strongest prerogatives. Mr. Nixon aims to exploit that prerogative.

A SALUTE TO TED WILLIAMS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my senior colleague from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), I wish to pay tribute to a great Bostonian.

Thirty years ago this month, Ted Williams broke in as a rookie for the Boston Red Sox. With time out for outstanding military service in two wars, Ted Williams thrilled the fans of our hometown for 15 years from his first time at bat to his last home run.

Now Ted Williams has moved to Washington where he celebrates his 30th anniversary in major league baseball. It gives me great pleasure to join in the praise which will be heaped upon him on this occasion.

I ask unanimous consent that a tribute written for this occasion by Bob Addie, sportswriter for the Washington Post, be printed in the RECORD.

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

A TRIBUTE TO TED WILLIAMS ON THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF HIS MAJOR LEAGUE DEBUT

(By Bob Addie)

Our newest Senator was never elected and in a sense he was never appointed. But he was "selected" to fill a vacancy and Washington welcomes the junior Senator representing the millions of baseball fans in this country—Ted Williams, manager of the Washington Senators baseball team.

It seems to have gotten around that Ted Williams was a great baseball player who batted .344 during his illustrious career that spanned three decades—from April 20, 1939, when he broke in as a 19-year-old rookie to Sept. 28, 1960 when he finally put away his playing spikes. (He wears rubber soled shoes with his manager's uniform now.)

It is significant that Williams ended his career with a home run in his last time at bat and before the Boston fans who had thrilled to his heroics for so many seasons. It is also known that Williams was elected to Baseball's Hall of Fame the first year he was eligible—in 1966.

Williams proved himself a vote-getter in that election by polling one of the highest totals ever recorded. It must be remembered that his "constituents" were the sportswriters with whom the great player had often feuded. But no petty feud could keep him out of the Hall of Fame.

In political parlance, Ted Williams was "a man who . . ." He was a man who won six American League batting championships; a man who batted .406 in 1941 (and the last man who attained the unbelievable .400 plateau); a man who played in 18 All-Star games; a man twice named his league's Most Valuable Player, and a man who hit 521 home runs.

All this is known and duly recorded by the sports historians. But there is another Ted

Williams—Ted Williams the American patriot, war hero and humanitarian.

With only a high school education, he was enrolled in the Navy V-12 program during World War II and held his own academically, graduating as a fighter pilot and assigned to the Marines.

Williams was recalled in the Korean War and it is a matter of record that he made the fastest transition from propeller aircraft to jets ever recorded by the military.

He was cited for a particularly daring feat in Korea during the war when he safely brought in his burning jet fighter riddled by enemy bullets. In typical Ted Williams style, he walked away from the burning plane and was embarrassed by the attention his heroic feat received throughout the world.

Williams endured his recall without bitterness. It cost him valuable time, as war does to every young man. Ted missed five years of competition—five years which could have put him on an unprecedented baseball peak, never to be reached.

But there was Ted Williams the humanitarian, too. He was asked to be the honorary chairman of the "The Jimmy Fund," an organization dedicated to cancer research for children. Williams did more than "honorary" work. He solicited contributions. He donated thousands of dollars he received from personal appearances on television, radio and for speeches. He literally helped raise over \$1 million with his dynamic personality and unflagging devotion to helping unfortunate children.

All of Boston, all of New England and all of America is grateful. We welcome the junior Senator of the United States of Baseball America.

Long may he be in office.

STUDENT SUPPORT FOR SLEEPING BEAR DUNES

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article written by John R. Luton, a student in the school of natural resources at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and published in the Michigan Daily of April 8, 1969. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD also the covering letter from John Luton, in which he explains the background of the article and his motivation in writing it.

No words of mine would so eloquently make the case for the Bear or for the quality of the overwhelming majority of our young people.

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

ANN ARBOR, MICH.,
April 9, 1969.

Senator PHILIP A. HART,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: Enclosed is a page from the Michigan Daily of April 8, 1969 which contains an editorial written by me in support of immediate creation of Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. I would like to thank your Detroit staff for their assistance which was readily given and which provided me with information that helped me better prepare my article. I would also like to extend thanks to you for your seemingly tireless support of the Dunes proposal.

At the risk of boring you, I should like to give some explanation of the reasons behind my article. I am in the School of Natural Resources at the University of Michigan and am concerned about almost any conservation controversy. When I graduate I hope to work in the National Park Service. Consequently, I watch very closely areas under consideration for inclusion into the National Park System.

Only too often I am frustrated by the great deal of delay that slows improvement and expansion in our outdoor recreation facilities—delay sometimes exacting costly tolls to rare or unique areas in terms of values and lands lost or despoiled.

I feel strongly that areas of the quality of Sleeping Bear need to be preserved now, for with each passing year there is an increase in demand for open spaces with no corresponding increase in lands and facilities to meet the demands. Each year brings instead a decrease in high quality land for outdoor recreation—a decrease in the amount of unspoiled land that is a great part of America's heritage. The National Park Service can best preserve the values and integrity of this legacy of primitive America. But in order for them to meet the future demands of my generation and other generations to come, they must be allowed more of these unique landscapes.

My generation has been criticized for being politically too radical and for wanting only to destroy our society or at least to escape from it. A portrait of my generation usually consists of hippies, drug users and students striking or demonstrating. This picture, to my father's and grandfather's generations represents the majority of my generation. Fortunately, the true majority of today's students are not tearing apart colleges but are studying. Yes, we want to change the world, for we are the recipients of a heritage of generations who seemingly put no thought toward the future. Our legacy is only partly unspoiled, a very small part. We want to change the world in an orderly manner and in a way that will halt the decay of the environment and provide a better, more pleasing place for our children and grandchildren to live in.

I wrote my article in the hopes that, in a very small way, I can help the cause of building a better society. I have tried through the main media on my campus to expose more students to conservation issues, and I hope, rather naively, that more students will more actively work for a better society and environment. I hoped to draw more support for your Sleeping Bear proposal and other conservation proposals.

I realize that I have digressed to a seemingly superfluous tangent, but I did so to demonstrate that many of my generation cares and desires only to be given a chance to help change and improve our heritage, and provide future generations with a legacy that is a credit to ourselves and America. We are waiting to take the reins from others, and are trying to prepare ourselves to adequately meet the challenge of the future.

Again, I would like to thank you for your valuable and continued support of Sleeping Bear, and for your concern for the future. I also thank you for taking the time to listen to my ramblings. I hope that you will lend your help to other conservation proposals and continue to be a leader in the fight to preserve our natural heritage for now and for posterity.

Sincerely

JOHN R. LUTON.

[From the Michigan Daily, Apr. 8, 1969]

FIGHTING TO SAVE A SLEEPING BEAR FROM DYING

(By John R. Luton)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—John Luton is a junior in the School of Natural Resources majoring in wildlife management. He has done extensive research into the Sleeping Bear controversy, backing the research up with several field trips to the Dunes area.)

The Ottawa and Chippewa Indians used to say the precipitous bluffs rising from Lake Michigan's eastern shore were the immobile hulk of a mother bear pining for her two drowned cubs. The huge Sleeping Bear Dune and her cubs—the off shore North and South

Manitou Islands still lie immobile 25 miles west of Traverse City in the northwestern reaches of the Lower Peninsula.

But the bear is not sleeping; it is dying. The National Park Service and several Michigan legislators have been trying unsuccessfully to make the dunes area a National Lakeshore. But each time a bill has been introduced in the last ten years it has been killed by local opposition and political influence.

The Sleeping Bear region has perhaps the most beautiful and striking landscapes found along the shoreline of Lake Michigan. It is an area of startling contrasts. Huge dunes lie atop the moraines forming parallel headlands 400 feet above the lake waters. Between ridges are lowlands with concave bays and small, very crystalline inland lakes.

A fascinating variety of plant life accentuates the diversity of the area. Beach grass and bog plants, pine forest and broad leaved trees often grow together, sometimes spread apart.

Receding glaciers carved the lowlands and ridges 11-20,000 years ago and wind and waves still re-shape the coast and move the dunes today.

This beautiful landscape makes the dunes an ideal vacation spot. Development of private and commercial summer cottages began early in this century and has continued at an accelerating rate, threatening the unspoiled lakeshore with unplanned, overcrowded ugliness, an extension of our urban sprawls.

Rampant subdivision, land speculation and uncontrolled tourist developments have accompanied the advance of urban families.

In 1959 the National Park Service made a survey of the Great Lakes and recognized the Sleeping Bear region as one of the twelve most important areas to be preserved for its scientific and recreational values.

The long battle to try to save the area as a National Lakeshore was begun in 1961 by Michigan Senator Philip A. Hart. Eight years have passed since then, and private developers continue to destroy the scenery, while some legislators foment controversy by misinforming the area's people.

Recognizing the urgency, conservation and civil groups in Michigan and nationwide are demanding immediate attention to the Bear. Last fall the powerful Sierra Club—having won its long battle for a Redwood National Park—adopted a strong resolution in support of the National Lakeshore.

The reasons for creating a National Lakeshore are obvious.

The proposed lakeshore lies in Benzie and Leelanau Counties, both of which could benefit from a boost to their lagging economies. Logging days have passed, and although manufacturing and agriculture have increased, they are slipping to second and third place in importance.

Tourism is the booming business. The region's proximity to the 20 million inhabitants of the Detroit and Chicago areas, its appeal to sportsmen—particularly the Coho Salmon fishermen—and its sheer beauty, make Sleeping Bear an attractive vacation area.

National Park Service Studies estimate that by the fifth year of operation, the lakeshore would draw more than three million annual visits and add as much as \$20 million to the area's economy every year.

Part of the money would come directly from tourists, part from government payrolls and contracts and the rest from private construction of motels, restaurants, service stations and stores. Although the park service would preserve the dunes' natural features, the region would be developed to accommodate the vacationers it is bound to draw.

But opposition, led by Rep. Guy Vander Jagt (R-9th District), the area's Congressman, has blocked creation of the lakeshore.

Many opponents of Sleeping Bear Lakeshore are summer residents, people who live

in the area only a few months of the year. They refuse to realize every American cannot have 40 acres and a mule on an undeveloped lakeshore. They have succeeded in blocking the proposal by a campaign of real and threatened reprisals.

Businessmen in the area who spoke out in favor of the proposal have been hurt financially by boycotts by the summer residents. Thus many businessmen refuse to support the park because boycotts could ruin their already marginal operations.

And some legislators still sought to mislead the local residents. In 1963 residents wrote to the Senate Subcommittee on Public Lands claiming they had been told that the Park Service would suddenly take land that had been in the family for generations.

The impression was given that after the initial acreage was acquired, the Park Service would continue to condemn and add land to the lakeshore's size—that the Park Service administrators were land-grabbers who would not be satisfied until every scrap of land was in their hands.

Opponents of the lakeshore claim that the present 61,000 acres is too much. They oppose setting aside areas that are not specifically the Sleeping Bear Dunes. The North and South Manitou Islands, several bays and some inland lakes would be part of the proposed park.

If just the Dunes were preserved, the varied landscape would be lost to land-grabbers. Alongside the natural dunes would be motel strips and subdivisions. And many of the reasons for keeping Sleeping Bear Dunes in the National Park System would be lost.

Sen. Hart has strongly championed the importance of preserving this total landscape and environment of Sleeping Bear Dunes.

Sen. Hart's bill to create the lakeshore goes overboard to protect private owners. Sleeping Bear would not be a national park per se, but a national lakeshore, and the intent of the Park Service would be to stabilize development, not remove it.

The bill provides for zoning to include improved private property in the Lakeshore area. This property could be condemned only if the owner used it for purposes such as subdividing or commercial enterprise that would adversely affect the lakeshore's quality.

The bill would allow the private owners who have already built a home to stay. Their property will be permanently protected from condemnation by the Park Service, and may be sold or transferred to heirs. Fair market value will be paid for any private property that is acquired.

As Sen. Hart points out, "It is not proposed that homes fall to the bulldozers; the basic objective is to preserve the beauty and values which make this area so matchless."

Park foes have created a furor by claiming that the proposal would remove \$70,000 in tax revenues every year, part of which would normally go to support the area's schools. But improved private property, which pays most of the taxes, will not be acquired by the federal government, and the tax loss will actually be very minor. Efforts are under way to have to state make up any temporary tax loss which may occur.

Besides, creation of a National Lakeshore would increase revenues and also make the area eligible for federal aid to schools, insuring that the proposed park would not cause erosion of the tax base.

Since the initial cries of outrage, many local residents—their fears allayed—have recognized the major benefits that would come from establishing the park.

But despite growing local support, Rep. Vander Jagt has continued his stubborn opposition to the bill.

Although Rep. Vander Jagt agrees that the Dunes should be saved, he has insisted that

this can best be done through the Michigan State Park system. But as Michigan Parks administrators have pointed out, Sleeping Bear is much too unique to be preserved on a state level. Sleeping Bear deserves federal, not state, administration standards.

Ten years have passed since the Sleeping Bear Dunes region was first recognized nationally. Ten years of political bickering and controversy, from the town of Frankfort, south of the Dunes, to Washington. Ten years that had seen land-grabbers despoil the countryside and force land prices up.

Both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, supported by former Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, backed the passage of the Sleeping Bear proposal. The new legislation introduced by Sen. Hart and Rep. Lucien Nedzi (D-14th District), has the backing of a majority of the local residents, and many Michigan legislators.

Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel has stated he is in favor of additions to the park system, especially near urban areas. Rep. Vander Jagt has presented Hickel with a compromise that would significantly decrease an area needed for the lakeshore. If Hickel is truly in favor of conservation he must deny Vander Jagt's proposal and support immediate passage of Sen. Hart's bill.

Rep. Vander Jagt has said that the Sleeping Bear Dunes have gone through many years of political torture. If he will accept the views of the majority of his constituents, that torture can end.

The last bill passed the Senate, but not the House of Representatives. Now is the time for the House to ignore Rep. Vander Jagt and act.

Sen. Hart's bill has twice passed the Senate. It has been favorably reported by the House Interior Committee. But well-placed opponents have managed to keep it from coming to a vote in the House of Representatives.

Further delay means further desecration of the land by profit-motivated developers. If "the Bear" is to be saved for future generations it is mandatory that Congress act now.

PRESIDENT NOTES CONFUSION IN EQUAL EMPLOYMENT COMPLIANCE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I note from the President's news conference this morning that the problems of complying with the intent of title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act have gained national attention.

If I recall correctly what the President said, he mentioned that the South Carolina textile contracts that have received attention were a matter of concern to the Department of Defense and the Office of Federal Contract Compliance—OFCC—while the North Carolina textile concern in question is under scrutiny of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission—EEOC—and the enforcement powers which derive from the 1964 act and are administered by the Justice Department.

The President noted that under these circumstances one might well get the impression that this administration's record has been mixed so far in the employment discrimination field.

Therefore I invite the Senate's attention once again to the bill, S. 931, which I introduced on February 7 of this year and which has been referred to the Judiciary Committee. The bill would have the effect of eliminating the confusion and overlap that presently exists between the EEOC and the OFCC. Our distinguished minority leader has noted the

difficulties involved here and been attacked because he has attempted to defend businessmen from harassment by overzealousness in these agencies. I placed in the RECORD on April 1 this year some of the examples of harassment that have been reported to me.

It would seem to me that we can perform a considerable service to the Nation if we move forward toward removing the confusion that presently exists in this area. I, therefore, renew my request that S. 931 be given consideration as a means to the end of creating an atmosphere in which we can achieve a genuinely fair approach to this significant problem.

DEATH OF ROBERT E. JOHNSON, MALIBU, CALIF.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I learned earlier this week of the death of Robert E. Johnson, of Malibu, Calif., on Friday, March 28, 1969. He was an informed and articulate authority on military procurement. Mr. Johnson was born in Iowa on September 14, 1925, and grew up in Gowanda, N.Y. He received a B.A. in business administration in 1951 and an M.A. in economics in 1952 from George Washington University. During this period he was a member of the economics faculty at that institution. In 1953 he joined the staff of the Logistics Department at the Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif. In 1956, he began service as department chairman with the Combat Operations Research Group, a unit of Technical Research, Inc. He returned to the Rand Corp. in 1960 and for the past several years had served as leader of its procurement group. His recent work involved military transportation, foreign economic aid, missile test systems, ground combat simulation, and command and control systems.

I first met Mr. Johnson when he testified before the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly during the summer of 1968 on the need for greater competition in the procurement by the military services of military hard goods and the desirability of competition in the procurement process. His testimony proved him to be an innovative thinker. A particular proposal of his which demonstrated this was his description of the desirability of providing improved access to technology by military contractors through a new form of compulsory licensing which would be combined with commercial transfer techniques.

Mr. President, I pay tribute to the service which Robert Johnson performed as a teacher, an economist, and a leader among thinkers on the military procurement process. He was fearless where the public need was concerned. He had many friends among military contractors, yet did not draw away from offering ideas which some might think to be to the economic detriment of these and other contractors. He saw no reason to refrain from criticizing policies of the military, though his employer was itself a contractor of the U.S. Air Force and possibly subject, therefore, to pressures from individual officers who might feel such criticism applied to them person-

ally. He was a man of strong personal convictions with the public interest constantly in the forefront of his thinking.

Mr. Johnson is survived by his wife, Betty Abbott, his daughters, Linda and Leslie, and his father, R. J. Johnson of Gowanda, N.Y. To them I send my deepest sympathy.

ARMY S. SGT. LESTER HUDSON, OF POINT PLEASANT, W. VA., CHOSEN ONE-MILLIONTH MAN TO PARTICIPATE IN REST AND RECUPERATION LEAVE FOR VIETNAM VETERANS, UNDER AIRLIFT ARRANGEMENTS WITH PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the continuing conflict in Southeast Asia has been debated in this Chamber many times. I have expressed my feelings on our involvement in Vietnam. It is to be hoped that negotiations in Paris will be successful and that genuine peace and stability can be achieved soon.

Regardless of the individual's feeling concerning the war, surely it is imperative that we continue to give the highest priority to supporting the needs of our valiant servicemen involved in it.

Next to coming home to rejoin their loved ones, our battle-weary men look

forward to their rest and recuperation leave. This R. & R. 5-day vacation, as developed by Pan American World Airways, has reached a new milestone—the carriage of the 1 millionth serviceman from Vietnam to Hawaii.

On April 8, 1969, Army S. Sgt. Lester Hudson of Point Pleasant, W. Va., arrived in Honolulu on board a special R. & R. flight. He was chosen as the millionth man, although there were four "millionth" men, one from each of the four military services in Vietnam.

Each branch of service having men coming to Hawaii for R. & R. was asked to nominate a contender for the millionth man title and of the four names drawn by lot, Sergeant Hudson won the honor. The other honored servicemen selected were Navy Gunner Specialist Mate Thomas A. Bruemer of St. Louis, Air Force Sgt. Joseph O. Durrance of Jacksonville, Fla., and Marine Sgt. Richard L. Jaramillo of Eagle Mountain, Calif. Their wives, who had all been flown to Hawaii the day before by Pan Am, were at planeside to greet their husbands. They were all escorted to the Governor's Lounge at Honolulu International Airport along a red-carpeted route, past a military color guard and a reception line which included top military and civilian leaders who were present to honor those

men as representatives of their respective services.

Sergeant Hudson, a West Virginia constituent, was an excellent choice. This much-decorated serviceman typifies the high caliber of our fighting men in Vietnam. His awards include the Bronze Star, the Purple Heart, the Army Commendation Medal, the Air Medal and the Combat Infantryman's Badge.

Because of the splendid cooperation of Pan American World Airways with our Government, I feel this event is noteworthy and newsworthy.

REPORTS ON FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND U.S. DOLLARS UTILIZED BY COMMITTEES IN 1968 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the reports of the committees of the Senate, certain joint committees, and parliamentary bodies concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1968 in connection with foreign travel.

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

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jack R. Miller:											
Australia.....	Australian dollars...	186.47	207.00	90.00	100.00	15.00	16.65	17.17	20.47	308.64	344.12
New Zealand.....	New Zealand dollars...	24.98	27.50	30.00	33.82			2.38	3.00	57.36	64.32
India.....	Rupees.....			50.00	6.74			25.00	3.06	75.00	9.80
Pakistan.....	do.....	74.30	8.80	40.00	4.70			7.70	.90	122.00	14.40
Total.....			243.30		145.26		16.65		27.43		432.64

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 432.64

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mar. 4, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Gordon Allott:											
France-Switzerland.....	DM.....						832.40				832.40
France.....	Fr. franc.....	608.75	121.75	303.14	61.24			108.90	22.00		204.99
Switzerland.....	Sw. franc.....			122.65	28.46					122.65	28.46
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
U.S.S.R.....	Ruble=\$1.11.....	259.46	288.00	105.86	117.50	81.08	90.00	51.35	57.00	497.75	552.50
Ireland.....	Pound=\$2.40.....	28.14.7	68.95	28.16.0	69.12	9.19.0	23.88	14.13.9	35.25	82.3.4	197.20
United Kingdom.....	do.....	38.7.9	92.13	67.19.2	163.10			27.18.0	66.96	134.4.11	322.19
Air travel: Washington, Moscow, intermediate points, and return.	Netherland guilder = \$0.27579.					3,997.30	1,102.40			3,997.30	1,102.40
Senator Allen J. Ellender:											
Transportation.....	Russian rubles.....					1,966	2,184.66			1,966	2,184.66
Transportation.....	Netherlands guilders.....					8,957	2,475.11			8,957	2,475.11
Australia.....	Australian dollars.....					179.32	179.32			179.32	179.32
Hong Kong.....	Hong Kong dollars.....					42.35	6.93	1,218	200	1,260.35	206.93
Indonesia.....	Rupees.....							21,150	50	21,150	50.00
Japan.....	Yen.....					8,853	24.59			8,853	24.59
New Zealand.....	New Zealand dollars.....					107.04	120.04			107.04	120.04
Taiwan.....	North Taiwan dollars.....							6,000	150	6,000	150.00
Senator Roman L. Hruska:											
France.....	Franc.....	441.00	90.00	220.50	45.00	73.50	15.00			735.00	150.00
Germany.....	Deutsche mark.....	35.75	9.07	19.25	4.88	124.60	31.60			179.60	45.55
Austria.....	Shilling.....	3,354.00	130.00	1,806.00	70.00	489.96	19.04			5,649.96	219.04

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Jacob K. Javits:											
Belgium	Franc		108.00		80.00		958.10		62.00		1,208.10
France	do		110.00		60.00		132.77		39.00		341.77
England	Pound sterling		None		40.00		10.00		10.00		60.00
Germany	DM		100.00		20.00		10.00		10.00		140.00
Italy	Lira		50.00		40.00		20.00		20.00		130.00
Senator John C. Stennis:											
Germany	DM	144	36.00	259.80	64.95	145.70	36.44	28.80	7.21	578.40	144.60
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	219.60	44.38	24.75	4.95	640.35	129.13
Senator Ralph W. Yarborough:											
Vietnam	Piasters	14,855	125.09	1,429	12.50			1,673	14.61	17,960	152.20
Thailand	Baht	902.25	43.65	1,171.99	56.70	434.07	21.00	596.40	28.65	3,100	150.00
Hong Kong and Macao	Dollar	644.54	105.79	305.50	50.00	183.30	30.00	145.66	23.84	1,279	209.63
Transportation	Marks					7,548.83	1,877.12				1,877.12
Defense expenditures in Vietnam								55.10			55.10
Kenneth J. Bousquet:											
Curacao, Netherlands Antilles	Guilders	250	141.00	200	112.80		205.00	15.35	8.70	465.35	467.50
Robert B. Clark:											
Lebanon	Lebanese pounds	142.36	45.00	257.26	81.33			44.28	14.00	443.90	140.33
Pakistan	Rupees	264	55.00	317	66.04	49	10.20	28	5.41	658	136.65
India	do	215	28.28	117	15.40			18	2.37	350	46.05
Hong Kong	HK\$	320	52.54	485	79.83	28	4.60	35	5.75	868	142.72
Japan	Yen	27,244	75.68	35,466	98.50	29,588	82.19	2,288	6.35	94,586	262.72
Philippines	Pesos	243	62.04	552.95	141.16	11	2.81	100	25.53	906.95	231.54
Italy	U.S. dollars		46.00		49.00						95.00
United States	U.S. dollars		24.00		23.00			16.00			63.00
Transportation	Pakistan rupees					6,008.64	1,247.90			6,008.64	1,247.90
Pual J. Cotter:											
England	Pound (1 Pd. = \$2.40)	25/17/8	62.11	4/15/0	11.40	5/5/0	12.59	1/5/0	3.00	37/2/8	89.10
Germany	D-Mark (4 DM = \$1.00)	197.45	49.35	114.60	28.65	20.00	5.00	26.00	6.50	358.00	89.50
France	Franc (4.95F = \$1.00)	283.80	57.33	66.53	13.44	9.15	1.85	17.32	3.50	376.80	76.12
Italy	Lira (622L = \$1.00)	42,580	68.46	23,797	38.26	5,906	9.50	7,937	12.75	80,220	128.97
Tunisia	T. Dinar (525D = \$1.00)	8,019	15.27	.499	9.52	.787	1.50	1.575	3.00	15.375	29.29
Turkey	T. Lira (9L = \$1.00)	245.00	27.22	68.04	7.56	15.74	1.75	42.72	4.75	371.50	41.28
Lebanon	L. Pound (L. Pd. 3.165 = \$1.00)	137.050	43.30	50.007	15.80	5.064	1.60	8.167	2.58	200.30	63.28
Pakistan	P. Rupee (7 Rp. = \$1.00)	332.12	47.31	84.00	12.00			22.04	3.15	437.25	62.46
India	I. Rupee (7.60 Rp. = \$1.00)	877.63	115.48	465.87	61.30	89.30	11.75	110.20	14.50	1,543.00	203.03
Thailand	Baht (20.67B = \$1.00)	828.40	40.08	304.96	14.75	1,431.00	69.23	69.04	3.34	2,633.40	127.40
Hong Kong	HK Dollar (HK\$6.105 = \$1.00)	285.24	46.72	161.88	26.52	10.99	1.80	27.27	4.46	485.35	79.50
Philippines	Peso (3.9125P = \$1.00)	107.28	27.42	56.74	14.50	5.87	1.50	21.99	5.62	191.88	49.04
Japan	Yen (360Y = \$1.00)	13,860	38.50	6,030	16.75	1,188	3.30	2,372	6.59	23,450	65.14
International transportation (airline ticket)	Indian Rupees					12,220.42	1,607.95			12,220.42	1,607.95
Gene E. Godley:											
Vietnam	Piasters	13,522	114.58	3,116	28.42			944	8.00	17,700	151.00
Thailand	Baht	1,202	58.15	1,131	54.70	397	19.20	374	18.00	3,100	150.05
Hong Kong	Dollar	618.85	101.28	303.21	50.57	33.61	5.50	18.38	3.00	974	160.35
German	Marks					7,529	1,877.12			7,529	1,877.12
Defense expenditures in Vietnam								51.49			51.49
Joe E. Gonzales:											
Argentina	Pesos	17,700	50.57	12,250	35.00	3,500	10.00	4,049	11.57	37,449	107.14
Uruguay	Pesos	10,925	43.70	7,500	30.00	2,000	8.00	1,412	5.65	21,837	87.35
Brazil	New Cruzeiros	100	26.21	35	8.50					135	34.71
Paraguay	Guaranis			630	5.00			370	3.00	1,000	8.00
Peru	Soles	524	11.80	444	10.00	132	3.00	119	2.11	1,220	26.91
Bolivia	Pesos	261	21.75	159	13.11			35	2.90	455	37.76
Ecuador	Suces	1,025	51.25	680	24.88			45	2.57	1,749	78.70
Transportation	German marks					2,591	645.97			2,591	645.97
William H. Jordan, Jr.:											
Hong Kong, British Crown Colony	Hong Kong dollar	96	15.71	82.15	13.45	21	3.43	1,135	1.86	210.50	34.45
Do	U.S. dollars								4.25		4.25
South Vietnam	Piastres	13,366	113.27	2,912	24.68			962	8.15	17,240	146.10
Do	U.S. dollars				22.75						22.75
Thailand	Baht	1,190	57.57	965	46.69			40.50	1.96	2,195.50	106.22
Do	U.S. dollars								3.25		3.25
Indonesia	Rupiah	21,320	52.25	4,651	11.40	40.30	9.88	1,274	3.12	31,275	76.65
Singapore	U.S. dollars		14.00		12.65		13.50		1.20	41.35	41.35
Philippines	Peso	193.49	49.48	215.56	55.13			1,850	4.73	42,755	109.34
Korea	Korean won	12,100	44.00	5,420	19.71			1,250	4.54	18,770	68.25
Japan	Yen	30,880	85.77	23,597	65.54	4,925	13.68	2,950	8.19	62,350	173.18
Do	U.S. dollars				16.50						16.50
San Francisco	U.S. dollars		12.00		12.25			6.70			32.35
Washington, D.C.	do							5.70			5.70
Transportation (airline ticket)	Marks					7,841.60	1,647.52				1,647.52
William J. Kennedy:											
Brazil	Cruzeiros	176	55.00	227.2	71.00	32	10.00	448	14.00	480	150.00
Argentina	Pesos	8,750	25.00	11,550	33.00	5,950	17.00	8,750	25.00	35,000	100.00
Transportation	Cruzeiros					5,060				5,060	
Do	Deutschemarks					1,680	2,000.83			1,680	2,000.83
Brazil	Cruzeiros	77.95	21.25	276.02	75.25	118.11	32.20	98.30	26.80	570.38	155.50
Republic of South Africa	Rands	64	89.50	53	72.80	15	19.75	12	17.95	144	200.00
Angola	Escudos			480	15.00	328	10.25	203	6.35	1,011	31.60
Liberia	do			202	6.30	181	5.65	206	6.45	589	18.40
Sierra Leone	Leoni			13.5	16.25	6.2	7.40	12.4	14.85	32.1	38.50
Senegal	do			15.6	18.75	7.7	9.25	7.5	9.00	30.8	37.00
Madeira Island	do			17.7	21.25	6.0	7.25	5.4	6.50	29.1	35.00
Transportation	Cruzeiros					12,790.8	3,523.64			12,790.8	3,523.64

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
J. S. Kimmitt:											
Germany	D.M.	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19063	30.60	11438	18.36	5719	9.18	1906	3.06	38127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Albert A. Lakeland:											
England	Pounds	39.1.6	95.00	26	63.00	4.4	10.00	2.4	5.20	71.96	173.20
Germany	Marks	117.70	29.42	6100	15.25	2000	5.00	1132	2.83	210.02	52.50
Italy	Lira	15,990	25.75	17,150	27.45	9,345	15.00	3,115	5.00	45,600	73.20
Italy	Lira (paid by U.S. Embassy in Rome)					4,950	7.96			4,950	7.96
Germany	Marks (air transportation)					2,660.20	668.22			2,660.20	668.22
Guy G. McConnell:											
U.S.S.R.	Ruble=\$1.11	259.46	288.00	105.86	117.50	81.08	90.00	51.35	57.00	497.75	552.50
Ireland	Pound=\$2.40	28.14.7	68.95	28.7.10	68.14	38.7.2	92.06	3.4.6	7.74	98.14.1	236.89
United Kingdom	Pounds and U.S. dollars		92.13	58.17.9	160.60	23.1.3	55.35	7.12.9	18.33	89.11.9	326.41
Air travel; Washington, Moscow, intermediate points, and return.											
	Netherlands, Guider=\$.27579					4,052.43	1,117.62			4,052.43	1,117.62
James Minotto:											
Panama	U.S. dollars		15.00		3.50		1.00		2.00		21.50
Brazil	N. cruzieros	1,008	315.00	853	266.56	90	28.13	184	57.50	2,135	667.19
Uruguay	Pesos	14,500	58.41	14,633	59.04	1,241	5.00	1,986	8.00	32,360	130.45
Paraguay	Guaranies	3,780	30.00	2,625	20.84	630	5.00	528	4.00	7,563	59.84
Argentina	Pesos	86,450	247.00	67,130	191.80	4,200	12.00	11,340	32.40	169,120	483.20
Chile	Escudos	2,290	286.61	1,980	247.81	120	15.00	253	31.68	4,643	581.10
Peru	Soles	2,502	57.52	2,296	52.78	150	3.45	520	12.00	5,465	125.75
Venezuela	Bolivars	714.85	159.38	399.70	89.12	49.34	11.00	69.52	15.50	1,233.41	275.00
Trinidad	U.S. dollars		13.47		13.99		10.00		4.00		41.46
Guyana	do		25.38		23.35		5.13		4.15		58.01
Trinidad	do		28.60		21.70		4.50		7.10		61.90
Barbados	do		14.67		13.48		2.00		2.50		32.65
Dominican Republic	Pesos	114.75	114.75	74.50	74.50	11.25	11.25	9.00	9.00	290.50	209.50
Jamaica	U.S. dollars		65.28		54.00		13.20		8.58		141.06
Panama	do		56.40		53.85		7.00		16.95		134.20
Costa Rica	Colones	304	41.26	225	30.52	50	6.78	55	7.46	634	86.02
Nicaragua	Cordobas	99.50	14.22	60.50	8.64	28	4.00	15	3.14	210	30.00
Honduras	Lempiras			18	9.00	15	7.50	42	21.00	75	37.50
El Salvador	Colones	123	49.20	110	44.00	15	6.00	10	4.00	258	103.20
Guatemala	Quetzales	42	42.00	43	43.00	9	9.00	6	6.00	100	100.00
Panama	U.S. dollars		12.00		11.75		218.00		4.00		245.75
Mexico	do		101.88		91.72		26.00		10.00		229.60
Puerto Rico	do								5.00		5.00
Transportation	do						186.60				186.60
Do	German marks						2,493.30				2,493.30
Vorley M. Rexroad:											
Belgium	Belgium franc	1,000	20.00	450	9.00	850	17.00	200	4.00	2,500	50.00
Germany	Mark	160	40.00	380	95.00	4,122.80	1,028.15	60	15.00	4,722.80	1,178.15
Italy	Lira	31,200	50.00	37,440	60.00	18,720	30.00	6,240	10.00	93,600	150.00
Spain	Peseta	6,275	90.00	6,120	95.00	690	10.00	340	5.00	13,925	200.00
Portugal	Escudo	1,430	50.00	1,144	40.00	143	5.00	143	5.00	2,860	100.00
England	Pound	29	70.00	31	75.00			2	5.00	62	150.00
Expenses in United States	Dollar								42.86		42.86
Raymond L. Schafer:											
United Kingdom	English pound	35-12-1	84.90	34-0-3	81.10	30-6-7	72.32	9-9-7	22.60	109-8-6	260.92
Ireland	Irish pound	32-13-6	78.00	18-15-0	44.76	28-18-6	69.05	7-6-7	17.50	87-13-7	209.31
Denmark	Danish krona	740.80	98.80	554.85	74.00	927.04	123.64	161.96	21.60	2,384.65	318.04
Germany	Deutsche marks	273.40	68.35	215.00	53.75	61.80	15.45	49.80	12.45	600.00	150.00
Netherlands	Guilders	241.64	67.20	199.72	55.54	46.03	12.80	32.61	9.07	520.00	144.61
France	French francs	425.32	86.80	371.66	75.85	144.11	29.41	116.13	23.70	1,057.22	215.76
Italy	Lira	80,814	130.10	66,589	107.20	91,653	147.55	20,374	32.80	259,430	417.65
Turkey	do	706.50	78.50	513.00	57.00	41.40	4.60	89.10	9.90	1,350.00	150.00
Lebanon	Pounds	325.80	103.20	227.94	72.20	40.72	12.90	36.94	11.70	631.40	200.00
Israel	Israel pounds	347.38	99.25	224.17	64.05	4,167.31	1,190.66	62.30	17.80	4,801.16	1,371.76
Greece	Drachmus	3,709	123.63	2,359	78.65	965	32.15	447	14.90	7,480	249.33
Spain	Pesetas	1,216.92	174.60	8,859.57	127.11	2,003.87	28.75	1,847.05	26.50	24,880.11	356.96
Portugal	Escudos	2,825.24	98.75	1,931.18	67.50	546.45	19.10	419.13	14.65	5,722.00	200.00
Mexico	Pesos	1,856.01	148.60	1,090.75	87.33	760.99	60.96	470.25	37.65	4,178.00	334.54
Transportation	U.S. dollars						493.06				493.06
William Spell:											
Germany	D.M.	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	6,250	125.00	3,750	75.00	1,875	37.50	625	12.50	12,500	250.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Mary L. Vaughan:											
England	Pound (1 Pd.=2.40)	25/17/8	62.11	4/15/0	11.40	5/5/0	12.59	1/5/0	3.00	37/2/8	89.10
Germany	D-Mark (4 DM=\$1.00)	197.45	49.35	114.60	28.65	20.00	5.00	26.00	6.50	358.00	89.50
France	Franc (4.95F=\$1.00)	283.80	57.33	66.53	13.44	9.15	1.85	17.32	3.50	376.80	76.12
Italy	Lira (622L=\$1.00)	42,580	68.46	23,797	38.26	5,906	9.50	7,937	12.75	80,220	128.97
Tunisia	Dinar (.525D=\$1.00)	8,019	15.27	.499	9.52	.787	1.50	1.575	3.00	15,375	29.29
Turkey	T. Lira (9L=\$1.00)	245.00	27.22	68.04	7.56	15.74	1.75	42.72	4.75	371.50	41.28
Lebanon	L. pound (L Pd. 3.165=\$1.00)	137.050	43.20	50.007	15.80	5.064	1.60	8.167	2.58	200.30	63.28
Pakistan	P. rupee (7 Rp.=\$1.00)	332.12	47.31	84.00	12.00			22.04	3.15	437.25	62.46
India	I. rupee (7.60 Rp.=\$1.00)	877.63	115.48	465.87	61.30	89.30	11.75	110.20	14.50	1,543.00	203.03
Thailand	Baht (20.67B=\$1.00)	828.40	40.08	304.96	14.75	31.00	1.50	69.04	3.34	1,233.40	59.67
Hong Kong	H.K. dollar (HK \$6.105=\$1.00)	285.24	46.72	161.88	26.52	32.64	5.34	27.27	4.46	507.00	83.04
Philippines	Peso (3.9125P=\$1.00)	107.28	27.42	56.74	14.50	5.87	1.50	21.99	5.62	191.88	49.04
Japan	Yen (360Y=\$1.00)	13,860	38.50	6,030	16.75	1,188	4.30	2,372	6.59	23,450	66.14
International transportation (air-line ticket)	Indian rupees					12,220.42	1,607.95			12,220.42	1,607.95
Total			9,247.87		6,946.13		33,741.29		2,362.77		52,298.06

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent).....	49,897.27
Appropriated funds:	
Government department:	
Defense Department.....	480.60
State Department.....	1,269.13
Agriculture Department.....	493.06
AID.....	158.00
Total.....	52,298.06

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations.

Mar. 31, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Stephen M. Young:											
Hawaii	United States		31.20		30.50				28.30		90.00
Japan	Yen			7,560	21.00			10,440	29.00	180.00	50.00
Hong Kong	HK\$	137.50	22.65	242.80	40.00			226.71	37.35	607.01	100.00
Thailand	Baht	6.60	32.00	721.70	35.00			639.22	31.00	98.00	98.00
Laos	Kip			10,000	20.00			15,000	30.00	25,000	50.00
Vietnam	Piaster			3,540	30.00			2,242	19.00	57.82	49.00
Israel	Pounds	42.35	12.00	87.50	25.00			77.00	22.00	206.85	59.00
Airline ticket	Israeli pounds					7,983.	1,993.44			7,983.22	1,993.44
Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr.:											
Italy	Lira	5,100	8.17	6,100	9.78					11,200	17.95
Greece	Drachma	478	15.93	122	4.07					600	20.00
United Arab Republic	Pounds	15.50	27.93	11.05	19.91					26,550	47.84
Turkey	Lira	140	15.55	146	16.22					286	31.77
Harry P. Byrd Jr.:											
Cyprus	Pounds	7.634	18.47	2.696	6.53					10,330	25.00
Israel	do	109.10	31.17	97.90	27.97					207	59.14
West Germany	Marks					5,437.36	1,359.00			5,437.36	1,359.00
Jack R. Miller:											
Singapore	Singapore dollar	189.65	63.22	90.00	30.00	21.00	7.00	38.35	12.78	339.00	113.00
Lebanon	LL	43.25	13.65					15.10	4.75	58.35	18.40
Israel	IL	118.80	34.00	87.50	25.00	7,491.75	2,140.50	11.95	3.30	7,720.50	2,202.80
West Germany	Marks	55.00	13.75	12.00	3.00			23.00	5.75	90.00	22.50
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	101.85	22.72			16.40	3.67	288.25	64.33
Brazil	Cruzeiro	240.26	75.05	98.71	30.50	69.33	21.69	57.70	17.90	466.00	143.14
Argentina	Peso	23,315	66.70	13,540	38.75	6,807	19.45	7,549	21.60	51,211	146.50
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	296.70	43.30			151.30	22.05	777.40	113.40
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	917.40	23.40			570.10	14.65	2,368.90	60.50
Panama	Dollar		37.50		26.40				5.30		69.20
Senator Jack R. Miller: Panama											
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	120.00	46.89	172.06	38.40			63.00	14.05	445.06	99.34
Brazil	Cruzeiro	272.96	85.25	228.83	71.05	69.33	21.69	47.25	14.78	618.37	192.77
Argentina	Peso	26,454	75.85	5,915	16.90	6,807	19.45	1,100	3.15	40,276	115.35
Chile	Escudo	462.48	67.45	343.88	50.20	135.70	19.80	83.23	12.15	1,025.29	149.60
Peru	Sol		230		5.90			155	3.95	385	9.85
Panama	Dollar		45.00		39.05				5.85		89.90
Senator Robert C. Byrd:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	79.28	17.70					249.28	55.64
Brazil	Cruzeiro	354.66	110.80	197.82	61.82	69.33	21.69	621.81	17.90	621.81	194.31
Germany	DM					13,221	339.00			13,221	339.00
Stuart P. French:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	35,027	128.00	61.57	22.50	7,484	27.35	100,397	366.88
Japan	Yen	69,433	192.87	53,460	148.50	10,080	28.00	11,520	32.00	144,493	401.37
Stuart P. French, airline fare	Deutsche marks					6,466	1,616.50			6,466	1,616.50
Ben Gilles:											
Germany	Marks	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	6,250	125.00	3,750	75.00	1,875	37.50	625	12.50	12,500	250.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Col. Paul B. Henley:											
Italy	Lira	5,100	8.17	4,000	6.41			2,100	3.67	11,200	17.95
Greece	Drachma	478	15.93	122	4.07			200	6.37	800	26.67
United Arab Republic	Pounds	15.50	27.93	11.05	19.91					26,550	47.84
Turkey	Lira	140	15.55	119	13.22			27	3.00	286	31.77
Cyprus	Pounds	7.634	18.47	2.697	6.53					10,331	25.00
Israel	do	109.10	31.17	87.90	25.11			10.00	2.86	207	59.14
West Germany	Marks					5,437.36	1,359.00			5,437.36	1,359.00
Col. Paul B. Henley, West Germany											
Gordon A. Nease:											
Belgium	B. Francs	1,000	20.00	450	9.00	850	17.00	200	4.00	2,500	50.00
Germany	Marks	160	40.00	380	95.00	4,122.80	1,028.15	60	15.00	4,722.80	1,178.15
Italy	Lira	31,200	50.00	37,440	60.00	18,720	30.00	6,240	10.00	93,600	150.00
Spain	Pesetas	6,275	90.00	6,620	95.00	690	10.00	340	5.00	13,925	200.00
Portugal	Escudos	1,430	50.00	1,144	40.00	143	5.00	143	5.00	2,860	100.00
England	Pounds	29	70.00	31	75.00			2	5.00	62	150.00
Lt. Col. James F. Senechal:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	12,220	44.66	4,800	17.54	4,880	17.83	73,629	269.06
Japan	Yen	69,432	192.87	6,550	18.19	3,340	9.53	3,080	8.55	82,492	229.14
Deutsche marks (airline fare)						6,700	1,660.50			6,700	1,660.50
Gen. Samuel R. Shaw:											
Korea	Won	51,729	189.03	36,397	133.00	6,157	22.50	6,799	24.85	101,082	369.38
Japan	Yen	69,433	192.87	55,269	153.50	10,530	29.25	10,980	30.50	146,203	406.12
Deutsche marks (airline fare)						6,466	1,616.50			6,466	1,616.50
Gen. Samuel R. Shaw, airline fare											
Jack Stempler:											
Germany	Marks	211.80	52.95	373	93.25	179.70	44.94	45.60	11.30	809.70	202.44
Belgium	Francs	5,850	117.00	3,510	70.20	1,755	35.10	585	11.70	11,700	234.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	37.2	89.45	22.3	53.66	11.1	26.84	3.7	8.95	74.5	178.90
Italy	Lira	19,063	30.60	11,438	18.36	5,719	9.18	1,906	3.06	38,127	61.20
France	Francs	247.50	49.90	148.50	29.90	74.25	14.95	24.75	4.95	495	99.70
Cdr. Gordon R. West:											
Japan	Yen			9,000	25.00			9,000	25.00	1,800	50.00
Hong Kong	HK\$	139.61	23.00	2,428	40.00			224.59	37.00	607	100.00
Thailand	Baht	660	32.00	721.70	35.00			639.22	31.00	2,020.76	98.00
Laos	Kip			10,000	20.00			15,000	30.00	25,000	50.00
Vietnam	Piaster			5,782	30.00			2,242	19.00	8,024	49.00
Israel	Pounds	42.35	12.00	87.50	25.00			77.00	22.00	206.50	59.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Comdr. Gordon R. West, airline fare	Israeli pound					7,983.22	1,993.44			7,983.22	1,993.44
Total			3,424.28		2,625.71		15,692.54		808.03		22,550.56

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	22,481.36	Amount
Other Legislative Reorganization Act	69.20	
Total	22,550.56	

 JOHN C. STENNIS,
 Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

Mar. 14, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator Edward W. Brooke:											
Germany	DM					6,624.40	1,654.45			6,624.40	1,654.45
Ivory Coast	CFAF			14,700	60.00			9800	40.00	24,500	100.00
Ghana	¢			61.30	60.00	40.70	40.00	51.06	50.00	153.06	150.00
Tanzania	Tsh			355.48	50.00	300.00	42.60	355.47	50.00	1,010.95	142.60
Kenya	KSh	600	80.00	300	50.00			165	20.00	1,065	150.00
Total			80.00		220.00		1,737.05		160.00		2,197.05
Clarence Elam:											
Germany	DM					6,680.40	1,668.43			6,680.40	1,668.43
Guinea	GFr					12,000	48.68				
Ivory Coast	CFAF	14,700	60.00	4,900	20.00			4,900	20.00	24,500	100.00
Ghana	¢	76.20	75.00	30.80	35.00	14.80	14.62	30.00	34.13	151.80	158.71
Clarence Elam:											
Nigeria	N			20,100	40.00	9,000	19.98	7,000	15.00	36,100	74.98
Congo	CZ	25	50.00	7.50	15.00	6.50	13.00			39.00	78.00
Zambia	ZK	75.00	100.00	40.00	60.00	62.50	869.28	26.16	40.00	761.66	1,069.28
Tanzania	Tsh	450.00	65.00			650.95	90.38			1,100.95	155.38
Kenya	KSh	600.00	80.00	300.00	50.00	570.00	80.46	165.00	20.00	1,635.00	230.46
Total			430.00		220.00		2,804.83		129.13		3,583.96
Marilyn Dexheimer:											
Germany	DM					6,624.40	1,654.45			6,624.40	1,654.45
Ivory Coast	CFAF	14,700.00	60.00	4,900.00	20.00			4,900.00	20.00	24,500.00	100.00
Ghana	¢	76.50	75.00	25.50	25.00	20.40	20.00	30.66	30.00	153.06	150.00
Congo	CZ	25.00	50.00	7.50	15.00	6.50	13.00			39.00	78.00
Tanzania	Tsh					655.48	92.60	355.47	50.00	1,010.95	142.60
Kenya	KSh	600.00	80.00	300.00	50.00			165.00	20.00	1,065.00	150.00
Total			265.00		110.00		1,780.05		120.00		2,275.05
Walter F. Mondale:											
Belgium	BF	600.00	12.00	225.00	4.50					825.00	16.50
United Kingdom	L	16.66	39.18	19,100	46.80	18,566	43.86	4,193	11.91	59,133	141.75
France	Fr	414.00	84.49	474.03	96.74	193.16	39.42	143.81	29.35	1,225.00	250.00
Switzerland	SwF	138.00	31.79	246.30	56.75	398.80	91.89	223.30	51.46	1,006.40	231.89
Austria	S	205.25	7.96	82.50	3.20	765.96	29.70	561.29	21.66	1,615.00	62.52
Romania	Lei	576.00	48.49	475.00	39.98			258.00	21.72	1,309.00	110.19
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	54.00	60.00	38.00	42.22			37.45	41.61	129.45	143.83
Senator Walter F. Mondale:											
Poland	Zl	370.60	5.70	2,600.00	40.00	2,242.50	34.50	1,286.90	19.80	6,500.00	100.00
Germany	DM					5,146.58	1,337.05			5,146.58	1,337.05
Total			289.61		330.19		1,576.42		197.51		2,393.73
Duane C. Scribner:											
Belgium	BF	600.00	12.00	195.00	3.40					795.00	15.40
United Kingdom	Pound	16.66	39.18	18,804	44.20	16,011	38.41	8,604	19.96	59,133	141.75
France	Fr	414.00	84.49	398.86	81.40	193.16	39.42	218.98	44.69	1,225.00	250.00
Switzerland	SwF	138.00	31.79	227.45	52.40	390.60	90.00	242.23	55.81	988.24	230.00
Austria	S	205.25	7.96	75.50	2.93	759.77	29.46	574.48	22.17	1,615.00	62.52
Romania	Lei	576.00	48.49	443.00	37.29			263.00	22.13	1,282.00	107.91
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	36.00	40.00	32.00	35.56			61.45	68.27	129.45	143.83
Duane C. Scribner: Germany:											
Germany	DM					5,146.58	1,337.04			5,146.58	1,337.04
Total			263.91		257.18		1,534.33		233.03		2,288.45
Carl A. S. Coan:											
Australia	A\$	141.50	157.82	86.85	96.86	14.00	15.61	44.79	49.96	287.14	320.25
Philippines	Peso	225.24	57.58	122.61	31.35	26.00	6.64	56.15	14.36	430.00	109.93
Taiwan	NT\$	2,200.00	55.00	345.00	8.63	210.00	5.25	445.00	11.12	3,200.00	80.00
Hong Kong	HK\$	332.20	54.41	137.00	22.44	18.00	2.95	106.70	17.48	593.90	97.28
Thailand	Baht	880.00	42.58	114.40	5.53	122.00	5.90	225.60	10.91	1,342.00	64.92
India	Rupee	474.48	70.33	240.55	35.65	12.50	1.85	32.47	4.81	760.00	112.64
Pakistan	do	180.00	25.66	89.90	12.81	21.50	3.06	40.10	5.72	331.50	47.20
Italy	Lira	80,480	129.18	29,120	46.75	24.00	3.85	12,600	20.22	124,600	200.05

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Carl A. S. Coan:											
Tunisia	Dinar	15,330	29.20	10,945	20.85			20,225	5.52	46,500	88.57
United Kingdom	£	2,315	57.00	1,410.0	34.80	1,050.0	25.80	93.0	21.96	583	139.56
Germany	DM					5,759.60	1,435.95			5,759.60	1,435.95
Total			678.76		315.67		1,506.86		195.06		2,696.35
Senator Charles H. Percy:											
Germany	Dollars							67.20			67.20
France	Francs	1,210.82	249.50	504.18	100.50	1,852.31		372.40		3,567.31	722.40
Total			249.50		100.50		439.60				789.60
Senator Edward V. Long:											
Japan	Yen	25,841	71.80	36,720	102.00	27.00	75.00	72.00	20.00	96,761	268.8
Hong Kong	H.K.\$	336.17	55.00	305.25	50.00	244.20	40.00	213.68	35.00	1,099.30	180.00
Senator Edward V. Long:											
Thailand	Baht	14.33	69.25	1,240	60.00	723	35.00	620	30.00	4,016	194.25
India	Rupees	475.80	62.60	516.85	68.00	342	45.00	243.20	32.00	1,577.85	207.60
Nepal	do	311.88	31.00					155.40	15.00	467.28	46.00
Afghanistan	Afghanis	573	8.00	143	2.00			375.50	5.00	1,091.50	15.00
Iran	Rials	2,491	33.00	830	11.00	375	5.00	750	7.50	4,446	56.50
Lebanon	LL	9,480	30.00	110.60	35.00	79	25.00	31.60	10.00	316	100.00
Turkey	Liras	729.00	81.00	450.00	50.00	247.50	27.50	135.00	15.00	1,561.50	173.55
Italy	Lire	78,498	126.00	623.00	100.00	373.80	60.00	186.90	30.00	196,868	316.00
Spain	Pesetas	2,506	36.00	2,088	30.00	1,392	20.00	835	12.00	6,821	98.00
Germany	Marks	289.55	72.35	280.00	70.00	120.00	30.00	72.00	18.00	761.55	190.30
England	Pounds	42.32.7	101.00	25.16.0	60.00	10.00	24.00	7.00	16.80	84.48.0	201.80
Senator Edward V. Long:											
France	Franc	506.00	102.00	388.00	78.00	187.00	37.50	124.00	25.00	1,205.00	242.50
Switzerland	Swiss franc	180.50	42.00	257.85	60.00	128.93	30.00	85.95	20.00	653.23	152.00
Denmark	Danish kroner	582.93	77.60	232.87	31.00	157.75	21.00	112.68	15.00	108.623	144.60
Sweden	Swedish kroner	165.12	32.00	51.60	10.00			25.80	5.00	242.52	47.00
Norway	Norwegian kroner	178.25	25.00	85.56	12.00	49.91	7.00	71.30	10.00	385.02	54.00
Netherlands	f					8,091.32	2,084.80			8,091.32	2,084.80
Total			1,055.60		829.00		2,566.80		321.30		4,772.70
Helen Dunlop:											
Japan	Yen	21,276	59.00	18,000	50.00	90.00	25.00	36.00	10.00	51,876	144.00
Hong Kong	H.K.\$	341.88	56.00	152.62	25.00	183.15	30.00	3,663	6.00	714.28	117.00
Thailand	Baht	1,384	67.00	826	40.00	413	20.00	103	5.00	2,726	132.0
Helen Dunlop:											
India	Rupees	292.60	38.50	342.00	45.00	271.32	35.70	76.00	10.00	981.92	129.20
Nepal	do	318.06	31.00							318.06	31.00
Afghanistan	Afghanistan	573	8.00	143	2.00					716	10.00
Iran	Rials	2,475	33.00	750	10.00					3225	43.00
Lebanon	LL	79.00	25.00	63.20	20.00	37.92	12.00	15.80	5.00	195.92	62.00
Turkey	Liras	585.00	65.00	315.00	35.00	198.00	22.00	72.00	8.00	1,170.00	130.00
Italy	Lira	747.60	120.00	467.25	75.00	155.75	25.00	934.5	15.00	1,464.05	235.00
Spain	Pesetas	3,237.33	46.50	1,044.30	15.00	696.20	10.00	522.15	7.50	5,499.98	79.00
Germany	Marks	290.00	72.50	89.80	22.45	80.00	20.00	48.00	12.00	507.80	126.95
England	Pounds	25.19	61.00	20.16	48.00	8	19.20	6	14.40	59.55.0	142.60
France	Franc	340.19	68.45	273.35	55.00	99.40	20.00	2,485	5.00	737.79	148.45
Helen Dunlop:											
Switzerland	Swiss franc	180.49	42.00	171.90	40.00	64.46	15.00	30.08	7.00	446.93	104.00
Denmark	Danish franc	236.62	31.50	187.80	25.00	90.14	12.00	67.60	9.00	582.16	77.50
Sweden	Swedish kroner	103.20	20.00	25.80	5.00					129.10	25.00
Norway	Norwegian kroner	97.68	13.70	71.30	10.00					168.98	23.70
Netherlands	f					7,609.62	2,084.80			7,609.62	2,084.80
Subtotal			858.15		522.45		2,350.70		113.90		3,845.20
Total			4,170.53		2,904.99		16,296.64		1,469.93		24,842.09

RECAPITULATION

Amount

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) \$24,842.09

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency.

Feb. 27, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Barksdale, Thomas:											
Germany	D. Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Hong Kong	H.K.\$	610	100.83	400	66.11	12.70	2.10	209.07	34.56	1,231.77	203.60
Japan	Yen	20,000	55.55	12,000	33.33			4,000	11.12	36,000	100.00
Vietnam	Piastres	13,354	113.17	2,295	19.44			219	1.85	15,868	134.46
Subtotal			269.55		118.88		1,863.74		47.53		2,299.70
Bevan, Donald:											
U.S.S.R.	Rubles	180	199.80	71.30	79.15	43.60	48.40	20.40	22.65	315.30	350.00
Netherlands	DF					5,085.55	1,408.35			5,085.55	1,408.35
Subtotal			199.80		79.15		14,56.75		22.65		1,758.35

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Cotton, Norris: Republic of Panama	U.S.\$		100.00		30.00		517.63		5.85		653.48
Dill, Clarence: U.S.S.R.	Rubles	236	263.00	202.70	225.00	1,338.10	1,486.70	11.09	12.31	1,787.89	1,987.01
Netherlands	DF			56.58	15.63	36.20	10.00			92.78	25.63
Subtotal			263.00		240.63		1,496.70		12.31		2,012.64
Lordan, Frederick: Belgium	BF	5,625	112.50	4,500	90.00	1500	30.00	875	17.50	12,500	250.00
France	Fr	330.75	67.50	274.40	56.00	78.40	16.00	51.45	10.50	735	150.00
Netherlands	DF					2,899.56	802.98			2,899.56	802.98
Subtotal			180.00		146.00		848.98		28.00		1,202.98
Moss, Frank E.: Germany	D. Marks					4,794	1,197.31			4,794	1,197.31
Hong Kong	H.K.\$	610	100.83	400	66.11	412.60	68.54	200	33.06	1,622.60	268.54
Japan	Yen	20,000	55.56	12,000	33.34	12,516	34.77	4,000	11.12	48,516	134.79
U.S.S.R.	Rubles	100	111.11	50	55.56			6	6.66	156	173.33
Netherlands	DG					4,605.20	1,270.05			4,605.20	1,270.05
Subtotal			267.50		155.01		2,570.67		50.84		3,044.02
Scott, Hugh: Denmark	Dkr	144.25	19.25	150	20.00	40.79	5.37	40.79	5.38	375.83	50.00
U.S.S.R.	Rubles	114.40	127.15	114.41	127.15	62.95	69.95	85.70	94.49	377.46	418.74
England	Pounds	33.00	79.20	33.00	79.20			17.15	41.60	83.15	200.00
Netherlands	DF					4,264.36	1,178.00			4,264.36	1,178.00
Subtotal			225.60		226.35		1,253.32		141.47		1,846.74
Trice, J. Mark: Republic of Panama	U.S.\$		100.00		22.00		464.35		5.00		591.35
Total			1,605.45		1,018.02		10,472.14		313.65		13,409.26

*If foreign currency is used, enter U.S.\$ equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. equivalent)	\$12,164.43
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 252	1,244.83
Total	13,409.26

Mar. 24, 1969

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1969

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Hartke (July): England (Local transportation)	Pounds	50.49	120.00	41.17.2	100.00	6.5.7	15.00	6.5.7	15.00	104.13.1	\$250.00
Hartke (December): England	Pounds	31.8.0	75.00	20.18.8	50.00	4.3.9	10.00	6.5.7	15.00	62.16.0	150.00
Belgium	Francs	2,500	50.00	1,500	30.00	250	5.00	750	15.00	5,000	100.00
Netherlands (Local transportation)	Florins	270.65	75.00	180.44	50.00	54.13	15.00	36.09	10.00	541.31	150.00
Switzerland (Local transportation)	Francs	214.95	50.00	128.97	30.00	353.07	97.37	42.99	10.00	353.07	97.37
Austria (Local transportation)	Schilling	2,574	100.00	882.20	30.00	124.50	28.98	386.10	15.00	429.90	100.00
Turkey (Local transportation)	Lira	900	100.00	225.00	25.00	128.70	5.00	90	10.00	124.50	28.98
Total			570.00		315.00		362.21		90.00		1,337.21
Hartke (Dec.): Greece	Drachmas	2,250.00	75.00	1,800.00	60.00	300.00	10.00	150.00	5.00	4,500.00	150.00
Germany	Marks (transportation)					4,697.20	1,171.08			4,697.20	1,171.08
Total			645.00		375.00		1,543.29		95.00		2,658.29

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	\$2,658.29

RUSSELL B. LONG,
Chairman, Committee on Finance.

Feb. 28, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dorothy Fosdick:											
United Kingdom	Pounds	40	96.00	20	48.00	10	24.00	9.8.0	22.56	79.8.0	190.56
Belgium	Belgian francs	3,000	60.00	1,000	20.00	500	10.00	350	7.00	4,850	97.00
Netherlands	Dutch guilder					2,727.40	759.30			2,727.40	759.30
West Germany	Marks					271.45	68.10			271.45	68.10
Subtotal			156.00		68.00		861.40		29.56		1,114.96
Belgium:											
Belgium	Belgian francs	3,500	70.00	3,750	75.00	1,500	30.00	1,250	25.00	10,000	200.00
Netherlands	Guilders	97	26.70	50	13.76	20	5.51	14.63	4.03	181.63	50.00
West Germany	Marks					1,662.56	417.10			1,662.56	417.10
Subtotal			96.70		88.76		452.61		29.03		667.10
Total			252.70		156.76		1,314.01		58.59		1,782.06
Albert A. Lakeland:											
Belgium	Francs	1,775	\$35.25	1,400	\$28.00	475	\$9.50	350	\$7.00	4,000	\$79.75
Italy	Lira	13,230	21.00	17,132	27.50	7,476	12.00	8,722	14.00	46,460	74.50
Germany	Marks			20	5.00					20	5.00
England	Pounds	5.10	13.17	7	17.79	6	14.00	2.4	3.44	20.50	48.40
France	Francs	175	35.00	70	15.00					245	50.00
Subtotal			104.42		93.29		35.50		24.44		257.65
Dr. William O. Farber:											
Belgium	BF	4,000	80.00	3,500	70.00	500	10.00	800	16.00	8,800	176.00
Germany	DM					2,065.40	518.16			2,065.40	518.16
Subtotal			80.00		70.00		528.16		16.00		694.16
Total			184.42		163.29		563.66		40.44		951.81
Senator Joseph M. Montoya:											
Peru	Sol	2,512.09	62.30	887.19	22.00			71.77	1.78	3,470.97	86.08
Bolivia	Peso			355.87	30.00	23.72	2.00	22.06	1.86	401.66	33.86
Argentina	do	38,501.92	110.00	8,001.40	80.00	4,900.24	14.00	1,281.06	3.66	69,184.45	207.66
Brazil	New Cruzeiro	384	120.00	176	55.00	220.19	68.81	19.81	6.19	800.00	250.00
Subtotal			292.30		187.00		84.81		13.49		577.60
Switzerland	Franc	129.64	30.00	108.04	25.00	140.00	32.40	11.28	2.61	388.98	90.01
Germany	Mark	200.00	50.00	104.00	26.00	83.76	20.94	12.16	3.06	400.00	100.00
United Kingdom	Pound	8.7.4	20.00	6.5.6	15.00	46.13.5	111.56	1.8.9	.44	62.15.0	150.00
France	Franc	147.00	30.00	100.01	20.41	977.99	199.59			1,225.00	782.97
Transportation	do					2,651	532.97				532.97
Belgium	do	4,250.00	85.00	2,750	55.00	300.00	6.00	200.00	4.00	7,500.00	150.00
Subtotal					141.41		903.46		13.11		1,272.98
Total			507.30		328.41		988.27		26.60		1,850.58

JOHN L. McCLELLAN,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations.

Mar. 14, 1969.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount \$4,584.45

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Birch Bayh:											
Hong Kong	HK\$	200	33	107	15.33	150	25	94	16	547	89.33
Indonesia	RP	17,760	60	10,468	35.36	4,736	16	4,736	16	37,700	127.36
Japan	Y	21,600	60	8,380	23	1,590	4.42	1,800	5.28	33,370	92.70
Thailand	B	1,175	56	302	15.69			84	4	1,562	75.69
Vietnam	VN\$	31,270	265	12,036	102	2,478	21	1,416	12	47,200	400
Denmark	DKR	960	128	450	60	553.41	73.74	91.70	12	2,055.11	273.74
Norway	NKR	928.20	130	464.10	65	1.100	154.17	34.70	5	2,527	354.17
Germany	DM					7,841.60	1,958.44			7,841.60	1,958.44
Subtotal			732		316.38		2,252.77		70.28		3,371.43
Jason Berman:											
Hong Kong	HK\$	400	66	125	20	300	50	55.50	9.02	880.50	145.02
Indonesia	RP	8,800	30	3,550	11.72					12,352	41.72
Japan	Yen	21,660	60.17	7,200	20			1,140	3.16	30,000	83.33
Thailand	B	1,176	56	567	28	214	11	105	5	2,062	100
Vietnam	VN\$	21,270	265	11,800	100	2,714	23	1,416	12	47,200	400
Germany	DM					8,472.36	2,115.43			8,472.36	2,115.43
Subtotal			477.17		179.72		2,199.43		29.18		2,885.50
John M. Blair:											
United Kingdom	Pound	146.16.5	350	83.18.0	200	67.14.0	161.59	92.12.11	220.84	391.1.2	932.43
Germany	Deutsche mark	995.25	250	398.10	100	3,585.05	900.54	199.05	50.00	5,177.45	1,300.54
Italy	Lira	31,150	50	18,690	30	71,115.45	114.15	12,460	20.00	133,415.45	214.15
Subtotal			650		330		1,176.28		290.84		2,447.12
David Burke:											
Vietnam	VN\$	41,300	350	23,600	200	8,850	75.00	8,850	75.00	82,600	700.00
Philippines		97.5	25	58.5	15	39	10.00			195.85	50.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					8,402.80	2,098.60			8,402.80	2,098.60
Subtotal			375		215		2,183.60		75.00		2,848.60

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Dale S. deHaen:											
Switzerland	Francs	258.90	60	323.625	75	21.575	5.00	43.15	10.00	647.25	150.00
Netherlands	Guilders	205.99	57	234.89	65	50.59	14.00	50.59	14.00	542.06	150.00
United Kingdom	Pounds	45.73.30	110	51.97.03	125	23.47.61	57.78	13.48.35	32.60	134.66	325.38
Germany	DM					3,858.00	963.54			3,858.00	963.54
Subtotal			227		265		1,040.32		56.60		1,588.92
M. Albert Figinski:											
Germany	DM					7,278.31	1,797.56			7,278.31	1,797.56
England	Pounds	116.10.4	279.48	49.10	118.34	15	35.85	22.3.5	55.19	204.3.9	488.86
Chile	Esc	296.38	40.44	643.16	88.40	209.46	28.88	111.26	30.39	1,260.26	188.11
Peru	Sol	2,595.84	66.38	1,908.47	48.81	135.00	3.33	2,616.89	69.45	7,256.20	187.97
Argentina	Pesos	24,565	69.44	17,400	50.71			10,710	30.35	52,675	150.50
Brazil	NCr	224.73	70.23	333.27	104.15	316.21	98.81	261.16	81.61	1,135.37	354.80
Subtotal			525.97		410.41		1,964.43		266.99		3,167.80
John M. Levinson:											
Germany	DM					7,469.44	1,865.49			7,469.44	1,865.49
Vietnam	Piastres	40,120	340	15,930	135	4,130	35.00	8,024	67.63	68,160	577.63
Subtotal			340		135		1,900.49		67.63		2,443.12
Fred M. Mesmer:											
Austria	Schilling	1,161.50	45.10	1,548	60.00	503	19.20	656	25.70	3,868.50	150.00
France	French franc	257	52.74	331	66.98	2,218.56	446.03	147	30.28	2,953.56	596.03
Germany	Mark	256	64.00	352	88.00	2,395.60	597.26	192	48.00	3,195.60	797.26
Greece	Drachma	1,575	52.50	2,025	67.50	360	12.00	540	18.00	4,500.00	150.00
Italy	Lira	31,707.50	51.39	41,052.50	66.52	8,476	13.87	12,214	18.22	93,450	150.00
Netherlands	Guilder	108.13	29.86	146	40.05	37	10.20	72	19.89	363.13	100.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	501.93	116.28	566.28	131.63	1,819	423.42	218.79	52.09	3,106	723.42
United Kingdom	Pound	20	48.00	29.05	70.00	5	12.00	8.10	20.00	62.15	150.00
Subtotal			459.87		590.68		1,533.98		232.18		2,816.71
John Nolan, Jr.:											
Germany	Deutsche mark					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Courtney C. Pace:											
Austria	Schilling	1,161.50	45.10	1,548	60.00	503	19.20	656	25.70	3,868.50	150.00
France	French franc	257	52.74	331	66.98	2,218.56	446.03	147	30.28	2,953.56	596.03
Germany	Mark	256	64.00	352	88.00	2,395.60	597.26	192	48.00	3,195.60	797.26
Greece	Drachma	1,575	52.50	2,025	67.50	360	12.00	540	18.00	4,500.00	150.00
Italy	Lira	31,707.50	51.39	41,052.50	66.52	8,476	13.87	12,214	18.22	93,450	150.00
Netherlands	Guilder	108.13	29.86	146	40.05	37	10.20	72	19.89	363.13	100.00
Switzerland	Swiss franc	501.93	116.28	566.28	131.63	1,819	423.42	218.79	52.09	3,106	723.42
United Kingdom	Pound	20	48.00	29.05	70.00	5	12.00	8.10	20.00	62.15	150.00
Subtotal			459.87		590.68		1,533.98		232.18		2,816.71
Thompson Powers:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	25,960	220	23,600	200	2,950	25.00	12,390	105	64,900	550.00
Japan	Yen						12.80				12.80
Subtotal			220		200		1,899.44		105		2,424.44
E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr.:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	31,913	329	9,821	101.24	3,154	32.51	1,972	19.11	46,860	481.86
Subtotal			329		101.24		1,894.15		19.11		2,343.50
John Sommer:											
Germany	Marks					7,454	1,861.64			7,454	1,861.64
Vietnam	Piastres	86,000	733.30	32,250	275			10,750	91.70	129,000	1,100.00
Subtotal			733.30		275		1,861.64		91.70		2,961.64
Julien G. Sourwine: Germany											
	Mark	48.05	9.81	143.50	29.28	3,459.95	858.17	50.35	10.28	3,701.85	907.54
Joseph D. Tydings:											
Germany	Mark					4,184	1,044.96	1,975.47	483	6,159.47	1,527.96
France	Francs	316.72	64.64	329.09	67.16	660.85	132.86	89.19	18.20	1,395.85	282.86
England	Pounds	65.16.8	157.40	74.12.6	179.10	134.1.3	319.65	26.16.10	63.50	301.7.3	719.65
Chile	Esc	490.53	73.05	517	77.00			106.22	15.73	1,113.75	165.78
Peru	Sol	2,509.74	64.69	2,908.47	74.83			3,031.79	77.84	8,450	217.36
Argentina	Pesos	32,265	92.09	16,843	48.22			3,567	10.19	52,675	150.50
Brazil	NCr	345.06	108.56	417.74	130.69			184	56.62	946.80	295.87
Subtotal			560.43		577.00		1,497.47		725.08		3,359.98
Total			6,099.42		4,215.39		25,657.79		2,272.05		38,244.65

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount \$38,244.65

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Spong, William B., Jr.:											
England	Pounds	£31.15.0	76.83	£29.10.0	70.75	£1.0.0	2.42			£62.5.0	150.00
Sweden	Kroner	208.00	40.33	158.00	30.61	280.00	54.16			646.00	125.10
Germany	Deutsche mark	100.00	25.00			747.20	186.61	91.12	22.80	938.32	234.41
Total			142.16		101.36		243.19		22.80		509.51

1 Excess baggage charges.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount \$509.51

Feb. 10, 1969.

JENNINGS RANDOLPH,
Chairman, Committee on Public Works, U.S. Senate.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gordon F. Harrison:											
Great Britain	£	48	\$115.20	35	\$84.00	26,11.11	\$39.85	5.2.9	\$11.92	98.2.9	\$250.97
Air transportation, Washington to London and return.	DM					1,727.20	431.37			1,727.20	431.37
Subtotal			115.20		84.00		471.22		11.92		682.34
William M. Cochrane:											
Germany	DM	16	4.00	142	35.50	20	5.00	25	6.25	203	50.75
Italy	Lire	44,000	70.62	41,000	65.82	2,000	3.21	10,000	16.05	97,000	155.70
England	£	10	24.00	15	36.00	5	12.00	4	9.60	34	81.60
Air travel	DM						930.70				930.70
Subtotal			98.62		137.32		950.61		31.90		1,218.75
John F. Haley:											
Germany	DM	78	19.50	165	41.25	66	16.50	69	17.25	378	94.50
Italy	Lire	55,000	88.00	52,500	84.00	14,000	22.40	15,000	24.00	136,500	218.40
England	£	16	38.40	15	36.00	11	26.40	6	14.40	48	115.20
Air travel	DM						930.70			3,723	930.70
Subtotal			145.90		161.25		996.00		55.65		1,358.80
Total			359.72		382.57		2,418.13		99.47		3,259.89

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent) Amount \$3,259.89

Feb. 28, 1969.

B. EVERETT JORDAN,
Chairman, Committee on Rules and Administration.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
H. Agnew:											
Germany	D. Marks	210.00	50.00	296.00	70.00	4,311.00	*1,075.43	4.00	9.60	4,821.00	1,205.03
Turkey	T. Lira	314.00	35.00	583.00	65.00	18.00	2.00	45.00	5.00	960.00	107.00
Greece	Drachmas	1,045.00	35.00	1,495.00	50.00	60.00	2.00	209.00	7.00	2,809.00	94.00
Italy	Lire	12,500.00	20.00	9,400.00	15.00					21,900.00	35.00
England	Pounds	28.6	40.00	28.6	40.00	3.6	5.00	3.9	5.40	64.7	90.40
J. B. Anderson:											
Korea	Won	6,924	25.00	8,260	30.00	2,214	8.36	2,762	10.00	20,160	73.36
Vietnam	Piastres	19,780	168.00	8,000	68.00			2,000	16.37	29,780	252.37
Thailand	Baht	1,280	64.00	1,390	69.50	280	14.00	350	17.50	3,300	165.00
W. F. Bennett:											
Peru	Soles	2,225	50.00	1,869	42.77	6,002	138.61	223	5.00	10,319	236.38
Argentina	Pesos	23,100	66.00	8,529	24.00					31,629	90.00
Brazil	Cruzeiros	350.20	90.00	103.00	26.00			14.30	8.15	467.50	124.15
Colombia	Pesos	1,068	63.00	571	34.83			175	10.00	1,814	107.83
Germany	D. Marks					4,018	*1,014.00			4,018	1,014.00
J. T. Conway:											
U.S.S.R.	Rubles	135.00	146.00	165.00	180.00	200.00	222.22	10	10.00	501.00	558.22
Austria	A. Schillings	1,155.00	45.00	900.00	35.00	258.00	10.00	258.00	10.00	2,571.00	100.00
Switzerland	S. Franc	80	18.50	90	20.50	22	5.50	22	5.50	214	50.00
U.K.	Pounds	12.2	17.00	9.3	13.00	7.2	10.00	7.2	10.00	35.9	50.00
Germany	D. Marks					4,598.40	1,153.64*			4,598.40	1,153.64
Austria	A. Schillings	1,328.00	51.79	900.00	35.23	5,050.00	196.27	129.00	5.00	7,407.00	288.29
B. B. Hickenlooper:											
France	Franc	366.85	74.87	100.00	20.41	62.90	12.65	34.00	7.00	563.75	114.93
Belgium	B. Franc	.855	17.00	.300	6.50			25	.50	1,180.00	24.00
Germany	D. Marks					3,567.00	889.45*			3,567.00	889.45
T. G. Morris:											
Korea	Won	13,004	48.00	10,246	37.00	1,345	5.00	2,770	10.00	27,365	100.00
Vietnam	VN \$	16,982	143.44	8,558	73.00	1,180	10.00	1,180	10.00	27,900	236.44
Thailand	Baht	1,059.60	50.33	1,500	71.25	450	21.37	368.40	20.78	3,378	163.73

See footnote at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
C. Hosmer:											
Korea	Won	9,000	32.00	6,200	22.00			1,365	6.07	16,565	60.07
Vietnam	Piastres	16,067	136.00	9,753	82.81			1,180	10.00	27,000	228.81
Thailand	Baht	1,064	52.00	1,609	76.91		200	10.00	200	10.00	148.91
Austria	A. Schillings	1,932	75.00	1,672	65.00		4,020	156.24	260	10.00	3,073
Germany	D. Marks	120.00	30.00	90	22.50	4,882.00	1,223.89	40	10.00	7,884	306.26
England	Pounds	14,00.0	40.00	9.11.9	26.00		2,02.2	5.00	1.01.1	26.15.2	74.96
Colombia	Soles	650	38.00	1,008	60.00		168	10.00	94	3.96	113.53
Peru	Esc.	2,826.50	63.00	3,238.50	72.36		890	20.00	445	10.00	165.36
Chile	Pesos	508.10	59.00	177.00	20.00			51.40	6.44	736.50	85.44
Argentina	Cruzeiros	35,868	102.00	22,132	63.71	3,500	10.00	3,500	10.00	65,000	185.71
Brazil	Cruzeiros	39,070	105.29	28,435	76.50	3,740	10.00	3,740	10.00	74,985	201.79
G. F. Murphy:											
Korea	Won	6,016	\$21.49	7,119	\$26.00			1,365	\$5.00	14,500	\$52.49
Vietnam	Piastres	18,584	157.00	6,990	59.00		556	\$5.00	559	5.00	26,689
Thailand	Baht	1,172.80	58.60	1,091.20	54.06		100	5.00	100	5.00	122.66
Turkey	T. Lira	371	41.30	328	36.40		45	5.00	45	5.00	87.70
Greece	Drachmas	1,103	36.75	977	32.65			150	5.00	2,230	74.40
Italy	Lira	4,710	7.50	8,370	13.40			3,120	5.00	16,200	25.90
Belgium	B. Franc.	2,906	57.50	3,505	70.10		250	5.00	500	10.23	142.83
England	Pounds	17.14.6	43.20	28.00.0	75.00	4,04.4	10.00	5.00.0	14.68	54.19.0	142.88
Austria	A. Schillings	1,881.60	72.36	1,170	45.00		260	10.00	260	10.00	3,571.60
France	Franc.	273	55.00	119	25.00		62.90	12.65	50	10.00	504.90
Germany	D. Marks	12	3.00	60	15.00	10,463.01	2,605.75	20	5.00	10,555.01	2,628.75
Colombia	Pesos	840.00	52.00	1,050.00	63.00	175.00	10.00	175.00	10.00	2,240.00	135.00
G. F. Murphy:											
Peru	Soles	1,837	34.50	2,458	50.50			445	10.00	4,740	104.00
Argentina	Pesos	27,913	80.00	15,662	44.50			3,500	10.00	47,075	134.50
Brazil	Cruzeiros	\$27.00	80.00	370.00	90.00	41.11	10.00	41.11	10.00	779.22	190.00
J. B. Radcliffe:											
Belgium	B. Francs	1,332	26.00	2,135	42.00	300	6.00	1,320	26.00	4,347	100.00
Italy	Lira	52,400	83.84	110,000	178.80	23,000	37.12	30,000	46.15	215,400	346.00
Germany	D. Marks	145.2	36.44	132	33.13	2,878.80	*772.23	57	11.71	3,172.80	803.51
Total			3,005.70		2,568.32		9,684.47		478.57		15,737.06

*Commercial Air Transportation

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 15,737.06

CHET HOLIFIELD
Chairman, Committee on JCAE

Mar. 6, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Martha W. Griffiths:											
Australia	Australian\$	78.77	87.75	51.39	57.25	96.89	107.93	4.49	5.00	231.54	257.93
Hong Kong	Hong Kong\$	603.50	98.77	282.47	46.23	25.21	4.13	30.55	5.00	941.73	154.13
Singapore	Singapore\$	432.12	142.38	159.70	52.62	123.60	40.72	15.18	5.00	730.60	240.72
Taiwan	New Taiwan\$	1,377	34.43	423	10.57			200	5.00	2,000	50.00
Thailand	Baht	1,069.20	51.73	894.39	43.27			103.35	5.00	2,066.94	100.00
Subtotal			415.06		209.94		152.78		25.00		802.78
Jacob K. Javits:											
France	Franc	147.00	30.00	98.00	20.00					245.00	50.00
Germany	DM	120.12	30.00	80.08	20.00	2,924.40	730.37			3,124.60	780.37
Italy	Lira			15,575	25.00			6,230	10.00	21,805	35.00
United Kingdom	Pound			10-8-4	25.00			4-3-4	10.00	14-11-8	35.00
Total			60.00		90.00		730.37		20.00		900.37
William S. Moorhead:											
France	Franc	1,122.10	229.00	519.40	106.00			73.50	15.00	1,715	350.00
Portugal	Escudos	2,373.21	82.93	1,475.89	51.57	1,199.91	41.93	445.20	15.56	5,494.21	191.99
Spain	Pesetas	7,951	114.24	4,900	70.40	3,266	46.92	1,069	15.36	17,186	246.92
United Kingdom	Pound	63-5-10	151.90	31-14-2	76.10	24-18-0	59.76	9-3-4	22.00	129-1-4	309.76
Subtotal			578.07		304.07		148.61		67.92		1,098.67
Henry S. Reuss: Germany											
	DM			22.10	5.52	92.00	22.98			114.10	28.50
					5.52		22.98				28.50
John R. Stark:											
United Kingdom	Pound	39-11-8	95.00	48-6-8	116.00	14-3-4	34.00	2-1-8	5.00	104-3-4	250.00
Netherlands	Guilder					1,576.07	1434.66			1,576.07	434.66
Subtotal			95.00		116.00		468.66		5.00		684.66
Total			1,148.13		725.53		1,523.40		117.92		3,514.98

¹ Round-trip transportation purchased by State Department.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)..... Amount 3,514.98

WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Joint Economic Committee.

Feb. 28, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY BRITISH-AMERICAN PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE (BERMUDA, FEB. 25-29, 1968) EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bourke B. Hickenlooper: Bermuda	Pound sterling	41-6-5 1/2	100.00	44-8-5	107.50	6-1-11	14.75	11-9-4 1/2	27.75	103-6-2	250.00
Vance Hartke: Bermuda	do	41-6-5 1/2	100.00	45-13-3	110.50	4-2-3	10.00	12-3-9 1/2	29.50	103-6-2	250.00
Edmund Muskie: Bermuda	do	41-6-5 1/2	100.00	38-8-7	93.00	6-7-3	15.39	12-3-11	29.51	97-18-18 1/2	237.90
Donald G. Henderson: Bermuda	do	41-6-5 1/2	100.00	28-18-6	70.00			2-16-2 1/2	6.80	73-1-2	176.80
Mary M. McLaughlin: Bermuda	do	41-6-5 1/2	100.00	37-12-1	91.00	4-13-0	11.25	2-11-8	6.25	86-3-2	208.50
Delegation expenses: Telephones, newspapers, and periodicals, stamps.								17-3-0	41.50	17-3-0	41.50
Total			500.00		472.00		51.39		141.31		1,164.70

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount \$1,164.70
B. B. HICKENLOOPER, Chairman, Senate Delegation.	
December 31, 1968	

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY AMERICAN GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Gordon Allott:											
Trinidad	TT\$	88.00	45.80	5.06	2.63					93.06	48.43
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	8,850	36.12			12,050	48.97	51,100	207.94
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	1,343.00	81.55			794.00	48.00	2,797.00	169.62
Peru	Soles	13,029	296.12	2,437	55.38			3,147	71.65	18,614	423.15
Peru-United States	DM					1,408.40	351.13			1,408.40	351.13
Howard W. Cannon:											
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	59.00	3.58					719.00	43.65
Peru	Soles	10,590	240.68	2,532	57.54			1,549	35.32	14,671	333.54
B. Everett Jordan:											
Trinidad	TT\$	88.00	45.80	42.05	21.90			20.00	10.42	150.05	78.12
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	6,720	27.42			13,150	53.67	49,970	203.94
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	79.00	4.80					739.00	44.87
Peru	Soles	10,714	243.50	3,796	86.27			1,205	27.50	15,715	357.27
A. S. Mike Monroney:											
Trinidad	TT\$	88.00	45.80	32.72	17.04					120.72	62.84
Senegal	CFA	30,100	122.85	6,955	28.38			12,250	50.00	49,305	201.23
Ralph Yarborough:											
Colombia	Pesos	450.00	27.32	86.70	5.28					536.70	32.60
Peru	Soles	9,672	219.83	666	15.00			10,871	247.18	21,209	482.01
Milrae Jensen:											
Colombia	Pesos	450.00	26.94	583.85	33.76			75.15	4.50	1,089.00	65.20
Peru	Soles	5,861	132.82	7,780	181.80	290	6.80	737	17.25	14,490	338.67
Delegation expenses, Transportation:											
Colombia	Pesos					1,972.50	121.38			1,972.50	121.38
Peru	Soles					120,564	2,664.42			120,564	2,664.42
Darrell St. Claire:											
Trinidad	TT\$	88.00	45.80	131.29	63.38					219.29	109.18
Delegation expenses:											
Meals	US\$				4.10						4.10
Supplies	US\$								85.75		85.75
Hotel offices	TT\$	68.00	35.40	244.13	127.15			22.70	11.82	344.83	174.37
Transportation	TT\$					725.03	364.67			725.03	364.67
Staff meals	TT\$			24.00	12.58					24.00	12.58
Commissary	US\$				130.00						130.00
Gratuities	US\$								2.10		2.10
Do	TT\$								12.70		12.70
Senegal	CFA	32,900	134.28	3,215	13.12			35,260	143.91	71,375	291.31
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US\$								44.38		44.38
Hotel offices	CFA	210,950	861.00							210,950	861.00
Transportation	CFA					33,050	134.89			33,050	134.89
Do	US\$						458.35				458.35
Delegation and staff meals	CFA					98,750	403.00			98,750	403.00
Do	US\$						30.00				30.00
Embassy receptions	do						1,715.00				1,715.00
Communications	CFA							40,550	165.51	40,550	165.51
Gratuities, etc.	do							14,150	58.31	14,150	58.31
Germany	US\$		47.90		71.10		584.75		42.00		745.75
Colombia	Pesos	660.00	40.07	84.00	5.12			168.70	11.43		56.62
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US\$								15.00		15.00
Hotel offices	Pesos	3,814.90	231.65							3,814.90	231.65
Transportation	US\$					9,660.00	568.35			9,660.00	568.35
Do	US\$						29.16				29.16
Embassy reception	Pesos		6,669.00	404.90						6,669.00	404.90
Do	US\$			274.91						274.91	174.91
Delegation and staff meals	Pesos		2,720.00	167.86						2,720.00	167.86
Do	US\$			20.00						20.00	20.00
Commissary	US\$			34.00						34.00	34.00
Gratuities, miscellaneous	Pesos							680.00	41.32	680.00	41.32
Peru	Soles	10,339.00	234.98	8,950.00	203.40			3,938.00	89.95	23,227.00	528.33
Delegation expenses:											
Supplies	US\$								93.00		93.00
Do	Soles							550	12.41	550	12.41
Hotel offices	do	75,245	1,761.63							75,245	1,761.63
Transportation	do					7,738	174.78			7,738	174.78
Embassy reception	do			2,620	60.24					2,620	60.24
Do	US\$				524.37						524.37

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY AMERICAN GROUP, INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Con.

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Darrell St. Clair—Continued											
Delegation expenses—Con.											
Delegation dinners	Soles			13,424	305.11					13,424	305.11
Commissary	US\$				137.55						137.55
Embassy staff overtime	Soles							10,950	261.75	10,950	261.75
Embassy personnel	do							1,010	22.79	1,010	22.79
Embassy services	do							28,763	649.28	28,763	649.28
Gratuities, miscellaneous	Soles							1,960	45.60	1,960	45.60
Total			5,206.08		3,217.34		7,606.68		2,423.47		18,453.57

Note: \$171.05 reimbursed to IPU funds by Darrell St. Claire for personal expenses.

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
Appropriated funds: Other 22 U.S.C. 276	3,658.80
Total	14,794.77
	18,453.57

ALEXANDER PIRNIE,
Chairman of Delegation and President of the Group.

Mar. 11, 1969.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE MEXICO-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—HONOLULU, HAWAII, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 11 AND APR. 17, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator John Sparkman; United States	Dollar		234.00		28.54				0.75		263.29
Senator Robert P. Griffin; United States	do		131.04		55.17						186.21
Senator Ernest Gruening; United States	do		131.04		46.77			5.24			183.05
Senator Len B. Jordan; United States	do		131.04		60.00						191.04
Senator Mike Mansfield; United States	do		131.04		106.45				14.66		252.15
Senator Frank E. Moss; United States	do		131.04		41.27				23.98		196.29
Robert Dockery; United States	do		117.00		76.84				19.30		213.14
Joann Green; United States	do		117.00		12.27				.25		129.52
Pat Holt; United States	do		131.04		71.63				18.73		221.40
Milrae Jensen; United States	do		195.00		132.65		17.35		17.78		362.78
Art Kuhl; United States	do		195.00		161.93		10.30		23.33		390.56
Mrs. Martha Solomon; United States	do		117.00		24.62						141.62
Elmira Vogtmann; United States	Dollar		117.00		5.80				.25		123.05
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and dinners				4,900.22							4,900.22
Transportation						3,772.06					3,772.06
Hotel offices			577.39								577.39
Telephone and telegraph								265.78			265.78
Stationery supplies								171.80			171.80
Interpreter's fees								1,472.39			1,472.39
Typewriter rental								44.00			44.00
Miscellaneous								70.72			70.72
Total			2,455.63		5,724.16		3,799.71		2,148.96		14,128.46

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: Public Law 86-420	Amount
	14,128.46

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—WASHINGTON, D.C. AND NEW ORLEANS, LA.—EXPENDED BETWEEN MARCH 20 AND MARCH 24, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Sen. George D. Aiken, United States	Dollar		53.00		5.00						58.00
Sen. Robert P. Griffin, United States	do		53.00		2.60						55.60
Sen. Allen J. Ellender, United States	do		42.40		3.64				1.57		47.61
Sen. Hiram L. Fong, United States	do		53.00		4.93						57.93
Sen. Len B. Jordan, United States	do		53.00		24.78						77.78
Sen. W. B. Spong, Jr., United States	do		53.00		4.00						57.00
Art Kuhl, United States	do		42.40		3.37				2.62		48.39
Milrae Jensen, United States	do		26.50		1.56				2.09		30.15
Delegation expenses:											
Official luncheons and dinners				4,556.95							4,556.95
Transportation						922.67					922.67
Stationery supplies								143.87			143.87
Reporting fees								26.77			26.77
Telephone charges								13.78			13.78
Hotel offices			188.57								188.57
Miscellaneous								112.13			112.13
Total			564.87		4,606.83		922.67		302.83		6,397.20

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY CANADA-UNITED STATES INTERPARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE—WASHINGTON, D.C. AND NEW ORLEANS, LA.—EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 20 AND MAR. 24, 1968

RECAPITULATION

Other Public Law 86-42..... Amount \$6,397.20
 GEORGE D. AIKEN,
 Chairman, Committee on Senate Delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE DELEGATION TO 14TH CONFERENCE, COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, U.S. SENATE, NASSAU, BAHAMAS, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 30 AND NOV. 3, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Senator B. Everett Jordan: Bahamas.....					17.85		2.00		3.20		23.05
Senator Jennings Randolph: Bahamas.....					.80		74.00				74.80
Senator Stephen M. Young: Bahamas.....					5.00		122.40				127.40
Senator Thomas J. McIntyre: Bahamas.....					26.65		2.00				28.65
Pat M. Holt: Bahamas.....					27.84		10.00		14.73		52.57
Delegation expenses:											
Official dinners and receptions.....					446.02						443.88
Local transportation.....							18.00				18.00
Total.....					524.16		228.40		17.93		770.49

RECAPITULATION

Appropriated funds: S. Res. 115..... \$770.49
 B. EVERETT JORDAN,
 Chairman, Senate Delegation.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE DELEGATION, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, 14TH CONFERENCE NOV. 10-23, 1968, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM; BERLIN AND BONN, GERMANY; LONDON, ENGLAND; AND PARIS, FRANCE; U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
John Sparkman:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		60.30		128.56				27.50		216.36
Belgium.....	Franc.....						1.180			1.180	22.87
England.....	Pound.....	60.8.6	145.12	56.8.0	135.36	118.3.9	281.80	8.2.0	19.44	243.2.3	581.72
France.....	Franc.....	340.10	69.41	353.30	72.09	564.71	113.97	41.60	8.50	1,299.71	263.97
John Stennis:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		105.60		183.48				30.16		319.24
Germany.....	do.....		82.23		14.49						96.72
Mike Mansfield:											
Belgium.....	do.....		61.82		70.82			.20			132.84
France.....	do.....		34.70		19.94						54.64
Albert Gore:											
Belgium.....	do.....		60.30		86.34			2.26			148.90
France.....	do.....		69.41		85.53			54.23			209.17
Henry M. Jackson:											
Belgium.....	do.....		60.30		76.80			.20			137.30
Lee Metcalf:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		74.80		163.50			17.00			255.30
Germany.....	do.....		73.90		27.54			4.03			105.47
England.....	do.....		56.70		39.72						96.42
France.....	do.....		69.41		34.87						104.28
Claiborne Pell:											
Belgium.....	do.....		60.50		90.18			22.60			173.28
France.....	Franc.....			202.10	42.83			18.45	3.74	220.55	46.57
Thomas J. McIntyre:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		75.38		142.40		3.60		14.60		235.98
Germany.....	do.....		62.58		68.66		24.90		12.63		168.77
France.....	do.....		69.41		74.33				12.33		156.07
France.....	Franc.....					371.65	75.01			371.65	75.01
Birch Bayh:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		65.56		165.66		9.50		41.34		282.06
France.....	do.....		34.70		35.34						70.04
Joseph D. Tydings:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		60.30		151.00				98.12		309.42
Do.....	do.....		61.84		85.22				6.62		153.68
William B. Spong:											
Germany.....	do.....		70.43		63.15			20.54			154.12
England.....	do.....		56.70		44.36			5.76			106.82
France.....	do.....		69.41		50.11			.20			119.72
Karl E. Mundt:											
Belgium.....	Franc.....	1,452	29.04	928	18.56			220	4.40	2,600	52.00
Netherlands.....	Guilder.....					2,853.5	794.40			2,853.5	794.40
United States.....	Dollar.....								5.55		5.55
Belgium.....	do.....		75.38		88.38				3.70		167.46
Germany.....	do.....		71.74		45.32						117.06
Do.....	Deutsche mark.....					92.00	22.94			92.00	22.94
England.....	Dollar.....		56.70		32.82				2.28		91.80
France.....	do.....		69.41		61.93						131.34
Roman Hruska:											
Belgium.....	Dollar.....		51.56		96.72				7.72		156.00
Germany.....	do.....		72.33		60.41				6.30		139.04
John Sherman Cooper:											
Belgium.....	do.....		66.12		76.92				27.68		170.72
France.....	do.....		20.83		19.06				6.30		46.19
Belgium.....	Belgian francs.....					997	19.32			997	19.32
Germany.....	Deutschmarks.....					1,588	398.89			1,588	398.89
United States.....	Dollar.....						33.00				33.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY THE COMMITTEE ON SENATE DELEGATION, NORTH ATLANTIC ASSEMBLY, 14TH CONFERENCE NOV. 10-23, 1968, BRUSSELS, BELGIUM; BERLIN AND BONN, GERMANY; LONDON, ENGLAND; AND PARIS, FRANCE; U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Jacob K. Javits: Belgium	do		58.22		40.00		794.40		20.00		912.62
Charles Percy:											
Belgium	do		74.58		137.56				31.20		243.34
Germany	do		57.16		51.88						109.04
France	do		69.41		33.72				2.91		106.04
Donald G. Henderson:											
Belgium	Belgian Franc.	2,828	56.56	2,397	47.94			695	13.90	5,920	118.40
France	Franc.	414	84.49	393	80.20	341.50	69.70	80	16.33	1,228.50	250.72
England	Pound	9.15.0	23.40	12.15.6	30.66	1.17.6	4.50	3.10.2	8.42	27.18.2	66.98
Netherlands	Guilder					2,853.5	794.40			2,853.5	794.40
United States	Dollar						18.00				23.55
Belgium	do		63.36		29.14				13.52		106.02
Do	Belgian Franc.			4,850.00	97.00				3.00	5,000	100.00
Germany	Deutsche mark.	82.20	20.62	96.10	23.96	175.50	43.76	21.70	5.42	375.50	93.76
Do	Dollar		42.89		46.36				1.51		90.76
France	Franc.	517.47	106.12	440.14	90.12			17.39	3.50	975.00	199.74
Milrae Jensen:											
Belgium	Dollar		52.80		66.20						119.00
Germany	do		42.87		54.31				12.50		109.68
Milrae Jensen:											
Germany	Deutsche mark.					92.00	22.94			92.00	22.94
England	Dollar		39.66		12.06				7.14		58.86
France	do		41.64		33.91						75.55
Mildred Mitchel:											
Belgium	do		53.00		60.32						113.32
France	do		62.48		38.45				.10		101.03
Belgium	do		52.80		52.04				38.30		143.14
Marian Kay Lovell:											
Germany	do		41.08		44.31						85.39
England	do		39.66		26.66						66.32
France	do		41.64		28.00						69.64
J. Stanley Kimmitt: Belgium	do		75.38		114.36				9.80		199.54
Octa Watson:											
Belgium	do		52.80		65.32				.40		118.52
Germany	do		42.05		49.27				5.00		96.32
England	do		39.66		16.77						56.43
France	do		41.64		38.48						80.12
William Farber:											
Belgium	Dollar		52.80		45.54				6.74		105.08
Germany	do		24.59		15.60						40.19
Do	Deutsche mark.					1,348.07	338.20			1,348.07	338.20
Albert Lakeland: Belgium	Dollar		52.80		76.04				24.32		153.16
William Miller:											
Belgium	do		52.80		71.62				15.90		140.32
Germany	do		42.68		45.31				4.50		92.49
England	do		39.66		22.53				6.15		68.34
France	do		41.64		63.34				7.30		112.28
Clark Norton:											
Belgium	do		52.80		34.66						87.46
Germany	do		42.00		13.93						55.93
England	do		39.96		18.00						57.96
France	do		41.65		23.97						65.62
Delegation expense: Belgium (dollars):											
Official luncheons and dinners					1,187.04						1,187.04
Hotel office rental			393.45		434.20						434.20
Office machines rental									56.63		56.63
Office supplies									92.79		92.79
Telephone charges									58.07		58.07
Overtime, Embassy personnel									949.93		949.93
Gratuities									25.00		25.00
Delegation expense, Germany:											
Official luncheons and dinners	Dollars				850.84						850.84
Hotel office rental	do		61.81								61.81
Telephone charges	do								19.05		19.05
Office supplies	do								21.70		21.70
Overtime, Embassy personnel	do								193.46		193.46
Local transportation	do										20.00
Do	D. Marks					3,141.45	783.21			3,141.45	783.21
Gratuities	Dollars								45.46		45.46
Delegation expense, England:											
Official meals	do				45.87						45.87
Hotel office rental	do		74.28								74.28
Local transportation	Pound					118.13.4	283.08			118.13.4	283.08
Gratuities	Dollars								11.66		11.66
Delegation expense, France:											
Official meals	Dollars				90.71						90.71
Hotel office rental	do		104.12								104.12
Local transportation	Franc.					2,185.99	443.34			2,185.99	1.71
Telephone charges	Dollars								1.71		443.34
Overtime, Embassy personnel	do								48.98		48.98
Gratuities	do								4.06		4.06
Total			4 717.02		7,100.60		5,415.73		2,257.84		19,491.19
RECAPITULATION											
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)											Amount
Appropriated funds: Other—Public Law 84-689											5,946.44
Total											13,544.75
											19,491.19

JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Senate Delegation, North Atlantic Assembly.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURE OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND DEC. 31, 1968

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Joseph Clark:											
Indonesia	Rupiah					9,035	34.75	14,317	55.07	23,352	89.82
Vietnam	Piast	2,891	24.50		25.00			33,539	284.23	39,380	333.73
Hong Kong	Dollar	287.40	47.36	182.10	30.00			210.35	34.33	670.85	111.69
Germany 1	Mark					7,842	1,960.40			7,842	1,960.40
Albert Gore:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	210.00	46.89	186.01	41.53			9.00	2.01	405.01	90.43
Brazil	Cruzeiro	272.26	85.07	196.92	61.53	69.33	21.65	60.20	18.71	598.71	186.96
Argentina	Peso	27,719	77.70	16,020	45.75	6,807	19.45	8,971	25.60	58,977	168.50
Chile	Escudo	462.48	67.45	390.55	57.01			135.20	19.65	988.23	144.11
Peru	Sol			560	14.30			194	4.95	754	19.25
Panama	Dollar		45.00		40.45		4.25		6.05		95.75
Czechoslovakia	Koruna			384.72	26.81	211.43	14.73	215.25	15.00	811.40	56.54
USSR	Ruble	108.00	120.00	180.22	200.25	42.50	47.22	9.00	10.00	339.72	377.47
Denmark	D. Kroner	187.63	25.00	142.60	19.00	156.33	20.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Netherlands 1	Guilders					1,780.85	492.08			1,780.85	492.08
Belgium	B. Franc					541.00	10.48			541.00	10.48
Senator Mike Mansfield:											
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	18	20.00					5	5.56	23	25.56
Czechoslovakia	Crown	623.40	43.44	287	20.00			287	20.00	1,197.40	83.44
France	Franc	406	83.20	303.80	62.00	1,527.19	307.28	343	70.00	2,579.99	522.48
Rumania	Lei	762.05	63.50	432	36.00			288	24.00	1,482.05	123.50
Germany	D.M.	94.85	27.00	120	30.00			80	20.00	294.85	77.00
Netherlands 1	Guilder					4,196.04	1,157.21			5,353.25	1,157.21
Yugoslavia 1	New Dinar	452.10	36.17	75	6.00	7,830.85	626.48	25	2.00	8,383.15	670.65
Italy	Lire			26,000	41.73			5,300	8.50	31,300	50.23
France	New Franc	348	71.00	245	50.00	1,044.36	209.96	147	30.00	1,784.36	360.96
England	Pound			41.4.12	75.00	35.4.3	83.96	20.16.7	50.00	975.10	208.96
Senator Claiborne Pell:											
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	344.40	24.00	945.53	65.89	601.45	41.91	455.18	31.72	2,346.56	163.52
France	Franc	313.11	63.00	101.29	20.38			44.73	9.00	459.13	92.38
Austria	Schilling	515.40	20.00	274.95	10.67	506.04	19.67	154.62	6.00	1,451.01	56.34
Germany 1	D. Mark					3,487.20	874.86			3,487.20	874.86
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	108.00	120.00	180.22	200.25	42.50	47.22	9.00	10.00	339.72	377.47
Denmark	D. Kroner	187.63	25.00	142.60	19.00	156.33	20.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Netherlands 1	Guilders					1,780.85	492.08			1,780.85	492.08
Belgium	B. Franc					541.00	10.48			541.00	10.48
Pat M. Holt:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	141.90	31.68			38.00	8.47	349.90	78.09
Brazil	Cruzeiro	167.86	52.40	227.19	70.87	69.33	21.69	114.00	35.59	578.38	180.55
Argentina	Peso	23,975	68.50	19,800	56.70	23,407.10	67.16	8,410	24.46	75,592.10	216.82
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	295.40	43.12			90.60	13.20	715.40	104.37
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	687.65	17.58			558.05	14.20	2,127.10	54.23
Panama	Dollars		37.50		51.25		10.50		24.86		124.11
Morella R. Hansen:											
Senegal	CFA Francs	7,660	30.89	2,540	10.24	3,000	12.10	600	2.42	13,800	55.65
Sierra Leone	S.L. Leones	35.70	42.59	16.12	19.23	26	31.02	6	7.16	83.82	100.00
Ivory Coast	CFA Francs	20,750	84.17	24,465	98.50			2,910	11.68	48,125	194.35
Ethiopia	Ethiopian \$	162.55	65.54	188.00	75.70	180.00	72.47	15.76	6.35	546.31	220.06
Kenya 1	Kenya Shilling	468.50	65.54	214.65	30.02	604.40	84.55	36.90	5.16	1,324.45	185.28
Ghana 1	New Ghanaian cedis					1,692.24	1,589.50			1,629.24	1,589.50
Norvill Jones:											
Thailand	Baht	989.76	48.00	886.66	43.00	103.10	5.00	958.52	46.49	2,938	142.49
South Vietnam	Piastre	48,576	410.00	11,832	102.00	580	5.00	6,072	52.35	66,060	569.35
Hong Kong	H.K.\$p.	485.60	80.00	338.35	55.75	48.56	8.00	496.74	81.85	1,369.25	225.60
Arthur M. Kuhl:											
Venezuela	Bolivar	170.00	37.94	133.00	29.67			9.50	2.12	312.50	69.73
Brazil	Cruzeiro	167.86	52.40	212.49	66.58	69.33	21.69	92.50	28.74	542.18	169.41
Argentina	Peso	23,975	68.50	21,100	60.20	6,807	19.54	7,656	21.80	59,538	169.95
Chile	Escudo	329.40	48.05	219.20	32.00			60.00	8.70	608.60	88.75
Peru	Sol	881.40	22.45	682.15	17.40			415.50	10.65	1,979.05	50.50
Panama	Dollar		37.50		34.33		8.25		7.81		87.88
Bader, William:											
Dinar 1						583.77	1,633.80			46	1,633.80
Germany	D. Mark	364	91.43	260	65.31	56	14.08	40	10.04	720	180.86
Britain	Pound	22	52.36	13	30.94	2	4.76			37	88.06
Israel	I. Pound	180	51.42	150	42.86	50	14.28	52	14.85	432	123.41
Jordan	Dinar			3,570	10.00					3,570	10.00
Lebanon	L. Pound	211	66.70	181	57.22	123	39.00	101	30.00	615	192.92
U.A.R.	E. Pound	33	59.41	30	54.00	2	3.60			63	117.01
Ferris, Charles:											
Belgium	Franc	4,558	91.16	4,920	98.40	1,660	33.20	710	14.20	11,848	236.96
Germany	D. Mark	211.3	52.95	357.1	89.50	166.6	41.63	33.9	8.50	768.6	192.58
United Kingdom	Pound	95.6	39.66	78.1	32.40	25.1	10.40	23.1	9.60	221.9	92.06
France	Franc	244.51	49.90	256.76	52.40	96.04	19.60	23.76	4.85	621.07	126.75
James G. Lowenstein:											
France	Franc	730.59	147.00	1,000.41	201.29	648.66	130.49	347.90	70.00	2,727.56	548.78
Czechoslovakia	Koruna	258.30	18.00	2,268.02	158.05	1,247.20	86.91	369.08	25.72	4,142.60	288.68
Germany 1	D. Mark			324.22	81.34	4,405.60	1,104.39	24.00	6.00	4,753.82	1,191.73
Austria	Schilling	1,391.58	54.00	1,262.73	49.00			308.98	11.99	2,963.29	114.99
Poland	Zlotys	648.00	27.00	1,123.92	46.83	810.60	33.78	168.00	7.00	2,750.52	114.61
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	108.00	120.00	62.50	69.44	96.85	107.61	4.50	5.00	271.85	302.05
Yugoslavia	Dinar	423.75	33.90	766.25	61.30	4,655.00	372.40	112.50	9.00	5,957.50	476.60
Romania	Lei	712.80	40.00					28.16	1.58	740.96	41.58
Netherlands	Guilders					192.00	53.05			192.00	53.05
Denmark	D. Kroner	135.09	18.00	142.60	19.00	208.87	27.83	45.03	6.00	531.59	70.83
Francis R. Valeo:											
U.S.S.R.	Ruble	98	20.00	30	33.34			20	22.22	148	75.56
Czechoslovakia	Crown	348.40	24.27	344.40	24.40			430.50	40.00	1,123.30	78.27
France	Franc	467.75	95.45	367.50	75.00			343	70.00	1,178.25	240.45
England	Pound	45.17.4	100.00	35.5.0	85.00			28.4.0	68.00	109.6.4	253.00
Netherlands 1	Guilder					4,196.04	1,157.21			5,353.25	1,157.21
Belgium	B. Franc	1,056	21.12	2,400	48.00	600	12.00	2,000	40.00	6,056	121.12
Yugoslavia 1	New Dinar	518.65	41.48	222	18.00	7,906.25	632.50	312	25.00	8,958.90	716.98
Italy	Lire			26,165	42.00	7,787	12.50	12,848	20.62	46,800	75.12
France	N. Franc	375.34	76.50	306.25	61.50	24.50	5.00	58.80	12.00	764.90	155.00
England	Pound	15.6.7	36.00	17.10.0	42.00	4.3.5	10.00	10.7.5	25.00	47.7.5	113.00
Robert H. Dockery											
Brazil	Cruzeiro	1,000.95	301.25	636.79	196.00	185.36	57.00	119.40	36.75	1,942.50	591.00
Netherlands	Florin					3,354.35	928.93			3,354.35	928.93

See footnote at end of table.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES OF FOREIGN CURRENCIES AND APPROPRIATED FUNDS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, U.S. SENATE, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1968—Continued

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Tillman, Seth:	D. mark					6,475.38	1,626.57			6,475.38	1,626.57
Germany ¹	Yen	8,280	23.00	23,466	65.18	1,350	3.75	2,496	6.94	35,492	98.87
Japan	Dollars	72.00	11.82	237.25	38.96	21.61	3.55	38.64	6.34	369.50	60.67
Hong Kong	Baht	1,050	50.80	3,167.80	153.26	280	13.54	480.20	23.23	4,978	240.83
Thailand	Rupees	350	46.05	513.80	67.61	230	30.26	70.00	9.21	1,163.80	153.13
India	Rials	2,265	30.20	5,550	74.00	400	5.33	485.00	6.47	8,700.00	116.00
Iran	Kip	4,200	8.40	1,524	3.05			926.00	1.85	6,650.00	13.30
Laos	Franc			154.67	31.30	24.70	5.00	5.43	1.10	184.80	37.40
France	Pound	10.15.0	25.65	11.0.8	26.33	3.18.9	9.39	6.1.6	14.46	31.15.11	75.83
England											
Total			4,420.57		4,448.19		16,717.50		1,841.96		27,428.22

RECAPITULATION

Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	Amount
S. Res. 226	\$27,120.48
Total	307.74
	27,428.22

¹Used to purchase commercial air ticket to countries visited.

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mar. 6, 1969

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the reports which I have placed in the RECORD show the use of foreign currencies by the committees of the Senate and certain joint committees during the calendar year 1968. These U.S. Government-owned foreign currencies are available in the various countries for use by the committees of the Congress without reimbursement to the Treasury Department. This is in accord with the provisions of Public Law 86-628, section 105 (b), and 22 U.S.C. 1754, as amended. I ask unanimous consent that these provisions of law be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PROVISIONS OF LAW RELATING TO THE REPORTING OF EXPENSES INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH TRAVEL OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES
MUTUAL SECURITY ACT AS AMENDED
22 U.S.C. 1754

"(b) Notwithstanding section 724 of title 31, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States, which are in excess of the amounts reserved under section 612(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and of the requirements of the United States Government in payment of its obligations outside the United States, as such requirements may be determined from time to time by the President (and any other local currencies owned by the United States in amounts not to exceed the equivalent of \$50 per day per person exclusive of the actual cost of transportation), shall be made available to appropriate committees of the Congress engaged in carrying out their duties under section 190d of title 2, and to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Joint Economic Committee and the Select Committees on Small Business of the Senate and House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Astronautics and Space Exploration of the House of Representatives and the Special Committee on Space and Astronautics of the Senate, for their local currency expenses: *Provided*, That each member or employee of any such committee shall make, to the chairman of such committee in accordance with regulations prescribed by such committee, an

itemized report showing the amounts and dollar equivalent values of each such foreign currency expended and the amounts of dollar expenditures made from appropriated funds in connection with travel outside the United States, together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within the first sixty days that Congress is in session in each calendar year, the chairman of each such committee shall prepare a consolidated report showing the total itemized expenditures during the preceding calendar year of the committee and each subcommittee thereof, and of each member and employee of such committee or subcommittee, and shall forward such consolidated report to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives (if the committee be a committee of the House of Representatives or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Clerk of the House) or to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate (if the committee be a Senate committee or a joint committee whose funds are disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate). Each such report submitted by each committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within ten legislative days after receipt by the Committee on House Administration of the House or the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATION ACT, 1961
SEC. 105 (B), PUBLIC LAW 86-628

"Each member of the United States group or delegation to the Interparliamentary Union, the NATO Parliamentarian's Conference, the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, the Mexico-United States Interparliamentary Group, or any similar interparliamentary group of which the United States is a member, and each employee of the Senate or House of Representatives, by whom or on whose behalf expenditures are made from funds appropriated for the expenses of such group or delegation, shall file with the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate in the case of Members or employees of the Senate, or with the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives in the case of Members or employees of the House, an itemized report showing all such expenditures made by or on behalf of each Member or employee together with the purposes of the expenditure, including lodging, meals, transportation, and other purposes. Within sixty days

after the beginning of each regular session of Congress, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall prepare consolidated reports showing with respect to each such group or delegation the total amount expended, the purposes of the expenditures, the amount expended for each such purpose, the names of the Members or employees by or on behalf of whom the expenditures were made and the amount expended by or on behalf of each Member or employee for each such purpose. The consolidated reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate shall be filed with the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate and the consolidated reports prepared by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House shall be filed with the Committee on House Administration of the House. Each such consolidated report shall be printed in the Congressional Record within ten days after receipt by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate or the Committee on House Administration of the House."

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, most of these currencies accrue to the credit of the United States because of international agreements that deal primarily with the sale of agricultural commodities to foreign purchasers for local currencies, or loans which may be repaid in the currency of the borrowing country.

The foreign currencies owned by the United States are divided into two categories. "Excess currencies" are currencies for which the Treasury Department determines that the supply is great enough to more than cover U.S. requirements for 2 years. "Nonexcess currencies" are currencies of all other countries not designated as "excess." In many of these "non-excess currency" countries, our supply is far below our needs and it is necessary for the U.S. Government to purchase currencies commercially to meet our requirements.

A great amount of the currencies which were utilized by Senate committees last year, and which are itemized in the reports I have placed in the RECORD, are

"nonexcess currencies." By reason of Congress utilizing these currencies, it means that the Treasury Department must use U.S. dollars to purchase these types of foreign currencies for other U.S. uses.

I have before me a tabulation which is from the budget for fiscal year 1970. It shows that the "excess" countries are: Burma, Ceylon, Guinea, India, Israel, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Tunisia, Egypt, and Yugoslavia. All other countries are in the "nonexcess" category.

This tabulation gives the estimated supply of "nonexcess currencies" as \$362,700,000, whereas the estimated requirements for "nonexcess currencies" are \$2,589,300,000. The requirement for commercial purchases in fiscal year 1970 of "nonexcess currencies" is \$2,277,400,000. I ask unanimous consent that this page from the budget be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

TABLE H-2.—FOREIGN CURRENCIES AVAILABLE TO MEET U.S. REQUIREMENTS

[In millions of dollar equivalents]

Country	Estimated supply for 1970	1970 estimated requirements (expenditures)		Amounts available for use after 1970	Requirements for commercial purchase in 1970
		Other than special programs	Special programs		
Excess currencies:					
Burma.....	15.7	0.5	0.6	14.6
Ceylon.....	6.5	.4	1.3	4.8
Guinea.....	7.3	.1	.4	6.8
India.....	912.5	11.5	19.8	881.2
Israel.....	27.6	17.5	5.3	4.8
Morocco.....	31.9	8.1	1.6	22.2
Pakistan.....	200.3	3.6	9.0	187.7
Poland.....	453.9	2.2	6.3	445.4
Tunisia.....	25.0	2.8	2.0	20.2
United Arab Republic (Egypt).....	182.5	1.2	2.6	178.7
Yugoslavia.....	82.2	4.4	9.4	68.4
Total, excess currencies.....	1,945.4	52.3	58.3	1,834.8
Nonexcess currencies:					
Bolivia ¹	6.5	6.8	0.3
Canada.....	5.9	102.9	97.0
France.....	1.6	40.5	(?)	38.9
Germany, Federal Republic of.....	6.6	944.5	.1	938.1
Ghana ¹	1.7	.89
Indonesia ¹	4.5	2.5	1.9
Italy.....	1.9	62.7	(?)	60.8
Japan.....	24.1	246.6	.1	22.0	244.4
Korea.....	13.2	84.1	(?)	71.0
Philippines.....	6.7	99.0	(?)	92.3
Spain.....	15.8	38.6	.1	23.0
Sudan ¹5	1.5	1.0
Thailand.....	7.5	151.3	143.8
Turkey.....	38.9	29.6	(?)	9.3
United Kingdom.....	4.1	105.6	.1	1.0	102.3
Vietnam.....	35.6	342.7	(?)	307.1
Other countries.....	187.6	328.6	.6	15.7	157.4
Total, nonexcess currencies.....	362.7	2,588.3	1.0	50.8	2,277.4
Total.....	2,308.1	2,640.6	59.3	1,885.4	2,277.4

¹ Currently designated as "near-excess" currency countries.
² Less than \$50,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think it is desirable to present his information to the Senate in order that there may be no misunderstanding about these foreign currencies, which are often referred to as counterpart funds. In most instances, the use of these currencies is comparable to spending U.S. dollars.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, APRIL 22, 1969

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 noon on Tuesday next.

Louis C. Bechtle, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Pennsylvania for the term of 4 years vice Drew J. T. O'Keefe, resigning.

U.S. MARSHAL

William L. Martin, Jr., of Georgia, to be U.S. marshal for the middle district of Georgia for the term of 4 years vice Robert O. Doyle.

BOARD OF PAROLE

George J. Reed, of Oregon, to be a member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1974.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Henry Lehne, of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Ronald B. Lee, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Frank J. Nunlist, of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Executive nomination received by the Senate April 17, 1969, under authority of order of Senate of April 15, 1969:

U.S. MARSHAL

Charles D. Loos, of Indiana, to be U.S. marshal for the southern district of Indiana for the term of 4 years vice Dale C. Stone, resigned.

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 18, 1969:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS

William E. Schuyler, Jr., of Maryland, to be Commissioner of Patents, vice Edward J. Brenner.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named Medical Corps officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States to the grades indicated under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Oscar Elliott Ursin, XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Dew Orr, XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. James Arista Wier, XXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. John Boyd Coates, Jr., XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. David Edward Thomas, XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Hughes, XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Col. Louis Joseph Hackett, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Col. Richard Ray Taylor, XXXXXX Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3306:

To be brigadier generals, Medical Corps

Col. David Edward Thomas, XXXXXX Medical Corps, U.S. Army.

Brig. Gen. Frederic John Hughes, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Hal Bruce Jennings, Jr., XXXXXX Army of the United States (colonel, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, April 22, 1969, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 16, 1969, under authority of order of Senate of April 15, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Shiro Kashiwa, of Hawaii, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Clyde O. Martz, resigned.

U.S. ATTORNEYS

Stewart O. H. Jones, of Connecticut, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Connecticut for the term of 4 years vice Jon O. Newman.

F. L. Peter Stone, of Delaware, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Delaware for the term of 4 years vice Alexander Greenfield.

Robert K. Fukuda, of Hawaii, to be U.S. attorney for the District of Hawaii for the term of 4 years vice Yoshimi Hayashi, resigning.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grades as indicated:

CAPTAIN, LINE

Adams, Lynn "W"
 Adkisson, Hubert K.
 Alexander, Robert J.
 Allred, Jimmie "B"
 Althoff, William B.
 Aitz, Leroy V., Jr.
 Anders, Samuel G., Jr.
 Anderson, James R.
 Anderson, Raymond M., Jr.
 Anderson, Vernon F.
 Ashley, Linsey S.
 Atkinson, Bert M., Jr.
 Aubert, George A.
 Auger, Thomas E.
 Ayers, George "L", Jr.
 Babbit, Franklin G.
 Bachert, John O.
 Bagley, Worth H.
 Bailey, John B.
 Bailey, John D.
 Baker, Royal W.
 Barker, Edwin F., Jr.
 Barlow, John F.
 Barton, Charles A.
 Baylis, John R.
 Bayly, Donald C.
 Bean, George F.
 Bellah, James C.
 Bennett, Arthur K., Jr.
 Bennett, Jack W.
 Bent, Jack
 Bergner, Robert B.
 Berude, John B.
 Bettis, Alfred M.
 Bischof, William W.
 Blackwelder, Buren L.
 Blair, Marvin S.
 Bodnaruk, Andrew
 Boniface, John G.
 Bond, Vernon C.
 Booker, Thomas F.
 Boule, Arthur E., Jr.
 Boutte, Lester H.
 Bowen, Alva M., Jr.
 Bowen, Llewellyn D.
 Bowling, Roland A.
 Boyd, Carl J.
 Boyd, Paul C.
 Boyle, Paul A.
 Brandenburg, John H.
 Brazzell, Robert J.
 Britte, Murrel C.
 Brooks, Richard S.
 Brown, Ian F.
 Brown, Keith F.
 Brozo, John G.
 Brumsted, Robert B.
 Bryce, Thomas A.
 Burns, William L.
 Burrell, Robert E.
 Burrill, James T.
 Cadenas, Ernest M. M.
 Caldwell, Jack
 Camp, Herbert E.
 Cannon, Herbert "B"
 Cantwell, William P., Jr.
 Carneghi, Albert J.
 Carrier, Francis A.
 Carroll, Eugene J., Jr.
 Clark, Gilbert L.
 Clausen, Paul K.
 Cobean, Warren R., Jr.
 Cody, Harold R.
 Coffey, Claude C., Jr.
 Collins, John T.
 Collister, Louis J.
 Connelley, Ernest C., Jr.
 Cooke, Edward W.
 Cooley, Homer K., Jr.
 Coulter, Fred W.
 Coursin, Jack T.
 Cox, Channing H.
 Crangle, Eugene V.
 Cravener, Leahmon A.
 Crawford, Robert E.
 Cummings, Arthur H., Jr.
 Cutchall, Lee G.
 Damrow, Julius P.
 Dehn, Emerson C.
 Deblor, Robert R.
 Delaware, Joseph L.
 Dickey, George L., Jr.
 Diss, Robert L.
 Doss, Robert F.
 Doty, William K.
 Dowling, Patrick S.
 Downey, Denis J. J.
 Doyle, James H., Jr.
 Duberg, Carl N.
 Dudley, Harrison G.
 Dunning, Richard A.
 Eckhart, Myron, Jr.
 Edelman, Sidney
 Ellis, George W.
 Engel, Wilson F., Jr.
 Evans, Jack R.
 Everhart, Charles D.
 Exum, John D.
 Fagan, John F., Jr.
 Faulders, Cyril T., Jr.
 Ferguson, William P.
 Field, Francis E.
 Finlay, Robert W., Jr.
 Fitzgerel, John H.
 Forgy, William J.
 Franch, Ardwin G.
 Francis, Samuel
 Freeman, DeWitt L.
 Friedman, Robert
 Fries, William D.
 Fromknecht, George W.
 Gately, Donald E.
 Gatewood, Walter P.
 Gautier, Robert H.
 Gerhard, Harry "E", Jr.
 Gernert, Harold F.
 Gilles, Donald A.
 Giorgis, Albert S.
 Glenzer, Hubert, Jr.
 Gless, Richard D.
 Gлиндeman, Henry P., Jr.
 Gortney, William M.
 Gray, Julian F.
 Greene, Joseph M.
 Griffin, Thomas H.
 Griffiths, Charles H.
 Grill, Robert W.
 Grojean, Charles D.
 Gullette, John G.
 Guthrie, Charles A.
 Haak, Frank S.
 Hahs, Orrie A.
 Hamberg, Harold A.
 Hanks, Robert J.
 Hansen, John E.
 Harlan, Wick R., Jr.
 Harper, George A.
 Hartley, Paul J., Jr.
 Haugh, Edward M.
 Hayes, Arthur M., Jr.
 Hayward, Thomas B.
 Hemler, Frank T.
 Henderson, Jerome E.
 Henriques, David N., Jr.

Herzog, John J.
 Heuer, Edward H.
 Hihn, Don E.
 Hoke, Charles H.
 Holschuh, Howard W.
 Horn, Maurice A.
 Howard, George D.
 Hoy, Hugh A.
 Hubert, William E.
 Huff, Andrew F.
 Hugus, James E.
 Jackson, Laurence L., Jr.
 Johnson, Dean R.
 Johnson, Keith V.
 Jones, Robert S.
 Joslin, Harold E.
 Joy, Harmon R.
 Kaufman, Robert Y.
 Kaye, Alan J.
 Kearns, John S.
 Kelly, George R.
 Kennedy, Alfred F.
 Kenyon, Eugene C., Jr.
 Kidd, John D.
 Kiley, Donald W.
 Kilpatrick, David D.
 Kimmons, George W.
 King, Herbert T.
 Kingsbury, Edward J., Jr.
 Kirkemo, Leland E.
 Koch, Ferdinand B.
 Komorowski, Raymond A.
 Koons, Jack L.
 Kulik, Adam P.
 Lademan, Dixon
 Lane, Dwight A., Jr.
 Langille, Justin E., III
 Laws, Walter T.
 Lessmann, Walter G.
 Leuschner, Robert J.
 Levi, Burna D., Jr.
 Lewis, George H.
 Lilly, Creighton D.
 Lindberg, Charles H.
 Linder, Isham W.
 Lindsay, John R.
 Linville, James C.
 Long, David A.
 Lonquest, Theodore C., Jr.
 Lowell, John E.
 Lowen, Ernest E.
 Lyon, Harvey E.
 Lyon, James O.
 Lyons, Kenneth H.
 Lyons, Richard T.
 Macmillan, Harold R.
 Mahinske, Edmund B.
 Malone, Walter J.
 Marshall, Daniel V., Jr.
 Marshall, Leo J., Jr.
 Matthes, Harold K.
 Maulden, Hoyt P.
 Maupin, Elwin C.
 May, Robert C.
 Mayer, William S.
 Mayes, Luther E., Jr.
 McCall, Robert E.
 McCauley, Henry B.
 McCormick, Gordon H.
 McCullough, William F.
 McDonnel, James L.
 McDonnell, John C.
 McElwee, Robert E.
 McKenzie, Robert P.
 Melin, Kenneth L.
 Meyer, Joseph J., Jr.
 Mikhalevsky, Nicholas
 Miller, John "X", Jr.
 Miller, Kirk C., Jr.
 Mills, Herbert D., Jr.
 Monthan, George R.
 Moore, Robert E.
 Moore, William V.
 Moorhead, Kenneth W.
 Morgan, Henry S., Jr.
 Morgan, Walter N.
 Morgan, William H.
 Morse, Kenneth L.
 Mouton, Edison E.
 Moyer, Eugene H.
 Muncie, Wendell B.
 Murphy, Francis J.
 Newbern, Robert O.
 Nicholson, John H.
 Nicklas, William C., Jr.
 Niehaus, Robert H.
 Norin, Herbert A.
 Nott, Hugh G.
 Nutt, Thomas A., Jr.
 O'Hopp, Michael
 Oshiek, Robert R.
 Overman, Dana C., Jr.
 Overn, John A.
 Palkovic, Richard M.
 Parady, James T.
 Parker, George A.
 Parrish, Harvey S., Jr.
 Pavis, George P.
 Pearson, Francis E., III
 Peed, George P.
 Penny, Harmon C.
 Peters, Bernard
 Phillips, Chester G.
 Piatek, John A.
 Pitz, Marcellus T.
 Pond, Robert B.
 Porter, Edward M., Jr.
 Potter, Horace S.
 Price, Arthur W., Jr.
 Purinton, David F.
 Putman, Orlin N.
 Quarton, Thomas J.
 Quelland, Obed R.
 Quisenberry, William R.
 Racette, Henry J., Jr.
 Ray, Charles E.
 Redden, Lawrence E.
 Redgrave, Dewitt C., III
 Reinhart, Leonard J.
 Renn, John E.
 Riggs, Wallace M.
 Robeson, Robert H., Jr.
 Rogers, Harris G., Jr.
 Rogerson, Reuben G.
 Rooney, Frederick T.
 Rose, Albert E., Jr.
 Roulstone, Don J.
 Roux, Vernon K.
 Ruebsamen, Darrel D.
 Russell, Joseph W.
 Russell, Thomas B., Jr.
 Sandeford, William H.
 Sanderson, James R.
 Savage, Richard A.
 Schwemler, Paul A.
 Schwitters, Merlin J.
 Scott, Richard Y.
 Scott, Wiley A.
 Searle, Willard F., Jr.
 Sellers, Harry S.
 Sells, Warren H.
 Setzer, Brooks W., Jr.
 Shaffer, James B.
 Sharer, Keith W.
 Sharp, Wallace E.
 Sherman, Benjamin F., Jr.
 Simpson, William E.
 Sims, Wilbur N.
 Skidmore, Edward O.
 Smith, Edwin P., Jr.
 Smith, Gerald W.
 Smith, Lloyd S., Jr.

Snowden, Macon S.
 Stahl, Lawrence E.
 St. Clair, Robert H., Jr.
 St. George, William R.
 Stufflebeem, John D.
 Sullivan, William P.
 Tallent, Carson R.
 Tesh, Charles P.
 Thigpen, Francis Y.
 Thompson, Bruce R.
 Thompson, Robert D.
 Tidd, Emmett H.
 Tiderman, Otto D.
 Tierney, John M.
 Tisdale, Robert S.
 Tolson, George F., Jr.
 Tonkovic, Andrew A.
 Travers, Edward P.
 Tribble, Robert J.
 Turk, Carl F.
 Turner, Stansfield
 Upshur, Giles C., Jr.
 Van Train, William A., Jr.
 Vaught, William J.
 Wade, William D.
 Wahl, Clyde F.
 Walery, Kenneth F.
 Walsh, John A.
 Warner, Robert L.
 Weatherford, Jack E.
 Welander, Robert O.

COMMANDER, LINE

Abbott, William B., III
 Ackerman, Richard F.
 Adair, Frederick S.
 Adams, Robert L., Jr.
 Adler, Robert E.
 Akagi, Joe L.
 Aldern, Donald D.
 Alexander, Marvin G.
 Alexander, Adam G., Jr.
 Alexich, Milton P.
 Allen, Douglas A.
 Allen, John B.
 Allen, Richard C.
 Allender, Gene T.
 Alley, Lester L.
 Altwegg, David M.
 Anderle, Charles K.
 Anderson, Charles L. R.
 Anderson, Norris O., Jr.
 Anderson, Paul L.
 Anderson, Stanley J.
 Anderson, William J., III
 Angier, Donald L.
 Anthony, David J.
 Applegarth, Samuel H., Jr.
 Argiro, Vincent J.
 Arn, Robert W.
 Arnold, Henry C., Jr.
 Arnold, John E.
 Ashurst, Albert J.
 Asmus, Paul A.
 Aston, William J.
 Atherton, Robert F.
 Avallone, Eugene M.
 Avery, Howell D.
 Axthelm, Charles E.
 Ayres, James H.
 Babine, Arthur L., Jr.
 Bachtold, James R.
 Backman, Fred M.
 Bacon, James A.
 Badgett, John J.
 Bahr, John J.
 Baillie, Richard H.
 Baker, James G.
 Baker, James E., Jr.
 Bakke, Harlan J.
 Balchunas, Robert C.
 Baldrige, Louis D., Jr.
 Baldwin, Robert A.
 Barker, Merle M.
 Barnes, Clifford P.
 Barnes, James P.
 Barnett, Gerald P.
 Barney, Glenn P.
 Barrett, Gardner S.
 Barrett, Roy F.
 Barrow, Robert W.
 Barunas, George A., Jr.
 Batten, Charles G.
 Bauer, Edward C.
 Beasley, James W.
 Beates, James K.
 Beatty, Lloyd D.
 Beck, Stuart M.
 Beech, Wayne "L"
 Beecher, John D.
 Beam, Jack M.
 Belk, Reece G., Jr.
 Bell, Gerald R.
 Bender, Albert F., Jr.
 Benton, Hugh A.
 Berg, Frederick H.
 Bergesen, Andrew J.
 Bibby, Lowe H., III
 Bills, Robert G.
 Bird, Charles S.
 Blades, Lawrence T.
 Blake, Harry R., Jr.
 Blaney, William C., Jr.
 Boakes, William H.
 Boles, Lee R.
 Boles, Richard L.
 Bos, Roger C.
 Boschen, Henry C., Jr.
 Bosse, Joseph H., Jr.
 Bowen, Jack W.
 Bowling, William H.
 Bradford, Gerald R.
 Bradshaw, Brice L.
 Brady, Allen C.
 Brandel, William J., Jr.
 Bres, John H.
 Bress, Allyn V.

- Brewer, Glenn M.
 Bridge, Daniel T.
 Bridgham, Russell B.
 Broadwell, Edward A.
 Brogan, Robert C.
 Brooks, Walter A.
 Brown, Bobby J.
 Brown, Charles H.
 Brown, Gideon L., Jr.
 Brown, Peter G.
 Brown, Robert L.
 Bryan, Gordon R., Jr.
 Bryant, William R.
 Buchanan, Alvin J., Jr.
 Buck, John A.
 Buckholts, Walter H., Jr.
 Bucklin, Jerald W.
 Burkemper, Raymond G.
 Burkhalter, Edward A., Jr.
 Burnett, James A.
 Burnett, John H.
 Burton, Herbert O.
 Butler, Charles A.
 Butts, John L.
 Buzzell, Carlisle W., Jr.
 Byrd, Paul R.
 Cahill, William A., Jr.
 Califf, Toxey H.
 Callahan, Earle R.
 Campbell, Neil V.
 Campbell, Ronald A.
 Campbell, William E., Jr.
 Campion, Robert F., Jr.
 Carlson, Burford A.
 Carter, Edward W., III
 Case, Richard W.
 Caskey, Donald L.
 Cassani, Henry L.
 Caswell, Frederic C., Jr.
 Caudill, William E.
 Cecil, Durward C.
 Cernan, Eugene A.
 Chambers, Lawrence C.
 Chandler, Albert N., Jr.
 Charbonneau, George L.
 Chasse, Robert L.
 Cheatham, Augustus B.
 Cherrier, Herbert A.
 Chertavian, Armen
 Chesser, Samuel L.
 Chewning, Robert W.
 Childers, Donald J.
 Chisum, Oscar C.
 Christenson, Donald A.
 Christie, Francis J.
 Clare, James S.
 Clarke, Walter L., Jr.
 Clausner, Edward, Jr.
 Clermont, William J., Jr.
 Coale, William A.
 Cobern, Ernest L.
 Coffman, Charles L.
 Coiner, John A.
 Colenda, Herbert F.
 Collins, Charles H.
 Collins, Frank C., Jr.
 Collins, Harold E.
 Combs, Robert E.
 Condon, Edward J.
 Conlon, Frank S.
 Connally, Robert F., III
 Connell, Lewis E.
 Connelly, Robert B.
 Connors, Eugene T.
 Conrad, Charles, Jr.
 Conrad, Peter C.
 Cooney, David M.
 Corbett, William J., III
 Cornellus, Winston W.
 Cornwell, Robert E.
 Corsepius, Everett D.
 Coski, Bernard J.
 Costigan, Robert A.
 Cotter, Charles L.
 Crawley, Don E.
 Criner, James E.
 Cromwell, John P., Jr.
 Cross, William F.
 Crowder, James P., Jr.
 Cullins, Peter K.
 Cunningham, Melville D.
 Cunningham, Richard B.
 Cunningham, Alan R.
 Dallaire, Richard P.
 Dalla Mura, Richard A.
 Danis, Anthony L., Jr.
 Danner, William P.
 DaRodda, Aldo J.
 Darrell, Charles G.
 Darwin, William C.
 Davis, Henry J., Jr.
 Davis, Jay K.
 Davis, Michael C.
 Davis, Paul H., Jr.
 Deaton, Paul
 DeCook, David W.
 De Mun, Taylor K.
 DeView, Joseph E.
 Diers, Charles E.
 Dietrich, Henry T., Jr.
 Dietz, Richard C.
 Dittmar, Louis C.
 Dobbins, John B., Jr.
 Dodd, Charles A.
 Dodd, Robert L.
 Doering, Eugene R.
 D'Orso, James N.
 Drews, Sheldon
 Duke, Marvin L.
 Dungan, John D.
 Dunn, Robert F.
 Dwyer, Laurence A.
 Dykers, Thomas M., Jr.
 Eakle, Burke E.
 Earl, William C.
 Easterling, Crawford A.
 Eastman, Alfred C., III
 Ebbert, Edwin L.
 Eckert, Richard H.
 Eckstein, John R.
 Edmonds, Hobart J., Jr.
 Edmunds, Philip H.
 Edwards, Chester C.
 Ekman, Roger E.
 Elder, James C.
 Elfelt, James S.
 Elinghausen, Walter A., Jr.
 Elliott, Charles L.
 Ellison, David J.
 Englehart, Harry J.
 Engquist, Gordon W.
 Enos, Ralph L.
 Erkelens, Clarence
 Eshman, John R.
 Estes, Dana II
 Etchison, Frank L., Jr.
 Evans, Daniel H., Jr.
 Farley, James W.
 Federico, Charles D.
 Fenton, Robert E.
 Finn, Gerard P., Jr.
 Fitzpatrick, Joseph A.
 Fletcher, Charles D.
 Fontaine, Richard K.
 Ford, James M., Jr.
 Forsyth, Robert J.
 Foster, John F.
 Foster, William F.
 Fowler, John W.
 Fox, Kenneth
 Fox, Raymond G., Jr.
 Frame, Edward L.
 Francis, John P.
 Francis, Thomas A.
 Franke, Richard D.
 Franklin, Billy D.
 Fremd, Harry L.
 Frost, William L.
 Fuller, Robert B.
 Gahafer, Joseph G.
 Gair, Bruce O.
 Galling, Searcy G.
 Gamber, Harold W.
 Garcia, Jaime
 Gardner, Richmond
 Gaskin, Richard G.
 Gatje, George C.
 Gearhart, Norman R.
 Geiger, Eugene D.
 Gibbins, Gareth W.
 Gilchrist, John F., II
 Gillchrist, Paul T.
 Gillespie, Charles R., Jr.
 Glancy, Thomas J., Jr.
 Goetschius, Forrest D.
 Gordon, David E.
 Goslow, Paul
 Gottschalk, Arthur W., Jr.
 Goulds, Ralph J.
 Govan, George W.
 Grandfield, Francis J., Jr.
 Grant, Richard T.
 Grant, Thaddeus R.
 Granum, Bradford S.
 Grappi, Robert L.
 Greathouse, David M.
 Green, Robert E.
 Greenleaf, Wilbur E.
 Greff, Clarence H., Jr.
 Griffin, Jack R.
 Groehn, Gerhard C.
 Gurney, Charles E., III
 Guyer, Robert A.
 Haff, William B.
 Hahnert, William F., Jr.
 Hale, William T.
 Hall, Harrell W.
 Hamilton, John W.
 Hansen, Merle C.
 Hansen, Ronald R.
 Harbick, Donald L.
 Hardisty, Huntington
 Harnden, Charles G.
 Harper, Lorren G.
 Hart, Donald F.
 Hart, Richard L.
 Hart, William D.
 Hartell, Ronald D.
 Hartley, Jack H.
 Hartnett, Bernard E., Jr.
 Hawkins, Phil "R"
 Hayes, Morris L.
 Hayman, Robert B.
 Head, John L.
 Healy, Richard H.
 Hedges, Ralph R.
 Heenan, Richard D.
 Heffernan, George A.
 Helgl, John T., Jr.
 Helgerson, Warren A.
 Heon, Robert H.
 Herbig, Henry F.
 Herndon, William J., Jr.
 Hession, James M.
 Hetu, Herbert E.
 Hibson, Leo A., Jr.
 Hiehle, Frank G., Jr.
 Hill, James C.
 Hines, Gulmer A., Jr.
 Hinkley, Harold L.
 Hodnett, Robert A.
 Hoffman, Merle L.
 Holgren, Marvin A.
 Holland, James S.
 Holler, Edward R.
 Hollick, Frederick B.
 Holloway, Floyd, Jr.
 Holmberg, Lennart G.
 Holt, Neil G.
 Hoover, Richard M.
 Hopper, Richard S.
 Horne, Charles F., III
 Hovater, James D.
 Howe, Richard B.
 Hughes, Peter F. H.
 Hughes, Wayne P., Jr.
 Hull, George T.
 Hume, Robert J.
 Hunt, Albert M.
 Hunt, Edmund W.
 Inman, Bobby R.
 Ismay, Arthur P.
 Jaburg, Conrad J.
 Jackson, Thomas L.
 James, Charlie N., Jr.
 Janulis, George
 Jarvis, John E.
 Jarvis, Donald H.
 Jayne, Gordon H.
 Jett, William S., III
 Jewell, Thomas A.
 Johns, Forrest R.
 Johnson, Donald L.
 Johnson, Guy D.
 Johnson, Joseph J.
 Johnston, Maurice M., Jr.
 Johnstone, Richard A.
 Joiner, Orrin
 Jones, Carol W.
 Jones, John E.
 Jones, Samuel O., Jr.
 Kaczmarek, Carl C.
 Karvala, Curtis A.
 Kaulback, Russell D.
 Keach, Donald L.
 Keane, James P.
 Keathley, Charles C.
 Kehoe, James W., Jr.
 Kelley, Frederick W.
 Kelln, Albert L.
 Kelsey, Robert L.
 Kemble, John R.
 Kemble, Richard E.
 Kennedy, Nevin, III
 Kennedy, Ronald W.
 Kennedy, Robert C.
 Kennedy, Walter J.
 Kilmer, Donald A.
 Kinnebrew, Thomas R.
 Kinsley, Donald T.
 Kirchner, David P.
 Kirschke, Ernest J.
 Klett, George J.
 Knopp, William A.
 Knutson, Donald W.
 Knutson, Wilbert D.
 Koehler, Walter C., Jr.
 Kollmorgen, Leland S.
 Kolar, William S., Jr.
 Kovarick, Frank L.
 Kraft, Leroy M.
 Kuehner, Karl E.
 Kuhn, Edwin A.
 Kully, Sheldon D.
 Lacy, James E.
 Lacy, Joe R.
 Laighton, Robert H.
 Lake, Charles M., Jr.
 Lamb, Derwin T.
 Lancaster, Robert W.
 Langton, Charles E., Jr.
 Larocque, George N.
 Lasowski, Donald T.
 Latimer, Samuel E., Jr.
 Lautermilch, Paul A., Jr.
 Layman, Lawrence
 Leach, Ralph W., Jr.
 Leahy, John P.
 Lenox, Glen W.
 Leppin, William F., Jr.
 Lewis, Charles G.
 Lewis, James T.
 Lewis, James R.
 Libey, John D.
 Lidel, Carl J.
 Lighter, Elbert D.
 Liston, John M.
 Loberger, James C.
 Lockhart, Glenn S.
 Lofton, Freeman L.
 Logner, Robert L.
 Longhi, William J.
 Lopper, Avery K., Jr.
 Lounsberry, Jack A.
 Luckett, Thomas W.
 Ludwick, Louis L.
 Lukas, Thomas E.
 Lunt, Vernon S.
 Luskin, Arthur G.
 Macfie, Richard B.
 MacKercher, John C.
 MacPherson, John J.
 Madden, Raymond A.
 Malce, Lee, Jr.
 Mains, Homer O., Jr.
 Malone, Roy W.
 Manara, Vincent J., Jr.
 Mann, Robert E.
 Manning, Charles D.
 Marbott, Henry W.
 Marin, William T.
 Martin, William R.
 Massimi, Robert F.
 Matherson, Richard
 Mattioni, Blasco
 Mau, George W., Jr.
 May, Porter E.
 Maynard, Donald J.
 McBurney, William J.
 McCarthy, Francis X.
 McCormick, Daniel G., III
 McCutcheon, Edwin L.
 McDaniel, Clarence L.
 McDonough, William D., Jr.
 McFadden, Grafton R.
 McGaughy, Richard W.
 McGeachy, Francis L.
 McGlohn, Robin H., Jr.
 McGrath, Harold A.
 McIntyre, John J.
 McKee, Kinnaid E.
 McKee, Robert X.
 McLaughlin, Robert F.
 McMillan, Donald G.
 McNeely, James S.
 McNerney, James F.
 McQueston, Jack E.
 McQuillin, John P.
 McWee, Russell B.
 Mead, Theodore E.
 Meader, Bruce I.
 Meadows, Okey I.
 Meek, Kenneth L.
 Meeks, Robert B., Jr.
 Meeks, Thomas L.
 Mehl, James P.
 Melim, Robert D.
 Meltzer, Melvin
 Mench, Leland E.
 Merrill, Forest "J"
 Merritt, Glen C.
 Meserve, Charles L.
 Messina, Sylvester C.
 Metcalf, Joseph, III
 Metcalf, Louis E., Jr.
 Michaels, Robert J.
 Militus, Paul L.
 Miller, Donald A.
 Miller, Floyd, H., Jr.
 Miller, James P.
 Miller, James L.
 Miller, Kenneth R.
 Miller, Robert L.
 Miner, Duane A.
 Minnigerode, John H. B.
 Mischke, Gayland J.
 Mitchell, Edgar D.
 Mitchell, John R. C.
 Mitchell, Leland G.
 Moseff, Russell L.
 Montgomery, Stephen C.
 Montgomery, Graden L.
 Moody, Thomas J.
 Moore, Charles J.
 Moore, Ernest M., Jr.
 Moore, Loren I.
 Moore, Tommy C.
 Moore, Virgil W., Jr.
 Morgan, James E.
 Moriarty, Peter M.
 Morin, Richard J.
 Morris, Howard L.
 Morris, Robert E.
 Morris, Robert E.
 Morrow, Charles D.
 Morse, Jack L.
 Mountford, Edward J.
 Mow, Douglas F.
 Moyer, Donald R.
 Mueller, George E.
 Mullin, James
 Muncy, William E.
 Murphy, Douglas C.
 Murphy, Gilbert F., Jr.
 Murphy, Ray D.
 Murray, Douglas V.
 Muto, Charles J.
 Myers, Carroll E.
 Myers, William S.
 Nation, William C.
 Naugle, James O.
 Naylor, Charles K.
 Neff, Richmond B., Jr.
 Nelson, Eric A., Jr.
 Nelson, Jack H.
 Nesky, Anthony, Jr.
 Nevius, William B.
 Newsome, James W.
 Nolan, Joseph, D.
 Norman, Thomas V., Jr.
 Norton, Richard J.
 Nunneley, James K.
 Nunneley, John K.
 Nyce, William E.
 O'Brien, Jerome L.
 Oder, Howard W.
 O'Donnell, John W.
 O'Gara, Patrick E.
 Ogden, Howard "A", Jr.
 O'Hara, Jack F.
 O'Leary, William E.
 Olson, James W.
 Olson, Willard R.

- Orem, John B., Jr.
Organ, James W.
Orrik, Frederick J., Jr.
Orvis, Peter H.
Orzalli, John B.
O'Toole, Kevin J.
Outlaw, Thurber A., Jr.
Overdorf, Thomas R.
Paddock, Charles O.
Palatini, Glenn L.
Palmer, Wallace C.
Panclera, Vincent W.
Pappas, George T.
Parks, William W.
Patch, Irwin, Jr.
Pattee, Richard S.
Patten, Michael A.
Paul, Raymond E.
Paul, Robert F.
Pauly, Donald E.
Pearce, Earl H.
Pearson, John F., Jr.
Pendell, Carl R.
Penney, William R.
Pennyacker, William S.
Pentony, John F.
Peterson, Richard E.
Pheasant, Alan G.
Phillips, Alan R.
Phillips, William R.
Pierce, Ray E.
Pierce, William H., Jr.
Pilon, Jerome R.
Piper, Harold L.
Pirano, Daniel
Pirrone, Anthony P.
Plow, Arthur E.
Pogue, David W.
Polatty, Donald B.
Pollak, Charles D.
Porter, Thomas
Potter, William W.
Pouls, Michael C., Jr.
Powell, William V.
Powers, Trent R.
Prezioso, Ronald
Prisby, Donald E.
Prosser, Walter R.
Purvis, Elvis E.
Quinn, Robert T.
Quitmeyer, Herman C.
Rabun, Floyd K.
Radja, James E.
Rainville, Duane D.
Raithel, Albert L., Jr.
Ramsey, David G.
Rankin, George M., Jr.
Raynes, Robert R.
Rea, Maurice W.
Redfield, John M.
Reed, Richard W.
Reed, William H.
Reeder, Ralph J.
Remsen, "T" Schenck
Renicky, Donald D.
Rentz, Frank L., Jr.
Reynolds, Roy S.
Ricardo, Benny J.
Rice, James O.
Richards, William C.
Ries, Allen L.
Rigsbee, Clifford M.
Rilling, Alexander W.
Riordan, Edward S.
Ritchey, Donald D.
Rivers, Wendell B.
Roane, Donald P.
Roberts, Charles T.
Roberts, John A.
Roberts, William E.
Robertson, Douglas B.
Robinson, Donald G., Jr.
Robinson, Robert B.
Roby, Grady H.
Rochford, John M.
Rockwell, Nevin L.
Rockwell, Richard F.
Rockwood, Jerred R.
Rodgers, Frederick A.
Rogers, James O.
Roscoe, John W. F.
Rough, Jimmie L.
Rowden, William H.
Rowland, James C.
Rowley, Reginald C.
Ruecker, Kenneth H.
Rueff, Eugene C.
Rush, Thornwell F.
Rushing, Charles F.
Russ, Jack E.
Sagerholm, James A.
Sain, Robert S.
Sassone, Charles H., Jr.
Saunders, William H., III
Sayers, Robert M., Jr.
Saylor, Eugene H.
Scarafone, Ronald
Schack, Edwin R., Jr.
Schaer, Oscar
Schonenberg, Hans P.
Schuller, Gordon J.
Schultz, Ford J. E.
Schutz, Walter J.
Schwartz, Sheldon O.
Scott, John H., Jr.
Scull, John D.
Sears, Glen R.
Sease, Hugh S., Jr.
Seay, Wesley, H., Jr.
Seeger, Charles E.
Service, James E.
Seymour, Ernest R.
Shabe, Gerard P.
Shafer, Lawrence
Shaffer, George W.
Shaffer, Guy H. B.
Shald, Robert A.
Shanahan, Thomas L.
Shaver, Frank T.
Sheehan, William F., Jr.
Sheldon, Robert E.
Shellman, Curtis B., Jr.
Sherar, Robert C.
Sherman, Peter W.
Shrine, Bertram, Jr.
Shutty, Michael S.
Slier, Paydon D., Jr.
Sigmon, Harold F.
Sigsworth, David E.
Simon, Phillip C.
Sims, Clifford M., Jr.
Sims, Gelzer L., Jr.
Sinclair, Alexander M.
Sisson, Donald E.
Skube, Edward A.
Skyrud, Jerome P.
Small, Robert H.
Smedberg, William R., IV
Smeltzer, John L., Jr.
Smith, Carol C., Jr.
Smith, Hugh T.
Smith, Kenneth G.
Smith, Ordell
Smith, Robert G.
Smith, Scott L.
Smith, St. Clair
Smith, William F.
Smoot, William N.
Smooth, William F.
Sobleski, Leonard J.
Solterer, Carl F.
Soracco, David L.
Span, William F.
Speer, Richard T.
Springer, Howard C.
Sprunk, William, Jr.
Squires, Walter G., Jr.
Stader, John F.
Stalder, Roy F., Jr.
Stanley, Joseph K.
Stanley, Richard M.
Stark, Peter A., Jr.
Starn, Harrison F., Jr.
Stein, George D., Jr.
Stewart, Rodney L.
Still, Donald A.
St. Lawrence, William P., Jr.
Stockmeir, Dean
Stoehr, Leonard A.
Stornetta, Wakefield S. M.
Stout, Edward N.
Stovall, Walter W.
Straney, Charles N.
Streightiff, Charles W.
Strohm, James J.
Strunk, Arthur A.
Sugg, Ross E.
Sullivan, Edward T.
Sullivan, Robert H.
Summers, Howard P.
Surman, William V., Jr.
Sutherland, Benjamin T. W.
Swank, Donald E.
Sylvester, Gerald D.
Tallet, Arthur J.
Tallman, Elmer C.
Tate, Charles G.
Taylor, Clinton W.
Taylor, Edmund B., Jr.
Taylor, James D., Jr.
Tetrick, Claude J.
Thamm, Tom B.
Thiel, Louis H. C., Jr.
Thomas, David H.
Thomas, Gerald E.
Thomas, John K.
Thomas, Kenneth G.
Thomas, Richard T.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thomas, Robert F.
Thompson, Archibald S.
Thompson, William S.
Till, Ernest A.
Tillerson, Leonard E.
Tillson, John G.
Tomb, Paul D.
Traub, Charles, III
Treadwell, Lawrence P., Jr.
Treiber, Arthur E.
Trens, Mike J.
Trimble, Richard W.
Troffer, George J., Jr.
Troutman, Burl A., Jr.
Turnage, Robert L.
Tuzo, Lamar W.
Tuzo, Paul B., III
Tyson, Bille C.
Uehlinger, John C.
Utterback, Paul W.
Vahsen, George M.
Vail, Harold W.
Valade, Larry G.
Van Arsdol, Robert A.
Van Buskirk, George F.
Van Hook, Gordan
Varley, James F.
Verser, John K.
Victor, Francis W.
Voegelein, Gordon R.
Wadsworth, Francis L.
Walden, John W.
Wales, John R.
Walker, George D.
Wallace, Robert J.
Wandres, Victor, C.
Ward, Arthur T.
Ward, Carl B.
Ward, Thomas M., Jr.
Wasilewski, Alex, Jr.
Watson, Thomas W.
Watts, Charles R., Jr.
Webber, Gene D.
Webster, Edward W. V.
Weeks, Robert H.
Welsheit, Burton A.
Wellman, Harold N.
Wenzel, Robert F.
Wettrich, John R.
Wheeler, Robert A.
Whelan, Edward C., Jr.
Whelchel, Henry C., Jr.
Whistler, Ralph N., Jr.
Whitaker, Robert M.
White, Maurice G.
White, Paul G. G.
White, Steven A.
Whorton, William R.
Whyte, Kent E.
Wilde, Stanford E.
Wilhelmi, Quentin E.
Wilkinson, Edward L.
Wilkinson, Joseph B., Jr.
Williams, Allen D.
Williams, Charles K.
Williams, Charles D.
Williams, John T.
Williams, Ross N.
Willard, Bobbie D.
Willis, Francis R.
Wilson, Charles E.
Wilson, Donald K.
Wilson, Jack L.
Wilson, James E., Jr.
Wimberly, Tommy C.
Winberg, William, III
Winfrey, John A., Jr.
Winkel, Raymond N.
Winkler, Richard C.
Winnefeld, James A.
Wisdom, Jessie R.
Wiseman, Charles H.
Withers, Christopher
Wolff, Kenneth E.
Wood, Ralph E.
Wood, Stephen C.
Woodbury, John L., Jr.
Woodbury, Robert E.
Wright, Richard L.
Wright, Ross W.
Wright, Sidney V., Jr.
Wynkoop, Thomas E.
Yamnicky, John D.
Yeager, George E.
Yetman, William R.
Yocom, Ernest
Yoran, George F., Jr.
Young, Robert A.
Youngquist, John A.
Yount, Tim B.
Zacharias, Jerrold M.
Zoehrer, Herbert A.
Zvanovec, Ladimir J.
Prescott, Eustace H., Jr.
Richardson, Fred W.
Rosenwinkel, Norbert E.
Sanderlin, Joseph M.
COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS
Aiken, Robert J.
Alexander, Charles E., Jr.
Andersen, Martin G.
Atkins, Claude C.
Baker, Richard A.
Balyeat, George E.
Barcay, Stephen J., Jr.
Bargatze, Fred O.
Barreca, Joseph P., Jr.
Belser, Robert D.
Best, William C.
Bingham, Elmer L.
Blackburn, Laurence H. Jr.,
Borowsky, Melvin
Boyd, Douglas G.
Bramlett, Charner W.
Brisbin, Robert L.
Brown, Robert A.
Carver, Michael C.
Clarke, Eugene J., Jr.
Colburn, James E.
Cooke, James K., Jr.
Cooper, Paul D., Jr.
Crews, Quintous E., Jr.
Daane, Thomas A.
Davis, Milton D.
Dean, Phillip J.
de Arrigotiaro-Driguez, Enrique M.
Dempsey, William C.
Dewaal, Jan G.
Deyton, John W., Jr.
Easterling, James F.
Emich, Charles H.
Escarjada, Richard M.
Fairfax, George T.
Fosburg, Richard G.
German, Roy E.
Glass, James L.
Glick, Herbert E.
Hamlin, Charles R.
Harrison, Lucius A., Jr.
Hart, George B.
Houston, Harry R.
CAPTAIN, SUPPLY CORPS
Adrian, Rodger J.
Baird, Richard S.
Clements, Daniel J., Jr.
Dellasega, Joseph L.
Doucette, Forrest H.
Elmore, John W.
Forrest, James E.
Harbaugh, Norman R.
Haslett, Robert H.
Holbert, Kelley V.
Jones, Joe L.
Josselyn, Allan H., Jr.
Keidel, Charles J.
Knight, Richard H.
Larson, Albert G.
Larson, Leslie O., Jr.
COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS
Baker, Clovis M.
Barrett, Charles W.
Benedict, Joseph W.
Boyce, Thomas A.
Boyle, John J.
Brady, James A.
Bray, Joseph A., Jr.
Brett, Justin D.
Hughes, James L.
Jones, Warren J., Jr.
Kawaguchi, Toshiyuki P.
Kibbey, Ianthus I.
Kinneman, Robert E., Jr.
Knab, Douglas R.
Kostohryz, Francis T.
Labudovich, Marco
Lambdin, Charles S.
Lee, Dixon A.
Linaweaver, Paul G., Jr.
Lowery, Clinton H.
Maher, Francis L.
Mazzarella, Italo C.
McGrew, Clinton J., Jr.
Miller, Alan G.
Millerick, Joseph D.
Mills, Mitchell
Mullen, Joseph T.
Mullin, Robert L.
Neugebauer, Marion K.
Plaut, Martin R.
Pratt, Hugh S., Jr.
Proulx, Ronald A.
Ralston, John "C", Jr.
Rinaldi, "J" Jerome
Rivas, Hector M.
Robinson, Donald W.
Royal, Orren L.
Rudinger, Edwin A.
Schanberger, John E.
Schorn, Victor G.
Seaton, Lewis H.
Stotka, Victor L.
TenEyck, David R.
Trone, James N.
Trumble, Theodore J.
Upton, Richard T.
Varon, Myron I.
Wenger, Norman E.
Whetsell, Joe E.
Willett, Leo V., Jr.
Woodstein, Ira J.
York, Ellhu
Young, James M.
Lewis, Raymond O.
MacDonald, Albert P., Jr.
McHenry, Wendell, Jr.
Peffley, John F.
Randolph, Karl W.
Renfro, Edward E., III
Rodgers, Wallace F.
Small, Joseph T.
Stafford, Dean C., Jr.
Surrain, Charles R.
Thurman, Horace E., Jr.
Walther, Frederick W.
Woolard, Kenneth A.

Cavanaugh, Alfred G.
 Conrad, Stanley J.
 Crane, Barrett
 Cuson, Charles E.
 Dickey, William H.
 Donnelly, Goodwin, III
 Drake, William D.
 Dreese, Richard N.
 Dunlevy, John H.
 Durham, Graydon M., Jr.
 Edsall, Van T.
 Fanelty, William C.
 Foster, Robert W.
 Francisco, Dick H.
 Frost, Shirley D.
 Galvez, Richard M.
 Gillespie, James A., Jr.
 Giordano, Andrew A.
 Goeres, Gerald F.
 Gordon, Donald B.
 Gudbranson, Larry G.
 Guffy, Wellard R.
 Gustavson, Arthur R.
 Hamilton, Oliver W., Jr.
 Hamilton, Walter S.
 Harris, Emerson M.
 Hendershot, Theodore R.
 Henderson, John S.
 Hill, Robert E.
 Hulsing, Don L.
 Hurt, Richard O.
 Jackson, Arthur D.
 Jerich, Frank J.
 Kauder, Robert
 Kelly, Robert C.
 Kerwath, Richard C. F.

CAPTAIN, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bonner, Robert A.
 Cloonan, Joseph F.
 Keeley, John A.
 Lavin, Henry T.

Kick, David L.
 King, Gerald H.
 Kirch, Frederick J.
 Klatt, Ivan J.
 Kohl, Jacob D.
 Landfair, Robert W.
 Luoto, Hugo M. Jr.
 Margason, Bernard L.
 Mayer, William H.
 Miller, Eric H., Jr.
 Mitchell, William F.
 Morrison, Quinn B.
 Nehez, James R., Jr.
 Newman, William H.
 Phleger, Charles P.
 Plicht, George C.
 Postak, John N.
 Postich, George
 Potter, David W.
 Reynolds, Richard F.
 Rice, Charles E.
 Ryan, William J.
 Samuelson, Charles H.
 Sandrock, John E.
 Schriener, James A.
 Searles, Donald W.
 Short, Carl W.
 Smith, Charles E.
 Smith, Herbert R.
 Spears, Laurence
 Stansbury, George L., III
 Stratton, Dene B.
 Tesch, Donald A.
 Thomas, Magnus R.
 Thompson, Gerald J.
 Trueblood, Howard G.
 Umstead, Walter W., Jr.
 Wadsworth, Ben A., Jr.
 Waller, Edmund M., Jr.
 Weisskopf, William M.
 White, George H.
 York, William B., Jr.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Parham, Thomas D., Jr.
 Ray, Milton U.
 Trower, Ross H.
 Vincer, John D.

COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Bevan, Leroy A.
 Bontrager, John K.
 Carr, John F.
 Geeza, Boris
 Goad, John T.
 Hogan, James J.
 Johns, Harry D.
 Kensta, Felix L.
 Letten, Lloyd W., Jr.

Linzer, Stanford E., Jr.
 Miller, Harry R.
 Morrill, Giles D.
 Schmid, Calvin F.
 Simmons, David E.
 Smith, Richard R.
 Tillberg, Harlin E.
 Titley, Richard K.
 Zeller, Dwight F.

CAPTAIN, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ashley, Donn L.
 Baker, Carlyle J., Jr.
 Cunning, David P.
 Devlin, John G.
 Forquer, Charles J.
 Francy, William J.
 Gault, Alan C.
 Griffiths, William H., Jr.
 Hansen, Bernard L.
 Iselin, Donald G.
 Jones, Whitney B.
 Kaloupek, William E.
 Klingensmeier, Russell J., Jr.

LaLande, Albert M., Jr.
 Miller, Charles G., Jr.
 Mitter, Wayne S.
 More, David C.
 Patrick, Donald A.
 Saunders, Edward M.
 Souder, Charles L.
 Spangler, William S.
 Sturman, William H.
 Van Leer, Blake W.
 Walton, Albion W., Jr.
 Yount, George R.

COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Armatrout, Merritt F.
 Bannister, William H.
 Biederman, Richard J.
 Biederman, Jack C.
 Calhoun, Charles W.
 Church, Archer E., Jr.
 Coughlin, Richard D.
 Courtright, Carl

DeGroot, Ward W., III
 Dixon, Olin L., III
 Field, Robert T.
 Gates, Paul R.
 Geoly, Charles
 Green, Lawrence J.
 McCoy, Arley E., Jr.
 Middleton, William D., Jr.
 Mooney, Malcolm T.

Myers, Clayman C., Jr.
 Olson, Paul D.
 Saravia, Benjamin L.
 Stevens, Warren G.
 Sutherland, Andrew G.
 Sutley, Robert M.
 Tombari, Henry A.

CAPTAIN, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Johnston, Frank S.
 Morgan, Horace H.
 Neely, William E.
 Parks, Larry G.

COMMANDER, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Bridges, Kenneth K.
 Evans, LaVerne E.
 Fink, Edward R.
 Fruchterman, Richard
 L., Jr.
 Haight, Gardiner M.
 Higgins, Clinton K., Jr.

CAPTAIN, DENTAL CORPS

Bartlett, Stephen O.
 DeLaurentis, Carlo A.
 Didion, Robert W.
 Echols, Archie D., Jr.
 Gregory, Worth B., Jr.
 Holmes, Corey H.
 Kramer, Howard S., Jr.

COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS

Allensworth, Thomas M., Jr.
 Billotte, Alfred C.
 Brault, Alfred O.
 Clark, Charles N., III
 Colvecchio, Emidio J.
 Collier, Richard D.
 Corderman, Roy G., Jr.
 Cotton, William R.
 Davidson, Richard S.
 Fulcher, Clyde L.
 Gaston, Robert A.
 Hall, Ollie V., Jr.
 Hayes, Daniel E.
 Kaneshiro, Kenneth K.
 Keene, Harris J.
 Kelly, James F.
 Koutraks, John

CAPTAIN, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baldrige, Henry D., Jr.
 Burr, Leonard W.
 Caldwell, Charlie C.
 Clauss, Edward L.
 Coggburn, Manfred W.
 Combs, Harrison T.
 Eastman, Robert W.
 Eisman, Leon P.
 Essman, Frederick B.
 Fennell, Chester C.
 Hull, William B.
 Mason, Anderson T.

COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Akers, Thomas G.
 Asche, Clifton A.
 Bean, Willis E.
 Boudreaux, Joseph C., Jr.
 Bower, Harold R.
 Browne, Weldon G., Jr.
 Chansky, Ralph D.
 Daniel, Harold E.
 Dowling, James H.
 Drake, Wilbur R.
 Garver, Richard M.
 Green, Gale R.
 Green, William J., Jr.
 Harris, Albert C.

Peppler, Leonard A.
 Reynolds, Donald C.
 Robinson, Donald J.
 Rudolph, Henry S.
 Schindele, Rodger F.
 Shaffer, Weller J., Jr.

CAPTAIN, NURSE CORPS

Houp, Geraldine A.

COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Boring, Martha L.
 Corcoran, Anna
 Hall, Lucy E.
 Hill, Gretchen S.
 McKay, Bernadette A.
 Murasheff, Lina D.
 Nielubowicz, Mary J.

Summerour, Thomas J.
 Tedford, Charles F.
 Verme, Dominic A.
 Williams, Daniel N.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, LINE

Adams, Ben L.
 Adams, Frederick G.
 Adams, Harold W.
 Adams, James J.
 Adams, Jessie W.
 Adams, Thomas C.
 Addison, Carl W., Jr.
 Adgent, Robert B.
 Ahrenstein, Monroe J.
 Ake, Charles F.
 Alberg, Donald J.
 Albritton, David L.
 Alexander, Sherman G.
 Allard, Frank A.
 Allemang, John D.
 Allen, Archie E.
 Allen, David L.
 Allen, John E.
 Allen, Richard O., Jr.
 Allen, Robert L., Jr.
 Allen, Scott
 Allison, William R., Jr.
 Alves, Arcenio, Jr.
 Ames, Laverne W.
 Anderson, Charles R.
 Anderson, Edwin K.
 Anderson, Franklin W.
 Anderson, Gary M.
 Anderson, Jerry P.
 Anderson, James B.
 Anderson, Peter N.
 Anderson, Richard W.
 Anderson, Thomas A.
 Anderson, Thomas J.
 Andrade, Allan L.
 Andrews, Bobbie
 Androksi, Frank N.
 Angus, Marvin S.
 Anthony, Phillip D.
 Appelhof, Gilbert A.
 Apple, John D., Jr.
 Aquilino, Salvatore P.
 Araki, Makoto
 Armor, Jack M.
 Armstrong, Clarence E., Jr.
 Arnold, David L.
 Arnold, James G.
 Arnold, Thomas F.
 Artuso, Michael A.
 Arvin, Vernon E.
 Atkins, Allan L.
 Aucoin, James B.
 Audlet, Garland O.
 Ausley, Joe H., Jr.
 Avery, Paul R.
 Aydt, Roger D.
 Ayres, David R.
 Baakkonen, Ronald R.
 Baals, John R.
 Bachman, Robert A.
 Bailes, Ralph T.
 Bailey, Donald C., Jr.
 Bailey, George M.
 Bailey, James E.
 Bailey, William B.
 Baker, Donald A.

Baker, Jack
 Baker, John K.
 Baker, Robert C.
 Baker, Robert E.
 Baker, Robert G.
 Baldwin, Oa F.
 Balesy, Joseph W.
 Bandy, Clifford W.
 Bankowski, Walter F.
 Banks, William K.
 Barbour, William J., Jr.
 Barenti, Jerome C.
 Baril, Robert F.
 Barlow, John R.
 Barnes, James A.
 Barnes, James H.
 Barnes, Joel F.
 Barnett, Charles E.
 Barney, Charles R.
 Barnhardt, David F.
 Barnhart, Harold D.
 Barrig, Donald B.
 Barringer, Robert A.
 Barrish, Paul D.
 Bartholomew, James H.
 Bartley, Robert H.
 Barton, Robert L.
 Bass, William H., III
 Bassett, Charles G.
 Bate, Ronald D.
 Bauer, Paul F., Jr.
 Bauman, John M.
 Baumgartner, James A.
 Baumstark, Richard B.
 Bauschka, Patrick F.
 Beach, Milton D.
 Beagle, Clyde A., Jr.
 Beall, Thomas J.
 Beamon, Joseph E., II
 Beck, Liston, C., Jr.
 Beck, Richard E.
 Bedow, Robert J.
 Bellisle, Gerald M.
 Bell, Roger Q.
 Bellinger, John R.
 Belto, Meryl A.
 Benditt, Billy L.
 Benediktsson, Phillip W.
 Bennett, Charles F.
 Bennett, Peter C.
 Bentley, Robert E.
 Bergfeld, Rudolph P., III
 Bergstrom, Kenneth I.
 Bernard, Eugene C.
 Bertrand, Jon S.
 Bess, George D.
 Best, Albert H., III
 Bethea, Carl L.
 Bethel, Robert G.
 Betts, Roger S.
 Betts, William M.
 Beversdorf, Donald W.
 Beving, Duane U.
 Bewley, Jack D.
 Beyl, David D.

- Biggs, Robert R.
Bigler, William W.
Biles, George E.
Billicki, Daniel R.
Bird, Ralph G.
Bird, Richard E.
Bird, Thomas C.
Bisek, Dennis G.
Bishop, Jack D.
Bishop, Larry D.
Blair, David B.
Blaisdell, Richard W.
Blanchard, Ralph W., Jr.
Blankenship, James M., II
Bley, John E., Jr.
Bloise, James E.
Bloom, Donald D.
Blouin, Robert E.
Blum, Brandon B.
Blumie, John A.
Boebert, Frank L., Jr.
Boelter, Dan A.
Boguslawski, William T.
Bolte, William S.
Bolton, John M.
Bone, John S., Jr.
Bonhag, Walter D., Jr.
Booth, Peter B.
Borcik, Andrew J., Jr.
Bossert, John L.
Bouder, Raymond S.
Bovey, Paul E.
Bowers, John P.
Bowers, Richard F.
Bowman, Henry C.
Box, Roger E.
Boyd, Richard M.
Boyle, Ronald R.
Boyles, Harlan H.
Bradford, "J" "W"
Branscomb, Max "G"
Braunschweiger, Andrew E.
Bredderman, Rudolf T.
Breeding Leslie E.
Breland, Edgar A.
Bremser, William J., Jr.
Brennan, John F., Jr.
Brennan, Richard J.
Brenneman, Harold R.
Brennen, William L.
Brestle, Charles A.
Briegel, Charles V.
Brigel, Braden R.
Briggs, Stanley
Bright, Richard A.
Bright, Thomas B.
Brisbois, Marshall B.
Britton, Jack B.
Britton, Vernon J., Jr.
Bronson, Hiram S., III
Brooks, Bernard A.
Brooks, Charles G. W.
Brooks, Otis M.
Brotton, Chester F.
Brown, Daniell M.
Brown, Donald B.
Brown, Donald L.
Brown, Frederick J.
Brown, Howard A.
Brown, Nicholas
Brown, Ora D., III
Brown, Peter J.
Brown, Ralph N.
Brown, Ralph E., Jr.
Brown, Roger W., Jr.
Brown, William S., Jr.
Brown, William M.
Browning, Elmer L.
Browning, Wayne B.
Broyles, Bill R.
Bruso, James W.
Bruyere, Thomas E.
Bryan, John E., Jr.
Bryans, Brian K.
Bryant, Don M.
Buchsieb, Louis D.
Buchwald, Robert D.
Buckland, Rann K.
Bueche, Arthur H., Jr.
Buehler, William S.
Buggy, Joseph S., Jr.
Burdick, Howard F., Jr.
Burgess, Eric C.
Burke, Francis J.
Burke, Joseph S.
Burke, Michael T.
Burkel, John F.
Burlerson, Frank M.
Burns, Gerald J.
Burns, James W.
Burpo, James H.
Burrows, Donn T.
Burrows, Jack
Burson, Donald L.
Burt, Russell H.
Burton, James L., Jr.
Busby, Richard E.
Bush, Vernon R.
Bushnell, Malcolm W.
Butler, Clarence B.
Butler, Francis M., Jr.
Button, Ralph L.
Butts, Richard F.
Byng, Weston H.
Byrom, James T.
Caccivio, John D.
Caine, Paul E.
Caldwell, Leland C.
Caldwell, Theodore E.
Calhan, James R.
Callaway, Jack M.
Camacho, Richard G.
Camp, Joe D.
Campbell, Carl E.
Campbell, John R.
Campbell, Norman D.
Campbell, Ronald K.
Campbell, Thomas G.
Canada, Donald E.
Cannon, James R.
Capley, Joe H.
Carder, Denny M.
Carlson, Richard A., Jr.
Carlson, Walter G.
Carmichael, Eddie I.
Carre, David M., Jr.
Carriagan, Richard C.
Carroll, Peter A.
Carson, James T.
Carswell, Michael S.
Casey, Richard F.
Casey, Ronald C.
Castle, Ronald G.
Cates, Gus V.
Catoe, Ralph D.
Catola, Stanley G.
Catron, Jerry M.
Cecelski, Arthur R.
Cellar, Charles J., Jr.
Chalmers, William C.
Chancellor, Dean H.
Chancy, Thomas M.
Chang, Ming E.
Charneco, Carlos M., Jr.
Chase, Henri B., III
Chase, Warren T., Jr.
Chatham, Walter L.
Chauncey, Arvin R.
Chester, Scott A.
Chilton, Holly H.
Chitty, Charles M., Jr.
Chrans, Ronald L.
Christensen, Charles C.
Christensen, Cyrus R.
Christopher, Richard V.
Chumley, Sylvester G.
Clark, Arthur R., Jr.
Clark, Bruce A.
Clark, George E.
Clark, George G.
Clark, James M.
Clark, Thomas B.
Clark, William E., Jr.
Clay, Jack D.
Cleary, Patrick R.
Clock, Richard V.
Cloud, Bruce L.
Clower, Claude D.
Clynes, Charles E.
Cobb, Roy L.
Cochran, Thomas L.
Cochran, William F.
Cocotis, Bruce T.
Coffey, Robert C.
Cole, Charles W., Jr.
Coleman, Douglas C.
Coleman Joseph S., Jr.
Coll, William A.
Collard, Keith P.
Collier, Lacey A.
Colville, Robert E.
Combs, Robert L.
Comstock, George W.
Connell, Earl W.
Connell, Laurence M.
Connell, Phillip J.
Connely, James H., Jr.
Connelly, John J., Jr.
Conner, John D.
Connolly, Leo J.
Connor, Ronald L. F.
Conti, Francis A.
Cook, John H., III
Cook, Richard D.
Cooke, Vincent E.
Cooley, David L.
Coons, Henry A.
Cooper, Daniel L.
Cooper, Estill A., Jr.
Cooper, Ross E.
Cooper, Scott E.
Corkins, Charles W., Jr.
Corkrum, Richard C.
Cornell, John P.
Cornett, Charles S., Jr.
Corrigan, Richard W.
Costello, Donald H.
Costlow, Kenneth L.
Cotsonas, John P.
Covey, Edward J.
Cowling, Cecil G.
Cox, Edward F.
Cox, Henry
Coyle, Charles A.
Coyne, Thomas
Coyne, William L.
Cracknell, William H., Jr.
Crafton, Robert W.
Craig, John E., Jr.
Crain, Carroll O., Jr.
Cramer, Dean E.
Cramer, Edward A., Jr.
Cramer, Erich H. E.
Crater, George H., Jr.
Crawford, Paul G.
Cremon, John, Jr.
Cress, Robert B.
Crew, Perry L.
Crim, Billy R.
Crook, Bernard
Crouse, David R.
Crouse, James U., Jr.
Crowell, George T., Jr.
Crowson, Christopher G.
Crudup, Everett H., Jr.
Crutchfield, Claud C.
Culberson, George W., Jr.
Cullen, Joseph P.
Cunningham, Richard S., III
Cummins, Clarence M.
Cunningham, John H.
Cunningham, Joseph F.
Cunningham, Donald E.
Curry, Keith R. W.
Curry, Thomas H.
Curtis, Joe C., Jr.
Cushing, Earl H.
Cust, Harlan R.
Cutting, Curtis B.
Cyr, Byron A.
Czar, Raymond J.
Dage, Jerry D.
Dahill, Edward E., III
Dahl, Lowell D.
Dailey, Eugene O.
Daly, John S.
Dangelo, Anthony V., Jr.
Daniels, Hal B.
Dankel, Kenneth M.
Darling, David D.
Darnell, Jack
Daugherty, Donald N.
Daulton, James T.
Daum, Richard A.
David, Ralph H.
Davis, Jimmy W.
Davis, Norman E.
Davis, Robert B.
Davis, Robert G.
Davis, Thomas A.
Davison, Gregory L.
Day, James O.
Dean, Robert V.
Deangelo, Mark J.
Dearle, Cyril G.
Debode, Donald G.
Deboxtel, Lawrence L., Jr.
Dechant, John A.
Deering, Robert M.
Degroot, Henry, Jr.
Demarco, Anthony R.
Denison, William F.
Dennison, James R.
Denoon, Norman L.
Denton, Douglas J.
De Nunzio, Nicholas J.
Desteiguer, John R.
Deutermann, David W.
DeWeese, Everette D.
Dewey, Richard F.
Dewitt, Michael T.
Dickens, Russell J.
Dickerson, Kenneth A.
Dickey, John E.
Dillard, John S.
Dilcreto, Lucio
Dixon, Jewel L. Jr.
Dodge, Richard H.
Doebbler, Gordon B.
Doerr, Peter J.
Doherty, Richard S.
Domville, Compton N., Jr.
Donahue, John F.
Donlan, William J.
Donnegan, Richard
Donohue, Douglas J.
Dore, Stanley M., Jr.
Dorow, William R.
Dorsey, James F., Jr.
Doubroff, Jerome S.
Dowd, Gregory P.
Downs, Eugene H.
Drake, Donald L.
Draper, Tim L.
Drewry, Dean T.
Duben, Edward M.
Duckworth, Jess "R"
Duffie, Charles L.
Duffield, Frederick H., Jr.
Dumas, Jaul J.
Dunbar, Fredric A.
Duncan, John G.
Dungan, David A.
Dunleavy, Richard M.
Dunmire, Rance D.
Dunnam, William L.
Durckel, Ronald E.
Dvorak, Robert
Dwyer, William L.
Dyer, Nathaniel B., Jr.
Dyer, William E.
Dyro, Stanislaus G.
Eagye, Vernon A.
Earhart, Kay E.
Earnest, Charles "M"
Eason, William G.
Easterbrook, Charles W., Jr.
Eaton, Robert H.
Eck, Billy C.
Eckert, John D.
Edmonds, Donald C.
Edwards, Claude E., Jr.
Edwards, James C.
Edwards, Joe D.
Edwards, Leslie R.
Edwards, Walter J.
Edwards, William F.
Egan, Robert W.
Egerton, James W.
Ehret, James D.
Ehrman, Robert G.
Elzenhoefer, David J.
Elle, Gayle O.
Elinski, Michael, Jr.
Eller, James B.
Ellingson, Norman D.
Ellingwood, Arthur R., Jr.
Ellis, Hall R., III
Elpers, William W.
Elwell, William D.
Emerick, Charles D.
Emery, William F.
Emmerson, Milo E.
Emsley, Albert P., Jr.
Endo, Norio B.
Englehardt, James H.
English, Glenn A.
Epstein, Julian D.
Erdei, Edward J.
Erle, Carl R.
Ermis, Leroy C.
Eskew, Perry R., Jr.
Estes, Edward D.
Etheredge, Teddy B.
Evans, Frederic H.
Evans, Gene O.
Evans, James A.
Evans, Phillip R.
Evans, Ronald E.
Everly, Vernon R.
Eylar, Frederick P.
Eylar, Armand T., Jr.
Fahey, William F.
Fair, Thomas W.
Fairbanks, Wayne K.
Faircloth, Gerald F.
Fallon, Thomas F., Jr.
Fantry, William T., Jr.
Farris, John H.
Featherston, Rex W.
Feingersch, Allen
Felkins, Charles G.
Fellowes, John H.
Fenzl, George J., Jr.
Ferguson, Van L.
Ferm, Dennis W.
Ferrari, Richard L.
Ferry, James M.
Feuerheim, Duane L.
Fieser, Arnold K.
Filbert, Arthur S.
Fink, George E.
Fink, Siegfried A.
Finley, Dean M.
Fiore, Adolph A.
Firey, Roger S.
Fischer, Robert J.
Fischer, Theodore A., Jr.
Fish, Benjamin L., Jr.
Fishback, Frederick I.
Fishburn, Lewis R.
Fisher, Norman E.
Fisher, Walter L., Jr.
Fitch, Dee N.
Fitch, Edward S.
Fitzgerald, John F.
Fitzgerald, Maurice D.
Fitzsimmons, Eugene W.
Fitzsimmons, Harry S., Jr.
Fitzwilliam, Peter K.
Flanary, Thomas N., D.
Flannery, Gerard J., Jr.
Flather, Charles R.
Flatley, James H., III
Fleak, Walter H., Jr.
Fleming, Bruce S.
Fleming, William J.
Fleshman, Samuel A., II
Florko, Donald J.
Flory, Richard L.
Flower, John R.
Floyd, Rodney R.
Flynn, John J., Jr.
Flynn, John J.
Flynn, Samuel C., Jr.
Flynn, William J.
Flyum, James K.
Foley, Jerold W.
Fontanesi, Francis D.
Foote, Everett W.
Ford, Alvis S.
Ford, Lyndall C.
Ford, Randolph W.
Forderhase, Larry A.
Fordham, Barton W., Jr.
Fordice, James E.
Forest, Robert E.
Forster, Johann R.
Forster, Robert M.
Fortenberry, Thomas N.
Fosko, Paul D.
Fossett, Birchard C.
Foster, Charles R.
Foster, Paul E.
Fournier, Joseph O.
Fournier, Paul R.
Fowler, Jim B.
Fox, George R.
Fox, John F. J.
Frank, Thomas P.
Frank, Vernon E.
Frankenberger, Paul F.
Franklin, William P.
Frankoski, John P.
Franzen, Richard D.
Frazier, Donald L.
Fredrick, Russell E.
Freeman, George H.
Freeman, Thomas L.
French, Douglas "E"
Frey, Robert D.
Fries, Charles L.
Frichtenicht, Richard D.
Froehlich, Kenneth R.
Frontz, Leroy, Jr.

- Fudala, Ernest M.
Fuld, Charles L.
Fuller, Dale G.
Fullerton, Frank E.
Funderburk, Jerry D.
Furey, Edwin M.
Furrow, Donald E.
Furtado, Francis J.
Fyles, Roderick A.
Gagne, Wilfred C.
Gallo, Henry A., Jr.
Gallagher, Joseph G.
Gallion, Lawrence B.
Gallotta, Richard A.
Galvin, Robert J.
Garber, Cecil E.
Gardella, John K.
Garman, Glen E.
Garretson, Arthur S.
Garrett, Roger D.
Garrison, Charles H., Jr.
Garvey, James J.
Gash, John A.
Gates, Richard L.
Gault, Harry R.
Gaylor, Elvin L.
Gearin, Billy D.
Gehrige, Jerome C.
Gelke, John J.
George, Troy H., Jr.
Gero, Richard L.
Gesling, Marion L.
Giaccino, Louis F.
Gibson, Clifford W.
Gibson, James C., Jr.
Gifford, Robert M.
Gilbert, Donald B.
Gilbert, James C.
Gilbert, Robert L.
Gilchrist, Craig G.
Gilchrist, James L.
Gilfry, Mason C.
Gilkison, Edward R., Jr.
Ginn, James T.
Ginther, Larry L.
Giulliani, Leonard E.
Glasgow, Billy R.
Glasson, William A., Jr.
Glenn, William A., II
Gluse, Michael R.
Godbey, Thomas N.
Godefroy, Pierre L.
Goewey, Lee E.
Goggin, Richard E.
Gojden, Edward E.
Golder, Thomas V.
Gonzalez, Robert N.
Goodale, Charles N.
Goodall, Thomas A.
Goodwin, James B.
Gordon, Stewart R.
Grady, Roger D.
Graham, Frank M.
Gralow, Richard T.
Grandjean, Charles A.
Grant, Freeman A., Jr.
Grant, Gerry D.
Grant, Howard W., Jr.
Grant, Richard L.
Graves, William S.
Gray, Anthony W., Jr.
Gray, Robert K.
Green, Gerald E.
Green, William H.
Greene, George O.
Greene, Richard C.
Greene, William H., Jr.
Greenhaw, Karl J., Jr.
Greenwood, Richard L.
Greer, Robert E.
Gregory, Kenneth A.
Grewe, Webster
Grier, Thomas C., Jr.
- Griffin, Robert F.
Griffin, Thomas R.
Grimmell, Robert L.
Griswold, Gale M.
Gross, Sidney L.
Grosscup, William D.
Gross, Sidney L.
Grossoehme, Clyde
Grove, Ronald R.
Grow, Robert L.
Guilmond, Louis F.
Guttery, Thomas H.
Haack, Norman E.
Hahn, Gary E.
Hahne, Dayton R.
Hale, Bill J.
Hale, Frederick W.
Haley, George K.
Haliday, George W.
Hall, Don L.
Hall, Joe L.
Hall, John O.
Hall, Robert A.
Hall, Thomas J.
Hamilt, Arthur
Hamilton, Edward A.
Hamilton, Verlie M.
Hamman, Kenneth A.
Hammock, Donald P.
Hammon, Colin P.
Hancock, Gus H., Jr.
Hanley, William L., Jr.
Hannaford, William H.
Hannah, Elmore K., Jr.
Hansen, Herbert L.
Hanson, David F.
Hanson, Deroy L.
Hanson, Donald C.
Hanson, Edwin E.
Hanson, Morton H.
Hardt, Hugo A.
Harkins, Vyron V., Jr.
Harmon, Jack E.
Harney, Patrick F.
Harris, Buford A., Jr.
Harris, Robert H.
Harris, William E.
Harscheid, David G.
Hart, Raymond J.
Hartley, Donald A.
Hartley, Donald H.
Hartman, Anthony G.
Hasch, Ralph H.
Haskell, Hugh B.
Hastings, Ralph H.
Haswell, Fremont G., Jr.
Hatch, Philip B., Jr.
Hatch, Ross R.
Haupt, Elmer H., Jr.
Hawkins, Charles D., Jr.
Hawkins, Sam H.
Hay, Donald G.
Hayes, Michael F.
Hayes, Newton G.
Hayman, Douglass F., Jr.
Hedstrom, Carl W.
Heekin, John P.
Hegeman, Joey W.
Holland, Charles E.
Heim, George J.
Heinlein, Joseph E., Jr.
Heinz, Paul R.
Helsing, Duane L.
Hellman, John S.
Henderson, Mark D., Jr.
Hennessey, John P.
Hennick, Raymond J.
Henry, John A., Jr.
Hensley, James V.
Herd, Robert V.
Hering, Frederick L.
Herring, Paul E.
- Hesse, Gerald H.
Hewitt, Paul E.
Hiatt, William D.
Hibbard, Grant W.
Hickerson, James M.
Hickey, John F., III
Hickman, Jimmie E.
Hickman, Thomas W.
Higgins, John J.
Higginson, John J.
Hilaire, Paul D.
Hill, Raymond W.
Hill, Richard L.
Hill, Rollin L.
Hills, Willard A.
Hippard, Clyde M.
Hippis, Carl E.
Hobbs, William L., Jr.
Hodge, William R.
Hodgkinson, John T.
Hodgskiss, William L.
Hoffman, Chauncey F.
Hoffner, Conrad C.
Hogg, James R.
Hogue, Robert L.
Hohenstein, Clyde G.
Holland, John O.
Holland, Tommy L.
Holland, Wylen R.
Hollandsworth, Paul F., Jr.
Holloway, Richard V.
Holm, John P.
Honea, Milton D.
Honsinger, Vernon C.
Hood, Joseph W., Jr.
Hoover, Cameron L.
Horne, Roger B., Jr.
Horne, Ronald G.
Horsley, George W., Jr.
Horton, Jerry D.
Houglum, Leon P.
House, Wayne, Jr.
Howard, Charles B.
Howard, Harlan C.
Howard, John A.
Howe, John E.
Howell, Thomas A., Jr.
Hoyes, Donald J.
Hueber, Fred P.
Huggins, Andrew C.
Huhn, Samuel P.
Hullander, Robert A.
Humphreys, David W.
Hunter, Wallace R.
Hurd, Devon "H"
Husted, Murl E., Jr.
Huston, William G.
Hutchinson, Charles K.
Hutton, James L.
Hyatt, Charles E.
Hyatt, Robert G.
Hyde, Ronald P.
Ingram, William A.
Inman, Ronald C.
Innes, Alexander R.
Ion, Dalton L.
Isenhour, William J.
Jackets, Michael E.
Jackson, Jack M.
Jackson, Lester T., Jr.
Jackson, William I.
Jaeger, Robert H.
James, Ernest W.
James, James E. M.
Jamison, Kermit
Jarratt, Guy C., III
Jarwin, Raymond J.
Jaus, Charles W.
Jellison, Harry E.
Jensen, Richard S.
Jeremiah, David E.
Johannesen, Allen C.
Johe, Richard E.
- Johns, Alan D.
Johns, Clifford M.
Johnson, David R.
Johnson, James E.
Johnson, Jerome L.
Johnson, Joseph W.
Johnson, Phillip S.
Johnson, Robert B.
Johnson, Ronald J.
Johnson, Verlyn D.
Johnson, Walter E.
Johnson, Wendell N.
Johnston, Donald H., Jr.
Johnston, Donald W.
Johnston, Harold B., Jr.
Jones, Clyde W.
Jones, Jack E.
Jones, Jerry E.
Jones, Stanley W.
Jordan, Henry M.
Jourden, Bud A., Jr.
Juf, Robert J.
Jumper, Vernon L.
Jurgens, Robert A.
Kalinowski, Raymond S.
Kalinyak, Paul P.
Kantor, Clifford S.
Karas, Robert E.
Karn, Alvin R., Jr.
Karnakis, Nicholas
Kassebaum, David L.
Kato, Haruo
Katz, Robert E.
Katzmann, Gerard H.
Keast, Paul H.
Keathley, James W.
Keegan, Arthur E.
Keene, Charles R.
Keiffer, Leo H.
Keith, John F.
Keller, Harry R.
Keller, William E., Jr.
Kelso, Frank B., II
Kemp, Ernest E.
Kemper, Ralph C.
Kemper, Robert D.
Kenaston, George W.
Kennedy, Raymond J.
Kennedy, Thomas C.
Kennedy, Thomas L.
Kennelly, Bernard J.
Kenney, Richard A.
Kenney, Theodore C., Jr.
Kent, Ronald H.
Keough, Edward P.
Keough, Robert J.
Kerslake, Ronald W.
Kersting, William H.
Kesteloot, Robert W.
Ketchum, William H.
Keyes, James L.
Kilgore, William H.
Kilpatrick, Thomas E.
Kilpatrick, Paul G., Jr.
Kimball, Paul E.
Kinert, John H.
King, Charles C.
King, John D.
King, Ural W.
Kinney, Ben J.
Kinney, Charles H.
Kiper, William D.
Kirkpatrick, John H.
Kirkpatrick, Wayne A.
Kirkwood, Robert L.
Kittleman, Donald L.
Kitzelman, Glenn E.
Kizer, Theodore L.
Klein, Argyle G.
Klein, Harry L.
Klish, Theodore, Jr.
Kloman, John H.
Knapp, Ralph E.
Knaus, Vincent L.
Knef, Andrew L.
- Knight, Burton L.
Knight, Dennis K.
Knott, Howard E., Jr.
Knowles, Russell, Jr.
Kolstad, Thomas C.
Komisarcik, Adam
Kordek, Walter A.
Korthe, James D.
Kraemer, Kenton K.
Kralik, Simon C.
Kramer, James B., Jr.
Kramer, Rex W., Jr.
Kratch, David A.
Krekel, Lyman E.
Kremin, Richard A.
Kristof, John J.
Krogh, David E.
Kronnagel, Julius
Krueger, Milton E.
Krueger, Richard G.
Kruger, Allen L.
Kuck, Donald L.
Kuehler, Donald E.
Kuehmeier, Joseph K.
Kuhn, Wendel S., Jr.
Kulo, Thomas S.
Kushner, David A.
Kuykendall, Herbert B.
Kvederis, James P.
Lacy, William A.
Lamb, Larry R.
Lambert, Raymond A.
Lamberth, Billy C.
Lambright, Harold R., Jr.
La Motte, Francis J.
Lang, William R.
Lange, Christian A., Jr.
Langenheim, John P.
Langley, Charles R.
Langley, Thomas R., Jr.
Langston, Nicholas D.
Lanning, Richard J.
Lapham, Joseph G.
Larison, John D., Jr.
Larsen, James L.
Lassetter, Keith M.
Lattig, Edward C.
Laurance, James D.
Laux, Arno H.
Lavelle, Thomas J.
Lawrence, Donald W.
Lawson, Ramsay
Leban, Carl
LeBlanc, James B.
LeBlanc, Thomas D.
Lee, Dennis B.
Lee, John J.
Lee, Kenneth C.
Leech, Robert J.
Leeds, Rene W.
Lees, Forrest A., Jr.
Leird, William A.
Lengel, Robert C.
Lenhardt, Harry F., Jr.
Lerner, Albert M.
Lewedag, Loren M.
Lewey, Ira D.
Lewin, Theodore E.
Lewis, Harold S.
Lewis, Norman H.
Lewis, Tom A.
Lightsey, James L.
Linch, Donald T.
Lincoln, John R.
Lindquist, Donald E.
Lipscomb, Jack C.
Littlewood, Lyle E.
Livingston, John G., Jr.
Locke, Jerry L.
Logan, David E.
Lohr, James R.
Lomheim, Louis G.
Longley, William N.
Loos, Donald G.
Loscavio, John M.
- Loudon, Richard S.
Loudal, Rodney H.
Lowe, William L.
Lown, Paul C.
Lowry, Abner P.
Lubberstedt, Richard L.
Luetschwager, Edward E.
Lumbert, Albert W.
Lund, John R.
Lundquist, Donald R.
Lybrand, Joe D.
Lynch, Robert E., Jr.
Lyons, James E.
Macan, John J.
Macaskill, Everett, Jr.
MacCable, Van L.
MacDonald, Richard W.
Mackay, Gerald W.
Mackin, Louis B., Jr.
MacLaren, John H.
MacNichol, Malcolm S.
MacQuarrie, Gary L.
Magness, Eddie E.
Magnus, Ralph S.
Mahler, George B.
Malberger, George L.
Majors, Frances D.
Majors, William T.
Malloy, Malcolm A.
Maloney, John J.
Malvin, Frederick B.
Manes, William C.
Mann, John P.
Mansfield, James L.
Marcantonio, Anthony W.
Marcus, Robert U.
Mares, Ernest
Markley, Wade E.
Marks, Arthur J.
Marovich, Michael
Marriott, Michael J.
Marryott, Ronald F.
Marshall, Raymond E.
Marthinson, Detlow M., Jr.
Martin, Frank P.
Martoski, Robert W.
Maston, Joseph H., III
Mater, Bernard E.
Maticko, Eugene R.
Matson, Bruce W.
Matt, George E., Jr.
Matteson, Kelvin L.
Matthews, John B.
Mattson, John A.
Maurer, Earl T.
Mautino, Richard L.
Maxwell, Matthew T., III
May, James L.
May, Robert C.
Maybee, Dan C.
McAllister, Richard C.
McAvenia, Harold G., Jr.
McBride, Michael A.
McBurnett, Kenneth S.
McCabe, George J.
McCaferly, Robert A.
McCampbell, Richard L.
McCarter, Kenneth W.
McClenahan, Tom P.
McClure, Dale R.
McConnell, Edward W., II
McCormick, Bruce A.
McCracken, David J.
McDaniel, Eugene B.
McDaniel, Rodney B.
McDermott, John G.
McDivitt, Ronald M.

- McDonald, George W., Jr.
 McDonald, Richard R.
 McDonough, Vincent P.
 McEachen, Angus D., III
 McEnaney, Thomas J., Jr.
 McEwen, Richard D.
 McFadden, John H., Jr.
 McGahan, John P.
 McGarry, John G.
 McGlynn, James R.
 McGrath, James J.
 McHenry, William G.
 McHugh, Charles E.
 McHugh, John T.
 McIndoe, James E.
 McIntire, Wilton H.
 McIntosh, Charles E.
 McKamey, John B.
 McKenzie, John H., Jr.
 McKinney, Gale A.
 McKinnon, Patrick C.
 McKinstry, Thomas W.
 McKissock, Donald J.
 McKitrick, Edward R., Jr.
 McKnight, James D.
 McLellan, Charles A.
 McMillan, Edward W.
 McMillan, Lee Q.
 McMurry, William T.
 McNeill, Richard J.
 McPherson, Albert A.
 McRae, James F.
 McTighe, Roger P., Jr.
 Mead, Gerald R.
 Meadows, Landon O.
 Mecaughy, Robert W.
 Medwedeff, Channing W.
 Meehan, James F.
 Meier, Leonard M.
 Melcher, Roland O.
 Melvin, Edmund W.
 Melvin, Virgil B.
 Mendenhall, Ivan F.
 Mercer, William C.
 Mesimer, Grady F., Jr.
 Metzler, Charles D.
 Meyer, Allan G.
 Meyer, "J" "D"
 Meyer, Richard E.
 Meyers, Roger A.
 Micell, Joseph D.
 Michaels, Danny J.
 Miefert, Milton D., Jr.
 Mikitarian, Samson
 Miles, DeWitt C., Jr.
 Millard, David R.
 Miller, Charles H., Jr.
 Miller, David G.
 Miller, Forrest R.
 Miller, George
 Miller, James T.
 Miller, John L.
 Miller, John A.
 Miller, Robert H.
 Miller, Walter W.
 Miller, Wayne W.
 Miller, Wendell E.
 Mills, Albert
 Mills, Leon R.
 Mills, Thad W.
 Milner, Harry M.
 Minton, David C., III
 Mirise, Kerry W.
 Miron, James J.
 Misura, Paul
- Mitchell, Clyde L.
 Mitchell, Kenneth
 Mitchell, Oscar E.
 Mitchell, Ralph M.
 Moke, Paul D.
 Molenda, Paul H.
 Monk, Samuel W.
 Monroe, Vincent D.
 Monteleone, Vito J.
 Montgomery, George C., Jr.
 Moore, Harold A., Jr.
 Moore, John W.
 Moore, Nelson E.
 Moore, Paul M.
 Moore, Robert W.
 Moore, Rowland W.
 Moran, Thomas J.
 Moravec, Henry J., Jr.
 Morgan, Garner E., Jr.
 Morris, Charles S.
 Morris, Hal B., Jr.
 Morris, Jesse B., Jr.
 Morris, John D.
 Morrison, Jon K.
 Morsches, Robert W.
 Mortimer, Edmund C.
 Morton, Stewart M.
 Mouser, Hugh P.
 Moyers, Gilbert E.
 Mozier, Richard A.
 Mueller, John A.
 Mullen, Cornelius W.
 Muller, Robert C.
 Mulloy, Charles S.
 Mulvihill, James H.
 Munn, Robert J., Jr.
 Munro, William S.
 Munsey, William D.
 Murphy, David R.
 Murphy, John A.
 Murray, Frank S.
 Murray, James C.
 Murray, Paul A.
 Musick, Wayne O.
 Myers, Charles E.
 Myers, Dale P.
 Myers, William K., Jr.
 Nagel, "L" "D"
 Nash, Michael J.
 Neeley, Wallace W.
 Nelson, Bobby C.
 Nelson, Carl A.
 Nelson, Glenn T.
 Nelson, Paul J., Jr.
 Nelson, Robert E.
 Nelson, Robert L.
 Nelson, Sven D.
 Neuhard, Henry H.
 Newbury, Alfred C.
 Newcomb, James W., Jr.
 Newcomb, Zeanious L.
 Newell, Richard E.
 Newman, Alvin S.
 Newsom, Joe R.
 Newton, Robert L. L., Jr.
 Nicholson, Robert C.
 Nicholson, Harry E.
 Nicholson, Herbert H. J.
 Nickell, Herbert E., Jr.
 Nofziger, Larry B.
 Noggle, George A., Jr.
 Norrington, Charles G.
 Northam, Thomas A., Jr.
 Norton, William S.
 Notargiacomo, Joseph M.
 Nucci, Eugene M.
 O'Berle, Ronald J.
 O'Brien, Donald W.
 O'Connell, Jerome A.
 O'Connor, Edwin A.
 O'Connor, Neil F.
- O'Connor, William J. M.
 O'Donnell, Daniel T.
 O'Donovan, James P.
 O'Dwyer, Kyran M.
 Ogle, Peter W.
 Ohmen, Douglass J.
 O'Keefe, Martin P.
 O'Keefe, Timothy R.
 O'Kelly, James R.
 Oliverio, Theodore E.
 Olmer, Lionel H.
 Olson, Albert W., Jr.
 Olson, Carroll A.
 Olson, Darryl D.
 Ondak, Gerald S.
 Onhalzer, Jerry E.
 Opprand, David A.
 Oppedahl, Phillip E.
 Ord, Donald C.
 Ore, William E.
 Orrik, David N.
 Orzech, Bernard P.
 Osborn, Oakley E.
 Osborne, Dale H.
 Osgood, Wayne R.
 Ostrom, Joseph E., Jr.
 Otto, Max W.
 Overstreet, George H.
 Owen, William L., Jr.
 Owens, Darrel D.
 Owens, John G.
 Owens, Robert S.
 Owens, Sherman H.
 Oyler, Charles C., Jr.
 Oyler, Donald R.
 Oyler, Jimmie D.
 Page, Arthur "M"
 Palmer, Edward J.
 Palmer, Gerald A.
 Palmer, Jerry J.
 Pape, Frank F.
 Pappas, Jimmy
 Parker, Jackson K.
 Parker, Ronald H.
 Parks, Charles L.
 Parks, Jack J., Jr.
 Parsons, Marland W., Jr.
 Pasquinelli, Francis C.
 Patrick, Andrew K.
 Patterson, Donald E.
 Pattin, Stephen M.
 Patton, James M.
 Peabody, James P.
 Peake, Stephen R.
 Pearigen, Jare M.
 Pearson, James W.
 Pearson, John E.
 Pearson, Merton A.
 Pedersen, Dan A.
 Peebles, Baker L.
 Peek, Robert F.
 Peoples, John M., Jr.
 Pellock, Lyle E.
 Penders, Joseph W.
 Pendleton, Benjamin L.
 Periolat, John J.
 Perrella, Albert J., Jr.
 Perro, Michael A., Jr.
 Perry, Albert J.
 Perry, Leonard G.
 Person, Herbert F.
 Persons, George R.
 Peters, Frank J., Jr.
 Peters, Vernon W.
 Peterson, Bob L.
 Peterson, John R.
 Peterson, Karl L.
 Peterson, Laurel C.
 Peterson, Peter C., Jr.
 Petree, Noel H., Jr.
 Petrich, Horst A.
 Pfister, William J.
 Phelps, Freddie J.
 Phillips, George L., Jr.
 Phillips, John M.
- Phillips, Ronald M.
 Phillips, Richard W.
 Philo, Arthur R.
 Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
 Ploche, Paul D.
 Pickel, Theodore C., Jr.
 Pickett, Ronald B.
 Piersall, Charles H., Jr.
 Pietrzak, Edward S., Jr.
 Pinion, David E.
 Piotti, Walter T., Jr.
 Pippins, Elery H.
 Pitotte, James H.
 Pitzen, John R.
 Pizzo, Phillip J.
 Plassmeyer, Joseph D.
 Pocklington, William D.
 Polfer, Clarence R.
 Pollard, Ronald T.
 Poole, Thomas E.
 Poore, Thomas W.
 Porcaro, Anthony P.
 Porter, Robert W.
 Potenti, John P., Jr.
 Potter, Clare E.
 Powell, Stewart G.
 Powell, Wendell W.
 Powell, William C.
 Poyet, Elmer F.
 Presley, Jack C.
 Previ, Wallace M.
 Prien, Richard K.
 Pritchard, Joseph R.
 Proctor, Allen D.
 Prokop, Phil G.
 Promersberger, Edward S.
 Proper, Vance D.
 Propper, Ronald M.
 Propst, William F.
 Pundt, Cameron A.
 Purdy, Dale C.
 Pursley, John E.
 Pyle, Loyd E.
 Pyle, Roger G.
 Queen, Ronald J.
 Quigley, Francis J.
 Quinn, James E., Jr.
 Quinn, Robert N., Jr.
 Raab, Charles F.
 Rabuck, Leo V.
 Rae, Paul O.
 Ragan, Charles P.
 Raines, Frederick L.
 Ransom, James P., II
 Ray, Willard D.
 Rayome, Francis L.
 Read, Benton M.
 Ream, Ronald L.
 Redder, Lawrence F.
 Redhage, James L.
 Redington, Jerome J.
 Reed, Jesse L.
 Reese, Russell R.
 Reich, Merrill D.
 Reid, Ralph G., Jr.
 Relley, Ralph H., Jr.
 Reinhardt, Ellwood B., Jr.
 Reis, Joseph J., Jr.
 Rennaker, Charles L.
 Renner, Lorraine E.
 Rentschler, Richard L.
 Repass, Donald E.
 Rettig, Godfrey A.
 Reynolds, Robert L.
 Rhoads, John D.
 Rice, Robert P.
 Rich, Willis S.
 Richards, Warren D.
 Richardson, Fred D., Jr.
 Riedemann, Walter J., Jr.
 Riefler, George B.
 Rigg, Richard G.
 Riggs, Selby B.
- Rij, Michael A., Jr.
 Rimson, Ira J.
 Ring, Stewart A.
 Rinkel, Richard A.
 Robbins, Phillip D.
 Roberts, Charles R.
 Roberts, Gordon W.
 Roberts, Ned C.
 Roberts, Tommie W.
 Robertson, Hollis E.
 Robins, John R.
 Roche, Peter A.
 Rodgers, Joseph L.
 Rodgers, Robert D.
 Rogers, David T.
 Rolfe, Clair E.
 Rollman, Gordon L.
 Romano, Gennaro J., Jr.
 Ronni, James A.
 Roper, Vincent W.
 Rothe, Jack F.
 Roundtree, Jack L.
 Rowell, George W.
 Rower, Jay A.
 Rowsey, James M., Jr.
 Ruchala, Joseph F.
 Ruhle, Robert C.
 Ruland, Donald O.
 Russ, William M., Jr.
 Russell, Kay
 Russell, Richard E.
 Ruthrauff, Clifford B.
 Ryan, Gerald F.
 Ryan, Patrick F.
 Ryan, Thomas M.
 Saavedra, Robert
 Sabin, James F.
 Sabine, Frederick R.
 Sachtjen, Jerry W.
 Sackett, Dean R., Jr.
 Sage, Robert A.
 Sale, William L.
 Saleh, Richard E.
 Salisbury, Jack S.
 Salo, Lennart R.
 Salo, Willard H.
 Saltz, Newell J., Jr.
 Sanders, Wilbur F., III
 Sandler, Charles A.
 Sarphe, Jack E., Jr.
 Saunders, Richard E.
 Saurey, Russell M.
 Savage, Jimmy R.
 Saville, Robert E.
 Saville, Terry D.
 Sayers, Samuel L.
 Scarborough, John R. L.
 Schade, Eric H., Jr.
 Schaedel, Joseph A.
 Schaeffer, George R.
 Schafer, Alfred E.
 Schaffert, Richard W.
 Schable, David L.
 Schaler, John D.
 Schatz, Robert G.
 Scherer, Francis H.
 Scheyder, Ernest J.
 Schilling, George F.
 Schmidt, Arnold C.
 Schmidt, Robert H.
 Schmitt, Arthur F., Jr.
 Schmitt, Robert W.
 Schnitzer, Lawrence E.
 Schoeff, Kendall "E"
 Schreadley, Richard L.
 Schreiner, Raymond J.
 Schroder, Donald C.
 Schroeder, John H.
 Schulz, Paul H.
 Schulze, John M., Jr.
 Schumacher, Duane O.
 Schussler, Gerald A.
 Schutte, John J.
 Schwaab, Denis T.
 Schwartz, Hugh L.
 Schwartz, Ralph C.
 Scofield, Gary A.
- Scott, Charles H.
 Scott, Philip J.
 Scott, Thomas P.
 Scott, Thomas W.
 Scovel, Frank D.
 Scruggs, Richard M.
 Seacat, Ralph L.
 Sears, Johnny M.
 Sechrest, Edward A.
 Seesholtz, John R.
 Sella, Melvin E.
 Selberg, John W.
 Senden, Paul W.
 Sesma, Ramon A.
 Shafer, Richard W.
 Shaffer, Clyde H.
 Shannon, Philip M.
 Shaw, Charles I.
 Sheehan, John P.
 Sheets, James R.
 Shelso, David A.
 Sheppard, Donald E.
 Sheubrooks, William L.
 Shinn, Robert A.
 Shipley, Carl N.
 Shirley, Fred E., Jr.
 Shirley, Vernon D.
 Shores, Howard V.
 Short, Benjamin F.
 Short, John S.
 Short, Leroy A., Jr.
 Shultz, Theodore B.
 Sibley, David N.
 Siegrist, Edward A., Jr.
 Sierra, Edward P.
 Sigmond, Arie C. A.
 Sikes, James H.
 Silberstein, George W.
 Simerly, Glen E.
 Simone, Thomas J.
 Simpson, Benjamin M., III
 Simpson, George T. K.
 Simpson, James H.
 Simpson, John E., II
 Simpson, Jon D.
 Sinclair, Leonard A.
 Sirch, Richard W. F.
 Skelly, Arthur R.
 Slaughter, William T.
 Sleeman, Charles F.
 Slingerland, Raymond L.
 Sloan, John H.
 Sloan, William D.
 Smetheram, Herbert E.
 Smith, Bernard J.
 Smith, Bradley G.
 Smith, Frederick H., Jr.
 Smith, Gene A.
 Smith, John P.
 Smith, Joseph C.
 Smith, Lee O.
 Smith, Leo B.
 Smith, Neil D.
 Smith, Paul J.
 Smith, Phillip D.
 Smith, Ronald E.
 Smith, Thomas C.
 Smith, Thomas F.
 Smith, Vernon C.
 Smith, William C.
 Smith, William L.
 Snell, Robert L., Jr.
 Snider, Donald M.
 Snow, Kennedy B.
 Snyder, Richard C.
 Sokill, George H.
 Somers, David W., Jr.
 Sommer, Leroy G.
 Songster, John H.
 Sonnabend, Jerome R.
 Soriano, Joseph R.
 Spellman, Fred G.
 Spencer, Barry W.
 Spencer, Charles H.

Spencer, Lane L.
Spero, Joseph R.
Spink, Peter J.
Spitz, Gerald A.
Splitt, Robert F.
Spoto, Victor S.
Spousta, Allen F.
Springer, Emerson T.
Squires, Howard J.
Stalcup, Jimmie M.
Stallings, Arthur C., Jr.
Stammer, Walter H., Jr.
Stanford, Robert L.
Steckel, John H.
Steele, William M., Jr.
Stefanou, Christopher M.
Steinbrink, Earl E.
Stelly, John M.
Stennett, William A.
Stennett, William A.
Stephens, John A.
Stephenson, Paul D.
Sterling, John C.
Stevenson, Connelly D.
Stevenson, Barr S.
Stewart, Charles C.
Stewart, Dennis J.
Stewart, George W.
Stewart, Joseph A., Jr.
Stiers, Lawrence W.
Stocking, Sigurd I.
Stoeckel, Anthony W.
Stokes, Bobby J.
Stone, Elmer M.
Stone, George P.
Stone, Lowell P.
Stopfel, Joseph E.
Storey, William D.
Stover, Richard C.
Stowell, Marshall A.
Stratford, Robert H.
Streull, Joseph W.
Strey, Dennis W.
Stromeyer, Anthony J.
Strommen, Gene A.
Strong, Henry H., Jr.
Strong, Paul L.
Stuart, Charles J., Jr.
Stutz, James D.
Sullivan, Eugene J., Jr.
Sullivan, Gerald T.
Sullivan, Gene F.
Sullivan, Robert G.
Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr.
Sullivan, William K.
Sumner, Donald M.
Swan, Robert S.
Swan, William R.
Swanson, Harlan D., Jr.
Swanson, Matthew C.
Swarthout, Gerald L.
Swartz, Theodore R.
Swinerton, Ronald H.
Sykes, Floyd E.
Sylvester, Vincent
Taff, Clarence O., Jr.
Tager, Bruce A.
Taggart, Donald J.
Talbert, Joseph T., Jr.
Talbot, Merrill L.
Tambini, Anthony L., II.
Tarbuck, Richard R.
Tasker, William G.
Taylor, Gaylen D.
Taylor, Hugh R.
Taylor, James E.
Taylor, James M.
Taylor, Jeremy D.
Taylor, John D.

Taylor, Lawrence H., Jr.
Taylor, Lewis H.
Taylor, Robert C., Jr.
Teachout, David S.
Teague, Foster S.
Templeton, Wilbur D., Jr.
Terrell, Jerry L.
Teter, Eugene V.
Tettelbach, Frederick M.
Thall, Raymond L.
Thaubald, Edward J.
Thearle, William J.
Theodorelos, Pete "J"
Thibault, George E., Jr.
Thomas, James W.
Thomas, James G.
Thomas, John H., IV
Thomas, Richard L.
Thompson, Jimmy P.
Thompson, James K.
Thompson, Jack D.
Thompson, Russell N.
Thompson, Theodore R.
Thompson, Tommy L.
Thornsley, John T.
Thorpe, Gordon L.
Thorpe, Jack C.
Thurber, John D.
Thurneysen, Jon S.
Tibbitts, Barrick F.
Tibbs, John C.
Tietgen, Charles A., Jr.
Timberlake, David W.
Timlin, Joseph W., Jr.
Timm, Dwight D.
Tinker, Charles L.
Titus, Edward D., Jr.
Tobey, Stephen
Toehike, Walter A.
Tollinger, John N., Jr.
Tomion, Jack W.
Touchton, John H., Jr.
Tracy, Theodore R.
Traylor, Harold K.
Trebber, Maurice L.
Trupp, Adam R.
Tubbs, Kenneth A.
Tucker, Edwin B.
Tucker, James E.
Tulley, Cecil R.
Tullis, James V.
Tully, Joseph F.
Turner, Charles W.
Turner, Robert C.
Turner, Warren D.
Turner, Wilson C.
Turplin, Thomas R.
Ulrich, Thomas R.
Ustick, John
Ustick, Richard C.
Vallera, Rocco D.
Vance, Walter N., III
Van Horne, Alfred L.
Van Metre, James M.
Vanoy, William E.
Vermillion, John E.
Vescelius, Milton J., Jr.
Vestal, Leroy N.
Vezina, George R.
Villemaire, Grant J., Jr.
Villenave, Robert A.
Volden, Thelmar O.
Vollmer, William E., Jr.
VonHendy, Richard D.
Vonler, Richard L.
Wachob, James R.
Wages, Clarence J., Jr.

Wagner, John A.
Wakatake, Clifford K.
Walden, Warren L.
Walder, Edward F., Jr.
Wales, George E.
Walker, Jimmy W.
Walker, Richard A.
Wall, Arthur D., Jr.
Wallace, Earl D.
Wallace, Laird E.
Wallace, Richard J.
Walling, Samuel E.
Walsh, Robert E., Jr.
Walston, Jerry D.
Walter, Clyde M.
Walter, Dale J.
Waltzer, Jacob
Ward, Compton E.
Ward, James A.
Ward, John A.
Wardell, William L., Jr.
Waring, James D.
Watkins, Robert L.
Watts, Henry A.
Watts, Jasper B.
Way, Edward R.
Weeks, William G.
Webb, Kenneth H.
Weber, Burtland B.
Weber, Gerald M.
Weber, Gustave A., Jr.
Webster, John A., Jr.
Wehner, George D.
Weichman, Denis R.
Weidman, Russell H.
Weinfeld, Richard M.
Weir, Richard W.
Weisman, Burton S.
Welch, Richard D.
Wells, Charles T.
Werenskjold, Gary W.
Werner, Marshall D.
Weseleskey, Allen E.
Wesolowski, Walter
West, Charles T.
Westall, Kenneth W.
Westfall, Ronald C.
Westfall, Van F.
Wheat, Elbert E.
Wheeler, James R.
Whelan, Mathew J., Jr.
White, Charles A.
White, Laurence A., Jr.
White, Richard F.
White, Robert S.
Whiting, Donald W.
Whittaker, Robert L.
Wichmann, William H.
Wicke, James O.
Widen, Richard D.
Wiebelhaus, Clarence J.
Wier, Ronald L.
Wieschhoff, Kenneth H.
Wiggins, Larry C.
Wilbern, Jack M.
Wild, Ronald A.

Wilke, John H., Jr.
Wiley, Byron A.
Wilkins, George H.
Wilkinson, Wilfrid P., III
Wilkinson, Thomas A. R.
Will, Robert A.
Williams, Carl E.
Williams, Doyne G.
Williams, Forrest R.
Williams, Richard E.
Wilson, Billy J.
Wilson, Donald G.
Wilson, Leonard O.
Wilson, Robert M.
Winchester, Morton S.
Windsor, Arthur D.
Wingerter, Edward W., Jr.
Winn, Perry R., Jr.
Winslow, Myron S., Jr.
Winter, Richard A.
Wirth, Charles G.
Witt, Robert F.
Wolfe, Robert E.
Wolfe, William F.
Womack, David R., Jr.
Wood, Clarence W.
Wood, Forrest H.
Wood, Joseph V.
Wood, Richard G.
Woodbury, Orpheus L., III
Woodlief, Frank L.
Woods, Brian D.
Woods, Herbert P.
Woodworth, Benjamin B.
Woolam, John E.
Workman, Charles E.
Works, William W.
Worst, Dale E.
Wright, Frederick E.
Wright, Harry W.
Wright, Joseph M. P., Jr.
Wright, Keith M.
Wright, Marsh E.
Wright, Orville, Jr.
Wuthrich, Richard E.
Wylie, Clayton R.
Wylie, Ronald P.
Wyly, James R., Jr.
Yelle, "A" Courtney
Yetter, William S.
York, David A.
Yost, David A.
Young, Edward B.
Young, Howard I.
Young, Philip M.
Zackowski, Terrence L.
Zagortz, Leonard "A", Jr.
Zaludek, George M.
Zechlin, Frank F.
Zelna, Denis P.
Zerwas, Richard L.
Zimmerman, Willard C.
Zipperer, William R.
Zipse, Robert L.
Zirbel, William D.
Zwick, John E.
Zwick, Stephen L.

Carpenter, Jack R.
Chapman, Melvin E.
Christopher, Allyn C.
Cicchetto, Mario J.
Clark, Orris V.
Clayton, George H., Jr.
Cohen, Milton N.
Collins, Jay R.
Cookson, Robert H.
Corsi, Joseph A.
Davis, Howard C.
Day, Earl F.
Dement, Ira B.
Dennis, Paul L.
Dwyer, John L.
Elfsten, Robert N.
England, Robert N.
Errickson, John J.
Farrar, Charles E.
Farrell, Edward J.
Fehrs, Walter H.
Festag, Albert P.
Ford, Homer L., Jr.
Forgy, James P.
Gerrald, Benjamin W.
Gill, Russell R.
Glaeser, Frederick W.
Hall, Roy V.
Hampton, Robert A.
Harmon, Oliver E.
Heath, Edmund W.
Hebert, Donald F.
Hicks, Clarence A., Jr.
Hipp, William J.
Hoppenjans, Lawrence G.
Hudson, Joe A.
Hughes, John W.
Hunt, Kirby P.
Husted, Richard C.
Ingalls, Frederick G.
James Edgar L.
Jebb, Robert D.
Johnson, Myron S.
Kasnicki, Edward J.
Kear, Donald
Keeley, Edward C.
Kinsel, Herman L.
Kreutzberger, Donald J.
Kurz, Walter C.
Lacklen, Albert J.
Landroche, William J., Jr.
Lane, Robert W.
Leach, William J.
Lowrey, Clifford A.
Malczowski, William
Martin, Harry C.
McCann, Joseph D.
McCarthy, Charles J., Jr.
McCarthy, Gerald D.
McClure, John S.
McGlamery, James L.
McKinnon, John D.
Miller, Robert L., Jr.
Millon, Donald H.
Morgan, William N.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER (LDO)
Allen, Bill R.
Ashbacher, Raymod W.
Augustyniak, Edward J.
Ballou, James E.
Barker, Monroe W.
Barnett, Stephen B.
Barret, Lee E., Jr.
Battles, Roy E.
Beltz, Russell C.
Benjamin, Charles L.
Bentley, Arthur L.
Berg, Milfred C.
Berry, Roy A.
Billings, Alfred J.
Borden, Archie D.
Borden, Robert C., Jr.
Boyle, James T.
Brecheen, John A.
Brooks, James W.
Brown, Claude C.
Brown, James E.
Brown, Robert C.
Brunick, Gerard P.
Brulder, Gustav F.
Cahill, Walter A.

LEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL CORPS
Aubrey, Royal G.
Austin, David A.
Bailey, Albert G.
Bailey, Robert J.
Balding, Thomas L.
Bassham, Harold L.
Bates, Thomas R.
Benoit, Richard P.
Bertuch, Albert W.
Biehl, Robert F.
Bistrong, Herbert W.
Boorstin, James B.
Bowlds, Joseph H.
Brierre, Joseph T., Jr.
Budd, Frank W., Jr.
Burkett, Patrick R.
Cantrell, Robert W.
Caratti, John F.
Cardoso, Norman
Carson, Thomas E.
Case, Jerry L.
Cassells, Joseph S.
Castell, Donald O.
Christensen, Harvey E.
Cochran, Robert C.
Conrad, Robert N.
Cowherd, Donald W.
Cramer, Adelbert D.
Diamond, Evans
Draper, Wilmot S.
Early, Calvin B.
Essex, Francis X.
Fenning, John E.
Flynn, Patrick W.

- Frankhouser, George V., Jr.
Gareis, Frank J.
Grossi, Thomas A.
Hebert, Peter W.
Heller, Warren
Hiehle, John F.
Hix, William R.
Johnson, David W.
Jones, Daniel "M"
Julian, Sydney R., Jr.
Karnel, Robert F., Jr.
Kostiuk, Eugene S.
Leisse, Fred C.
Leshar, Robert C.
Lewer, Frederick D.
Lopez, Domingo A.
Lord, James M.
Luehrs, James G.
Lynch, John I., Jr.
Manning, Daniel A.
Markham, Thomas N.
McClain, Garvin H.
McClellan, Walter L.
McMahon, David J.
Monell, William C.
Murphy, Eugene L.
Nicholas, William R.
Norton, John W.
O'Donnell, Joseph E.
O'Loughlin, John M.
O'Reilly, Richard R.
O'Sullivan, Michael J., Jr.
Pedersen, Carl M.
Petway, Malcolm L.
Pine, Robert H.
- Polglase, Van N., Jr.
Pope, Herbert L.
Ramlo, John H.
Reed, Jerome M.
Rivers, Leslie D.
Robitaille, George A.
Roling, Gerald T.
Roy, Donald E.
Rutland, Eugene D., Jr.
Schneider, Paul J.
Schwartz, Ronald A.
Seal, Robert B.
Sechler, Leslie I.
Senn, James P.
Shea, David W., Jr.
Shultz, Richard R.
Skinner, Wendell L.
Smith, Franklin A.
Smith, Raphael F.
Smith, William W.
Spaur, William H.
Steimel, Herbert A.
Strickland, George T., Jr.
Swensson, Norman L.
Urbanc, Andrew N.
Urschel, William P.
Vandewyngaerde, George A.
Volcjak, Charles B.
Wachter, Francis W.
Wall, Norman R.
Weber, David M.
Wilkes, Harman D.
Wolfe, Wayne H.
Woodall, Martin A.
- Lantsberger, Robert E.
Larsen, Henry O.
LeBlanc, John F., Jr.
LeMay, Jerome S.
Linehan, Daniel J., Jr.
Locke, Olive C.
Loftus, Raymond P.
Loveday, William G., Jr.
Lubben, Vernon L.
Luther, James R., Jr.
Magee, Gilbert L.
Malzahn, Walter G.
Marino, Leonard J.
Martin, Michael J.
Martin, William J.
McCullers, Lawrence E.
McFarland, Wayne B.
McGarvey, John J.
McHugh, Thomas H.
McKinnon, Daniel W., Jr.
McMullen, Franklin D., Jr.
Melners, Arthur C., Jr.
Milburn, Raymond F.
Miller, James E.
Mitts, Joseph P.
Morgan, Richard E.
Moss, Stephen A.
Munkres, Glenn R.
Murphy, Joseph J.
Murray, Harlan E., Jr.
Naughton, Thomas J.
Nichols, Gerald M.
Oaks, Jacob G., Jr.
O'Connell, Arthur B.
Olivier, Denny R.
Olson, Gene P.
Osgood, Douglas C.
Otto, Ronald E.
Pace, Earl H.
Peck, Joe D.
Peters, William A.
Petras, George A.
Pistolessi, Vincent J.
Plante, Rene E.
Platt, Stuart F.
Pliska, Robert F.
Pope, Jere P.
Prokop, Jan S.
Quartana, Joseph P.
Raffels, John F.
Ranieri, Richard A. J.
Raymond, James A.
Reed, Dale H.
Rice, Henry L., Jr.
- Ridley, David E.
Rounds, Richard N.
Rubenstein, Ralph S.
Ruehlin, John H.
Rupe, Charles H.
Rusch, Donald R.
Schaaf, Alvin D., Jr.
Sechler, John L.
Sellars, James B.
Shaughnessy, John M.
Smith, Franklin D.
Smith, John A., Jr.
Sofey, Billy R.
Stanton, James M.
Starrett, William I., Jr.
Steadman, Willard G., III
Stoeffler, John A.
Stone, Donald R.
Szwed, James A.
Tannone, Rocco J.
Terry, Victor W.
Thomas, Gary B.
Thompson, Robert L.
Tobin, Isidore L., III
Trawick, George L.
Tudor, Clyde E.
VanHouten, Richard E.
VanNaman, Thomas L.
Walker, Richard C., Jr.
Wallace, Edwin R.
Walsh, Richard S.
Walters, Robert A.
Webb, James R.
Webster, John C.
Weinberg, Harry H.
Westmoreland, Perry L.
White, Donald B.
White, James A.
Whitman, Earl K.
Williams, Robert L.
Williams, Thomas C., Jr.
Willis, John J.
Wilson, Roger C.
Wright, James H.
Youmans, Raymond W.
Young, Benjamin L.
Young, Jack L.
Young, Ronald A.
Youngblood, Norbert V.
- Voth, Murray H.
Wendler, Herman F.
Westlund, Orville A.
Whitaker, Frederick E.
- Yeich, John D.
Young, Christopher B.
Young, Robert J.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS
- Ahrens, William N.
Anderson, Walter I.
Ayers, Charles D.
Baggs, Charles C.
Bradtmiller, Paul H.
Brockwell, Sterling M., Jr.
Burton, Joseph T., Jr.
Carle, Barry
Cerreta, Ralph M., Jr.
Collins, Allan W.
Cope, Ronald P.
Crisp, Hugh A.
Crosson, William E.
Dickpeddie, John I.
Dobler, Leland R.
Endebrock, Frank L., III
Flack, Frederick P.
Ford, James E.
Gillam, Harold R.
Glover, William F.
Godsey, Jack L.
Goodman, Robert F.
Groff, James B.
Jacob, Richard E.
Johnson, Don P.
Jones, Darrell E.
Kartalis, Andrew
Kelch, John A., Jr.
Keppel, Henry E., Jr.
Kirkwood, Kenneth K.
Klein, Dale M.
- Landes, William G.
Ledder, William R.
Lonegan, Thomas L.
Lukacz, John, Jr.
MacDonald, Malcolm J.
McCorkle, William J.
McHugh, Robert J., Jr.
McNeill, James E.
McPartland, Eugene J.
Merritt, Frederick D.
Miller, Robert K.
Morris, Robert B., Jr.
Mosher, Thomas F.
Nash, Archie R.
Newcomb, Frank M.
Petersen, Norman W.
Popowich, Clyde V. W.
Quinn, Robert E., Jr.
Resnick, Rudolf
Schade, Robert A., Jr.
Schattnar, Bernard L.
Schumann, James F.
Seeber, Earl R., Jr.
Shanley, John J., Jr.
Shirley, Ronald G.
Shumate, James W.
Siegler, Richard L.
Tobin, James M.
Totten, John C.
Uber, Charles B.
Weir, James W., Jr.
Wilson, Robert B.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS (LDO)
- Kenny, Robert E.
Kimmons, Victor H.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS
- Abernathy, Kenneth L.
Allen, Walter S.
Brown, Charles E., II
Christian, Alvern D.
Eisele, Roderick L.
Eoff, Albert W., II
Farrell, Lawrence M.
Fasanaro, Michael F., Jr.
Flynn, Thomas E.
Gladis, John T.
Gresens, Larry W.
- Grunawalt, Richard J.
Howay, John W.
King, Melbourne P.
Latsch, Lowell C.
Legg, Billy J.
Mario, David A.
Palmer, William R.
Pinsonneault, Richard J.
Pope, Charles E., III
Toms, James E.
Wille, Paul A.
Woods, Theodore K., Jr.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, DENTAL CORPS
- Annis, Robert B.
Baker, Terrance W.
Ballard, Gerald T.
Benn, Barry
Besley, Keith W.
Bisson, Roger E.
Box, John M.
Brown, Charles A.
Brown, Max W.
Buckis, David C.
Clegg, Milton C.
Cowen, Carlton R.
Crawford, John D.
Cronin, Thomas J.
Cushing, John R., Jr.
Davis, Charles M., Jr.
Douglas, Robert J.
Drake, David L.
Ebert, Walter H.
Eden, George T.
Eklind, Ronald R.
Esposito, Richard A.
Fisher, David L.
Fitzgerald, Donald E.
- Foley, John M.
Greeley, William E.
Hansen, Duane A.
Howarth, Hugh C.
Hube, Albert R.
Hudson, Elmer R., Jr.
Huelster, Peter C.
Johnson, Charles M.
Kasenchak, Peter
Kozma, Ernest S.
Kravets, Thomas F.
Krzeminski, Arthur E.
Lekas, James S.
Linkenbach, Charles R.
Loizeaux, Alfred D.
Lowe, Cameron A.
Luke, Alan B.
Mason, Billie M.
Maw, Ralph B.
McCall, Frank J., Jr.
McWalter, George M.
Monasky, George E.
Mosby, Edward L.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS
- Allnutt, Alvin H.
Ault, William U.
Banas, John M.
Barnett, Andrew F., Jr.
Baxter, John W.
Beck, Kermit "E"
Bedenbaugh, Jack R.
Billece, Eric W. H.
Bittner, Burton F., Jr.
Boike, Robert J.
Booth, Stanley L.
Borchardt, Heinz R.
Bosco, Clement, Jr.
Bradley, Donald A.
Brookes, Jack E.
Brown, Alan S.
Brown, Lee
Brown, Troy L.
Buckley, John E.
Buffoni, Thomas J.
Bulluck, Edgar G.
Butts, Whitmore S., Jr.
Carenza, John L.
Carson, Francis W.
Chafey, William D.
Chipley, Charles L., Jr.
Connolly, George S., Jr.
Coombs, Douglas F.
Corbitt, James R.
Cornett, Fred O.
Crawford, James L.
Cronin, George W., Jr.
Crutchfield, Franklin D.
Cunningham, John H.
Daddona, John M.
Damm, John A.
Daughtridge, Gerald R.
Dennis, Ward "J"
Dewey, Edward P.
Dickey, James A.
Dickinson, Thomas D.
Dodds, Richard E.
Dolenga, Harold E.
Driggers, Richard A.
- Dunn, Bernard D.
Easley, Richard P.
Eaton, Thomas E., Jr.
Elgen, Thomas D.
Eppen, Eugene D.
Erickson, Douglas L.
Estes, Arthur, Jr.
Evans, Lloyd R.
Farley, Charles V.
Fidd, Joseph A.
Fields, Simeon
Finbraaten, Laurence K.
Fitzpatrick, Edmond J., Jr.
Flach, Lynn R.
Foley, Donald P.
Frampton, Robert T.
Fries, Paul A., Jr.
Gaddis, Carl K.
Gerstenberger, Wayne W.
Gilvary, Daniel J.
Girman, Robert J.
Gore, Bobby J.
Gorenflo, Louis W.
Goulette, James D.
Greene, Walter C., Jr.
Griffin, Edward J.
Gumpert, LeRoy C.
Hagen, Dale N.
Harmon, Robert G.
Hawkey, William C.
Higgins, Ernest C. M.
Hinds, Duane E.
Hinkle, Otis R.
Hopkins, Richard B.
Horner, Raymond N., Jr.
Houghton, Donald W.
Hummel, Don F.
Hurst, Harvey R.
Irons, John H.
Jantz, Jack L.
Jones, Channing E.
Juncker, Carl F.
Kalafut, George W.
Knoth, Robert L.
Krueger, Lloyd W.
Kruse, William E.
Kunkle, John H.
Langer, Gerald D.
- McInnis, William H.
Murray, Robert E.
O'Donnell, William P.
Parr, Harold S.
Shuler, Jettie C.
Smith, Allen F.
Todd, Blaxton V.
Vedra, Charles A.
Wright, Cary F.
- Kase, Mark
Keefe, Lawrence F.
Kelly, Henry T.
Kennard, William E.
MacCall, Harry F., III
McDermott, Thomas J.
McMorrow, James E.
McPhail, Clark B.
Murray, Frederick J.
Murray, George P.
O'Brien, Eugene C.
Parker, Joe H.
Patton, Darrell P.
Pihrt, John A.
Ressep, Thomas B., Jr.
Six, Jack E.
Tate, Robert C., Jr.
Vantassel, Lowell W.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, SUPPLY CORPS (LDO)
- Baggott, Frank B.
Baker, Robert E.
Bedingfield, Robert W.
Berg, Vernon E., Jr.
Bertulio, Caesar J.
Black, Gerald W.
Bray, William E.
Bredemeier, George F.
Brown, Robert G.
Craven, Allen B.
Davis, Eugene B.
Donan, William E., Jr.
Dumas, John F.
Fallon, Edward F.
Fountain, David B.
Franklin, Robert C.
Gaughan, Geoffrey E.
Gordon, Robert E.
Jerould, Philip E.
- LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, CHAPLAIN CORPS

Muir, Theodore E.
 Murphy, Richard A.
 Oshields, Paul W.
 Rochford, Philip
 Rucker, William H., Jr.
 Scott, Gale L.
 Shaffer, Richard G.
 Shell, Ronald A.
 Short, George A.

Stevens, Mark M.
 Terhune, Raymond C.
 Toth, Wayne J.
 Turner, Donald W.
 Vernino, Arthur R.
 Williams, Robert E., Jr.
 Wingard, Charles E.
 Yacabucci, James E.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Barbo, Samuel H., Jr.
 Boone, Harry M., Jr.
 Boudreau, Harold J.
 Breidenstein, Frederick W.
 Clark, James L.
 Cooper, Thomas G.
 Davis, William P.
 Devane, James J.
 Fletcher, William E.
 Formeller, Frank J., Jr.
 Fowler, Ephraim E., Jr.
 Fussell, Edsel M.
 Gallagher, Thomas J.
 Gillenwaters, John D.
 Halverson, Charles W.
 Hammel, James W.
 Hawkins, Kenneth L.
 Hunt, James A.

Jones, George D.
 Joseph, Sammy W.
 Lachapelle, Norman C.
 Mobbs, Philip H.
 Myers, James I.
 Nelson, Paul D.
 Nichols, Lloyd B.
 Palmer, Jack J.
 Pittington, Francis C.
 Roberts, Billy D.
 Roberts, Billie C.
 Ryan, William A.
 Shuler, Donald E.
 Sickles, Forman J.
 Sollman, John R.
 Van Hooser, Russel P.
 Wilcox, James G.
 Ziegler, Harry F., Jr.
 Zselitvay, Andrew J., Jr.

LIEUTENANT COMMANDER, NURSE CORPS

Effner, Dorothy J.
 Perreault, Madelon M.
 Cordell, Billie E.
 Gendron, Marie M. T.
 Marble, Ella E.
 Dyer, Norma G.
 Martin, Ruth S.
 Krisanda, Sylvia M.
 Olson, Marilyn F.
 Nicholson, Anna B.
 Schley, Doris C.
 Tudor, Betty L.
 Melcer, Marjorie I.
 Yohanan, Barbara J.
 Carleton, Ethel R.
 DeCicco, Virginia A.
 King, Dorothy C.
 Dunn, Dorothea J.
 Elsass, Phyllis J.
 Hassell, June R.
 Elliott, Ruth L.
 Mason, Ruth A.
 Rudd, Donna R. E.
 Gampper, Mary E.
 Brakke, Josephine D.
 Millard, Arlys M.
 Mack, Beverly T.
 Hinckley, Colleen
 Johnson, Patricia R.
 Guzman, Frances F.
 Steinocher, Anne M.
 Joyce, Jane P.

MacClelland, Doris C.
 Nyllin, Esther D.
 Jones, Kathaleen R.
 Nickerson, Lois E.
 Verdier, Ellin P.
 Walker, Marilyn J.
 Butler, Phyllis A.
 Shaw, Joan S.
 Dennis, Joan T.
 McGuckin, Dorothy E.
 Trudgeon, Joyce A.
 Parker, Helen C.
 Nelson, Marilyn V.
 Lindsay, Magdalene A.
 Morton, Jo A.
 Slater, Patricia A.
 McIntyre, Lora J.
 Barker, Elizabeth A.
 Weiss, Jean C.
 Fitzgerald, Helen M.
 Boone, Kathleen L.
 Long, Rose M.
 Parnell, Maryann C.
 Patmore, Nancy M.
 Garluzzo, Kathryn R.
 Birkhimer, Marion L.
 Gaughan, Rose A.
 Altenhofel, Dorothy A.
 Adams, Louise "J"
 Moris, Patricia J.
 Wilson, Lela B.
 Chisholm, Marie A.

Butler, Lois J.
 Frazier, Frances M.
 Williams, Erlene I.
 Gillespie, Jacquellin C.
 Thomas, Betty A.
 Schulze, Charlotte I.
 Walsh, Eileen C.
 O'Beirne, Eileen B.
 Halsema, Grace M.
 Noble, Frances A.
 Elsiminger, Vetah M.
 Durian, Emma T.
 Jacobson, Dorothy M.
 Sisk, Elizabeth A.
 Gomes, Alma M.
 MacEnergy, Joan M.
 Rosenquist, Hildegarde
 Rohde, Esther J.
 Bell, Lou E.
 Whitesell, Margaret L.

Goleblewski, Rita J.
 Kinney, Eleanor J.
 Sabold, Sarah R.
 Allen, Patricia M.
 Schreiber, Marilyn T.
 Herrington, Dalsy J.
 Miller, Eleanor J.
 Miller, Eva F.
 Jones, Beverly J.
 Beran, Irene L.
 Yelle, Dorothy A.
 Kearns, Joyce C.
 Gedrys, Patricia C.
 Emond, Lucille G.
 Higgins, Margaret J.
 Marcotte, Natalie M. G.
 Morlock, Ruth E.
 Cabay, Cecelia H.
 Pechulis, Verna M.
 Burrell, Margaret M.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 18, 1969:

OZARKS REGIONAL COMMISSION

E. L. Stewart, of Oklahoma, to be Federal cochairman of the Ozarks Regional Commission.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

John D. J. Moore, of New Jersey, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ireland.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

LETTER FROM A SOUTH CAROLINA FATHER WHOSE SON WAS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 18, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have received a copy of a letter to the editor which appeared in the March 16, 1969, issue of the Anderson Independent newspaper concerning the views of a father whose son was killed in action against Communist forces in Vietnam.

It is a letter that cannot be read without experiencing a feeling of great compassion for this man and his family, and this compassion is compounded by the sad realization that had this Nation, the most powerful military force in the world, applied the full might of that military power, this unfortunate sacrifice could probably have been avoided.

I ask unanimous consent the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A FATHER WRITES: HEROES DIE, HIPPIES LIVE AND HEARTBREAK IS BITTER

Mr. Editor: Forgive my bitterness, but today my son's personal belongings came to us from Vietnam, just six months after we laid his body in its resting place to await the Final Assembly call.

The sum total of his earthly possessions, other than two winter uniforms, were one pair of shoes, one pair of socks, one fountain pen, one silver identification bracelet, one 14K gold ring, one Confederate flag, riddled and torn and one battered, wrinkled billfold, with half a dozen pictures. Some one had

washed his blood from the billfold and had carefully tried to wipe it from the pictures, but had not been successful in doing so.

These items could be held in one hand, palm up. His other things had been lost or stolen while he was under siege on Hill 861 at Khe Sanh.

My bitterness grows when I think back and recall that the sum total of all his earthly possessions, other than clothing and shoes, could be carried on his battered old bike. My bitterness grows deeper and wider when I look at his income tax forms that come to my mail box promptly on Jan. 1.

It almost goes beyond my power to control when I think of the people in Washington who would tax a man fighting for what he believes is his country, yet will sit idly by while the scum of the earth tear down our colleges and wreck our educational process.

These same people in government will cry and wring their hands about poverty and at the same time vote themselves a thousand dollars a month raise. And our sons go on fighting and dying and having their shoe string salary taxed.

I wonder if these sons of ours who gave their all could look back on the scene and see just what is happening, would they be willing to go through it again? Would they be proud to be called Americans? What would they think of the stinking bum who only last week on a nation wide television network proudly showed some of his North Vietnam movies and bragged about showing them across the nation on the college campuses?

And there is where my bitterness reaches its peak. Mr. Editor, it just wouldn't do for me to meet this filthy looking rascal face to face. When I see this type, I see the man who ambushed my son on the trail northwest of Camp Corral.

I thank God for the fact that my son's earthly possessions were not and could not be measured in material things. A humble home with love was all he owned, yet he would proudly tell anyone that he was rich beyond measure.

He was a man's man, a Marine's Marine, who could lay down his life for his friends.

The heartbreak will never mend, the bitterness grows deeper, sleep only comes from exhaustion. And daily we watch our other two sons as they grow closer to the time when some politician decides to boost the economy with a "step-up" in Vietnam or a "holding-action" somewhere else thousands of miles away, while the "hippie types" keep chipping away here at home.

Heartbroken? Yes. Bitter? Yes. And I'm sure that thousands of other parents feel just as deeply as we do. So I would beg you, please ask your readers to pray for all of us who have lost a son. And for those whose sons are still in Vietnam and elsewhere. And especially for our country that we may some day stop this senseless down-hill rush toward destruction.

PAUL L. PETTIT.

ROUTE 2, LIBERTY, S.C.

NORTH KOREAN AGGRESSION

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 17, 1969

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, with the lingering memories of the shameful Pueblo incident still fresh in the minds of Americans, our country has suffered another outrageous attack by North Korea when they wantonly destroyed one of our military aircraft in which the lives of 31 Americans were taken.

We cannot afford to stand idly by and permit these unprovoked assaults with impunity. Diplomatic protest and exhaustive oratory will not bring back 31 American lives, nor will it deter any future hostile acts. Insurance against these contemptible acts of aggression can only be realized by immediate, firm, and positive action.