the State of Iowa, relative to amending the Constitution of the United States to allow the people of each State greater freedom of choice in the apportionment of their legislature and local governing bodies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

161. Also, memorial to the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the consent of Congress to the agreement of the States of Minnesota and North Dakota transferring certain lands in Kittson County, Minn.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the sharing of Federal income tax revenues with the States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 11168. A bill for the relief of 2d Lt. Lennart G. Krals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAZEN:

H.R. 11169. A bill for the relief of Juan and Trinidad V. Esquivel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

105. The Speaker presented a petition of the City Council, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the antiballistic-missile plan, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE—*Monday, May 12, 1969*

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

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

Almighty God, whose temple is in the heart which is ever open to Thy presence, we pause before Thee this day to thank Thee for the light and truth of Thy kingdom mediated to this Nation by many faiths. For the elevated insights and dynamic drives of men and women, who being in tune with the infinite, have kept the higher goals and the loftier vision of Thy kingdom ever before us, we give Thee thanks.

In these disturbing and difficult days strengthen our faith in the enduring and eternal values of our heritage. Make us to heed and respond to the cry of Thy children for justice and peace. When we are unsure of the course we should follow, enable us to hear above the din of many voices Thy voice echoing across the years. "This is the way, walk ye in it."

O Father of our spirits, we commend this Nation and all its leaders to Thy divine direction.

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 Thursday, May 8, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate sundry messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

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

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

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

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

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

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.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

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

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

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

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

The bill clerk read the nomination of George Meany, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp.

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

NOMINATION PASSED OVER

The bill clerk read the nomination of Carl J. Gilbert, of Massachusetts, to be special representative for trade negotiations, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that the nomination go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nomination will be passed over.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ON THE NATO COUNCIL

The bill clerk read the nomination of Robert Ellsworth, of Kansas, to be U.S. permanent representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

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

AMBASSADORS

The bill clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of Ambassadors.

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

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

U.S. NAVY

The bill clerk read the nomination of Rear Adm. Arthur R. Gralla, U.S. Navy, to be vice admiral.

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.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

THE ABM AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Los Angeles Times of May 4 and May 6 appeared two articles on the ABM and the national security. I think they both present fair assessments. Each attempts to indicate that there are wo sides to this particular question.

I ask unanimous consent that these articles, plus one published in the Christian Science Monitor of May 10, 1969, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 4, 1969]

VIEWPOINT OF THE TIMES: THE ABM AND THE NATIONAL SECURITY

(This first viewpoint of the Times concerns the anti-ballistic missile controversy. The second will explore the dangerous implications of a unilateral missile freeze and examine some of the current assumptions regarding "excessive" military spending.)

President Nixon vows to fight as hard as he can for the proposed "Safeguard" missile defense system because he believes "it is absolutely essential to the security of this country."

ABM critics, in turn, deride the proposed system as a military boondoggle, and charge that its deployment will set off a new arms race, divert resources from badly needed domestic programs and "turn the United States into a garrison state."

The controversy, which turns on whether Congress will or will not vote $900 million for the first phase of the $7 billion project, is developing an emotional intensity of the same sort which caused the country to tear itself apart over Vietnam.

In a statement calling for rational debate instead of name-calling, Freedom House correctly observed that opposition to the ABM does not necessarily signify indifference toward the security of the United States.

But the moderate, nonpartisan society also warned that ABM supporters should not be dismissed as "bloodthirsty warmongers, tools of the 'military-industrial complex' or the like."

ARGUMENT HAS GROWN

If there is more heat than light in the debate, it is because the confrontation has escalated into much more than an argument over the merits of a specific weapons system.

Aviation Week, which is anything but hostile to defense spending, made precisely this point in a recent editorial.

The uproar over the ABM, the journal warned its readers, represents an "emotional explosion" against the growth of the military establishment into what many people see as a "vast octopus consuming enormous amounts of blood and money without producing very much security for the nation."

As a result, a jaundiced congressional eye is being cast not just on the ABM, but on military spending as a whole.

Some members of the Senate, in particular, are demanding slashes of a magnitude which would condemn the United States to a second-best military posture relative to the Soviet Union—a situation which most Americans, if faced with a conscious choice, are not prepared to accept.

MUST BE PUT IN FOCUS

If the new skepticism toward defense spending is to serve constructive ends, some perspective is needed, both in regard to the ABM itself and to the larger issue of allocating more resources to civil needs and less to the military.

What is Safeguard?

It is important to understand first what the ABM system, as announced by the Nixon Administration on March 14, would not do.

It would *not* protect the cities of the United States against the kind of massive missile attack which the Russians are capable of launching, nor is it intended to.

As the White House put it, "There is no way of doing that. Even if we built a 'thick' defense around our cities at enormous cost, some attacking missiles would get through—enough to inflict extremely high casualties and damage."

To deter the Russians from launching such an attack, Mr. Nixon would continue to rely—as did his predecessors—on keeping the Kremlin convinced that we could absorb a surprise blow and still destroy the Soviet Union with what is left of our missiles and bombers.

As of now, there is absolutely no doubt but that the United States has this capability. The question is whether we will have it in the period from 1973 on.

Russian buildup

In 1965, the year of the massive U.S. escalation in Vietnam, the Soviet Union had some 200 land-based intercontinental ballistic missiles in place compared to our 854.

As of last summer, the Russians had 800 ICBMs compared with our 1,054. Today, they have something over 1,000—and are still deploying more every month—while we have leveled off at 1,054.

The Administration readily agrees that, as of now, our superior bomber forces and missile-firing Polaris submarines give us a clear edge, despite the parity in land-based ICBMs.

The Russians, however, are not standing still.

If they continue to deploy ICBMs at the rate of 200 to 250 a year, while the United States indulges in a unilateral missile freeze, they could have twice as many ICBMs as us by 1973.

Furthermore, the ICBMs now being deployed are the big SS–9 or Scarp missiles which can carry single warheads up to 25 megatons or three smaller multiple-reentry warheads—each of which is several times larger than the warheads atop our Minutemen.

The Russians, meanwhile, also are building missile-firing submarines of their own, as well as killer subs which presumably are intended, in event of hostilities, to knock our Polaris subs out of action before they can fire their missiles.

Finally, they have already built a relatively unsophisticated ABM system around Moscow, and are known to be conducting research and development toward a more advanced system.

The Pentagon's best judgment is, as President Nixon told a recent news conference, that the Soviet Union may be "substantially ahead of us in overall nuclear capability" in 1972 or 1973, unless something is done now.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird is convinced that the Russians are trying to build a "first strike" capability—that is, the ability to knock us out with a surprise blow.

There is no proof of that. But, as Mr. Nixon put it, "We have to base our policies on their capability"—and this capability is rising in an ominous way.

Enter Safeguard

The main purpose of the ABM proposed by the President is to insure the survival of a significant proportion of our land-based Minuteman ICBMs (and of our bomber forces) in the event of a first strike by the Soviets.

Safeguard is designed secondarily to protect virtually the whole country against the kind of smaller-scale ICBM threat which Communist China will be able to pose in the 1970s.

Finally, if a missile were to be fired accidentally in our direction from any quarter, Safeguard supposedly would enable us to shoot it down.

Negotiations

In announcing a proposed go-ahead on the ABM, President Nixon made it plain that he hopes it will not be necessary to build the whole $7 billion system. Construction can be stopped whenever arms control talks with the Russians produce results.

In the first phase, what amounts to prototype ABM installations would be built in the vicinities of two Minuteman complexes (in Montana and North Dakota) which are said to contain about 350 ICBMs.

Mr. Nixon is convinced that these two ABM complexes alone should, upon their completion in 1973, go a long way toward deterring a would-be enemy from the temptation of a surprise attack on the United States.

Whether the remaining ten Safeguard complexes would ever be built depends upon the progress of arms control talks with Moscow.

The opposition

One thing which makes the ABM debate so confusing to the ordinary American is the sharp disagreement among the so-called experts.

The Safeguard system, which has been likened to "shooting a bullet with a bullet," involves an extremely complex marriage of radars, computers and missiles.

Some of our most eminent scientists sincerely doubt that, if built, it will work—and they have mounted a vigorous and highly effective lobbying effort to impress their skepticism upon Congress and the public.

Other scientists, equally qualified and sincere, are confident that Safeguard will do the job it is designed to do and believe it should be built.

Officials recall that both the hydrogen bomb and the Polaris submarine were developed—fortunately for the security of the United States—in the face of similar disagreement among the "experts."

Dean Acheson, who chaired a presidential advisory group on the hydrogen bomb question 20 years ago, says that "everything which is being said at the present time was said to me then." And he added: "Then, as now, scientists were acting as professors of morality."

Calling Dr. Strangelove

Assuming Safeguard will work, there are still a lot of knowledgeable people who argue that it will not really provide the protection advertised.

If the Communist Chinese were to decide to commit national suicide by launching a nuclear attack on the United States in the 1970s, it is argued, the existence of Safeguard would not stop them.

AN EASY JOB

They would need only to lob in a few short-range missiles from offshore submarines, or smuggle some A-bombs aboard freighters bound for Los Angeles, New York or other port cities.

In the event of a massive Soviet missile attack on the United States, ABM opponents argue that we could fire off our Minutemen before the incoming missiles arrived.

Even if we failed to do so, they insist, the Russians would still have to score near-perfect bull's-eye on virtually all of our Minuteman silos, bomber bases and Polaris subs—else they would face certain destruction from our retaliatory blow.

The survival of a substantial retaliatory force is best guaranteed, in the opinion of many experts, not by installing ABMs, but by building more offensive missiles, putting multiple warheads on them—and perhaps mounting some on hard-to-hit mobile platforms such as barges or railroad cars.

Surely, argue the ABM critics, a start on Safeguard can at least be postponed for a few months more. By that time, arms control talks should be under way, and we will have better intelligence on whether the Soviet ICBM buildup is aimed at achieving parity with the United States or an intimidating superiority.

SOME ROOM FOR DOUBT

The Nixon Administration has not, as a matter of fact, been entirely convincing in its insistence that the country faces a now-or-never decision on the ABM. Even if one assumes the worst about Soviet intentions, a few months' delay does not have to condemn the United States to a position of inferior power.

The U.S. Senate, however, will gravely and irresponsibly imperil the security of the United States if it votes down the ABM without serving clear notice that the action is provisional—that the Soviet Union is expected to match our own show of good faith by stopping its buildup of offensive missiles.

If Moscow disappoints these expectations, the anti-ABM senators should make plain, they will support President Nixon in doing whatever is necessary to maintain the American nuclear lead.

Unfortunately, there is no evidence that the more emotional foes of the ABM are prepared to exercise that kind of statesmanship.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 6, 1969]

VIEWPOINT OF THE TIMES: ABM: SHOULD THE UNITED STATES GO AHEAD?

Sen. Henry Jackson (D-Wash.) noted the other day that we were spending five times as much on defense against manned bombers at the end of the 1950s as we would spend on the "Safeguard" missile defense system proposed by President Nixon.

Why was there so little outcry then and so much now?

The answer, of course, lies in the rising resistance to military spending—the feeling among Americans that we have allowed our national priorities to get out of whack.

To keep the record straight, the polls show that the American people as a whole still favor a strong defense establishment. And, of those who have made up their minds on the ABM, over 60% are for it.

There is no question, however, but that sentiment for a tight rein on Pentagon spending is on the increase.

Paper eagle

As far as the average citizen is concerned, the new resistance to military spending has many roots. These include frustration over high taxes, inflation—plus the seeming inability of the world's most powerful military establishment to defeat a rag-tag army of Vietnamese Communists, or prevent the kind of humiliation we suffered in the Pueblo incident.

Credibility gap

Leaving disenchantment of that sort aside, the heart of the trouble is the growing cost and complexity of modern weapons systems.

During World War II, destroyers and submarines cost in the neighborhood of $5 to $9 million apiece; today, the going price is closer to $200 million. Today's fighter planes can carry price tags a hundred times higher than the models which outfought the Germans and Japanese 25 years ago.

What particularly angers congressional critics are the cases where costs run 200% to 300% higher than estimated. The over-run on the big C-5A transport plane alone is now calculated at $2.1 billion.

Even after soaking up enormous resources, the new weapons systems are sometimes a flop, the prime example being the Navy version of the F-111 swing-wing jet fighter.

Pork barrel, 1969 style

While all these factors are relevant, they are not the whole story.

"WALK AROUND" VIETNAM

In hard-rock political terms, what we are seeing is the opening round in a fight over the so-called Vietnam dividend—the billions of dollars which will be up for grabs when the war ends or is drastically reduced.

In this context, the so-called military industrial complex is locked in a struggle with competitive power centers—made up of scientists, educators, anti-poverty warriors, etc.—which want federal money for their own projects.

Since the end of the Vietnam tunnel is not in sight, these interests tend to favor a big slash in the non-Vietnam portion of the defense budget now.

The ABM, because of its controversial nature, makes an attractive target. If the first domino falls, reason the more zealous anti-Pentagon crusaders, the political atmosphere will be conducive to congressional veto of other portions of the defense budget.

Fair is fair

There can be no question but that the attack on America's urban ills—poverty, slum housing, snarled transportation, environmental pollution and the like—deserves a far greater claim on the country's resources than it has enjoyed in the past.

If the new skepticism is to serve a constructive purpose, however, it is important to separate fact from distortion. And the facts are as follows:

In 1960, long before the Kennedy-Johnson escalation in Vietnam, defense spending accounted for 8.7% of the gross national product and 47% of the total federal budget.

In 1969, defense spending is $35 billion higher than it was nine years ago. But it still accounts for only 8.8% of GNP and 43% of the total federal budget.

During the Vietnam war years, spending for major social programs has more than doubled, while defense outlays are up only 52%.

To cite specifics, the federal contribution to welfare programs is almost twice what it was six years ago. Outlays for education and manpower training have more than quadrupled, as has spending for community and regional development. Medical expenditures, thanks to Medicare, are up more than 700%.

Where to cut?

These statistics hardly bear out the picture, assiduously cultivated by Pentagon critics, of a country which has turned its back on human needs in the name of national security.

Obviously, however, the pertinent standard for "sufficiency" in the war on poverty and environmental blight is not the past but the future.

We can do better—if ways can be found to cut the military budget, which is the largest single category of federal spending. And given sufficient determination, ways can be found.

It is hard to believe, for example, that the United States really needs all the 429 major and 2,972 minor military bases which it maintains around the world. Surely a substantial number can be closed if U.S. overseas commitments are reviewed hardheadedly.

Another obvious target is the Pentagon's contracting and weapons evaluation procedures, so that the problems of cost over-runs and "white elephant" weapons systems can be reduced to manageable proportions.

The Soviet enigma

Inevitably, such a tightening up means that more weapons projects must be vetoed before too much money is invested in them—and Safeguard, all things considered, is a borderline case.

What must be avoided, however, is the know-nothing approach which manages simultaneously to be against the ABM, advanced new bombers and fighters, modernization of the Navy and upgrading of our Minuteman and Polaris missiles—all without regard to what the Russians are up to.

And, the Russians have been up to plenty while the United States has been otherwise engaged in Vietnam.

In fiscal 1965, the last year before the massive escalation of the U.S. role in the war, our defense spending totaled $50 billion.

As a result of war outlays, the total figure soared to $80 billion—but the non-Vietnam portion of the military budget is still not much over $50 billion.

The downhold in non-Vietnam spending was accomplished, to a considerable degree, by postponing or stretching out new strategic weapons projects.

As Sen. Jackson observed the other day, the budget for strategic forces is actually almost 50% less than it was in fiscal 1962, if inflation is taken into account.

While we were cranking down our side of the arms race the Russians have been cranking their side up.

The Institute for Strategic Studies estimates that total Soviet military spending is now on a parity with the non-Vietnam portion of ours—and as a percentage of GNP, is almost twice as large.

Beyond parity?

Four years ago, we had a four to one lead in ICBMs. Today, the Russians have caught up with us and may be going beyond parity to superiority.

We still have a big lead in bombers, ballistic missile-firing submarines and total number of warheads. But the Soviets are now building Polaris-type subs of their own, as well as sub-killers which could be used against our Polaris fleet.

As for the big U.S. lead in warheads, UCLA Prof. William G. McMillan, a longtime defense consultant, warns that the Russians may be using a different kind of arithmetic.

They may figure that one nuclear torpedo can destroy a Polaris submarine and all 16 of its missiles. One suborbital missile could take out a bomber field with a score of B-52s and a much larger number of H-bombs.

At this point, no one says for sure that the Soviets are shooting for an intimidating strategic superiority. But the evidence is too strong to be ignored.

Missile freeze

Both the Administration and ABM opponents agree that the best solution is a Big Two arms control arrangement which would effectively prevent either side from gaining a first strike capability over the other.

Mr. Nixon argues that an immediate start on Safeguard is essential to the U.S. bargaining position in such talks. Sen. William Fulbright (D-Ark.) charges that a start on the ABM would imperil the arms control talks and provoke the Russians to countermoves.

Neither argument stands up to critical analysis.

The Kremlin, it turns out, has accepted President Nixon's announcement on the ABM with more equanimity than the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Arms control talks are still expected within a few weeks or months.

This is not surprising. After all, the Russians have 67 ABMs of their own in place around Moscow, and are thus in no position to argue that defensive missiles are provocative.

U.S. DETERMINATION VITAL

Beyond that, the Kremlin leaders understand, if Fulbright and like-minded senators do not, that deployment of ABMs around ICBM silos—as distinct from cities—is not the act of a nation which is thinking in terms of a surprise attack on the other side.

There would be little point, after all, in spending billions to protect empty silos against a retaliatory blow.

Compromise

It does not necessarily follow, however, that congressional approval of Safeguard is essential to success of arms control negotiations.

What is essential is that the Russians know that the United States is not prepared to indulge in a unilateral missile freeze while the Kremlin indulges in a unilateral drive for strategic supremacy.

Unfortunately, the ABM opponents are coming perilously close to creating the opposite impression.

What, then, is the solution? Two alternatives suggest themselves:

Congress can approve a go-ahead on phase one of Safeguard—with language putting the Administration on notice that construction should be stopped if arms control talks show promise.

Congress can withhold approval—but with language putting the Soviets on clear notice that we are prepared to escalate our side of the arms race if the Soviets do not halt their own missile buildup.

The latter alternative is preferable.

If the lawmakers choose neither of these alternatives, but instead turn the ABM down in a euphoric atmosphere of unilateral disarmament, they will be not only wrong but irresponsible.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 10, 1969]

THE MISSILE HASSLE

The battle for and against deployment of the Sentinel antiballistic missiles wages fitfully in Congress and the public forums. Predictions suggest that the Nixon administration, favoring the ABM system, may win in the House and lose in the Senate, but no one is quite sure. Now the anti-ABM case is bolstered by the Wiesner-Chayes report, a lengthy analytical document which argues that the ABM system for destroying incoming missiles would be ineffective, unnecessary, and mainly a contribution to international tensions.

This 344-page report—by Jerome Wiesner, science adviser to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; Abram Chayes, former State Department legal adviser; plus a group of scientific and academic experts—was in part politically inspired. Sen. Edward Kennedy commissioned it last February, when he decided to take up the cudgels against the administration's—and Pentagon's—ABM proposal. It will be referred to, and quoted from, a good many times from here on in the crescendoing debate.

The Pentagon has promptly retaliated with its own evaluation—by two scientific experts and Nathan Twining, former chairman of the joint chiefs—which brands the report as unscientific in method, inconsistent and full of errors.

The average individual will wonder what he should believe. Probably the most compelling argument by the Wiesner-Chayes document is its conclusion that, there is no need for a decision, now, to deploy a missile defense system. In short, why go ahead with a new system when the United States is just about to engage in crucial arms-curtailment talks with the Soviet Union?

The impact of the report also is to cast further doubt on the testimony of Defense Secretary Melvin Laird, already disputed, that Moscow is seeking a "first strike" capability against the United States—an ability to knock out America's total defenses in a first devastating blow. Hence the report concludes that deployment, now, of an untried and controversial new defense line would not enhance, but would lessen, national security.

It is useful, to public debate and final decision, that this report is at hand. Dr. Wiesner was one of those who labored long to persuade Moscow that arms-cutback talks would be worthwhile. It is also useful to have the Pentagon's rebuttal which declares the ABM system to be workable and effective. Let the debate continue. But let the administration and Pentagon realize they are under heavy obligation to show why an ABM system would need to be set in motion now, only shortly before talks with Moscow begin.

THE ABM AND THE PRIMARY DANGER

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in the Washington Post of May 3, 1969, is published a letter by Mr. Mark A. Weiss. It carries a heading, "The ABM and the Primary Danger." Mr. Weiss has written a most thoughtful letter which relates the question of the deployment of the ABM to the larger issue of the need for general adjustments in U.S. policy in the light of contemporary national and international realities. He urges that the debate of the issue not be reduced to a partisan irrelevancy but, rather, that it be utilized as a profound opportunity to bring up to date our outlook on the situation which confronts the Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 3, 1969]

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR: THE ABM AND THE PRIMARY DANGER

If the anti-ballistic missile controversy is permitted to deteriorate into a partisan test of the President's political skill and prestige, we fail to see it for what it is: a major opportunity to put aside outdated ideas and to begin molding our international and domestic policies to the realities of the post-Vietnam era.

What was sophisticated policy in the past has become naive dogma. We persist in the view that our physical survival and our world influence depend upon our possession of ever-growing nuclear might, yet we know that the security and influence of the great powers continue to decline as their nuclear arsenals increase. We pour vast resources into more and more ultimate weapons that at heart we believe never will be used precisely because they are ultimate.

Sophisticated strategy today does call for preservation of an American nuclear deterrent—less because an adversary actually would be likely to use his nuclear weapons than because of the subtle effects our inability to retaliate would have on our policies and the policies of other nations. But this means only that we must retain the ability to exact an unacceptable price of any attacker, not that we must be able to shield ourselves from injury in the first instance or devastate the globe. Since we have missiles and bombers and nuclear submarines, any small part of which would make an attack foolhardy, either the ABM proposal must assume the imminent development of hostile weapons systems capable of neutralizing every part of this excessive destructive force, or the ABM deployment is only a sly first round in the expenditure of many more tens of billions in pursuit of a total security that we could not achieve even if we could afford it.

Whether we can afford the ABM in the broadest sense is the heart of the matter. To be sure, there are risks in every direction, but we pay a terrible price for the delusion that the sole, or even the primary danger is the one that nuclear weapons are made to meet. We undermine our political and social structure at home, and curtail our opportunities to influence others through cooperation and example. As the McCarthyism of the 1950s mistakenly saw our security threatened more from within than from without, will we in the 1970s mistakenly see our survival threatened more by the weapons of other nations than by the frustrated grievances of our own people?

To stop grasping for omnipotence need not be to withdraw into neo-isolationism. Moreover, the choice is not between our aims as a world power and our aims as a society, for it is increasingly plain that our present course does not lead toward either set of objectives, while the alternative offers a better prospect of both.

If we can accept the inevitability of a world in which no nation can have ultimate power or security, perhaps there will be a basis for global de-escalation of military spending and redirection of effort toward human and environmental needs.

If we can overcome our preoccupation with the chronic danger of a future external attack long enough to notice the acute symptoms of cancer, perhaps we will take the first step toward a cure by rejecting deployment of the ABM system.

MARK A. WEISS.

CHEVY CHASE.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

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

THE SUPREME COURT

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, the people of our Nation have been stunned by information indicating the extent to which Justices of the U.S. Supreme Court have been involved in practices which are glaringly inconsistent with the duties and responsibilities of the office of U.S. Supreme Court Justice.

Our Nation is in debt to those who have brought this information to public attention, and particularly to the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. WILLIAMS), who has put together and placed in the RECORD what must rank as one of the most devastating indictments ever leveled against practices which appear to have become commonplace on the Court.

Mr. President, moral and ethical issues have been raised of crisis proportions. I wholeheartedly concur in the judgment of many Senators that a full scale investigation is imperative and that enactment of legislation will be necessary to incise what amounts to an amoral malignancy revealed in certain practices of some members of the Court.

In examining the issues presented, from the standpoint of proposed legislation, it may be helpful to avoid a rush to judgment on the basis of single factual situations. It may be well to back up a bit and see if there is not a pattern revealed to suggest that the present problem may be the effect of a deeper and more profound cause. If so, the legislative approach must do more than treat the symptoms—it must reach the underlying cause.

In this connection, Mr. President, we must bear in mind that Justice Fortas is not the only member of the Court who has accepted fees, royalties, gratuities, and honorariums from outside sources. We are confronted with a pattern and practice apparently deemed acceptable and therefore condoned by the Supreme Court.

For example, Justice Douglas has accepted an annual stipend of $12,000 a year for extra work or services, from sources outside the Court. In the case of Justice Douglas, as in the case of Justice Fortas, money was paid by tax-exempt foundations. And it may be no more than a coincidence, but both foundations had a connection with individuals

and interests in trouble with the U.S. Department of Justice. The mere possibility of something more than coincidence in these similarities is enough to send shivers down the spine.

Then, of course, there is the matter of Supreme Court Justices who market books, and capitalize on the opportunity to harvest royalties from sale of books. And there is the practice of reaping substantial honorariums for speaking engagements. Justice Fortas previously accepted a $15,000 honorarium for a series of lectures paid from a "kitty" made up from contributions of clients of the law firm of which he was formerly a member.

More recently, it has been reported that Justice Fortas had agreed on a $2,500 honorarium as adequate compensation for making a speech. One cannot help wonder if dickering on the price took place in arriving at the amount of honorarium to be paid. Apparently, most of the Justices on the Supreme Court find nothing wrong in this sort of "moonlighting" and consider it proper to reap a financial harvest from the banquet circuit.

Of course, this practice may or may not result in conflicts of interest in individual cases, but what of constitutional principles which come before the Court for definitive adjudication? Who pays the piper? Who calls the piper's tune? The possibility for undue influence in structuring speeches to the demands of a particular audience is too real not to recognize it as a potential danger; and, as a source of income, it is one incompatible with the office of Supreme Court Justice.

Another aspect of this problem is that members of the Court are shamelessly profiteering on the prestige of the Court. The guardians of our liberties are subjecting the Court to criticism for what appears to be crass commercialism demonstrated by a willingness to trade on the prestige of their office for personal gain.

Frankly, I can not accept the attitude of some Supreme Court Justices that it is permissible to seek outside income simply because there is no law against it. A Supreme Court Justice is appointed for life; he receives $60,000 a year in salary; and is entitled to retire on full pay. Under these circumstances, there should be no financial reason, unless it is love of money, to use the position of Justice of the Supreme Court for personal gain in commercialization of the office. Yet it is a common practice. What is to be done?

Frankly, there is something distasteful in the idea of imposing criminal sanctions in order to regulate the conduct of Supreme Court Justices. But as distasteful as it is, if their conduct in certain areas is not regulated by moral inhibitions or by canons of the legal profession, then Congress may have no choice and must take legislative action. It is perfectly obvious that some members of the Supreme Court see nothing wrong in "judicial hustling." Such a distorted judgment is adequate reason for enacting a law which says otherwise.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there are three separate aspects of the overall problem which may need legislative attention.

First, the practice of members accepting gifts, honorariums, or allowances from individuals, corporations, or any special interest group. This practice suggests the relationship of a patron of the arts, and a down and out suppliant. The idea of a Supreme Court Justice feeling compelled to measure his words or conduct to demonstrate a proper respect and gratitude to a benefactor or benefactors is depressing to think about and downright degrading in practice. Let us put an end to the practice.

Second, Mr. President, a Justice of the Supreme Court has a full-time job—with adequate compensation. There should be no reason to "moonlight" in order to make ends meet and there can be no excuse for having to write books and magazine articles to sell on the commercial market. Since themes for books and articles frequently are chosen to meet demands of the current market and since pornography is the hottest theme on the market today—it is distressing to have to wonder if one of our judicial authors might be tempted to hit the market with a book on obscenity and pornography.

Commercialization of the office is rampant, to the extent even that one Justice has found it necessary to employ a booking agent to go about hawking a "sure-fire guaranteed hit" in much the same manner as a vaudeville agent selling a "talking dog act." Are we to awake one day to read an advertisement in Variety—"Have Speech, Will Travel," promoting the financial interest of a Justice of the Supreme Court?

Mr. President, this crass commercialization of the Supreme Court presents us with an accumulated mess. It smells to high heaven. The need for cleansing is reminiscent of the Aëgean stables or perhaps the situation in the temple in the time of Christ. I do not know which comparison is more apt. In any event—cleansing there must be.

Next, Mr. President, I believe that Federal criminal statutes might be tightened up a bit—made a bit more precise in the area of undue influence, to the extent that individuals, corporations, and special interest groups might be discouraged from dreaming up ways to tempt Supreme Court Justices by way of commercial or other offers of reward for any kind of advice, counsel, or service.

Finally, Mr. President, in order to effectively achieve these ends, it would seem necessary that some provisions be made for periodic financial disclosure of income sources of members of the Court.

Mr. President, it is unpleasant to think about the need to legislate along these lines. I most sincerely hope that legislation may not be necessary. I hope that the Court will clean up its own house by the formulation and adoption of a code of ethics. I hope that such a code may be a first priority item in the current order of business and that standards adopted will accomplish not less than a correction of the glaring improprieties outlined above.

If the U.S. Supreme Court does not act, then Congress must.

Mr. President, last January I made a speech on the floor of the Senate against the salary raise for Members of Congress and members of the Supreme Court. At that time I said that I believe the Court would be much improved by the resignation of a majority of the Justices of the Supreme Court. I still stand by that statement.

To be a little more precise and exact I would say the Court would be much better off if Mr. Justice Fortas and Mr. Justice Douglas would resign.

I yield the floor.

SAIGON MURDERER NOW GUEST OF AMERICAN TAXPAYERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, many Americans will distinctly remember the picture in most metropolitan newspapers of the South Vietnam militarist national police chief, Nguyen Ngoc Loan, murdering a Vietcong officer with a single pistol shot during the Tet offensive last year. This Vietcong officer had been taken prisoner by American GI's. Unfortunately, although our Nation is signatory to the Geneva Pact guaranteeing the humane treatment of prisoners of war, it is our continuing policy in Vietnam to turn over all Vietcong prisoners taken by American troops to officers of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces.

We do this notwithstanding the fact our military leaders know that usually those prisoners of war taken by our GI's are often subjected to brutality and torture immediately and that many are murdered. Soldiers of the Saigon militarist regime tie their hands behind their backs, usually blindfold them, invariably torture them, and too often murder unfortunate Vietcong prisoners of war. This particular outrageous murder was also depicted on television screens as part of the Vietnam war news of that day and viewed by millions of Americans.

Americans should now know that this murderer, Brig. Gen. Nguyen Ngoc Loan who was seriously wounded in street fighting in Saigon has been brought to the United States on a commercial jet liner at the expense of our taxpayers who are footing the bill for this murderer.

This brutal murderer, accompanied by his wife, four children, chauffeur, cook, and military aide, is in the United States and en route to Washington, D.C., where arrangements have been made for him to be given a suite at Walter Reed Hospital and have the services of U.S. surgeons and doctors attending him under the pretext that he has diplomatic status and is connected with the South Vietnam Embassy in Washington.

This murderer will soon be at Walter Reed Hospital, Washington, receiving the best medical, surgical, and nursing attention available. All this, of course, at the expense of American taxpayers. Incidentally, the suite he will occupy should be occupied instead by some American GI's wounded in fighting in Vietnam to maintain in office the militarist regime in Saigon of which he is a general officer.

American citizens are beginning to realize that the Saigon regime of President Thieu and Vice President Ky represent at most but 20 percent of the people living in South Vietnam. At least 80 per-

cent are sympathetic to or fighting with the Vietnam or forces of the National Liberation Front.

When I was in South Vietnam, the chief deputy of General Westmoreland informed me that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting against Americans in the Mekong Delta, south and west of Saigon, were born and reared in the Saigon Delta.

This most recent picture of this Saigon murderer shows a well-dressed man in civilian clothes, carrying a cane, accompanied by his wife and, presumably, his daughter, or a friend. He will soon be a guest and patient at the Walter Reed Hospital "where his injured leg will be operated on."

Mr. President, this seems to me to be a disgraceful end to a disgraceful, murderous episode.

UNTIMELY DEATH OF JACK JUREY, WTOP NEWSMAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with sadness and regret that I read in the press this morning of the passing of an old friend, an excellent journalist, and first-rate reporter, Jack Jurey, who had been with station WTOP since 1958.

Jack Jurey, I believe, was the originator of the use of the broadcast editorial both on radio and television; at least in the Washington area he was one of the first to employ this kind of reporting.

He was the winner of a number of Sigma Delta Chi, and local Emmy awards. He was a man of outstanding honesty. His editorials were brief, thorough, and to the point. I cannot recall one to which I listened—and I listened to many—which did not impress me very much.

I knew that Jack had been ill over the past few months but, nevertheless, I am deeply sorry that the career of this outstanding correspondent, reporter, and newspaperman has been brought to such an untimely end.

On behalf of Mrs. Mansfield and myself, I extend our deepest condolences and sympathies to his wife, Philomena, and to his daughter, Mrs. Edwin Conklin, Jr., who lives with her husband in Istanbul, Turkey.

Mr. President, we will all miss Jack Jurey. He was a rare man in the reportorial field. It will be some time before his like will once again appear on the scene.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an obituary from the Washington Post of this morning.

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

JACK JUREY, 45, WTOP NEWSMAN

Jack Jurey, senior correspondent for WTOP News, died yesterday of cancer at his home, 3211 Rowland pl. nw. He was 45.

Mr. Jurey's career with WTOP, which began in August, 1958, included participation in several award-winning efforts. He originated the station's editorial, which in 1963 won the Radio-Television News Directors Association Award.

Also, a two-week fact-finding tour of Vietnam in 1965 led to a series of editorials that won the award of Sigma Delta Chi, the national professional journalism fraternity, for distinguished service in television editorializing.

Mr. Jurey was named news director of WTOP in 1968. He supervised the station's coverage of the April disturbances here. Two WTOP documentaries on the riots, "Dialogue With Whitey" and "The Silent Cash Register," was named for local Emmy awards by the Washington chapter of the National Academy of Arts and Sciences.

In December, 1968, he asked to be relieved of his administrative duties to devote full time to reporting. He was named senior correspondent.

Born in Youngstown, Ohio, Mr. Jurey attended Youngstown University. He began his career with WKBN in his home town in 1941. After service with the Army Air Corps in World War II, he returned to the station as news director.

Mr. Jurey covered the 1960, 1964, and 1968 political campaigns and conventions.

Larry H. Israel, chairman of the board of Post-Newsweek stations, said, "Jack Jurey's pioneering in editorials for local stations was a major contribution to broadcast journalism. His recruitment and encouragement of young people coming into the field made his off-camera contribution as meaningful as his work on television."

John Corporon, vice president and general manager of WTOP–TV, said, "Jack will be missed as a friend and as a journalist. He made many contributions to the Washington community as an editorialist, a reporter and as a news director. His devotion to truth-seeking and his high standards of professionalism made him one of Washington's most respected newsmen."

Mr. Jurey is survived by his wife, Philomena, and his daughter by a previous marriage, Mrs. Edwin Conklin Jr., who lives with her husband in Istanbul.

YOUTH PATRIOTISM WEEK

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in these troublesome days, it frequently is easy to view the acts of some members of the younger generation through a jaundiced eye. Consequently, it is indeed a privilege for me to call to the attention of the Congress the Youth Patriotism Week sponsored by the Fayetteville, N.C., Youth Council from March 2 through 8.

With the thought that other communities might be interested in sponsoring a similar activity, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement outlining the activities of Youth Patriotism Week and the essays on patriotism which won the first, second, and third prizes.

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

YOUTH PATRIOTISM WEEK

(Sponsored by the Fayetteville Youth Council)

The week of March 2, thru March 8, 1969 was set aside to show that the youth of Fayetteville have a deep love for their country. On Sunday, March 2, a rally was held at Rowan Park. Sgt. Lawrence Joel, Medal of Honor winner, was the speaker for the rally. High school glee clubs and folk singers gave a suitable program. The four city high school service clubs took a project during the week. Some of these projects were visiting the local Veteran's Hospital, making posters, flag raising ceremonies at each school and special P. A. School announcements and programs at the schools. The high school ROTC units helped with the flag raisings at the schools.

An essay contest, with high school students submitting a 300 word or less essay on what patriotism means to them. The Mayor of Fayetteville, Monroe E. Evans, gave the prizes for the three winners. David Freeman won first prize. Wanda Mitchener placed second and Cathy Hobbs won third prize.

American flag decals were distributed by the Youth Council to all interested people in displaying them on their automobiles.

Radio spot tapes were made by teen-agers on patriotism to be played on the local radio stations.

Murray Fogler, a Fayetteville Youth Council member, wrote a letter to Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., stating the confidence that we have in our country.

The week closed on Saturday, March 8, 1969, with a Cavalcade through downtown Fayetteville with high school students driving decorated cars. A prize was given to the group with the best decorated car. The ROTC car from Reid Ross High School won the prize.

The Fayetteville Youth Council feels that this week made many of the teen-agers of this area more aware of the feelings that they have for their country.

[First Place]

AN ESSAY ON PATRIOTISM

(By David S. Freeman III, Terry Sanford, Sr., High School, Fayetteville, N.C.)

Klansman burn crosses—the panther snarl! Freedom rings—how sweet it is; the big bear is hugging us again! Clinched black fists and shiny medals—the flag goes up but the head goes down! Wallace ran—a racist army embraced him! Wallace ran—tears ran! 45, 22, 38—not a figure but an arsenal. This is like it is, but not like it ought to be.

History is still repeating itself and someone has rightly said that "the worst thing about history is that every time it repeats itself the price goes up!"

Those who wrap themselves most conspicuously in the stars and stripes—the symbol of liberty and equality—are the most likely to be, either openly or tacitly, anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, anti-Foreign, and anti-intellectual, secure in the most un-American confidence that only they themselves are true Americans. For them, the oath of allegiance is the passport to patriotism and the ritual observed is the end desired.

Like most outward professions, the claim of patriotism ironically can mask a lack of faith. The patriot who thinks of himself as a patriot may pledge allegiance to the flag, but he may not truly believe in the democracy for which it stands and the justice it is sworn to maintain. The real patriot believes in both. But you might not recognize him, because he carries his allegiance within his heart and his banner within his blood.

If we are true patriots, when the flag goes up, our fists and medals go down, and our heads go up with pride.

[Second Place]

PATRIOTISM

(By Wanda K. Mitchener, E. E. Smith Senior High, Fayetteville, N.C.)

"My country claims me all, claims every passion; her liberty henceforth be all my thought; for her, my life,

"I'd willingly resign, and say with transport that the gain was mine."—MARTYN.

"O say does that star-spangled banner yet wave; Or' the land of the Free and the home of the Brave."

And thus ends the celebrated anthem of America. Yet, how many Americans continue to hum it's melody or think twice about the meaning and thought contained within the lines of our National Anthem.

At the historic time in history when these glorious words were written by Frances Scott Key, Americans were aware of their nativity. At a time in history when Americans were fighting to maintain freedom, Frances Scott Key expressed the feelings of many American

people. Patriotism was strong and Americans were filled with love and devotion for their country; and they sang, "My country 'tis of Thee sweet land of liberty, of thee I sing."

How many Americans are forced to seek their dictionary's help when patriotism is mentioned? How many Americans have to force themselves to stand tall when the anthem is sung? How many Americans truly know the words and meaning of our national anthem? How many Americans think about their wonderful heritage? How many Americans love their country? These are all questions which should become a challenge to each individual in this democracy.

Patriotism is not to be taken lightly, as many persons seem to think, but it is to be practiced in day to day living. Patriotism should be stressed not only at Football and Basketball games, but in homes, schools, churches, at work and recreation.

The true patriot forgets not the struggles of his forefathers which made him free and comfortable today. In the words of the late John F. Kennedy, a true patriot "ask not what his country can do for him, but rather what he can do for his country."

A patriot has so expertly been defined as, "one who loves and zealously supports his *own* country." Love for one's own country is the key to patriotism which unlocks the door to an individual's heart and enables him to sing with renewed vigor, "God bless America, land that I love."

[Third Place]

PATRIOTISM

(By Cathy Hobbs, Reid Ross High School, Fayetteville, N.C.)

Patriotism must truly come from the heart. The dictionary defines it as a deep love for one's country. But it can't just stop at that. Ask yourself, "Would I be willing to lay down my life for my country?" "Would I be willing to defend my country's beliefs, policies, and form of government?" These points are only a few of the many aspects covered by the word patriotism.

We, as young people, should be primarily concerned with a love of our country. We are the leaders of tomorrow and the only hope for the future. Now is the time when we should be preparing ourselves for the problems that lie ahead. Our country depends on us. It is the *people* that represent the United States, not the figures on a national graph. It is said that the United States is the most influential and the richest country of today. The people before us have made it that way. Their love of our land has brought us unbelievable wealth. This wealth isn't necessarily from our economic standpoint, but from the small intangible aspects of life in general. Our fathers, grandfathers,, and great-grandfathers have all laid down their lives for this wonderful country. They did this not because they had to, but because they wanted to fulfill the dream of all Americans—the dream of freedom and peace for everyone.

Freedom and peace can't come by just sitting back and letting nature take its course. Peace will come only through brotherly love, and there is no better place to start than by loving one's own country.

As I said before, patriotism must come from the heart. Only when sincerity plays its proper role will this land of ours be free and peaceful.

ADDRESS OF REV. IRVIN R. PUSEY, BEFORE THE CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF MASONS IN NORTH AMERICA

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, on February 24, 1969, the Reverend Irvin R. Pusey, grand chaplain of the Grand Lodge of Delaware and pastor of the Red Lion Methodist Church, Red Lion, Del., made an address before the Conference of Grand Masters of Masons in North America at the Shoreham Hotel in Washington, D.C. This speech dealt in very eloquent fashion with the fundamental principles upon which our country was founded. This address merits the consideration of all thoughtful Americans and for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS OF REV. IRVIN R. PUSEY, GRAND CHAPLAIN OF THE GRAND LODGE OF DELAWARE AND PASTOR OF THE RED LION METHODIST CHURCH, RED LION, DEL., BEFORE THE CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF MASONS IN NORTH AMERICA, WASHINGTON, D.C., FEBRUARY 24, 1969

I consider it a privilege to be with you tonight to share in this great meeting with great people. I come to you as a Mason; as a Minister; and as an American. I have a love for my Lodge; a love for my land; and a love for my Lord. And these themes of circumstances will color what I have to say to you tonight. They all flow together; they all mingle in; they cannot be separated. I thank God for all of these.

I should like to share with you three things you can hang your thoughts on: Masons as men of purpose; Masons as men of patriotism; Masons as men of prayer.

So to you distinguished guests; to you, Mr. Chairman; to you dear ladies and to you brethren, let me speak to these three things.

Masons as men of purpose. We live in a divided world tonight; a world where there are two Koreas; two Vietnams; two Germanys; two Chinas; two Berlins. A world that is divided by philosophical and political ideologies and even in our fair land, we see many, many problems. Freedom is under attack by Communism. Don't you think it is not. Men by the hundreds are coming back from Vietnam in little wooden boxes; pant legs pinned up, coat sleeves tucked in. They know Freedom is under attack tonight. We see in America tonight the ravages of an increasing crime rate that many of our police departments are now admitting they cannot really control. Immorality in America is no longer a disgrace—it is a way of life. If there was ever a time for Masons to live by the spirit of their Fraternity, it is now. To become men of purpose, and I do not mean men of purpose just by saying "Oh, I have a purpose for my life", but as Masons to take the purposes and the spirit of Masonry and get it out of the ritual of a Lodge Room and let it live in our hearts; on the streets, in our homes and in our factories. Let Masonry come alive; let it become incarnate in our bodies, because unless it does then I am afraid of its future.

Not long ago I gave my little daughter a stuffed toy lion. She played with it, carried it around; kicked and mauled it. I often wondered what would happen if that stuffed lion ever came alive. Many Masons are treating Masonry that way. We dabble in it; we play with it. Oh, if it could only come alive. I hear people say "you know we have got to defend Masonry." I do not believe it. You do not have to defend Masonry any more than you have to defend a lion. Let it loose. It will protect itself. Let it loose in your life and my life.

We read in the Book of Acts in the Bible, of Peter and John going up to the Temple and they met a lame man at the gate of the temple. He was begging. It was quite surprising, because at that time most beggars used to beg on the outside of the city at the gates of the city where the marketing was done and the caravans came through. But, this man was begging at the gates of the Temple. Why? Because he expected more from those who entered the temple, more from those who believed in God. I think he was right. And I believe tonight that the world has a right to expect more from Masons than many other groups. And God help us if we do not think so. I believe Masonry makes a man a better man and if it does, it gives him an awesome responsibility to let loose the spirit and the morals and the principles of Masonry. Let it come alive. Let that be our purpose.

I want to say that Masons ought to be patriotic. This is a dirty word in our day and time. The thing to do if you want to be popular is to criticize America; find fault with her. And this can be done. She has got her faults and she is certainly open to criticism. I have done some myself. But I am just a little bit weary of hearing all of this. Because, as I look at this land, I believe there is a lot to be said for America. And now I would like to say a good word for America. I think she is the greatest nation on earth. I make no apologies for that. Patriotism, comes from the word patriarch. It means love of fatherland. Let us not be ashamed of it.

I would like to take the letters of the word America: America. And ascribe some thoughts for each letter.

A. A is for *Ahead.* We live in a time of social and political revolution, where people are telling us that a democracy can no longer cope with the needs of the time. This is a technological age, they say, and the only way a government can control and compete and take care of its people is to become socialistic or communistic. I do not believe it. No nation has done more for her people than America. No Nation has given more dignity and freedom and opportunity to her people than America. And I know her standard of living is the envy of the world. There are some who like to compare us with the communist nations, notably the Soviet Union.

Do you realize that if we were to become equal with the Soviet Union, we would have to go backwards? We would have to cut our agricultural and industrial production by great percentages. We would not be able to meet here tonight, if this hotel was located in Russia. Such a thing as Masonry would not be tolerated. Such a society could not exist in the Soviet Union. You couldn't be here tonight and if you were, there would be secret police in the garage taking down your license numbers from your cars.

Speaking of police. The police in Russia are there to protect the *government.* The police in America are here to protect the *public.* And I am one who thinks that the police of America are doing a *great job* and are ridiculed unnecessarily. The Grand Master of Delaware, Warren Schueler, is a lieutenant colonel of the state police. We have three other state troopers on the staff, who are Masons, and whenever I hear the cry of police brutality go up I cringe, because usually, it is just an attempt to get out of a crime a person has already committed. And I will tell you something tonight, brethren and friends. I hope I never have to make the choice, but if I do have to make the choice, I would far rather have police brutality of the criminal rather than criminal brutality of the public the way it is being done today. And so as I look at America, I see that she is already *far ahead* of any other system of government. Name any system of government that has done as much for their people as the United States of America! In fact, many of these governments today exist because of the American dollar that's kept them afloat. So why should we want to change to another form of government when we are *already ahead!*

M stands for *Mighty,* she is a mighty nation; and I, for one, am not ashamed of the military power of the United States because I'm convinced tonight that the only thing that stands between the Soviet, the

Red Chinese war machine and world domination is the military power of the United States! I believe they fear and respect it and I'm not ashamed of our military power! I'm proud of every one of our men in uniform because they not only represent their country, but they represent a direct challenge to a way of life that would ruin our way of life. They represent power that the enemy will respect! And to those who would burn the American flag and tear it down, burn their draft cards (and by the way, when they burn their draft cards, I would have a lot more respect for them if they burnt their social security cards at the same time). Those who burn the American flag ought to read up on their history and I'll make this statement in front of anybody—No nation has done more for the world in the history of the world than the United States of America!

Ask any Englishman if there would be an England today without America's help in World War II. Of course not! Charles De Gaulle, in France, can say all he wants to about his anti-Americanism (you notice he doesn't do it too much anymore . . . not since he got stung himself by the Communists last spring when they turned on him), but he used to be very anti-American in many respects. Yet, Charles De Gaulle has a nation to be president of tonight because there are *10,000* American graves in Normandy and throughout France that bought his country back from Hitler! I'll say this too! There wouldn't even be a Russia tonight without America! Just go back in history a few years. In 1942, Hitler's armies were at the gates of Moscow and we know that the Russian winter took its toll. But it wasn't the Russian winter that defeated Hitler's army—it was the Russian army that defeated Hitler's armies, but with what? Ships—hundreds of them left American ports and put in at Russian ports. It was *American* guns, and *American* tanks, and *American* planes, and *American* bombs in the hands of Russian soldiers that turned the tide and if she didn't have the war equipment we gave to her, she could never have done it! Hitler would have marched right into the streets of Moscow. So there is a Russia today because there was an America who pumped out of her factories war materials and armed the Soviet soldiers. And then those who would say about America's involvement in Vietnam—how criminal we are over there—look at the past! What did we do with West Germany, this enemy that had ravaged Europe and killed many of our men? Why we turned our treasuries loose and we poured money into West Germany and today she is the fastest growing economy in all of Western Europe and her dollar is the soundest! What did we do with Japan? Here is an enemy that had a sneak attack on Pearl Harbor and 2700 American men died! With this enemy that stabbed us in the back, we signed a peace treaty on the decks of the U.S.S. Missouri. Did we go in and plunder and loot and rape that nation? No! We sent money, medical aid, food supplies, factory equipment—we went in there and we put Japan back on her feet! We also turned back to her many islands of the Pacific taken at such a high price, Iwo Jima to name one. Today, Japan is the fastest growing economy in the whole world, thanks to her *enemy*, America, who treated her better than she had ever been treated before, even after Pearl Harbor. Who was the first one to come to the aid of the South Koreans, even before the United Nations involved themselves in it? And those in South Vietnam! When no other nation cared, the very finest of our young men went over there and are over there going through the ravages of war for the freedom of another country! Don't tell me we're criminal—history just doesn't prove it!

I am reminded of a story I heard when I was in theological seminary. It was told to me by one of the associate editors of the Baltimore Sun Newspaper. He said, "when I was born, my mother died in giving me childbirth. He said, my father was a good man—a farmer, and I was the last of eleven children. Dad wanted to keep the family together and he did. He said one warm summer day I saw my dad sitting on the front porch of the old farm house and I ran and climbed up into his lap. I was then about seven years old. Dad put his big arm around me and began to tell me all about my mother, whom I never knew. Tears rolled down his cheeks and when he had finished he pointed to a little cemetery across the way and said, son, you'll never know how much you cost me."

All across the world America can point to hundreds of thousands of little white crosses and say to the world, you'll never know how much you cost me. She is a *mighty* nation and I am not ashamed of her military power.

E stands for *Everyone*. Now we know and we have to admit that there have been injustices in this country. This is certainly, true. But there have been injustices in every country. I do believe, however, that more people have been given an opportunity in this country than in any other nation. There are a lot of people tonight who are submitting bills to America. They want something. It is like the little boy who went to school. He found out from his classmates that some of them were getting a larger allowance than he was getting. When he found it out he thought he would give Mom the word. But when he got home, he chickened out and could not bring himself to tell her that he needed a larger allowance because every one else in the class was getting it. He wrote her a note, and left it on the dining room table. When he went to school the next morning his mother found it. She picked it up and read it. It went something like this: (To Mom. A bill from your son. For taking out the garbage, fifty cents; for helping with the dishes, seventy-five cents; for saying thank you and please, two dollars. It all totaled up to several dollars.

When he came home that night his mother did not say a word to him and he was a little bit surprised, but he was too afraid to bring up the subject. After he finished his supper, he saw a little note sticking out from under the plate. He pulled it out and opened it up. It said something like this: *To my son, a bill from your Mother.* For bringing you into this world and going into the jaws of death to do it, the cost was love. For walking the floor with you at night when you were sick, the cost was love. For teaching you to talk and to walk, the cost was love. He got the idea. He could never repay his mother).

Suppose that in some way America could submit a bill to us for the privilege of being born in this country. The cost was the grace of God. For the freedom you have enjoyed, the cost was innumerable lives given at Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Iwo Jima, Korea and so on. We could never repay her for what she has done for us.

R stands for *Religion*. We will never be able to understand this great American phenomenon *apart from GOD*. What is it that makes America unique? Not democracy. Other nations have had democracy. The Greeks had it thousands of years ago. Not her military power. Other nations have had military power. Not her resources. Other nations have great resources. I believe it is the fact that she is one nation under God. Notice that phrase—Under God. Not equal with God, or above God, or along side of God, but a nation under God. Under God's rule and law. As I have surveyed the American scene, I have wondered how people can get the idea she is supposed to be religiously neutral. Oh, I know that there was no religious denomination to be supported by our government. But I cannot buy the idea that she was supposed to be religiously neutral, not when I look at history. When the Pilgrims would rather have their Bibles than their lives, and came to these shores and wrote a Mayflower pact and stated therein that they took possession of this land in the name of God and for the propagation of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

When I see Washington kneeling at Valley Forge, praying. When I hear Benjamin Franklin call thirteen colonies together when they were about to split up at the Continental Congress and say to those gentleman, "let us pray". And out of that prayer meeting came much of the structures of our Government. I see the Continental Congress in 1775—one year before the Declaration of Independence—call upon the American people on July 12th to have a day of fasting and prayer in humility and recognition of Almighty God. That was done by the Continental Congress in 1775. It was George Washington who issued a statement that he would like to see ministers or chaplains in all branches of the armed services. And it was Washington, after he had finished his oath of office said *"so help me God"*, and so has every President all down through history. The Congress in 1853 decreed that the motto on our coinage and our money should be "In God We Trust". Consider the National Anthem of this Nation (*The Star Spangled Banner*). It has this phrase in it: (*"Praise the power that has made us and preserved us a nation. Then conquer we must when our cause it is just and this be our motto In God is our Trust.*) That is our National Anthem. Go to the Lincoln Memorial and there you can read his Gettysburg address which has this phrase in it ("one nation under God"). Go to the tomb of the Unknown Soldier and there you can read (*"Here Lies One Known Only To God"*). Go to the Washington Monument and there you can read many portions of Scripture, one of which says (*"Suffer the little children to come unto me and forbid them not for of such is the Kingdom of God"*). In 1956 the Congress of the United States had the phrase (*"One Nation Under God"*) inserted into the Pledge of Allegiance to our flag. Many of the men who wrote our great historic documents were *Men of God* and they *did not* separate their Religious Convictions from the Political Philosophy. America's history is rooted in the Bible; she was reared in the cradle of prayer and nursed at the breast of the church.

I stands for her *Institutions!* Which one of her institutions would you want to do away with? A trial by jury? I wouldn't! A free press? I wouldn't! Free Elections? I wouldn't! Some may need updating, as times change, but, those who want to eliminate them never seem to have any better alternatives. And until they do, I am not for destroying a structure of government that has served so many, so well, for so long.

C stands for *Capitalism*. Here is another dirty word today. It simply defines an economic system that says a man has a right to make a profit and own property. And it is this economic system called capitalism that has released the energies of man as no other system has, that he might achieve the capabilities God gave him. And this system, as Senator Walter Judd said, "has made it possible for *six percent* of the world's population living in the United States to own *fifty* per cent of the world's wealth. Six per cent of the world's population owns fifty per cent of the world's wealth. It didn't just happen. There was an economic system that sparked it and primed it and that system is called capitalism. Although there are many nations around the world who look down their noses at it and do not want to have anything to do with it, they will take all the cream that it can produce. They will take all the money capitalism can make. They do not want the system, but they want all that it can produce."

We have this great system of capitalism because the political structure of our Government says that man is endowed with certain inalienable rights, and these rights are endowed by his Creator, including the right to own property and to make a profit. This rests on the foundation of a religious philosophy that men are important to God. That they are made in the image of God, and that freedom is not just something that we obtained. Freedom is something in the human heart. We can go back to the Book of Genesis in the Old Testament and note the creation of Adam and Eve. When God made Adam he gave him a free will. And God did it at a risk. A risk that he would rebel and disobey God. God was willing to take that risk because he thought it was so valuable for man to have freedom. Whenever the flame of that freedom planted there by Almighty God, has been imprisoned it has leaped out into the world. All are created with certain inalienable rights and endowed by their Creator. That is the philosophy that lets capitalism be what it is tonight.

A stands for *Abundance.* America is an abundant nation. We have over 500,000 men in Vietnam; 300,000 or so in Europe; 50,000 in Korea; hundreds of other thousands scattered around the world. We are fighting a costly, bloody war. We have a multi-billion dollar program in space going on now, reaching out to the stars. We have a multi-billion dollar social improvement program reaching out to the people. And not one of us a ration card for food or gasoline. She is an abundant nation, she's been good to you and to me.

I remember several years ago a couple who celebrated their 60th wedding anniversary. Their daughter, now grown up, with children of her own, wanted to take mother and dad out for dinner. The parents said certainly we will be happy to go, but before we do, we would like to go to an old farm some miles from here. So the daughter drove them out to the farm. The barn had fallen down. Someone else was tilling the ground. The house had burned down. They got out of the car and they walked up the lane, the old farm lane, covered now with weeds. The wife said to the husband, let's stop right here. The daughter shook her head and said I do not understand it. I wanted to take you out to a very lovely dinner for your 60th wedding anniversary, and here you are in the middle of nowhere. Why did you come here before we go to dinner? The wife slipped her hand into that of her husband, saying, it was right here that your father first told me that he loved me. It is a meaningful place.

When history is written, may they look back on this troubled era of America saying of the Masonic Lodges, they were one of the first that told America they loved her.

Finally, Masons should not only be men of *purpose* and men of *patriotism,* but men of *prayer.* Men of faith who not only believe in the reality of God but that they can commune and communicate with God through prayer. If our prayers have simply degenerated into a little ritual that means nothing, then God help us. Whenever the Masonic Lodge loses its spiritual dimensions it will lose its life. We need to keep alive the great sinews of faith, a belief in God. A supreme being, not just an ideal but a personal God, who I believe as a Christian minister has made himself known in Jesus Christ.

Someone has said when you depend on money, you will get what money can do. And that is something. If you depend on organization, you will get what organization can provide. And that is something. If you depend on programs, you will get what programs can do. And that is something. But, when you depend on prayer, you will get what God can do. I know in my life I need what God can do. What my church needs is what God can do. What America needs tonight so desperately is what God can do for her through people like you.

Abraham Lincoln in his famous Gettysburg Address said that this nation needed a new birth of freedom and in his time that was very true. I think tonight we could change the words to say that this nation needs a new birth of faith; faith in God, so that government of the people, by the people, and for the people *shall not perish* from the earth.

S–2118—INTRODUCTION OF THE COMPOSITE VERSION FEDERAL COAL MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY ACT

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons who work in the important and vital coal mining industry of the United States.

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

The bill (S. 2118) to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States, introduced by Mr. RANDOLPH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this bill is what I call a composite approach. My version of the legislation embraces numerous provisions of measures now pending in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on which we have heard voluminous testimony from many, many witnesses for over 60 hours.

I stress, Mr. President, that the proposed form of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969 is submitted as my version of what I believe to be a workable and potentially effective composite of six bills, namely, S. 355 and S. 467, introduced by this Senator; S. 1094 and S. 1178, introduced by the junior Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS); S. 1300, introduced by the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and other Senators on the minority side for the Nixon administration; and S. 1907, introduced by the junior Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), by request.

Thorough hearings on all six measures were conducted capably by the Subcommittee on Labor, chaired by Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., of New Jersey. Chairman WILLIAMS' record of presence throughout the hearings was commendably close to 100 percent. I sat beside him through more than 52 hours of testimony by witnesses.

I wish to express my personal and official appreciation to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor for the capable manner in which he conducted the hearings.

I think it is important for us to realize that members of the subcommittee entered into this task with the realization that the answers would not be easy to come by as we seek to improve safety and health conditions in the coal mines of this country.

I think we also realize that we were not to polarize our thinking, that we were not to say one bill is right and another bill is wrong, but that we were to take the legislative proposals, listen to the testimony, read the appended material—often in very minute detail and in the technical terms as presented to us by able physicians, lawyers, engineers, and mining technicians and practitioners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

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

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, at the outset, even before the hearings began, I indicated that I was not committed just to words but to the purpose of the legislation. Now, we are able to look back at the completed record of hearings and to make our assessments of the testimony as we begin executive sessions to agree on and to report specifics of important and necessary modernization of Federal coal mine health and safety laws. I hope and I believe we will perform this responsibility promptly and will have our recommendations before the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare by early June.

I do not feel that I have an inflexible position because I know that there must be give-and-take discussions by our subcommittee before we complete action and prepare our report.

It is emphasized, Mr. President, that this legislation is the fulfillment of what I believe to be a commitment I must make as a Senator from West Virginia, the leading coal-producing State, and the one with the largest number of active miners. The commitment I make also is that of the ranking majority member of the subcommittee having jurisdiction over this legislation. In the pursuit of fulfillment, I am calling on a quarter of a century of congressional experience spanning the whole life of the fight—which began in the mid-1930's—on the Federal role in matters pertaining to coal mine health and safety.

Our first breakthrough on the Federal role occurred in 1941. I was then chairman of the Subcommittee on Coal of the House Mines and Mining Committee. I have been a consistent advocate of strengthening safety and improving occupational health in coal mines. My objective always has been to work for fair treatment for miners and operators alike—but always for improved safety of the miners, whether or not the operators agreed with our formula for expressing the Federal role. In the present legislative considerations, I am gratified to find management and labor closer to agreements on ways and means to achieve better health and safety conditions in the mines than usually was true in the past.

The primary objectives of the newly introduced version, based on study of the several bills and voluminous testimony, are first, to prescribe and to provide in law means and requirements for healthier and safer working conditions, but, second, to do so without overtly and ill advisedly destroying any more jobs of men employed in the coal industry than necessary, and, third, to do so without

depriving the American and the world economy of the coal tonnage expansion that this country's and worldwide energy needs will continue to demand.

Mr. President, we must move forward with this mission of developing the Federal role more fully in the area of coal mine health and safety. But we must do so realistically and with an awareness that even a conservative Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act will mean substantial increases in the cost of producing coal and in the price of coal at the marketplaces. Likewise, the costs of the production of the byproducts of coal, electricity, some chemicals, steel, and, eventually, automobiles and appliances, will be increased as a consequence of higher coal costs and prices. So, consumers will pay more, too, for the end products.

Vast new capital investments will have to be made by many of the coal mine owners and operators to achieve the new and broader health and safety standards that the new law apparently will provide.

I anticipate that there will have to be many acquisitions of marginal and underfinanced mining properties by the larger companies—hence, there will be a concentration of coal reserve ownership, as well as a concentration of active mining property ownership, within a smaller circle of companies. If we pass—and I feel sure we will pass—this new legislation, let us be prepared to accept these conditions.

And I predict, too, that there will be many job losses as hundreds of small and medium-size mines feel the impact of the new health and safety legal requirements. It is probable, too, that much lost time will be experienced—even at some of the large mines—as new requirements and tighter inspections come to the fore. It is likely, also, that many miners and their families will have to relocate to continue employment in mining, as occurred extensively during the early mechanization of coal mines. Out of these conditions, I fear that there will be renewals of the problems inherent in pockets of poverty—especially in the mining sections of the Appalachian region.

Yes, Mr. President, these are costs we must expect and the prices we must be prepared to pay for the fulfillment of the objective of making coal mining safer, and for making coal mines healthier places in which to be gainfully employed.

As in our endeavors on behalf of cleaner air to breathe and purer water to consume, we must realize, however, that there does not exist the ultimate in technology to make for pristine purity of air and water, so we must realize, also, that there does not exist the complete technology to guarantee absolute safety and no impairment of health in underground coal mining.

The capital investment and operating costs of mining coal under the health and safety conditions which would be required or authorized under the measure I offer will be vastly larger industrywide than are the costs under existing law. But I hope that I have suggested ways to remove some of the overload costs without impairing fulfillment of the primary objectives of this legislation.

Above all, I trust that in the overall my proposed version of a new and broader coal mine health and safety act will help to save lives and will improve occupational health conditions for the brave and strong men who mine the Nation's coal.

All of the six bills on which we heard testimony were subjected to some criticism. That does not impugn the integrity of those who wrote, endorsed, or introduced and sponsored them.

My new bill, the seventh to be added to the lineup of proposals before the subcommittee when executive sessions begin, likewise will have its critics—probably from coal management as well as coal labor. My effort is a well-meaning one as to language I offer in this composite of the measures on which we have heard testimony.

Mr. President, in essence my proposal follows the format of both the Johnson administration bill (S. 355), which I introduced January 16, and the Nixon administration bill (S. 1300), which the senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) introduced on March 4 for himself and other Senators.

Changes, some of them substantial, have been made. This legislation contains the principal provisions of both the Johnson administration and the Nixon administration bills, but I believe improvements are present in: First, title I, section 101, which provides that both the health and safety standards established in titles II and III will be the mandatory health and safety standards in permanent law, rather than interim standards to be replaced by regulations by the Secretary of the Interior. In title I, section 101, of our version, however, the Secretary of the Interior may go beyond the mandatory standards established in titles II and III and develop new or revised standards where there are changes in technology or research data, but subject to notice of hearing and review procedures. I consider this to be a reasonable and workable compromise between first, the position of the United Mine Workers and the operators, whose officers have urged that all standards be made permanent in the statute, not subject to change by the Secretary of the Interior; and second, the position of the Johnson and Nixon administration bills giving the Secretary broad powers to develop or revise "interim" standards.

As to coal dust abatement and control in the interest of reducing health hazards—especially coal miners' black lung disease—we continue the 4.5 mgm/m³ standard, although recognizing that this standard may be difficult to meet in many mines—especially in the thin seam low-sulfur coal mones of southern West Virginia where prime coking and "chemical" coals are produced. In order to carry out the purpose of the dust standard, which is to protect the health of the miners, and in order not to deprive men of work through mine closures or excessive withdrawals, respirators and other equipment are required to be provided by operators and used by miners where the 4.5 mgm standard cannot be attained under existing technology. Also created is a coal dust advisory committee to be composed of equal representation of coal miners, coal operators, and the U.S. Bureau of Mines. An admonition is provided to reduce the dust standard—when and where technology makes it feasible—to a level of at least 3 mgm/m³ level. Additional provisions refer to the exposure of a miner to dust over a work shift. There is a necessary provision for X-rays of miners every 2 years.

Technical changes are suggested in the safety standards—although, as with other sections, there is general agreement on principle with other bills, except as to the important matter of gassy and nongassy mines. I will explain in greater detail on a later occasion my reasons for restoring gassy and nongassy categories of mines and for the establishment of standards for both categories. Declaring all mines gassy in a new coal mine health and safety bill, when more than 75 percent of American mines have been classed nongassy for years, is going too far too fast.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the consideration of Executive Calendar Nos. 2 and 3, a convention and an agreement, reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

This matter has been cleared with the distinguished minority leader, the ranking member of the committee on the Republican side, and the chairman of the committee.

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

CONVENTION ON OFFENSES COMMITTED ON BOARD AIRCRAFT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive L (90th Cong., second sess.), a convention of offenses committed on board aircraft.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention (Ex. L 90th Cong., second sess.), a convention on offenses committed on board aircraft, signed at Tokyo on September 14, 1963, which was read the second time, as follows:

CONVENTION OF OFFENCES AND CERTAIN OTHER ACTS COMMITTED ON BOARD AIRCRAFT

The States parties to this Convention have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I—SCOPE OF THE CONVENTION

Article 1

1. This Convention shall apply in respect of:

a) offences against penal law;

b) acts which, whether or not they are offences, may or do jeopardize the safety of the aircraft or of persons or property therein or which jeopardize good order and discipline on board.

2. Except as provided in Chapter III, this Convention shall apply in respect of offences committed or acts done by a person on board any aircraft registered in a Contracting State, while that aircraft is in flight or on

the surface of the high seas or of any other area outside the territory of any State.

3. For the purposes of this Convention, an aircraft is considered to be in flight from the moment when power is applied for the purpose of take-off until the moment when the landing run ends.

4. This Convention shall not apply to aircraft used in military, customs or police services.

Article 2

Without prejudice to the provisions of Article 4 and except when the safety of the aircraft or of persons or property on board so requires, no provision of this Convention shall be interpreted as authorizing or requiring any action in respect of offences against penal laws of a political nature or those based on racial or religious discrimination.

CHAPTER II—JURISDICTION

Article 3

1. The State of registration of the aircraft is competent to exercise jurisdiction over offences and acts committed on board.

2. Each Contracting State shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction as the State of registration over offences committed on board aircraft registered in such State.

3. This Convention does not exclude any criminal jurisdiction exercised in accordance with national law.

Article 4

A Contracting State which is not the State of registration may not interfere with an aircraft in flight in order to exercise its criminal jurisdiction over an offence committed on board except in the following cases:

a) the offence has effect on the territory of such State;

b) the offence has been committed by or against a national or permanent resident of such State;

c) the offence is against the security of such State;

d) the offence consists of a breach of any rules or regulations relating to the flight or manoeuvre of aircraft in force in such State;

e) the exercise of jurisdiction is necessary to ensure the observance of any obligation of such State under a multilateral international agreement.

CHAPTER III—POWERS OF THE AIRCRAFT COMMANDER

Article 5

1. The provisions of this Chapter shall not apply to offences and acts committed or about to be committed by a person on board an aircraft in flight in the airspace of the State or registration or over the high seas or any other area outside the territory of any State unless the last point of take-off or the next point of intended landing is situated in a State other than that of registration, or the aircraft subsequently flies in the airspace of a State other than that of registration with such person still on board.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 3, an aircraft shall for the purposes of this Chapter, be considered to be in flight at any time from the moment when all its external doors are closed following embarkation until the moment when any such door is opened for disembarkation. In the case of a forced landing, the provisions of this Chapter shall continue to apply with respect to offences and acts committed on board until competent authorities of a State take over the responsibility for the aircraft and for the persons and property on board.

Article 6

1. The aircraft commander may, when he has reasonable grounds to believe that a person has committed, or is about to commit, on board the aircraft, an offence or act contemplated in Article 1, paragraph 1, impose upon such person reasonable measures including restraint which are necessary:

a) to protect the safety of the aircraft, or of persons or property therein; or

b) to maintain good order and discipline on board; or

c) to enable him to deliver such person to competent authorities or to disembark him in accordance with the provisions of this Chapter.

2. The aircraft commander may require or authorize the assistance of other crew members and may request or authorize, but not require, the assistance of passengers to restrain any person whom he is entitled to restrain. Any crew member or passenger may also take reasonable preventive measures without such authorization when he has reasonable grounds to believe that such action is immediately necessary to protect the safety or the aircraft, or of persons or property therein.

Article 7

1. Measures of restraint imposed upon a person in accordance with Article 6 shall not be continued beyond any point at which the aircraft lands unless:

a) such point is in the territory of a non-Contracting State and its authorities refuse to permit disembarkation of that person or those measures have been imposed in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 1c) in order to enable his delivery to competent authorities;

b) the aircraft makes a forced landing and the aircraft commander is unable to deliver that person to competent authorities; or

c) that person agrees to onward carriage under restraint.

2. The aircraft commander shall as soon as practicable, and if possible before landing in the territory of a State with a person on board who has been placed under restraint in accordance with the provisions of Article 6, notify the authorities of such State of the fact that a person on board is under restraint and of the reasons for such restraint.

Article 8

1. The aircraft commander may, in so far as it is necessary for the purpose of subparagraph a) or b) of paragraph 1 of Article 6, disembark in the territory of any State in which the aircraft lands any person who he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed, or is about to commit, on board the aircraft an act contemplated in Article 1, paragraph 1b).

2. The aircraft commander shall report to the authorities of the State in which he disembarks any person pursuant to this Article, the fact of, and the reasons for, such disembarkation.

Article 9

1. The aircraft commander may deliver to the competent authorities of any Contracting State in the territory of which the aircraft lands any person who he has reasonable grounds to believe has committed on board the aircraft an act which, in his opinion, is a serious offence according to the penal law of the State of registration of the aircraft.

2. The aircraft commander shall as soon as practicable and if possible before landing in the territory of a Contracting State with a person on board whom the aircraft commander intends to deliver in accordance with the preceding paragraph, notify the authorities of such State of his intention to deliver such person and the reasons therefor.

3. The aircraft commander shall furnish the authorities to whom any suspected offender is delivered in accordance with the provisions of this Article with evidence and information which, under the law of the State of registration of the aircraft, are lawfully in his possession.

Article 10

For actions taken in accordance with this Convention, neither the aircraft commander, any other member of the crew, any passenger, the owner or operator of the aircraft, nor the person on whose behalf the flight was performed shall be held responsible in any proceeding on account of the treatment undergone by the person against whom the actions were taken.

CHAPTER IV—UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AIRCRAFT

Article 11

1. When a person on board has unlawfully committed by force or threat thereof an act of interference, seizure, or other wrongful exercise of control of an aircraft in flight or when such an act is about to be committed, Contracting States shall take all appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander or to preserve his control of the aircraft.

2. In the cases contemplated in the preceding paragraph, the Contracting State in which the aircraft lands shall permit its passengers and crew to continue their journey as soon as practicable, and shall return the aircraft and its cargo to the persons lawfully entitled to possession.

CHAPTER V—POWERS AND DUTIES OF STATES

Article 12

Any Contracting State shall allow the commander of an aircraft registered in another Contracting State to disembark any person pursuant to Article 8, paragraph 1.

Article 13

1. Any Contracting State shall take delivery of any person whom the aircraft commander delivers pursuant to Article 9, paragraph 1.

2. Upon being satisfied that the circumstances so warrant, any Contracting State shall take custody or other measures to ensure the presence of any person suspected of an act contemplated in Article 11, paragraph 1 and of any person of whom it has taken delivery. The custody and other measures shall be as provided in the law of that State but may only be continued for such time as is reasonably necessary to enable any criminal or extradition proceedings to be instituted.

3. Any person in custody pursuant to the previous paragraph shall be assisted in communicating immediately with the nearest appropriate respresentative of the State of which he is a national.

4. Any Contracting State, to which a person is delivered pursuant to Article 9, paragraph 1, or in whose territory an aircraft lands following the commission of an act contemplated in Article 11, paragraph 1, shall immediately make a preliminary inquiry into the facts.

5. When a State, pursuant to this Article, has taken a person into custody, it shall immediately notify the State of registration of the aircraft and the State of nationality of the detained person and, if it considers it advisable, any other interested State of the fact that such person is in custody and of the circumstances which warrant his detention. The State which makes the preliminary inquiry contemplated in paragraph 4 of this Article shall promptly report its findings to the said States and shall indicate whether it intends to exercise jurisdiction.

Article 14

1. When any person has been disembarked in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 1, or delivered in accordance with Article 9, paragraph 1, or has disembarked after committing an act contemplated in Article 11, paragraph 1, and when such person cannot or does not desire to continue his journey and the State of landing refuses to admit him, that State may, if the person in question is not a national or permanent resident of that State, return him to the territory of the State of which he is a national or permanent resident or to the territory of the State in which he began his journey by air.

2. Neither disembarkation, nor delivery, nor the taking of custody or other measures contemplated in Article 13, paragraph 2, nor return of the person concerned, shall be con-

sidered as admission to the territory of the Contracting State concerned for the purpose of its law relating to entry or admission of persons and nothing in this Convention shall affect the law of a Contracting State relating to the expulsion of persons from its territory.

Article 15

1. Without prejudice to Article 14, any person who has been disembarked in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 1, or delivered in accordance with Article 9, paragraph 1, or has disembarked after committing an act contemplated in Article 11, paragraph 1, and who desires to continue his journey shall be at liberty as soon as practicable to proceed to any destination of his choice unless his presence is required by the law of the State of landing for the purpose of extradition or criminal proceedings.

2. Without prejudice to its law as to entry and admission to, and extradition and expulsion from its territory, a Contracting State in whose territory a person has been disembarked in accordance with Article 8, paragraph 1, or delivered in accordance with Article 9, paragraph 1 or has disembarked and is suspected of having committed an act contemplated in Article 11, paragraph 1, shall accord to such person treatment which is no less favourable for his protection and security than that accorded to nationals of such Contracting State in like circumstances.

CHAPTER VI—OTHER PROVISIONS

Article 16

1. Offences committed on aircraft registered in a Contracting State shall be treated, for the purpose of extradition, as if they had been committed not only in the place in which they have occurred but also in the territory of the State of registration of the aircraft.

2. Without prejudice to the provisions of the preceding paragraph, nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to create an obligation to grant extradition.

Article 17

In taking any measures for investigation or arrest or otherwise exercising jurisdiction in connection with any offence committed on board an aircraft the Contracting States shall pay due regard to the safety and other interests of air navigation and shall so act as to avoid unnecessary delay of the aircraft, passengers, crew or cargo.

Article 18

If Contracting States establish joint air transport operating organizations or international operating agencies, which operate aircraft not registered in any one State those States shall, according to the circumstances of the case, designate the State among them which, for the purposes of this Convention shall be considered as the State of registration and shall give notice thereof to the International Civil Aviation Organization which shall communicate the notice to all States Parties to this Convention.

CHAPTER VII—FINAL CLAUSES

Article 19

Until the date on which this Convention comes into force in accordance with the provisions of Article 21, it shall remain open for signature on behalf of any State which at that date is a Member of the United Nations or of any of the Specialized Agencies.

Article 20

1. This Convention shall be subject to ratification by the signatory States in accordance with their constitutional procedures.

2. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization

Article 21

1. As soon as twelve of the signatory States have deposited their instruments of ratification of this Convention, it shall come into force between them on the ninetieth day after the date of the deposit of the twelfth instrument of ratification. It shall come into force for each State ratifying thereafter on the ninetieth day after the deposit of its instrument of ratification.

2. As soon as this Convention comes into force, it shall be registered with the Secretary-General of the United Nations by the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Article 22

1. This Convention shall, after it has come into force, be open for accession by any State Member of the United Nations or of any of the Specialized Agencies.

2. The accession of a State shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the International Civil Aviation Organization and shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of such deposit.

Article 23

1. Any Contracting State may denounce this Convention by notification addressed to the Interational Civil Aviation Organization.

2. Denunciation shall take effect six months after the date of receipt by the International Civil Aviation Organization of the notification of denunciation.

Article 24

1. Any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.

2. Each State may at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by the preceding paragraph. The other Contracting States shall not be bound by the preceding paragraph with respect to any Contracting State having made such a reservation.

3. Any Contracting State having made a reservation in accordance with the preceding paragraph may at any time withdraw this reservation by notification to the International Civil Aviation Organization.

Article 25

Except as provided in Article 24 no reservation may be made to this Convention.

Article 26

The International Civil Aviation Organization shall give notice to all States Members of the United Nations or of any of the Specialized Agencies:

a) of any signature of this Convention and the date thereof;

b) of the deposit of any instrument of ratification or accession and the date thereof;

c) of the date on which this Convention comes into force in accordance with Article 21, paragraph 1;

d) of the receipt of any notification of denunciation and the date thereof; and

e) of the receipt of any declaration or notification made under Article 24 and the date thereof.

In witness whereof the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, having been duly authorized, have signed this Convention.

Done at Tokyo on the fourteenth day of September One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty-three in three authentic texts drawn up in the English, French and Spanish languages.

This Convention shall be deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization with which, in accordance with Article 19, it shall remain open for signature and the said Organization shall send certified copies thereof to all States Members of the United Nations or of any Specialized Agency.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this convention on offenses committed on board aircraft is not complicated; it was reported unanimously, and there is no objection that we know of from any source. What is undertaken to be done is to be more precise about the rules governing jurisdiction over, and the types of recourse that could be had with regard to, crimes and other offenses committed on board aircraft engaged in international aviation. The convention provides that the country in which the aircraft is registered is competent to exercise jurisdiction over offenses committed aboard that aircraft when it is in flight or on the surface of the high seas, or any other area which is outside the territory of any country. This is similar to the widely accepted principle of jurisdiction in maritime law which is based on the nationality of a vessel's registration when the vessel is outside the territorial jurisdiction of other states.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the committee report (Ex. Rept. No. 3) summarizing the background and purpose of the convention.

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

BACKGROUND

A study dealing with the matters covered by this convention was initiated by the Legal Committee of the International Civil Aviation Organization in June 1950. After 13 years of discussion and negotiation, the pending convention was signed at Tokyo on September 14, 1963. Five years later, on September 25, 1968, it was submitted to the Senate for advice and consent to ratification.

According to the executive branch, the reason for the delay in submitting the convention was "because of the need to assure that implementing legislation could be drafted which is fully consistent with the national interest." Such draft legislation was submitted to the Congress just prior to adjournment last year and again on April 25, 1969. It is expected that the legislation in question will be referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of the Tokyo Convention is to establish international rules providing for continuity of jurisdiction with respect to crimes and other offenses committed on board aircraft engaged in international aviation. The convention provides that the country in which the aircraft is registered is competent to exercise jurisdiction over offenses committed aboard that aircraft when it is in flight or on the surface of the high seas or any other area which is outside the territory of any country. This is similar to the widely accepted principle of jurisdiction in maritime law which is based on the nationality of a vessel's registration when the vessel is outside the territorial jurisdiction of other states.

The committee emphasizes that although the pending convention contains a provision relating to air piracy ("hijacking"), it does *not* provide for punishment or extradition of the "hijacker." In other words, desirable as it may be, this convention is not designed to prevent or to punish "hijackings." It should be noted, however, that Administration officials have been working through the International Civil Aviation Organization in an effort to find an acceptable solution to the problems of punishment and extradition in

air piracy cases. A summary of those activities is contained in a letter from the Department of State which is included in the appendix to this report.

MAIN PROVISIONS OF CONVENTION

Article 1 of the convention states that it shall apply to offenses against penal law and other acts which may jeopardize the safety of the aircraft or passengers "while that aircraft is in flight or on the surface of the high seas or of any other area outside the territory of any state." Acts or offenses committed by persons not on board the aircraft (saboteurs who remain on the ground) are excluded from the provisions of the convention. Moreover, the convention does not apply to aircraft used in military, customs, or police services. However, the implementing legislation recommended by the executive branch would amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to make its criminal provisions apply to all aircraft, including military, within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States.

Pursuant to article 3, the country in which the aircraft is registered has authority to exercise jurisdiction over offenses and acts committed on board. There are certain exceptions (art. 4) under which a country in whose airspace an offense has been committed may interfere with an aircraft while in flight for the purpose of exercising its criminal jurisdiction.

Articles 5–10 of the convention cover the powers of the aircraft commander and the acts and offenses to which his authority applies, the period of time during which it exists, its extent, and its limitations. In addition, these provisions grant the aircraft commander and crew protection from legal action brought against them because of the use of force which might otherwise subject them to legal liability or criminal prosecution.

Under the terms of article 11, when an aircraft is "hijacked" the countries party to the convention "shall take all appropriate measures to restore control of the aircraft to its lawful commander or to preserve his control of the aircraft." In addition, the country in which the aircraft lands "shall permit its passengers and crew to continue their journey as soon as practicable." In this connection, article 16 provides that "Nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to create an obligation to grant extradition" for offenses committed on board aircraft.

DATE OF ENTRY INTO FORCE

The convention will come into force 90 days after 12 countries have deposited their instruments of ratification (article 21). As of this date, 33 countries have signed the convention and nine have deposited their instruments of ratification. Cuba is *not* a signatory.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on this convention, often referred to as the Tokyo Convention, on April 29, 1969. At that time testimony in support of the convention was received from Mr. Murray Belman, Deputy Legal Adviser, Department of State, and Mr. Charles Ruby, president, Air Line Pilots Associations. The record of that hearing is printed in the appendix to this report. The convention was considered by the committee in executive session on May 6, and ordered reported favorably to the Senate.

The committee is not aware of any opposition to the pending convention which has been endorsed by the Interagency Group on International Aviation, consisting of representatives of the Departments of Commerce, State, Defense, and Transportation and the Civil Aeronautics Board. In the committee's view, the convention is a significant step in the development of international aviation law. The committee recommends, therefore, that the Senate give its advice and consent to ratification of the convention.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There was no objection from any source. We heard representatives of the pilots' organizations, and of course of the State Department also. Some 33 countries have signed this convention. Nine have already deposited their instruments of ratification. Cuba is not a signatory, nor is the Soviet Union. However, the Soviet Union had observers present at the International Federation of Air Line Pilots Association Conference which was held in Amsterdam March 20–27, 1969. There were observers in behalf of Indonesia, Panama, Poland, Uruguay, and the U.S.S.R.; and it is quite possible that later on, as this matter develops, they may become signatories.

I might add, by way of information, that this does not really solve the hijacking problem; it does not provide for punishment or extradition of the hijacker. That is a problem that could not be dealt with in this convention, and I am not sure it would be useful in any case for us, with Cuba not a signatory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the convention will be considered as having passed through its various preliminary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolution of ratification, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, signed at Tokyo on September 14, 1963 (Ex. L., 90th Cong. 2d sess.).

AGREEMENT WITH CANADA PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY DIVERSIONS FROM THE NIAGARA RIVER FOR POWER PRODUCTION PURPOSES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive C (91st Cong., first sess), an agreement with Canada providing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the agreement (Ex. C, 91st Cong., first sess.), an agreement with Canada providing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes, signed at Washington on March 21, 1969, which was read the second time, as follows:

EXCHANGE OF NOTES ON DIVERSIONS FOR POWER PURPOSES—UNITED STATES AND CANADA

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 21, 1969.

His Excellency A. EDGAR RITCHIE,
Ambassador of Canada.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to an exchange of notes between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, dated March 21, 1969, authorizing the construction of a temporary cofferdam to divert water away from the American Falls at Niagara, so as to permit the on-site investigation of measures that might be taken to preserve or enhance the beauty of the American Falls.

It appears advantageous to make use of the additional energy resource thus made available, by authorizing the temporary additional diversion for power purposes of the water normally flowing over the American Falls.

Accordingly, I have the honor to propose that during the period in 1969 when the cofferdam is in place, the following arrangements shall be put into effect:

1. The minimum flows over the Falls stipulated in Article IV of the Niagara River Treaty of 1950 shall be reduced from 100,000 c.f.s. and 50,000 c.f.s., respectively, to 92,000 c.f.s. and 41,000 c.f.s, respectively, during the hours designated in that Article. Any water in excess of these new temporary minimums may be diverted for power purposes; provided that when the 41,000 c.f.s. minimum applies at least 9,000 c.f.s. of the waters thus diverted shall be either passed through the low-head plants or released to the Horseshoe Falls so as to maintain a minimum flow of 50,000 c.f.s. into the Maid-of-the-Mist Pool at all times.

2. Entitlement to the power benefits deriving from this temporary additional diversion shall be divided equally between the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, upon the agreement of each such power entity to—

(A) contribute in cash or in services to the cost of the cofferdam and ensuing investigations, the value of $385,500 in its national currency, if the additional diversion is permitted during the entire period from April 30, 1969 to December 31, 1969, or a portion of said contribution corresponding to any shorter period during which the additional diversion is permitted, such portion to be determined on the same basis as was the $385,500 by the International Joint Commission in consultation with the power entities; and

(B) assume responsibility for the disposition of claims for physical injury or damage to persons or property occurring in the lower Niagara River on its side of the international boundary line, caused by the resulting temporary alteration of water levels in the lower river below that normally experienced at flows of 100,000 c.f.s. and 50,000 c.f.s., and for the satisfaction of any such claims that are valid.

3. The temporary additional diversions permitted by these arrangements shall not be considered as creating any vested right or interest in the use of such additional amounts of water.

If the foregoing proposed arrangements are acceptable to the Government of Canada, I have the honor to propose that your reply to that effect and the present Note shall constitute an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada which will enter into force upon notification that it has been approved by the Senate of the United States of America.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

For the Secretary of State:

MARTIN J. HILLENBRAND.

EXCHANGE OF NOTES ON CONSTRUCTION OF TEMPORARY COFFERDAM—UNITED STATES AND CANADA

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

No. 89.

The Honourable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State, Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have the honour to refer to your Note of March 21, 1969, concerning the proposed temporary additional diversion of Niagara water for power purposes.

I wish to advise that the Government of Canada accepts the proposals set forth in your Note and agrees that your Note, together with this reply, which is authentic in English and French, shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments which will enter into force upon notification by you that it has been approved by the Senate of the United States.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. E. RITCHIE,
Ambassador.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 21, 1969.

His Excellency A. EDGAR RITCHIE,
Ambassador of Canada.

EXCELLENCY: I have the honor to refer to the Reference from the Government of the United States and Canada to the International Joint Commission, dated March 31, 1967, requesting the Commission to investigate and report on measures that may be feasible and desirable to preserve or enhance the beauty of the American Falls at Niagara. The Commission has convened an American Falls International Board consisting of experts from each country, has conducted initial hearings, and has in its letter of November 6, 1967, proposed that the two Governments arrange by the most expeditious procedure to authorize the construction of a temporary cofferdam to redirect to the Horseshoe Falls the normal flow over the American Falls so as to permit the necessary on-site investigation and collection of data.

Under Article III of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, temporary or permanent obstructions or diversions of boundary waters on one side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side, may be authorized by special agreement between the two Parties. Accordingly, I have the honor to propose as follows:

1. The United States Army Corps of Engineers shall be authorized to construct or to have constructed a temporary cofferdam between the head of Goat Island and the United States mainland in the channel above the American Falls at Niagara; if such authority is exercised, said cofferdam shall be installed during the calendar year 1969 in sufficient time to carry out the necessary on-site investigation and collection of data and shall be removed by or at the direction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers no later than December 31, 1969.

2. The costs incurred in such installation and removal, and in conducting on-site investigations while the temporary cofferdam is in place, shall qualify for inclusion in the costs to be recommended for allocation as between the United States and Canada by the International Joint Commission pursuant to the Reference of March 31, 1967.

3. Neither the United States nor Canada shall be responsible for physical injury or damage to persons or property in the territory of the other which may be caused by any act authorized or provided for by this agreement.

If the foregoing proposals are agreeable to the Government of Canada, I have the honor further to propose that your reply to that effect and the present Note shall constitute an agreement between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, which will enter into force upon the date of your reply.

Accept, Excellency, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

For the Secretary of State:

MARTIN J. HILLENBRAND.

CANADIAN EMBASSY,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

No. 88.

The Honourable WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I have the honour to refer to your Note of March 21, 1969, concerning the construction of a temporary cofferdam between Goat Island and the United States mainland.

I wish to advise that the Government of Canada accepts the proposals set forth in your Note and agrees that your Note, together with this reply, which is authentic in English and French, shall constitute an agreement between our two Governments which will enter into force on the date of this Note.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

A. E. RITCHIE,
Ambassador.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this convention is noncontroversial and was reported unanimously. The agreement with Canada is simply to allow the diversion of the water on the American side of Niagara Falls, pending study of how to prevent the continued erosion of the rock underneath. That study is necessary to preserve the beauty of the falls and there is no objection from any source whatever that I know of.

I ask unanimous consent that an excerpt from the committee report (Ex. Rept. No. 4), explaining the purpose and background of the agreement, be printed in the RECORD.

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

PURPOSE

The basic purpose of this agreement with Canada is to provide for the temporary diverison of water from the American falls on the Niagara River for power production purposes. The agreement requires the advice and consent of the Senate because it would authorize a departure from the minimum flow limitations set forth in article IV of the Niagara River Treaty of February 27, 1950.

BACKGROUND

This agreement is the outgrowth of an effort to find means to preserve and enhance the beauty of the American Falls on the Niagara River. Conservationists have been concerned for some years over the deterioration of the falls and have felt that study of the erosion problem and the feasibility of removing the accumulated rock at the base of the Falls was desirable. In 1967 the Government of Canada and the United States requested the International Joint Commission, established under the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909, to investigate and report upon measures to preserve and improve the appearance of the American Falls. The Commission appointed a board of experts to study the problem, conduct public hearings, and submit recommendations for agreement that would permit the study to proceed.

In order to study the rock formations and make other on-the-site investigations there must be a temporary "dewatering" of the American Falls. This would be accomplished by construction by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers of a temporary earth and rock cofferdam above the falls. The estimated cost of the cofferdam is $1,500,000. Construction is expected to be completed by July 1, 1969, and the dam to be removed no later than December 31, 1969.

required on a separate exchange of notes with Canada, dated March 21, 1969, relating to construction of the cofferdam. Article III of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 provides that temporary diversions of water, such as will be the case here, may be authorized by special agreement between the Governments of Canada and the United States. However, article IV of the Niagara River Treaty of 1950 provides that the minimum water flows over the combined falls shall be 100,000 cubic feet per second in the daytime and 50,000 cubic feet per second at night. The agreement before the Senate would reduce those minimums by the amount normally flowing over the American Falls and allow the excess water, diverted by the cofferdam, to be used for power generation. Under the agreement the Canadian and United States power entities (Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario) would each contribute, in cash or services, one-half the value of the power to be generated with the diverted water. This amount is equal to slightly more than one-half the total estimated cost of the cofferdam.

PROVISIONS OF THE AGREEMENT

The agreement provides that during the period in 1969 when the cofferdam is in place, the following arrangements shall be in effect:

1. The minimum flows over the falls stipulated in article IV of the Niagara River Treaty of 1950 shall be reduced from 100,000 cubic feet per second and 50,000 cubic feet per second, respectively, to 92,000 cubic feet per second and 41,000 cubic feet per second, respectively, during the hours designated in that article. Any water in excess of these new temporary minimums may be diverted for power purposes; provided that when the 41,000 cubic feet per second minimum applies at least 9,000 cubic feet per second of the waters thus diverted shall be either passed through the low-head plants or released to the Horseshoe Falls so as to maintain a minimum flow of 50,000 cubic feet per second into the Maid-of-the-Mist Pool at all times.

2. Entitlement to the power benefits deriving from this temporary additional diversion shall be divided equally between the Power Authority of the State of New York and the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario, upon the agreement of each such power entity to—

(A) contribute in cash or in services to the cost of the cofferdam and ensuing investigation, the value of $385,500 in its national currency, if the additional diversion is permitted during the entire period from April 30, 1969, to December 31, 1969, or a portion of said contribution corresponding to any shorter period during which the additional diversion is permitted, such portion to be determined on the same basis as was the $385,500 by the International Joint Commission in consultation with the Power entities; and

(B) assume responsibility for the disposition of claims for physical injury or damage to persons or property occurring in the lower Niagara River on its side of the international boundary line, caused by the resulting temporary alteration of water levels in the lower river below that normally experienced at flows of 100,000 cubic feet per second and 50,000 cubic feet per second, and for the satisfaction of any such claims that are valid.

3. The temporary additional diversions permitted by these arrangements shall not be considered as creating any vested right or interest in the use of such additional amounts of water. (Except from note dated March 21, 1969, from Assistant Secretary of State Martin J. Hillenbrand to Ambassador of Canada A. Edgar Ritchie.)

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

Executive C (91st Cong., first sess.) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations on April 14, 1969. The committee held a public hearing on the agreement on May 5, 1959, receiving testimony from Assistant Secretary of State Martin J. Hillenbrand and Col. Fred E. Anderson, Jr., U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The hearing is appended to this report. The committee considered the agreement in executive session on May 6, 1969, and ordered it favorably reported to the Senate.

This agreement would provide a means by which the Federal Government can recoup approximately one-half the cost of the cofferdam needed to permit inspection of the problem at the American Falls. Without this agreement, the diverted water would be channeled over the Canadian Horseshoe Falls, benefiting no one, and, perhaps, impairing the esthetic appearance of the Horseshoe Falls by the increased flow.

The committee was assured that the ap-

proval of this agreement would not be construed by the executive branch as a commitment to support recommendations that may come out of the investigation and that Senate approval will be sought for implementing any subsequent agreements relating to the problem. According to the testimony, there is no known opposition to the agreement.

The Committee on Foreign Relations believes that the arrangement is in the public interest and recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the agreement will be considered as having passed through its various parliamentary stages up to the point of consideration of the resolution of ratification, which will be read for the information of the Senate.

The bill clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Agreement with Canada Providing for Additional Temporary Diversions From the Niagara River for Power Production Purposes (Ex. C, 91st Cong. 1st sess.).

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending convention and agreement occur at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair inquires of the distinguished majority leader whether he wishes them voted on separately.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Separately and consecutively; yes.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the convention and the agreement to be voted on tomorrow at 12:30.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

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

CLASSIFICATION OF STATISTICS ON THE VIETNAM WAR

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the selective release by administration officials of heretofore secret data, in connection with debate on the ABM issue, illustrates an inherent difficulty Congress faces in coping with the enormous public relations mechanism of the executive branch. Congress, in trying to appraise executive branch policies on national security matters is, in effect, playing a game where the rules are revised at will by the opposing side. Conflict is inevitable under our system of separation of powers but when one coequal branch of the Government, under the guise of security, withholds any information it chooses, and releases that information piecemeal in an effort to make its case, the democratic process suffers.

There are few real secrets in the operations of a democratic Government as anyone who reads the New York Times, the Washington Post, or Aviation Week, knows. Much of the information given the Committee on Foreign Relations on a classified basis either has already appeared in print, or appears in print shortly thereafter—through executive branch leaks. For example, the committee recently received a briefing on the shooting down of the Navy EC–121 intelligence-gathering plane off the coast of North Korea. The spokesman for the Department of Defense was quite reluctant, on grounds of national security, to discuss some of the most basic aspects of our aerial intelligence-gathering operations, even on an off-the-record basis. It turned out that much of the information he was reluctant to discuss had already appeared in the press. There has since been a further baring of the breast by the executive branch, and readers of Time and Newsweek know far more about aerial intelligence-gathering activities than members of our committee learned from the official briefing.

Protection by classification and selective leaks have been particularly troublesome to the Committee on Foreign Relations in the last several years in connection with its study of the developments in Vietnam. The official distortion of the facts on Vietnam has been one of the most shameful episodes in our history, a period when the full propaganda resources of the Government were devoted to concealing the truth about the war. But "truth will come to light" and the American people in time perceived the truth through the plethora of rosy reports and optimistic predictions, and recognized the war for what it actually is—a military and political stalemate.

Although the truth about Vietnam has slowly come to light, there is still much suppression of information that has great bearing on the prospects for peace. Earlier this year I became disturbed over news reports that United States and South Vietnamese forces substantially expanded offensive operations following the November 1 halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. I had assumed that the bombing halt signaled a move toward mutual deescalation of military activities and a turning away from the futile search for a military solution. Although the monthly statistics on Vietnam furnished the Committee by the Department of Defense gave some clues to what had taken place in the months following the bombing halt, I felt that I should have more detailed information before reaching any conclusions. Accordingly, on March 7 I wrote to Secretary of Defense Laird, asking for answers to a series of questions, and on March 22 I received a reply from Robert C. Moot, Assistant Secretary of Defense. Each of the answers to my questions was classified. I wrote to Secretary Laird again on April 15, questioning the necessity for classifying much of the data. In that letter I wrote:

I can understand the need to classify information that might be helpful to the other side, such as that concerning the disposition of U.S. troops, but I cannot understand why the Department classifies data obviously known to the other side, such as that concerning infiltration, hamlet control, changes in the infrastructure, and so on. I hope you will review the information furnished the Committee and declassify as much of it as possible. On those items which you feel should remain classified I would appreciate your providing me with a justification of the Department's position.

Secretary Laird replied on April 28, refusing to declassify any of the most pertinent information. He also failed to justify the continued classification of each item, as I had reqeusted, pleading the problems of relations with our allies and possible compromise of intelligence sources, citing infiltration data as an example where release would reveal techniques. This example illustrates the problem of selective leaking. In a statement, released 2 days after Secretary Laird's letter was sent, Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., the Pentagon research chief, praised the sensor system which detects infiltrators, stating that the listening devices "will rank as one of the major technological contributors" of the Vietnam war. Dr. Foster apparently did not share Secretary Laird's concern over revealing the "accuracy of our intelligence and effectiveness of our techniques." I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following my remarks, an article on this subject from the May 1 Washington Post, as well as the exchange of correspondence, minus the classified data, of course, thus complying with the law.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the enemy is not being kept in the dark by continued classification of most of this information. He knows what the facts are in Vietnam and has repeatedly shown that his intelligence sources, primitive as they may be, can confound our most sophisticated electronic gadetry. But the American people who must pay the costs of this war in lives and dollars have a right to know whether or not our side's military posture in South Vietnam is helping or hindering the search for peace in Paris. Actions still speak more loudly than words.

On the basis of the information provided by the Department of Defense, I think there is ample reason for the other side to question whether the United States is seriously interested in a political settlement. The creditibility gap—at home and abroad—led to the downfall of the last administration. I hope that this administration has the capacity to profit from that experience.

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICIAL HAILS DETECTORS ALONG HO CHI MINH TRAIL

(By George C. Wilson)

Listening devices the United States has placed along the Ho Chi Minh trail to detect enemy infiltrators "will rank as one of the major technological contributions" of the Vietnam War, the Pentagon research chief said yesterday.

John S. Foster Jr., in making that as-

sertion in his annual statement on research and development, added that "we may well be on the verge" of keeping a battlefield under mechanical surveillance around the clock.

While Foster did not specify where sensors have been sown, it is known they have been placed along infiltration trails in Laos as well as North and South Vietnam.

"Land combat may well have been revolutionized for the years ahead," Foster said, "by the emergence of a new family of sensors for remote detection and for rapid delivery of firepower. Building on our experience in Vietnam, the instrumented battlefield has become possible."

SUCCESSFUL IN SIEGE

The research chief said the anti-infiltration devices—including ones which listen for vibrations in the ground as well as noises in the air—were used with success in the siege of Khesanh and in the defense of Saigon.

The Fuller system the Pentagon in working on calls for sensors to warn an automated command and control network of the approach of enemy troops. Then artillery and bombing could be loosed into the area, or infantry flown there.

The system Foster praised goes beyond the $1.6 billion McNamara line of mechanical obstacles installed along part of the DMZ separating the two Vietnams, Defense Secretary Melvin R. Laird said earlier this year that the line—code named Project Dye Marker/Muscle Shoals—had not lived up to expectations.

To combat a Soviet military threat which he said is supported by a research program growing faster than our own (10 per cent growth a year in military, space and atomic energy research compared to 1 per cent for the U.S. in "the last few years"). Foster said he is thinking of building a giant test submarine with long-range missiles inside.

CONTINUE BLASTS

While considering such a weapon for under the sea, Foster said the Pentagon will continue setting off nuclear blasts underground to test such things as the effect X-rays have on warheads for our Polaris and Minuteman missiles.

In case the United States reaches an arms control agreement with Russia, Foster said he has asked a Defense Science Board task force to analyze how the Pentagon's research program should be rearranged to keep track of Soviet "capability and intent."

MARCH 7, 1969.

The HONORABLE MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I would appreciate it if you would provide the Committee, as soon as possible, with the data listed on the enclosure concerning certain military operations in South Vietnam since the bombing halt.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

DATA CONCERNING MILITARY OPERATIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM SINCE THE BOMBING HALT

1. Net changes in troop strength since November 1, 1968 for the: (a) United States, (b) South Vietnam, (c) Third Countries, (d) Viet Cong/North Vietnam (operating in South Vietnam).

2. Number of battalion-sized offensive operations, by month, for the period from July-February: (a) By the Viet Cong/North Vietnamese; (b) By U.S. forces; (c) By South Vietnamese forces.

3. Number of other contacts with enemy units for the months from July-February: (a) Initiated by the enemy; (b) Initiated by U.S. forces; (c) Initiated by South Vietnamese forces.

4. (A) Number of B–52 bombing sorties in South Vietnam, by month, from July-February.

(B) Number of other bombing or attack sorties by aircraft other than B–52's during the same period.

(C) Number of tons of bombs dropped, by month, during this period.

(D) Total ammunition used, by month, by U.S. and allied forces during this period.

5. (A) Battle deaths, by month, for the period from July–February, compared with the same months a year ago: (a) U.S. Forces; (b) South Vietnamese Forces; (c) Viet Cong/North Vietnamese Forces.

(B) Data on number of troops captured during that period.

6. Changes in the number of troops stationed in each of the tactical corps between November–February for forces of the (a) United States, (b) South Vietnam, (c) Viet Cong/North Vietnam.

7. Number of hamlets brought under government control (changed from "D" or "E" status to "A", "B", or "C"), by month, from July–February.

8. Viet Cong recruiting data, by month, for July–February.

9. Number of members of the Viet Cong political infrastructure killed, jailed, or otherwise eliminated, by month, for the months of July–February.

10. Enemy infiltration, by month, for July–February.

11. Enemy weapons and ammunition captured from July–February.

12. Number of reconnaissance sorties flown over North Vietnam, by month, from November–February.

13. Number of aircraft shot down over North Vietnam from November–February.

14. Estimated changes in troop strength in the DMZ area from November–February for the: (a) United States, (b) South Vietnamese, (c) Viet Cong/North Vietnamese.

15. Estimates of the tons of weapons and ammunition infiltrated from North Vietnam, by month, from July–February.

APRIL 15, 1969.

Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have received a reply from Assistant Secretary Robert C. Moot to my letter of March 7 in which I requested information on certain military operations in Vietnam since the halt in the bombing.

The overall classification of the material provided in "Secret" although a number of the specific answers are "Confidential." The fact that this data is classified represents a continuous problem which this Committee has had in connection with its study of the Vietnam war. From your service in the Congress I know that you can appreciate the problems involved in trying to carry on an intelligent public discussion concerning military aspects of the war when the basic information provided by the Department of Defense is classified. Yet, as you know, the press seems to have no difficulty in obtaining access to classified information through sources in the Executive Branch.

I can understand the need to classify information that might be helpful to the other side, such as that concerning the disposition of U.S. troops, but I cannot understand why the Department classifies data obviously known to the other side, such as that concerning infiltration, hamlet control, changes in the infrastructure, and so on. I hope you will review the information furnished the Committee and declassify as much of it as possible. On those items which you feel should remain classified I would appreciate your providing me with a justification of the Department's position.

Sincerely yours,

J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., April 28, 1969.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
U.S. Senate

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in reply to your letter of April 15, 1969 in which you raised the question of the security classification of the data transmitted to you by Assistant Secretary Moot on March 22, 1969.

A review of that transmittal indicates that all of the information included must be classified for security reasons with the exception of the changes in U.S. and Third Nation troop strength, the battle deaths of U.S. and enemy forces and enemy weapons captured which you may use as unclassified.

As you know, since December 1967, we have been forwarding to you, at your request, a series of classified data which we update each month. Beginning March 1, 1968, our monthly updates to you have also included a monthly series of unclassified information that we had developed for general use. Included are data on U.S. and Third Nation troop strength, U.S. and enemy casualties and enemy weapons captured.

We continuously review the classification of information on Southeast Asia with a view toward declassification of those items that will no longer be of military value to the enemy and, as individual items or series of data are declassified, they are available to members of Congress and the general public.

One of the constraints placed upon us in this effort is that much of the information regarding Southeast Asia is provided in classified form by the Government of South Vietnam and other sovereign Governments which we cannot unilaterally declassify. Another consideration which inhibits declassification is when disclosure would compromise sources with resultant denial of valuable military information. As an example, a full breakout of infiltration data would reveal the accuracy of our intelligence and effectiveness of our techniques.

As information of the type provided in the classified part of our monthly report to you is declassified, it will be reflected in the unclassified portion of the information we send you.

Sincerely,

MELVIN LAIRD.

HOW THE PENTAGON CAN SAVE $9 BILLION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there are signs that perhaps the Department of Defense budget will, at last, be given more than casual attention by the Congress and that it is no longer unpatriotic to question military spending. The Washington Monthly for March 1969 contains an article by Robert S. Benson, a former employee in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, entitled "How the Pentagon Can Save $9,000,000,000." In view of the interest of many of my colleagues in analyzing military spending programs more carefully, I am sure that they will find this article of interest. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW THE PENTAGON CAN SAVE $9 BILLION

(By Robert S. Benson)

I have a modest proposal.

I should like to demonstrate, in as brief and as simple a way as the complexities permit, how $9 billion can be cut from the Pentagon budget without reducing our na-

tional security or touching those funds earmarked for the war in Vietnam.

Let me emphasize at the outset that this is truly a modest proposal, offered from an earnest belief in its practicality and with the conviction that savings from its adoption could be applied to our fiscally undernourished concerns for human opportunity.

The process by which the Pentagon budget—as well as the rest of the federal budget—is shaped and reviewed is a strange and not always wonderful thing. Any new program is usually given thorough scrutiny in Congress: debate rages over the program's purposes and over the level of funding required. Once it is accepted, however, only the funding level is certain to receive continuing Congressional attention. A nation's needs change, but rarely is a program's reason for existence ever challenged again, either in the executive branch or on Capitol Hill. On the contrary, its administering agency and its Congressional advocates, cheered on by its beneficiaries, strive to perpetuate or expand it, seldom pausing to ponder whether it is still worthwhile or whether something else is needed more.

The process can be insidious. Man, the social animal, takes comfort from acting in accord with the wishes of friends and associates. But over years of advocacy he loses some ability to discriminate, to relate the particular to the whole. In the case of Pentagon outlays, the built-in protection inherent in established programs often achieves invulnerability.

Because a mystique of secrecy and complexity surrounds the Pentagon, most Americans feel uncomfortable, or even vaguely unpatriotic, if they question any part of the military budget. But the fact is that the federal budget's provisions for defense far exceed our national security requirements. Although not many Americans realize it, a great deal of information about the threats to our security (and the forces we procure to meet them) can be gleaned from unclassified papers: budget statements of the President every January, annual posture statements by the Secretary of Defense, transcripts of Congressional hearings, and articles in the newspapers. Any serious student will soon discover that items in the defense budget, as in any other, range from fundamental to marginal. The difference is that in the Pentagon budget (a) vastly larger sums are involved, and (b) far less Congressional scrutiny is applied to them.

I

Using the sources above, my two years of experience in the Comptroller's office of the Department of Defense, and my own judgment of the issues, I hope first to outline how the budget can be trimmed by $9 billion and then proceed to a discussion of the weaknesses in the system which allowed this fat to survive even in the cost-conscious regime of Robert S. McNamara.

In our budget-cutting exercise these ground rules will apply:

None of the cuts is related to the war in Vietnam.

None of the cuts would impair our national security requirements.

All of the cuts are in what the Pentagon calls ongoing core programs.

All of the cuts could be effected within the next 24 months, which would allow the savings to be applied rather quickly to unfilled domestic needs.

The focus is on areas where forces or weapons systems are either duplicated or outmoded, where an enemy threat is no longer credible in today's political and technological environment, or where money is being lost through grossly inefficient performance.

Perhaps the best place to begin is with the Manned Orbiting Laboratory, which receives half a billion dollars a year and ought to rank dead last on any rational scale of national priorities. The MOL, a carbon copy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's spacecraft operation, is in the budget because the Air Force wants a piece of the extraterrestrial action, with its glamor and glory, and Congress has been only too happy to oblige.

Although there have been valiant attempts to make the MOL seem different, Pentagon space research is alarmingly similar to that of NASA. Listen as Dr. Alexander H. Flax, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Research and Development, tries to draw the distinction for members of the House Appropriations Committee:

"If you view the objectives of these programs as being simply to get data on humans exposed for some period of time, I think you have to conclude that there is a great deal of duplication, but I tried to make the point that our objective is primarily to test equipment, not humans. The humans interact with the equipment, of course."

True, there are potential military uses for space vehicles. But little thought appears to have been given to whether a separate program was required or whether the same results could have been achieved through slight adjustments in the parallel NASA activities. The MOL program is duplicative and wasteful. Of the $600 million requested for it last year, Congress approved all but $85 million. This year's budget calls for $576 million. I would strike all of it.

Saving: $576,000,000.

As for grossly inefficient Pentagon performance, the most obvious example is manpower management and utilization. Manpower is the single largest commodity the Defense Department buys; this year, the Pentagon will directly purchase the services of nearly five million Americans. Assuming an average of $7,000 each in pay, allowances, and supplementary benefits, the department payroll is about $34 billion, of which about $22 billion goes to military personnel and $12 billion to civilians.

The Pentagon has little direct control over the costs of its civilian personnel, who are recruited mainly through a government-wide civil-service pool. But its control over military personnel is complete, covering not only the $22 billion payroll but also about $7 billion annually in training costs and nearly $2 billion in moving expenses for men changing assignments.

enlist in preference to being drafted. All

Most men enter the armed forces either because they are drafted or because they enlisted men entering the service receive basic training, which in the Army takes eight weeks and costs about $1,000 per head. After advanced training in a specialty, these short-term new servicemen generally spend the rest of their hitches on assignments requiring that specialty.

A more flexible training policy would not employ such a lockstep approach. Some basic training is needed for everyone, and combat infantrymen certainly need the full eight weeks. But not all of the Army's 535,000 new soldiers this year will serve in combat, and four weeks would suffice for the others. The Navy and Air Force have already abbreviated their basic training; for the Army to do so would yield, in direct training savings alone, $50 million.

Saving: $50,000,000.

Although the pattern of training and assignments for officers is far different, even greater economies are possible—and with a clear gain in individual job performance. After initial training, which is more diverse than it is for enlisted men, almost every officer is shuttled around through an amazing variety of assignments and further training designed to give him enough breadth of experience to become Chief of Staff some day, often at the sacrifice of obtaining no deep experience in any one field. The expectation is that every seasoned officer can lead an infantry battalion through a swamp on one assignment, promulgate personnel promotion policies behind a Pentagon desk on the next, and discuss black separatism with Ethiopians as a military attache in Addis Ababa a year later.

In this age of specialization, such a philosophy is anachronistic and expensive. No efficient business would move its men around in so illogical a pattern. By perpetuating the illusion that every officer can aspire to the top organizational position, rather than screening the candidates earlier in their careers, the services suffer from having an excessive number of men struggling to learn totally unfamiliar jobs. Moreover, today's technological and analytical complexities demand the development of specialists whose entire experience is focused on performing one particular function well. By attempting to fill the growing number of specialist slots with generalists, job performance diminishes for all.

If we were to reduce by a modest one-fourth the present number of assignment changes (whereby servicemen move almost once a year), the annual saving in transportation and moving costs alone would be slightly over $500 million, to say nothing of the improvement in work effectiveness.

Savings: $500,000,000.

A further saving can be accomplished by changing the way the military calculates individual manpower requirements. Unlike business, which requires work units to absorb the impact of absences, the Pentagon includes a cushion to compensate for men absent on leave, in the hospital, in school, and en route to new assignments. And the military's 30 days of annual leave—which all servicemen get—is far more than the norm for civilian work forces of comparable age and experience, even acknowledging that the 30 days includes weekends. The military argues that this amount of leave time is compensation for being on duty 24 hours a day, seven days a week—but this is a myth long in need of explosion. Except for those at sea and in Vietnam, most military men work evenings or weekends no more and no less than civilians do. Cutting leave time to 20 days a year—with the exception of men on hardship duty overseas—would reduce the total armed forces manpower requirements enough to save $450 million annually.

Saving: $450,000,000.

Thanks to Beetle Bailey, Catch 22, and the fact that so many Americans are veterans, the supernumerary theory of military staffing has had great visibility. But an area of far greater inefficiency—supplier performance on large weapons system contracts—draws almost no attention at all. This is especially serious because the same contractor who can be extremely efficient under the conditions imposed by the private competitive marketplace can waste millions when working under a government contract. Few Americans are aware that about 90 per cent of the major weapons systems that the Defense Department procures end up costing at least twice as much as was originally estimated. Some of this cost growth comes from Pentagon-ordered changes in design or configuration, but much of it results from inefficient contractor practices or from his knowledge that the government will underwrite his excessive overhead.

It is up to the government, therefore, to impose on a non-competitive defense contractor the same cost discipline that the contractor would be forced to impose on himself in a competitive situation. Instead, the present procurement system is geared almost exclusively to securing timely delivery and good technical performance. Cost comes last.

The engine contract for the controversial F–111 fighter-bomber offers a classic illustration of what happens to costs after a decision is reached to proceed with procurement.

An aircraft of this kind has three major components: airframe (wings and fuselage), avionics (electronic navigation and weapons-guiding gear), and engines. For a technologically advanced fighter-bomber, the airframe will account for about 55 per cent of total cost, avionics 25 per cent, and engines 20 per cent. The initial F–111 contract for 2,053 engines was awarded to Pratt & Whitney on the basis of an estimated cost of $270,000 per engine. Today the engines are expected to cost more than $700,000 each.

In the F–111 case, and in general, four major factors account for such cost escalation:

1. The Buy-In: Our procurement system encourages contractors to play the game called "buy-in." The rules are simple. Contracts are awarded to the company which offers the lowest bid with a straight face. Later cost overruns may bring a mild reproach or a stern reprimand, but they will not prevent the contractor from getting enough money to cover all his costs and pocket a profit. A contractor rarely takes these reprimands seriously; he knows that his competitors have similar experiences. Besides, the procurement officials have told him to worry about performance and prompt delivery, not about cost. So the buy-in game produces initial cost estimates that everyone knows are unrealistically low.

2. Design Changes: From the time bids are requested on a new weapons system until final delivery, a great many changes in design specification develop. These changes are often initiated by the Defense Department, although some reflect contractor production problems. In either case, the costs change—usually justifiably, but almost always upward.

3. Volume: Changes in volume are even farther beyond the contractor's control. In large contracts, economies of scale are often achievable; if a weapons system is found highly useful, as was the F–4 fighter, and more units are ordered than were initially planned, the later unit costs are lower. In the case of the Air Force F–111, however, cancellation of British orders and the Congressional decision to kill the Navy version reduced the number of aircraft to be purchased, thereby raising the unit cost.

4. Sheer Inefficiency: These costs arise because a contractor has slipshod purchasing procedures, poor scheduling of men and machines, ineffective work standards, or other managerial deficiencies. Such extra costs would be a threat to a company's survival in the competitive private marketplace; they should not be tolerated in defense procurement.

In calculating how much of the F–111 engine's cost growth was due to this intolerable fourth factor, we need to begin by figuring how much the first three factors cost.

We know that the orginal $270,000 estimate was artificially low. Allowing for buy-in fibbing and for some early required changes in design, an initial figure of $450,000 would have been more realistic. Later design changes may have raised the allowable price to $500,000. But the contractor's final estimate of $700,000-plus, made after the British action but before the Congressional cutback, probably should not be adjusted for volume changes, because the British buy was to have been proportionately very small and there are good indications that this actually enabled Pratt & Whitney to disengage itself from some expensive subcontracts. So unjustifiable contractor inefficiency amounted to around $200,000 per engine.

It could have been worse. Past practice in such cases, where the government is dealing with a single supplier rather than with several competitors, has been to accept whatever price is commensurate with the costs the supplier has incurred, regardless of how efficient or inefficient he is. But, in an unprecedented action, the Defense Department ordered an investigation of Pratt & Whitney operations to determine how much such an engine ought to cost if produced under efficient manufacturing procedures. After that, the Navy—which had contract responsibility for all F–111 engines—took the further unprecedented step of unilaterally setting the price it intended to pay. Indications are that the Navy compromised its position somewhat after some hard bargaining, but the final contract did reduce by about 15 per cent the price proposed by the company, which customary procedure would have accepted outright. This saved the government roughly $200 million.

Two other good examples of spiraling costs were described in recent hearings before the Congressional Joint Economic Committee. A. E. Fitzgerald of the Defense Department reported that the C–5A transport may cost $2 billion more than the original contract ceiling of $3 billion; yet when Defense negotiated the contract with Lockheed, then-Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara described it as "a model method of doing Defense business . . . a damn good contract." In another case, retired Air Force Colonel Albert W. Buesking, a former financial officer for the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile, said the Minuteman contractors received 43 per cent pre-tax profit based on net worth, or about twice the normal industrial return; he estimated that defense contract costs are 30–50 per cent "in excess of what they might have been under conditions of competitive-type commercial environment."

Conservatively assuming that aerospace and shipbuilding contractors harbor an inefficiency of 15 per cent, and figuring that the average annual amount provided for research and procurement of such systems over the past three years is about $17.9 billion, then wiping out the inefficiency would annually save the government $2.7 billion.

This is no pipedream. It requires no dramatic breakthrough in management techniques. Such savings could be achieved quickly if the Secretary of Defense and the Secretaries of the individual services resolved to focus the energies of their top financial and engineering men on procurement of these major weapons systems. What is needed is some truly independent cost-sleuthing into contractors' operations, with firm backing from top Defense management for appropriate follow-up efforts.

Saving: $2,700,000,000.

The most fruitful way of all for saving defense dollars is to eliminate forces which no longer pack a credible punch or which were designed to meet a threat that is no longer credible.

The Navy's Polaris/Poseidon fleet ballistic missile program is vital to our national security. But the Navy's three primary and independent conventional warfare missions—tactical air, amphibious operations, and shipping protection—are overequipped, as are their associated support units. Current force levels cannot be justified by any potential threats. In my view, President Nixon was misguided when he decried America's loss of sea power during the campaign last fall. He made the mistake of applying the same argument the admirals use when they attempt to eternalize and expand their favorite programs: that the United States must have superiority in numbers, ship-type by ship-type, over the Soviet Navy. This is a legacy of late-1940's thinking, when it was assumed that we must always be ready to fight and win an extended war at sea. In the nuclear age, such thinking is highly unrealistic.

Fifteen aircraft carriers are presently assigned to the Navy's tactical air mission. Since the wallop they pack is purely the firepower of their aircraft, they should be compared with the alternative means of delivering that firepower—Air Force tactical aircraft. Carriers can deploy quickly to areas where we have no airfields, and they are safe from insurgent attacks (though they now appear to be vulnerable to Russian Styx missiles). But this flexibility comes at a high price. Independent studies place the cost of carrier-based tactical missions at three to four times that of similar missions flown from ground fields. Because of the many air bases we have built all over the world, we can rapidly deploy land-based aircraft to most areas. Carriers still play a necessary role in providing the potential to fight in a handful of otherwise inaccessible places and in meeting initial "surge" requirements for a non-nuclear war. But there is no justifiable reason to use them on extended deployments in major wars as we do now in Vietnam. Although the Defense Department will never admit it, the only reason we continue to employ carrier-based air strikes there is that the jealous Navy doesn't want to be shut out of some role in the war.

Tactical aircraft carriers could be cut from 15 to 10 without risk to the country's security. The average annual peacetime operating and modernization/replacement cost per carrier appears to be about $120 million. Assuming that the costs of expanding Air Force tactical missions to take up the slack were one-third as much, the net annual saving from the elimination of five carriers would be $400 million.

Saving: $400,000,000.

Marine Corps amphibious assault tactics have been used in minor contingencies such as Lebanon and the Dominican Republic, but against a major power they would be highly vulnerable to a tactical nuclear weapon. Nor are Marine forces now structured logistically for sustained combat, the type of war that Vietnam would suggest is most probable. Without eliminating any Marine troops, we could—by restricting their amphibious training and equipment and phasing out a proportionate share of assault ships—save $100 million annually.

Saving: $100,000,000.

A classic example of continued spending for protection against a no longer important threat is the third major area of Navy tactical forces—protection for shipping. The structuring of our anti-submarine and supporting antiaircraft and fleet escort forces harks back to the post-World War II prospect of a sea war with Russia. If we ever do begin destroying each other's ships, there seems little prospect of avoiding escalation to nuclear war, which would make shipping protection irrelevant. Further, as various jumbo aircraft near production, the cost gap between a ton-mile of plane transportation and a ton-mile of ship transportation is narrowing. Yet instead of scaling down our protective forces, we are keeping them up and even expanding them, through last year's implausible decision to begin procuring VSX anti-submarine aircraft. Killing this program and reducing overall shipping defenses to a sensible level—four anti-submarine carriers and three air groups rather than the present eight carriers—would save an annual $600 million.

Saving: $600,000,000.

Another major area in which our involvement is unreasonably large is our troop commitment in Europe. We have about 310,000 soldiers there now, accompanied by more than 200,000 dependents. Such a staggering share of the NATO burden was appropriate while our World War II allies struggled to get back on their feet, but they can now afford a larger load. Part of the thesis behind U.S. deployments is to make certain that any substantial attack by Warsaw Pact forces would engage American forces, thereby creating potential consequences that the Soviet Union would find untenable. But this could be assured with far fewer than 310,000 U.S. troops. Says Senator Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), a former Air Force Secretary recently assigned as chairman of a Foreign Relations subcommittee that will investigate the involvement of U.S. forces abroad: "Surely 50,000 American troops would be sufficient to

make sure that no Soviet probe could succeed in Berlin or elsewhere in Europe without a direct confrontation with the United States."

In the event of a truly major Soviet attack, not even 310,000 U.S. troops plus the NATO allies' forces would be sufficient to thwart it. But both sides recognize that an assault of such proportions is likely to evoke a nuclear response.

Psychological reasons prevented us from making a major cut in our European forces close on the heels of the Russian takeover in Czechoslovakia last year. But that should not deter us from effecting the cut this year. If anything, our non-response to the Czech invasion simply reinforces the reality learned in Hungary in 1956—that the United States is not about to send troops into Eastern Europe no matter what the Soviet provocation.

Realistically, we could cut back to a total of 125,000 troops in Europe plus 50,000 at home earmarked for NATO contingencies, and cut by one-fourth the air power assigned to the European theater (a McNamara comparision shows that NATO air forces can deliver a payload more than three times greater than that of their Warsaw Pact counterparts). Altogether, these reductions would annually save about $1.5 billion.

Saving: $1,500,000,000.

The final two programs of questionable value—the SAGE-Air Defense Command system and the Sentinel anti-ballistic missile system share some common characteristics. Both are defensive, in an age when the balance of terror rests on offensive missile strength. Both encompass a detection function and an intercept guidance function. And numerous technical experts express serious doubts about the potential operational effectiveness of either.

SAGE represents yesteryear's attempt to defend against the Soviet version of our Strategic Air Command. It is widely conceded that the Soviets have grounded their bomber development efforts and no longer pose their primary strategic threat in this area. Nonetheless we persist in trying to further refine our bomber defenses, when in fact we have already achieved a satisfactory capability in the detection sphere. Moreover, SAGE's role as a guide to interceptor pilots is rather superfluous, given its imperfections and our primary reliance on a strong offensive deterrent. Some reductions have already been effected in the Air Defense Command, but conversion from a full defensive system to purely a warning system ought to save $600 million annually.

Saving: $600,000,000.

If SAGE is intended to sustain a mostly futile yesteryear system, the Sentinel ABM represents a misguided attempt to provide protection tomorrow. Against the destructive power of the missile, our best defense is a good offense. Particularly tragic is the staggering cost of a full-blown "thin" Sentinel system. Because it is so expensive, and the work is therefore parceled out to many Congressional districts, many politicians have favored it. It therefore may be difficult to stop before we have spent $40 billion. However, the Sentinel program faces increasingly fervent opposition in the Senate this year—partly because residents in four cities where ABM sites are being developed have objected so loudly.

Sentinel would make some sense if it truly promised blanket protection against strategic offensive missiles. But it doesn't. As Secretary McNamara said in a speech in San Francisco 18 months ago: ". . . any such system can rather obviously be defeated by an enemy simply sending more offensive warheads, or dummy warheads, than there are defensive missiles capable of disposing of them."

Secretary McNamara opposed the Sentinel, but President Johnson overruled him and decided to proceed with the program. Today we are on the road toward building a $5 billion ABM system, ostensibly for protection against Chinese missiles—as yet undeveloped—should Peking miscalculate our potential response and attack us.

It seems unrealistic not to expect the Soviets to perceive the $5 billion "thin" Sentinel as a first stage in a $40 billion "thick" defense against themselves. Senator Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.) said as much last year when he was chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee: ". . . there is no doubt that this is a first step in a defense system against an atomic attack from the Soviet Union." Yet all seven of the men who have served over the past decade in the jobs of Science Adviser to the President or Director of Research and Engineering in the Defense Department have recommended against deployment of a "thick" ABM system designed to protect our population against a Soviet attack.

By halting the Sentinel now, before it acquires irreversible momentum, we could save $1.8 billion this year, not to mention vastly larger sums during the next decade.

Saving: $1,800,000,000.

The items above do not exhaust the list of things to cut—there are other savings to be made in such areas as mapping operations, the reserve forces, logistics—but the total here will serve as a start. It amounts to:

Total savings: $9,276,000,000.

II

If all these Pentagon budget cuts are so obvious, why didn't the cost-conscious McNamara regime push them through? Did the Whiz Kids fail? Were they really trying? I think a fair assessment would have to conclude that they were trying hard but were only partly successful, for five basic reasons.

First, McNamara's Band was grealty outnumbered by experienced adversaries bound together by a shared goal—more and bigger military programs. All the elements in this military-industrial-Congressional complex are served by an enlarged defense budget, though their motivations are different. Industry wants greater sales and profits. The military wants expanded power, plus the assurance that they will be on the forefront of technology. Congressmen respond to pressure from contractors and military employees in their districts, and those on the military committees yearn for the prestige and power that comes from presiding over a bigger slice of the federal pie. The combination made life difficult even for a man as strong and courageous as Robert McNamara.

Second, in selecting systems to analyze for effectiveness, the Whiz Kids chose to concentrate on the relatively uncluttered strategic programs instead of digging into such fat and messy activities as we have catalogued here. Within their selected framework, they generally performed technically sound, objective initial analyses. Once they arrived at a position, however, they too often "overdefended" their conclusions; that is, they were unwilling to reassess them against subsequent cost experience, technological advances, or a changing international political environment. For example, the current structuring of our programmed airlift/sealift needs emanates from a carefully developed linear programming model. This model attaches a high value to rapid deployment, stemming from an early 1960's Europe-oriented study which showed high benefits in terms of political bargaining power and casualty minimization. This analysis still makes good sense in Europe, but now appears grossly misapplied in Asia. Yet nothing has been done to revise the high value placed on rapid deployment. Such a change would point to a different desired mix of airlift and sealift.

Third, the Defense Department's budget review process concedes too much at the beginning. Last year's budgeted amounts are generally taken by everyone as this year's starting points. This practice ignores the possibility that fat crept into preceding budgets or that some of last year's activities are now outmoded. Consider, for example, the subject of training, in which the armed services have been pioneering for years by applying new technology to education. This area should be a prime candidate for frequent review from the ground up (what the managers call "zero-base" budgeting). Rather, the Defense Department budgeting process virtually concedes last year's amount and focuses on whatever incremental changes have been requested. The result, of course, is higher budgets, with past errors compounded year after year.

A fourth limitation also derives from the planning and budgeting system. Discussions about the desirable level of various forces are conducted in terms of numbers of things—missiles, carriers, fighter wings. This flows naturally out of intelligence estimates of enemy forces and subsequent analyses of how much counterforce the United States needs to nullify them. Approval is then given to the Air Force to buy 40 more fighters or the Navy to buy four more submarines, each with specified capabilities. But carrying out such purchases is not like walking into an automobile showroom and asking for a yellow Plymouth Belvedere sedan with power steering. As a submarine is built, many unanticipated choices present themselves; they involve different levels of effectiveness or convenience for different levels of dollars. Inevitably the generals and admirals want to buy as much capability as possible; it is almost always more than is required to meet the threat. For want of adequate follow-up by top procurement officials, the generals often have their way.

Finally, the President and the Budget Bureau have shied from making public any meaningful comparisons between military and domestic programs. Systems analysis, the technique that aims to measure the relative national worth of results obtained from alternative programs, cannot precisely compare the benefits to be gained from highly diverse activities. Yet inexact as such comparisons may be, the Budget Bureau does make them and present them to the President from time to time. If the President, for his part, were to discuss national priorities more frequently and candidly with the public, then Congressmen might be less likely to base their judgments on the only other available view—that the present balance of activities is about right.

The present balance of activities is anything but right. Unmet national concerns for human opportunity and the quality of life require an investment even larger than the amount that would be freed if all of the Pentagon reforms outlined in this report were carried out.

Perhaps the clearest, most thorough delineation of these high-priority social needs is found in the report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. To redress root causes of despair and frustration, the Commission recommended a long series of measures which, if enacted in full, would cost between $13 billion and $18 billion a year over their first several years.

The only way to begin addressing these unfilled needs is to take money away from Pentagon programs that must rank lower on any rational national-priority scale. Examples provide compelling support for this argument. We have such choices as:

Funding the Manned Oribiting Laboratory—or providing Upward Bound summer courses for the 600,000 additional ghetto students who have the potential to go to college;

Spending this year's Sentinel funds—or training 510,000 more hard-core unemployed;

Continuing to operate one of the marginal tactical aircraft carriers—or training and

supporting 20,000 more Teacher Corps members;

Maintaining our full troop complement in Europe—or diverting an additional $10 million to each of 150 Model Cities;

Permitting excessive contractor costs to flourish unchecked—or providing Head Start education for 2,250,000 more children, plus enough school lunches to feed 20 million children for a whole year.

These alternatives are real and immediate. They do not represent wishful dreaming. The choices are up to Mr. Nixon, to the Congress, and ultimately to ourselves.

VIETNAM IN 1969—STATEMENT BY THE AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the American Friends Service Committee has released a statement on ending the war in Vietnam entitled simply "Vietnam, 1969." It is a persuasive statement on the need to bring this war to an end. I commend it to my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD following my remarks, together with excerpts from letters from Miss Dorothy Weller, a senior physical therapist in the Quaker-run rehabilitation center in Quang Ngai province, South Vietnam.

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

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Miss Weller's letters give a small glimpse of the agony and suffering being endured by the simple people of South Vietnam, trapped in the middle of a war they neither understand nor support. It is an antiseptic war to most Americans, halfway around the world from the suffering and dying. Miss Weller's letters help to bring the war home in very human terms. They constitute an eloquent plea for ending the killing and I hope they will be read by those who are promoting a Korea-like end to the war, a situation which will assure the indefinite continuation of the fighting. It is conceivable that such a policy could result in maintaining the Saigon government in power for a while longer—but the price of such a "victory" would be America's soul.

EXHIBIT 1

VIETNAM, 1969: AN AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER ON ENDING THE WAR

MAY 5, 1969.

The last year: It has been more than a year since the rhetoric of peace began in Vietnam. During this time scores of thousands of men and women and children have died in the fighting. They continue to die today, and every evidence in Vietnam is that they will continue to die tomorrow unless there is an unparalleled demand from the American people that the slaughter be halted. The American Friends Service Committee calls for a halt—now.

Like millions of others the world over, we felt a sense of relief a year ago that our country was at last moving toward a Vietnam settlement. We welcomed the initiation of the Paris talks, the halting of the bombing of North Vietnam, and, more recently, the reports of an Administration decision to undertake some form of U.S. military disengagement. We have hoped these steps would lead to a cease-fire and our country would begin to right its distorted priorities that require spending billions on destruction while our cities decay and our poor despair. But hope has not been enough. Little has really changed in the year that has passed.

Present illusions: We believe U.S. military and government leaders are fostering illusions in regard to Vietnam. Our own experience in Vietnam is so at variance with official interpretations that we cannot reconcile what we have seen with what is officially reported. Americans are under the impression that the war is all but over; it is not. They are being told that the U.S. military policy is one of restraint in the interest of progress in Paris; it is not. They are encouraged to think that the Thieu-Ky government is becoming more acceptable to the Vietnamese, that it is politically more secure, more resolute in carrying on the war, more ready to institute reforms, more competent to carry on with diminishing U.S. help. We find no evidence that these things are so.

In our judgment, the human situation in Vietnam today is worse than it has ever been; the cumulative result of U.S. involvement (on top of 25 years of warfare) borders not on Vietnam's salvation, but on its death. An entire nation is being physically, morally, and spiritually destroyed—and the tempo of destruction has increased, not decreased, since the beginning of the Paris talks and the bombing halt.

AFSC qualifications to comment: Our judgment on these matters is based on 15 years of relationship with Vietnam, the last four with fulltime staff stationed variously in Saigon, Vung Tau, My Tho, Danang, An Khe, Pleiku, Hue, and, for the last two years, Quang Ngai. As far back as June 1954, we urged the U.S. not to follow the French example of trying to deal with Indo-China's problems in military terms, insisting that "nothing but disaster lies down that road." [1] Since the U.S. military involvement escalated in 1965, our field staff, speaking Vietnamese and living as closely as possible among the people, have regularly reported to us on the conditions around them. These reports make hard reading, chronicling as they do a tide of destruction that has gradually engulfed a people and torn apart the fabric of their lives. Here is what these reports have recorded:

Refugees: Four million people—one-third of the rural population of this rural nation—have fled their homes and become refugees in a country where land and village roots have an importance unknown in western culture.[2] Most have fled to the cities, which are quite unprepared to cope with the influx. Saigon's population has swelled to 2,800,000, making it the world's most crowded city, with more than twice the population concentration of Tokyo.[3]

Destruction: Physical destruction is enormous. Hundreds of thousands of acres have been defoliated, countless villages have been razed, and bomb craters pockmark the countryside. B–52 raids alone have torn 2½ million holes 45 feet in diameter and 30 feet deep [4]—holes that are now filled with water and serve as breeding grounds for malarial mosquitoes and other insects. More tons of explosives have been dropped on this tiny country than were dropped on all the Axis powers in all of World War II, and with every month that passes the loads are bigger and the bombs heavier.[5] In December 1968, the U.S. for the first time began using in Vietnam 10,000-pound bombs that had been stored in military depots for 15 years.[6]

Economic impact of war: The basic economy of the country has been destroyed, and only heavy imports of consumer goods from the U.S. and Japan keep inflation from assuming explosive dimensions. Corruption is epidemic. Vietnam's ancient Buddhist culture, with its village roots, its veneration of ancestors, its reliance on the extended family, has been torn apart by the impact of having quartered in its midst a half million foreign troops who know nothing of its ways or sensibilities. Prostitution and black marketing are rampant.

Suffering: In all of this the suffering of the Vietnamese has reached levels that would appall the American people if they could see it. Many thousands have been forced from their homes on short notice, incarcerated in tent cities and then after weeks or months been permitted to return to their villages—their homes destroyed, their animals dead, and their fields mined.[7] More thousands are caught under the bombs or between the contending forces, and the result is carnage.[8] Even before the 1968 Tet offensive it was estimated that there were from 150,000 to 200,000 civilian casualties annually.[9] Provision for caring for the victims is hopelessly inadequate. Provincial hospitals today have few doctors, poor facilities, and often a shortage of medical supplies and even pain killers.[10] The American Friends Service Committee, which has been involved in the relief of war suffering for more than half a century, has rarely encountered such misery as is found in Vietnam today.[11]

U.S. escalation since Nov. 1, 1968: The United States, while it is publicly committed to a search for peace, has in fact stepped up its military activity since the bombing of the North was halted on November 1, 1968. Consider the following:

1. There are more U.S. troops in Vietnam today than there have ever been since the war began. On March 15 this figure was 540,500, in addition to 45,000 in Thailand and 35,000 in the Navy offshore.[12]

2. The number of battalion-sized operations initiated by the Allies and in progress during each month has grown steadily since the bombing halt. In November the figure was 800; in December, 956; in January, 1077.[13] The actual figures for less-than-battalion-sized operations in this same period are still classified, but it is known that they, too, reflect a steady increase. Enemy-initiated actions in both of these categories are substantially lower than allied actions during these months, which indicates that it is the allies who have been pressing the fighting.[14] Indeed, the North Vietnamese withdrew 30,000 to 40,000 troops from South Vietnam after the bombing halt.[15] The inclusion of small scale terrorist activity by the NLF forces does not significantly alter the picture. These actions remained relatively constant through December at a level of approximately 100 a month, involving the deaths of from 350 to 450 civilians monthly.[16]

3. Despite the cessation of missions over the North on November 1, the total tonnage of bombs dropped on Vietnam has increased every month since then, except for a slight decrease in the shorter month of February. In November, 115,000 tons were dropped; in December, 127,700; in January, 129,700; in February, 115,800.[17] The January figure represents the highest monthly tonnage dropped since the war began.[18]

4. Since October the war has been carried into ostensibly neutral Laos with greatly increased intensity. Before November 1 there was an average of 150 bombing strikes daily over Laos in 1968.[19] By the end of January the U.S. had 300 to 400 planes a day over Laos, or more than double the number being used before the November 1 bombing halt.[20] U.S. commanders have also been permitted to cross the border and carry ground fighting into Laos when they have felt the military situation required it.

5. U.S. battle deaths—always the inexorable barometer of the level of military action—offer final confirmation of the validity of the preceding statistics. These show a rise every month since the bombing halt; 600 American men lost their lives in October; 703 in November; 749 in December; 795 in January; 1073 in February; 1265 in March.[21] Renewed military initiatives by the NLF and

Footnotes at end of article.

DRV forces did not begin until the last week of February.

Where is there evidence in these statistics of a scaling down of allied operations?

U.S. Aims in Vietnam. Americans are assured that U.S. goals in Vietnam are limited ones. Earlier talk of victory has ceased as the death toll has risen and as the decimation of Vietnam has become apparent. Today the apologists for continued U.S. military action argue that our commitment will be fulfilled if our forces can achieve a reasonably pacified countryside, a reasonably stable government, and a reasonably effective Vietnamese army, capable of defending itself against its opponents. The American people are being assured that progress toward these goals is being made.[22] On the basis of our experience, however, and without considering whether these are appropriate goals for the U.S. to be seeking, we do not believe they are in fact attainable:

1. Pacification efforts have repeatedly failed over a ten-year period, and they will continue to fail. The Hamlet Evaluation System, a U.S. introduced, computerized measurement of territorial security, may show the country to be 75% secure, but all who know the Vietnamese countryside dismiss such figures out of hand. They are worthless because the sources of data are biased, and the definition of "security" is elusive. As the recent Tet offensive has shown once again, the NLF can still move with impunity into any part of Vietnam, even into the very centers of U.S. military power. Despite the contrived reports of the computers and despite the billions of dollars spent on pacification, there is today no part of Vietnam that is truly secure. Neither the U.S. nor Saigon is "winning the minds and hearts" of the Vietnamese. The countryside has not been pacified; it is less secure in 1969 than it was in 1965. Even the major cities, though ringed with fortifications, are vulnerable to attack and infiltration.[23] Quaker workers and Vietnamese sources report to us that anti-American feeling has never before been so intense as it is now.

2. The Thieu-Ky government does not offer any promise of future stability. The government in Saigon is a military dictatorship propped up by U.S. power, despised by most Vietnamese and notoriously corrupt. Freedom of speech is suppressed. No one knows exactly how many Vietnamese political prisoners languish in Vietnam's prisons, but the figure is certainly in the thousands, and includes many of the country's leading intellectuals: university professors, religious leaders, lawyers, students, newspaper editors, politicians—anyone who has dared to advocate political initiatives to end the war. Many of the leading figures in the present Saigon government fought for the French against their own countrymen. They represent an old and vanished order. Whatever the outcome in Vietnam, they will be swept away the moment the Vietnamese regain control of their own affairs. They are too weak a reed on which to pin any U.S. hope for future political stability.[24]

3. The South Vietnamese armed forces will never successfully take over the military burden now carried by the United States. It is not hardware or training that is lacking in Saigon's armies. It is will, the one ingredient the United States will never be able to provide. Thieu's soldiers have no heart for this struggle and have not had any for years. Indeed, one of the most striking phenomena of the war is the contrast between the contending forces: a Vietnamese dressed in the peasant garb of the NLF is one of the world's most formidable fighting men; the same man in the uniform of Saigon is one of the world's poorest. Why? Because one believes he fights to drive the foreigner from his soil while the other fights only to sustain the power of a corrupt military clique.

Why the U.S. should withdraw: If, therefore, as the American Friends Service Committee believes, a continuing U.S. military presence in Vietnam will not result in any genuine pacification of a war-weary and embittered countryside, and will not make palatable a government that is not palatable, nor an army fight that has no will to fight, it becomes useless to pursue further a course that is leading nowhere. It is useless to stay on even for the purpose of a bargaining position in Paris, because we find no reason to think that time will serve to strengthen the U.S. position. This is why we believe that the only viable option left for the U.S. in Vietnam is to withdraw from the whole tragically misconceived adventure.

This is something the U.S. can do. Our military can cease all offensive action, all search-and-destroy missions, all air and sea attacks, and withdraw U.S. troops to port areas for repatriation. This action would have the paramount advantage of returning the future of Vietnam to the Vietnamese, where it belongs. Questions of reunification and political settlement are questions for the Vietnamese to answer, because the Vietnamese, whether they live in Hanoi or in Saigon, are still a single people. They were divided by foreign fiat at Geneva; they have been kept divided by U.S. preoccupation with anti-communism; but fiat and power do not undo the history of a thousand years. The Vietnamese remain one people and not two. They are presently torn by strife between North and South, and between contending forces within South Vietnam, but these struggles can only be resolved by the Vietnamese themselves.

As the only foreigners in South Vietnam, the U.S. and its allies have nothing to negotiate but the rate and manner of their withdrawal. If our leaders were to acknowledge this and move to act on it, it would at once open up a whole new range of possibilities for the good offices or other nations to be used in mediation and arranging for sanctuary or amnesty for those open to reprisal. This in itself would be a hopeful development.

There will be suffering and turmoil if the U.S. leaves. There may be a government in Saigon led by Ho Chi Minh; there may not be. Withdrawal does not mean that justice will be done. It does not insure fair elections or well-protected freedoms. It does not even insure that urgently needed resources will at last be released for use in America's cities, since the Pentagon has plans to use any savings for its own new weapons projects. But whatever happens, or fails to happen, will, in our judgment, be preferable to going on with the present agony of death and destruction that is literally destroying Vietnam, undermining our own domestic social fabric, and damaging our country's name in the world community.

The real problem for the United States in unilateral withdrawal is not in the military consequences in Vietnam, but the political consequences at home. We do not underestimate their magnitude, or the courage that would be required to face them. The President is under great pressure, and it may seem safer and wiser for him to pursue a less drastic course. But we believe that both the American people and the world at large would respond to forthright leadership to withdraw our country from this war, especially if it were made clear simultaneously that the U.S. stood ready to assist generously in the task of economic reconstruction. We are not calling for the United States to abandon Vietnam, but only to replace a destructive American presence with a constructive one that will act in concert with an international effort to provide such economic help as may be requested by the Vietnamese.

This approach would give us a whole new position in Southeast Asia. At the very least, it would change the present tragic image of the United States. Every day sees the armed forces of the world's most powerful nation raining bombs and chemicals and napalm on the rice fields and bamboo huts of one of the poorest and most defenseless countries. As long as this continues, millions must wonder whether the Americans have indeed become the New Barbarians.

Let us therefore order a cease-fire and withdrawal from Vietnam, unilaterally and immediately. Let us get on with what is really important: the rebuilding of their country—and ours—and the lifting of the burden of poverty from the backs of Vietnamese and Americans alike. These are tasks in which Americans can join with enthusiasm.

GILBERT F. WHITE,
Chairman.
BRONSON P. CLARK,
Executive Secretary.

FOOTNOTES

[1] June 8, 1954, Public Statement issued by the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee.

[2] Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees, Senator Edward Kennedy, chairman. May 9, 1968. The same report indicates that 80% of these refugees fled because of U.S. bombing. In our Quaker experience, this percentage is a conservative estimate.

[3] *The Vietnam Guardian*, March 22, 1969: "Saigon: The World's Most Crowded City." Average density of Saigon is reported as 148 persons per acre; Tokyo, the second most densely populated city in the world, averages 63. Densities in Saigon are up to 830 persons per acre.

[4] *The Nation*, April 21, 1969. Report from Professors E. W. Pfeiffer and G. N. Orians of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, as quoted in editorial, "Ravaging Vietnam."

[5] November, 6.94 tons per sortie; December, 7.00 tons per sortie; January, 7.55 tons per sortie; February, 7.55 tons per sortie. These estimates were computed on the basis of figures on total tonnage and total number of sorties provided by the Southeast Asian News Desk, Directorate for Defense Information of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), March 26, 1969.

[6] *Washington Post*, December 27, 1968: "10,000-Pound Bombs Used to Clear Viet Landing Zone." These bombs, too big for conventional fighter-bombers, are reported as being dropped from C–130 cargo planes or flying crane helicopters.

[7] In one such removal, during Operation Bold Mariner in January 1969, 12,000 peasants from the Batangan Peninsula were taken to a waterless camp near Quang Ngai over whose guarded gate floated a banner saying, "We thank you for liberating us from communist terror." These people had been given an hour to get out before the USS New Jersey began to shell their homes. After 8 weeks of imprisonment they were ferried back to what was left of their villages, given a few sheets of corrugated metal and told to fend for themselves. When asked what they would live on until new crops could be raised, the Vietnamese camp commander said, "Maybe they can fish."

[8] A quaker worker, writing from Quang Ngai late in February 1969, describes the situation as follows:

"Several of us went to the roof about 3 a.m. The Americans unleashed the terrifying 'Puff the Magic Dragon.' a DC3 that spews forth 5000 machine gun bullets per minute. As I watched it circle overhead last night, silhouetted against the low clouds in the light of the flares, flinging indiscriminate bolts of death earthward, I could vividly visualize the scene below. Men, women, children and animals, caught like rats in a flood. No place to hide, no way to plead their case of innocence to the machine in the sky, no time to prepare for death. The beating the civil-

ians are taking in this war is beyond adequate description.

"Sitting behind the others on the roof I felt tears welling up and was shocked as I became aware of feelings foreign to my conscious self, which surfaced under the indescribable strain of watching man slaughter man en masse. The cold, mechanical, compassionless way that monster circled around and around and around, ruthlessly pursuing an unseen 'enemy,' stabbing viciously earthward again and again, probing, searching, killing and maiming all in its path . . . We have survived, but a lot of Quang Ngai people didn't make it. And a lot more who are now clinging to life over at the hospital will not make it until morning. If only we could bring this horrifying scene of human devastation in its true dimensions home to the people who must know what it's like. The ones who are pulling the strings on this deadly puppet show. Man's inhumanity to man has reached its climax in Vietnam."

[9] Report of the Kennedy Subcommittee, cited above. These figures, the report notes, are prior to the 1968 Tet offensive, which greatly increased the rate of civilian casualties.

[10] In Quang Ngai's 500-bed provincial hospital, for example, there were in late February over 600 patients, the great majority war-related. At one point, our Quaker physician was the only non-Vietnamese medical personnel available to care for this overflow load, with the exception of a single Vietnamese doctor.

[11] Consider the following, taken from one of many recent reports from Quaker workers in Quang Ngai:

"How can I tell you what it was like! These people coming in filthy, with glazed looks, numb. Nobody talking, nobody crying and the sounds of furious battle not yet ended pursuing them in the door. The emergency room floor still covered with blood from yesterday's casualties, smelled in the heat of the day and was oppressive . . .

"One little fella of ten or so, shot in the face. Three bullet or fragment holes in the back and buttocks, one of which had exited through his abdomen, the others lodged somewhere. He, like most of the others, came in lying in a pool of blood. Feces and ground up bits of bones were flowing out of the buttocks wound. Vomitus ran from his mouth and mixed with the blood pouring from the face wound. We worked with him for a long time but his chances are slim. He was in shock (most of them were) and struggling to get up from time to time, at times opening his eyes wide to beg for water or complain of the pain in his belly and then lapsing into unconsciousness. His father stood by silently, grief written all over his face. A girl, maybe seven years old, with a head wound and skull fracture. Also major portions of one foot missing. Mother and grandmother crying quietly while trying to help us dress the wounds. A mother lying on a stretcher on the floor smeared with blood and with her infant lying silently on her chest. The baby also was covered with blood and I never saw it move.

"I've seen all this before! Why can't I get used to it?! Each lifeless form, every scream of anguish, each blank stare of those who have suffered too much strikes pain in the pit of my stomach. Are there really those who can look at a scene like this and not suffer with the people?"

[12] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

[13] Ibid.

[14] This is confirmed by the New York Times, April 18, 1969 ("U.S. Battle Let-Up Denied in Saigon") which reports that "American troops are continuing to follow a policy of maximum pressure against the enemy. Allied units are continuing to patrol and pursue the enemy aggressively." Later in the story an unidentified colonel is quoted as follows: "All our battalions and brigades are out and operating from one end of the country to the other, just as they've been doing for months. If the casualty figures are down, it's because the Vietcong didn't want to fight—not the United States."

[15] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Senator George McGovern, speaking on the Senate floor March 17, 1969, reports this withdrawal was of "22 full regiments." Sources differed as to the reason for the withdrawal. The military attributed it to the need of North Vietnam to rest its battered forces; Senator McGovern suggests it was in response to the bombing halt.

[16] South Vietnamese government figures, as reported by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Data available only through December 1968. These show 443 killed in October, 440 killed in November, 355 killed in December.

[17] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

[18] Representative Don Edwards (Dem., Calif.) in a speech on the floor of the House, March 26, 1969.

[19] New York Times, November 1, 1968. William Beecher, "Laos Route to Be Pounded."

[20] U.P.I., January 29, 1969.

[21] Pentagon figures, updated from those quoted by W. F. Ryan (Dem., N.Y.) in the Congressional Record, March 26, 1969.

[22] New York Times, January 3, 1969. Charles Mohr, "Major Gains Made by Vietnam Allies, Even Critics Assert." Reader's Digest, February 1969, an interview with Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., "In Vietnam the Enemy Is Beaten." When the NLF stepped up the fighting late in February 1969, the military made efforts to keep the vision of U.S. progress alive by downgrading these actions. See New York Times, March 11, 1969, Charles Mohr, "Field Checks in Vietnam Show Allies Understated Foe's Gains." The American Friends Service Committee can document this charge from its own experience as far as Quang Ngai is concerned, since the city has more than once since February 23 been subject to night ground attacks that have resulted in an occupation of at least 25% over a period of several hours. Yet, as far as we know, these actions have not been reported by the military briefers.

[23] Quang Ngai, has one provincial capital, for example, has over the past year been regularly infiltrated at night. In the weeks following Tet 1969, heavy street fighting erupted twice around our unarmed and unprotected Quaker compound, which is well within the city limits. Every house in Quang Ngai city has its sandbagged shelter to protect the occupants. This is the situation in a provincial city garrisoned by allied troops. Is this security?

[24] Estimates from our AFSC contacts in Vietnam suggest 20% as the maximum support that Thieu-Ky could claim, with 80% in opposition. Some U.S. government estimates use these same figures but in reverse. We find it difficult to understand the basis for the official U.S. optimism on this point.

EXHIBIT 2

REPORT NO. 23, MARCH 1969: QUAKER SERVICE, VIETNAM, AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE COMMITTEE

(NOTE.—Dorothy Weller is senior physical therapist in the American Friends Service Committee's Prosthetics and Rehabilitation Program in Quang Ngai. These portions of her recent letters describe the circumstances in which the Quaker team's work is currently being carried out.)

QUANG NGAI, SOUTH VIETNAM,
February 23, 1969.

DEAR FRIENDS: When I went to bed last night, sleep wouldn't come. I was as jumpy as a cat. Finally got up about 1:30 a.m. and was rummaging around in the dark for a match to light the candle when the old familiar sound of incoming mortars split the night. My reaction was almost one of relief, since what we all knew was coming had at last come, and it felt better to be able to face the threat. It was a hellish battle, an inferno of death. Fortunately for us, none of the fighting or shelling came any closer than a mile or so. The main battle seemed to be around the main bridge across the Tra Khuc river (just where highway 1 exits town and heads north) and over Binh Son which is the next little village north. But while that was the main battle within earshot, it wasn't the only one. Quang Ngai was being hit from three sides—north, east and west. This morning the focus of fighting switched to the south. It seems obvious that the city is pretty well surrounded. There were so many incoming mortars and rockets competing for air space with outgoing shells plus a hail of bullets traveling both ways, it's a wonder there weren't mid-air collisions. The night was all but chased away by the hundreds of flares drifting overhead and the bright flashes of light given off by the explosions of bombs, shells, rockets, etc. It went on and on hour after hour.

Several of us, perhaps exhibiting more courage (or curiosity) than good judgment went to the roof of Pixton Hall about 3 a.m. and watched the Roman spectacle from there. The Americans unleashed the terrifying "Puff the Magic Dragon" (DC3 that spews forth 5000 rounds of machine gun bullets per minute). It's a horrible, horrible weapon and just the hideous sound it makes as it belches forth solid streams of red tracers makes my blood run cold. As I watched it circle overhead last night, silhouetted against the low clouds in the light of the flares, flinging indiscriminate bolts of death earthward, I could vividly visualize the scene below. Men, women, children and animals, caught like rats in a flood. No place to hide, no way to plead their case of innocence to the machine in the sky, no time to prepare for death. The beating the civilians are taking in this war is beyond adequate description.

Sitting behind the others on the roof I felt tears welling up and was shocked as I became aware of feelings foreign to my conscious self, which surfaced under the indescribable strain of watching man slaughter man en masse. The cold, mechanical, compassionless way that monster circled around and around and around, ruthlessly pursuing an unseen "enemy," stabbing viciously earthward again and again, probing, searching, killing and maiming all in its path. The pilot and the gunners, American boys who could just as easily be my own brothers or sons—men "just doing their job." In this particular instance, the NFL appears to have started the mayhem. They, too, had killed or injured their own share of their innocent "brothers" in the initial barrage. When the "Dragon" came down low on several occasions, he was, indeed, shot at. Twice, climbing streams of tracers from the ground almost connected. We came down from the roof about 4:30 a.m. Things were quieter but far from over.

At 7 this morning I managed to get BBC on the shortwave and learned that Quang Ngai was not alone in her agonies. Some 30 cities in the country had been attacked simultaneously: Saigon, Hue, Da Nang, Quang Tri and so on down the line.

After the newscast I dressed and went downstairs as it was just getting light. Others of the team were already outside with the same idea: to go to the hospital, check for damage at the Quaker Rehabilitation Center (QRC) to see if the emergency room needed help. QRC was fine but the Emergency Room was filled.

I've seen all this before! Five times, ten times. It seems like a thousand times. I've seen too much, and heard too much and smelled too much, but yet each time is like the first time. Why can't I get used to it?! Each lifeless form, every scream of anguish,

each blank stare of those who have suffered too much strikes pain in the pit of my stomach. My emotional strength is a sham. Are there really those who can look at a scene like this and not suffer with the people?

As I approached the Emergency Room of the hospital I saw a fellow from CORDS–USAID sitting on the steps in the filth. I walked up to him and noted that he looked as if he had been crying. Wondering what was wrong, I softened my greeting and asked him what he knew about the military situation. His remark was irrelevant to the qestion, but he obviously spoke what was foremost in his mind. "We lost one of our men last night," he said in a choked voice. Apprehension rising, I sat down beside him and asked who it was. He told me then that it had been George Gaines and that he had been killed by a direct rocket hit on his house. (It wasn't until later that the real story came out through a Vietnamese guard who had been wounded trying to help George.) "He's in there," he said, motioning with a shaky hand towards the emergency room. There wasn't anything that would have been appropriate to say at the moment so I just squeezed his hand and got up to go in.

As it was bound to happen ultimately, death has hit us where it hurts. George Gaines, a personal friend of most of the team members, had worked in Quang Ngai with CORDS–USAID for almost four years. He was here when I came in July '67 and just last month returned from a leave to start his third tour of duty. Of all people, it shouldn't have been George! An American Negro, he was one of the kindest and gentlest men I've known here, big, bulky and cheerful. He never wore a gun as most of his colleagues did and really had genuine concern and affection for the Vietnamese people, something found in only a minority of foreigners in Vietnam. The Vietnamese had a great respect for him.

As I went in the door of the emergency room, a young boy of ten or so was being carried out. His eyes rolled back, his face and hair covered with blood, his frail body arched in the extension of a decerebrate. A brain stem injury, most likely. They put him into an ambulance that had just driven up with a middle aged woman. She was pulled out just momentarily, checked briefly by a Vietnamese doctor and shoved back in. The two of them were driven down to the soccer field and sent to Chu Lai Army hospital by helicopter. (The lad died before reaching Chu Lai.) The medivac helicopters have been unable to land behind the hospital today because of the proximity of the NLF snipers.

As I went into the dark first room of the emergency area, the four stretcher racks were full. Two with dead bodies; one a child, one an adult. On the floor lay three more stretchers soaked with blood flowing from major wounds of the people on them.

7:15 p.m.: I must try to stay chronological about all this. So, to go back to this morning.

I stepped over the stretchers on the floor and went into the back room. In the far corner, a husky good looking Vietnamese boy lay on his back, feet manacled together, hands tied over his head to the stretcher poles. His face was covered with dried blood and his hair was matted. An IV (intravenous) needle was askew in his arm and the bottle half full but it was not running. The boy was breathing (a captured VC) but seemed comatose. Later investigation showed that he had a bullet wound just behind the left ear. He obviously was moribund.

To my left as I walked into the back room was a body wrapped in a green sheet and labeled Gaines, George; American; CORDS. As I stood there I just couldn't bring myself to accept the fact that George was dead. Kneeling, I uncovered his face expecting to find a grisly sight. Any man killed by a rocket would be badly mangled. It was George with not a mark on his face. Pulling the sheet further down I saw in his chest three holes from bullets which had been fired at close range. There was no denying his death any longer, and I couldn't keep back the tears. Such a good guy who had done more for the Vietnamese people than most, had been executed for his efforts. But there's no sense trying to find logic or justice in war. None of these other casualties now being brought in deserved to die either. I guess George knew the risks he ran as well as we do.

The hospital was flooded in casualties. Dr. Marge Nelson, who arrived shortly, went right into surgery with Dr. Khai, and Joe and I went over to QRC and loaded up a stretcher with medical supplies. Took the supplies back to the emergency room and set up shop in the back room. By that time George's body had been taken out to the airport to start the long final journey home.

As I was sorting things out on the stretcher, the Viet Cong casualty gave a tortured cry, lifted his head and seemingly looked me in the eye. His entire body convulsed in a strong seizure, the intent look in his eyes faded, and he died. As I turned back to my work I thought: this guy had given his life for a cause very important to him.

Clark Kerr carried innumerable pails of water from the QRC and helped Joe and me wash and temporarily bandage patients. Our biggest battle was trying to counteract the patients' shock. Most of them have lost so much blood by the time they get here, and there was little or none available to replace it. No pain killers are given; presumably because there are none. All this time (and even now while I'm writing) the fighting was going on right behind the hospital, maybe half a mile. A mortar was set up right behind the surgical unit and was firing every few minutes. At times we had to yell to be heard above the chatter of rifle and machine guns. One of the patients I tried to help was a middle aged woman, pregnant and with a penetrating abdominal wound and numerous lacerations and a possible skull fracture.

Another patient was an older woman with a severe scalp laceration and possible skull fracture, severe lacerations of the left thigh and a left arm hanging on by an inch wide piece of skin. The relatives of this woman had heavily packed her arm with tobacco and bound it tightly. Probably saved her life as it certainly stopped the bleeding but it is appalling to think of the contamination there. Fortunately, Marge had come back from Surgery by the time I had finished dressing her other wounds. That arm had me buffaloed. I was afraid to remove the tobacco dressing, feeling that if I did it might well start pumping blood again and I wouldn't be able to stop it. I helped Marge work on that arm and was shaken as I never have been before. Marge unwrapped it and I came very close to passing out. The hand was bloody but intact, curled into a grotesque claw. Between the wrist and the elbow it was shattered to pulp. The bones were in a dozen pieces, the skin ripped from the underlying tissue and hanging in dark reddish strips. An unrecognizable mass of muscle, bone and blood. Hoping to save all the tissue possible, we washed the entire arm in a pail of water. With the dirt, tobacco and blood washed away, Marge hoped to be able to determine what was viable tissue and what wasn't. Even now, my skin crawls as I think about holding the cold dead hand while Marge tried to finish the amputation with a pair of bandage scissors. The skin holding the hand on looked dead but wasn't. Rather than cause the woman further shock by cutting this one inch piece of tissue, Marge decided to simply dress it, splint it and put a tourniquet on in case she started to bleed and transferred her to the waiting line for surgery. (She was still waiting with no further treatment 24 hours later.) There, if she survives, the arm was probably removed above the elbow. And so it went until about 12:30. Things were slackening up so we came home, tired, liberally spotted with blood and very depressed.

We got back to the hospital at 3 p.m. to find the floor and porches lined with patients on stretchers. These people had already had their wounds dressed, they were tagged efficiently with military casualty tags and the IVs were started. Turns out that most of them had been flown down from Chu Lai military hospital. Up there the hospital is full and they have no more room. The irony was that we had already been full up by noon. (Some 45 casualties came in this morning alone. Don't have any figures for this afternoon yet but it seemed like one steady stream.) But Dr. Khai and Marge checked them in and registered them while Lou, Roger, Joe, Eric and I carried them to various wards and crammed their stretchers into the narrow aisles between the ends of the beds. Once there, one could only crawl over the ends of the beds to get by.

Lou strung rope from the overhead beams to hang the IV bottles from. Roger Marshall and I discovered that all the IVs had been stopped somewhere along the line so we opened them and adjusted the flow. Found one fellow in agony, shot through both shoulders and his IV had infiltrated. Neither Roger nor I knew how to take care of it so went back to emergency to get Marge. It was an hour or so before she could break away but when she could she took Lou, Roger and I with her and gave us a graphic lesson in how to restart an IV. Hoped I learned as I have a feeling we may be called upon to do this in the next 24 hours or so. There isn't time to show us more than once.

Back at the Emergency Room, new patients, freshly injured, began to flow in again. The fighting had moved to within 300 yards of the hospital according to one person. Don't know about that but it was close enough for me. The din was deafening and terrifying for the patients (I was too busy to be scared then but I am now.)

We worked until 6:30 p.m. and when there was a slack period, we came on home. This evening Marge, Joe and Lou went back to help further but they are home now (10:15 p.m.) Lou drove one of our cars over to QRC and locked it up inside. No sense having all the cars destroyed in one fell swoop in case we take a rocket tonight. The bottled gas is buried and we have taken the ladder down from Pixton Hall roof. Don't want anyone using that vantage spot as a machine gun nest. The bunker is cleared of furniture and we have water and medical supplies in there in case we need it.

The senior USAID Province representative stopped by the house tonight and sat down to coffee with us. He told us calmly of the situation which isn't particularly good. He was going around town collecting all the foreign relief and government workers and taking them into their heavily fortified compound. The government workers were ordered to go and the voluntary agencies invited.) All the USAID people, CORDS, German and Canadian teams, Red Cross team I guess, were gathered together. All but the Quakers and possibly the Vietnam Christian Service team will probably be there. Having a lot of understanding for the Quaker position, the USAID Province Rep made it easy for us to refuse, although grateful for his concern. So here we are. It's almost 10:30 p.m. and ominously silent for the moment.

February 24, 1969: Last night was unexpectedly quiet. I slept some but it was fitful, and I think the rest of the team fared about the same. We were just too keyed up and tense. By the time I got up at 6:45 this morning, the quiet was ended. The sky was rapidly filling with planes and already a mortar (ARVN) was beginning to bark about a thousand yards from the house.

We went to work not knowing if we would

be doing our regular work or helping to pick up more human pieces but when we got there the emergency area was empty. Dr. Khai had only a couple of hours sleep so the casualties must have kept dribbling in all night long. QRC was in good shape but filthy! The constant concussions of the explosions had knocked down months worth of dust and gecko, bat and bird dung! We were relieved to see all our employees back to work with three exceptions. One is in Saigon on vacation. The other two are brothers and they live in the Nghia Hanh area where much of the heaviest fighting has been going on. It may just be that they can't get in through the battle areas. Let's hope it's only that.

I had rather expected that we would have very few patients coming over for treatment today, since many of them had gone home for Tet and I was sure that they couldn't get back. But far from it, Mr. Ry and I were swamped with patients. Not as many had gone home as I thought and of those who did, many came back to Quang Ngai before the fighting started. Then the wards were filled with new amputees, most of which won't be ready to start the prosthetic process for several weeks but there were some who were ready to start so start we did amidst the din of a raging air assault against the NFL forces just south of us. It's hard to describe what it's like to work in the midst of the roar of the battle. The relentless noise was very unsettling and nerves were frayed. B52s were incessantly hitting an area maybe 20 miles south of here. My guess is that since the NFL and NVA didn't hit last night, they drew back their main force and this is most likely the group taking the heavy bombing today. Plus a "few" innocent people who always manage to plant their homes right in the middle of the front lines. All morning long, jets were screaming in at roof top level, flinging bombs and rockets at an NFL force just a mile or so behind the hospital. Bird dog planes circled around and around and around marking the enemy troop concentrations back there with smoke rockets. Helicopter gunships were raking the area with their guns. I'm sure the NFL are well dug in and not taking a lot of casualties but it will be a miracle if anything or anybody else survived.

It is close to 1 a.m. now. The fighting is so close in, it's next to impossible to classify shells as "incoming" or "outgoing." You're just as likely to get zapped by one as the other. Until just a few moments ago it has been a pretty noisy night. Puff was in the air again tonight with its obscene utterances of terror, B52s, jets, and all sorts of unexplainable explosions. To the south, to the west and to the north.

I realize I haven't talked of anything but the military situation in this letter, but the thing that we are most happy about is that despite extensive military action the patients are continuing to come to QRC for their treatments, and we can keep working. As long as we can do the work we came here to do, there's no reason for us to even think about leaving.

Another gratifying aspect of the past 48 hours or so is that we have found that we can function as an emergency medical team. Obviously we are not as polished and coordinated as we should like to be. This experience has taught us a lot and pointed out some of the weak spots in our preparation for such emergencies. Drs. Khai and Thanh seemed to welcome the help; in fact, it was in response to a request for help from them that Marge, Joe and Lou went back last night.

The team, as I said, is in good shape. Nervous? Yes. But if we weren't, I'd say there would be some real cause for worry. I'd say my prevailing mood at the moment and for the last few days has been more one of sadness and depression over the tragic drama taking place before our eyes. Tragedy for everyone involved. No one is going to win here. I can't help but wonder how many more times yet this is going to happen, how many more people are going to die, before something comes of the peace talks. And when it does, who then is going to have the power to bring the dead back to life, to restore the limbs and health of the maimed, to mend the breaks in family unity, to say nothing of this country's cohesiveness. The United States of America hasn't got enough power or money in its golden lined pockets to restore what it has helped to destroy. I think history will make it very hard for America to live with "Vietnam."

February 25, 1969, 10:45 p.m.: We have survived another 24 hours, but a lot of Quang Ngai people didn't make it. And a lot more who are now clinging to life over at the hospital will not make it until morning. At the moment, like all other members of the team to varying degrees, I am exhausted, bitter and very upset. Small complaints compared to the hell we have seen passing in unending streams tonight. If only we could bring this horrifying scene of human devastation in its true dimensions home to the people who must know what it's like. The people in Paris, the people in Washington, Hanoi, Saigon. The ones who are pulling the strings on this deadly puppet show. These puppets in the production or living, flesh and blood humans! Man's inhumanity to man has reached its climax in Vietnam and leaves me wondering how much worse it can get.

All day long battles have continued to the south, to the north and to the west. Heavy fighting not more than a mile south of the hospital and at times it sounded closer. To the west they are battling out near the airport and maybe closer in. I don't know how close.

All day long with few breaks, the planes of all descriptions have been overhead: B52s dropping the heavy ones. The jets and smaller planes diving over and over again down behind the hospital hurling the powerful explosives earthward and streaking for the sky again. Just long enough to gain altitude to turn around and come in again. Helicopter gunships growling and spitting lead in solid sheets. While some went back to re-load, new ones took their places and kept up the barrage. Mortars going both directions. I can't describe the noise for you. It can't be imagined unless it was your eardrums that were being besieged. We have learned tonight that some of the less familiar and earsplitting explosions we heard were shells coming from an offshore gunship. Artillery going off, machine gun fire. . . Incredible . . . Incredible. . . .

We all went to work this morning as usual. Again the emergency room wasn't too full so we were able to run our own departments.

After a rocket landed in town near a school the youngsters were sent home in our Child Day Care Center this afternoon. But the Rehab. Center stayed open all day. Mr. Ry and I didn't have too many patients. Not surprisingly. Many were just too tired and sick from days of fear and nights of no sleep.

In the midst of all this chaos and immediate emergency a new amputee presented himself at our door this afternoon. His leg has been off for 24 years and he came in today for a prosthesis!!! He told (somewhat reluctantly) an interesting story, however. He lived in Son Quang in the Batangan Peninsula and he and his family had been moved into the new refugee camp on the sand spit just the other side of the bridge, into which the military have put those 12,000 people who were forced from their homes in "Operation Bold Mariner." He said that he had been told that if he came into the Quang Ngai hospital he could obtain an artificial leg. I don't know how he got in (walked) through all that fighting without getting shot. We had another refugee from that camp come in yesterday.

I returned to the hospital early after lunch. The concussion of all the explosions is keeping it half an inch deep in dust and cinder all the time. Trying to clean it is a waste of time. The air around Quang Ngai is filled with dust, grit, smoke and the acrid smell of guns hot from firing. Shortly after I got back there, I heard the medivac helicopters coming in. This morning is the first time they have been able to get in here since the attacks started.

I went over to Emergency to see if I could be of some help. Found people streaming in through the doors. Those two choppers had brought in 23 or 24 people. Some were walking wounded, some had to be carried in on a litter. Some of the litters had two people on them; head to toe. With babies or children carried on top. Old women carrying babies. Some wounded and some not. A large number of this group were soldiers wounded just a few minutes before, right behind the hospital. One soldier with a good portion of his leg shot away came in carrying another soldier who had been shot in the abdomen. The hospital is full, full, full. It was full yesterday morning. But they keep on coming. Most of these soldiers were herded right on through the civilian hospital grounds and across the road to the military hospital. They must be full too. I think it was 100 casualties they received yesterday.

How can I tell you what it was like! These people coming in filthy, with glazed looks, numb. Nobody talking, nobody crying and the sounds of furious battle not yet ended pursuing them in the door. The emergency room floor still covered wtih blood from yesterday's casualties, smelled in the heat of the day and was oppressive. The hospital staff plus some of the MILPHAP men were on hand and equal to the job at noon; so I went back to work at QRC.

At 9:30 this morning the USAID nurses were evacuated once again to Da Nang. They were unhappy about the decision, but the physician in charge feels the burden of responsibility for them weighing heavily on his shoulders and he ordered them out. Heaven knows how we could have used them tonight!

Just before I left work this afternoon at 5:45, I went over to the emergency room again and found it filled and beginning to overflow. There was no one there but one Vietnamese nurse and one medical technician, both of whom seemed overwhelmed and incapable of much action. They had several serious cases. One a head wound and one abdominal wound. I asked the nurse who the doctor on duty was and she told me. I suggested she go ask him if he needed help. (He was operating at the time.) She did and came back saying that he needed help very badly. I went back to the house and got Marge and Joe. We went back and started to work. There were eight or so casualties there when we started. But it seemed not ten minutes later when I looked up from a wound I was dressing and saw twice as many people, most with horrifying injuries. And they kept jamming in the door or lay on the porch. At this point I don't know how many there were. We just kept going.

Before long a number of Joe's prosthetic trainees came in. How they knew the situation, I don't know. I paused long enough to send Lan (the pros. trainee who was wounded himself back in August) back to the house for more help. Pretty soon we had all the rest of the Quaker team on the job: Quy, Mr. Bich, Xuan Lan and Ngo and the youngest teenage son. We needed them all. Before long more Vietnamese doctors materialized and went right to work in surgery. Marge stayed in the Emergency Room and did yeoman duty there. Our team functioned well, although it seemed at times as though we were going to be swamped. Most of the casualties tonight

had major injuries. Those who didn't get shoved out the door and had to wait until the last. Kids, gosh, so many kids!

One little fella of ten or so, shot in the face. Three bullet or fragment holes in the back and buttocks; one of which had exited through his abdomen, the others lodged somewhere. He like most of the others came in lying in a pool of blood. Feces and ground up bits of bone were flowing out of the buttock wound. Vomitus ran from his mouth and mixed with the blood pouring from the face wound. We worked with him a long time and his chances are slim. He was in shock (most of them were) and struggling to get up from time to time; at times opening his eyes wide to beg for water or complain of the pain in his belly and then lapsing into unconsciousness. His father stood by silently, grief written all over his face. A girl, maybe seven years old, with a head wound and skull fracture. Also major portion of one foot missing. Mother and grandmother crying quietly while trying to help us dress the wounds. A boy, maybe eight or nine, came in with leg bent at right angles at the thigh and in deep shock, bleeding heavily from a hole in his back. Doubt that this little fella will ever see the light of another day. A teenaged girl with most of the arm between the elbow and hand destroyed. Blood pooling under her stretcher quickly and becoming a hazard to safe walking. A mother lying on a stretcher on the floor smeared with blood and with her infant lying silently on her chest. The baby also was covered with blood and I never saw it move. It could have been dead. It later disappeared while I was busy with someone else.

The patients' relatives were swarming all over the place. You had to gently shove them aside to get to the patients. But in some cases they were a big help. Vaguely in the midst of all this chaos I was aware of a man hovering near the stretchers. He was dirty and bloody but didn't seem to be wounded. His face was a mask and I couldn't tell who he belonged to. We were too busy to pay any attention to him. All of a sudden I looked up and this poor fella was standing there hanging on to one of the stretcher rack poles and sobbing convulsively, hiding his face with an upraised arm. I moved to put a hand on his shoulder and he turned and walked out the door. I didn't see him again.

Lou and Eric did a lot of carrying patients to the wards after they had been given emergency treatment. I don't know where they put them. NTD had three to a bed and in the aisles. In the old ortho ward, there is no place to walk. They scrubbed stretchers, they ran back and forth for medical supplies and water from the *QRC*. The rolled sheet bandages Mom had sent me were a godsend. Fortunately we had enough bandages, etc. stocked in QRC for just this emergency. Tomorrow I've got to find more.

Roger, Joe and I worked with Margy in the emergency room. I don't know who did what, but thank God each of them was there. Everybody was great. The X-ray tech stayed on until the flow of casualties stopped, bless him. We have to give credit to the hospital staff. There is all the difference in the world between now and in 1967 here at the hospital. They are really trying. Tonight several of the medical techs showed up in civvies and stayed to help. Yesterday, several Vietnamese nurses came in and helped during their off duty hours. I found myself assisting the Vietnamese medical technicians, and then I'd find them helping me. There was no friction. Everybody was working together. I guess we were there for three hours or so, but it seemed like a hundred years.

Now, finally, the fighting seems to have worn itself out. The hospital is awash in human agony. We all are wondering how many more are still lying out there in the fields. How many will never make it in. How many more will be killed or wounded tonight or tomorrow or the next day. When will this stop?

A rocket hit the military compound again this morning. This time a U.S. marine was killed and several others injured. Several more marines were injured at the airport. Saw a line of cyclos loaded with two bright red coffins each headed for the hospital today at noon. Yesterday Carroll noted lines of montagnards streaming down Phan Boi Chau headed for town with their possessions on their heads. Very few people on the streets. Many of the shops downtown closed up. Now as I write it is no longer quiet. Rockets are coming into the town somewhere. Not right here.

Xuan Lan, Ngo and their kids are here with us tonight. Last night their area was swarming with NFL troops. Supposedly several crack NFL units are around there. Mr. Ry asked me as he left for his house tonight if he could bring his family down to us if the VC moved into the Tu Lo refugee camp. The answer was obvious. Of course. But the last two nights have been relatively quiet and maybe tonight will be too. It's a real switch for the major fighting to take place during the day. This is a whole new war. And we hear talk of the bombing of the North to perhaps start again. One more round of retaliations? Even now Vietnam is writhing in agony, and must she suffer more?

The team is fine. There have been no close shellings here, and we don't seem to be in any immediate danger. We are functioning well, both in normal program activities and in the emergency situation. We know we are needed here; we know we can help, and that goes a heck of a long ways toward helping us keep an even keel.

Will keep you posted. Remember as you read these letters the fighting here will probably be over. So there is nothing to worry about.

The team sends love to all.

February 26, 1969, 10:15 p.m.: It has been a much quieter day and while I'm really tuckered tonight I think I will be able to get some sleep for the first time in days. I think much the same could be said of the rest of the team, as well.

There has been some bombing (both B52 and jet) off and on all day and around 5:30 tonight, quite a battle heated up just back of the hospital for 45 minutes or so. Strafing rockets and ground fire. But taken in comparison to yesterday, the hostilities within earshot have been light. It's hard for us to know just what the military situation is now but we have heard the usual plethora of rumor.

Son and his brother finally showed up intact this afternoon much to everyone's relief; particularly theirs. They told of being trapped in their house during the first night and the next day and the terror of having heavy bombs dropping within 300 yards of them. Somewhere along the line their home was burned and they had to flee to another hiding place. Finally they decided to chance it. They live near Nghia Hanh but apparently the road was so heavily fought over today that they didn't dare try to come in via that route. They cut across country and came in on Highway #1. Seems like six of one and half a dozen of the other. That entire area is crawling with troops from both sides. They are very lucky to be alive and unhurt. Son was also telling us that the Americans attacked a large force of NFL in the Nghia Hanh area yesterday and were quickly routed by the Viet Cong. He spoke of large numbers of killed and wounded, both civilian and military. We asked him how the wounded were getting in to the hospital and he said, they weren't. Most of the ones he saw were still lying there; presumably to die since there was no care or medical supplies for them. The helicopters couldn't get in to evacuate them and the roads between there, and Quang Ngai would be a suicide-route. The implication is just what I suspected. The floods of casualties we did see at the hospital didn't represent even a fraction of the total. It has been mass slaughter here, and I wonder how they are going to arrive at accurate casualty figures. My guess is that they won't.

Today casualties were never so heavy that the Quaker emergency unit was needed, so we paid attention to our normal business. Seemed almost a "normal" day. Mr. Ry and I had 21 patients to tend to, with a usual supplement of hangers-on. The patient population here at the hospital seems to be very aware of our presence in the Emergency Room over the past few days, and it has made a visible impact on them.

We have learned that the Viet Cong penetrated the city as far as the Post Office yesterday. That's about as far in as you can come, I'd say. Haven't heard anything about damage downtown though, or casualties. We have stayed away from there for the most part. However, the Viet Cong are just as apt to show up under your bed as anywhere else. And all these rockets, mortars and bullets flying around are very non-discriminating missiles.

The CDCC ran a normal day today. The kiddies glad to be back to a normal routine as a thin grasp on security. However, one of our staff members there is looking for another house, feeling that it is much too dangerous where she is. That's so but I don't know where she is going to go where it isn't dangerous around here.

The wards at the hospital today were a study in horror. The overcrowding is incredible. If they have another sudden influx of patients I don't have any idea where they are going to put them. The hospital staff seems to be trying valiantly to keep up, but it's an overwhelming job that would tax the capabilities of even a sophisticated medical staff with good facilities and peaceful surroundings.

No more now. Going to go to bed and try to get some sleep. At the moment it is very quiet outside. I pray it stays that way!

February 27, 1969, 10:15 p.m.: Today hasn't been too bad. In fact, the morning and early afternoon seemed almost "normal" with just a little distant B52 bombing and some jets strafing behind the hospital. But around 3 p.m. the battles started up again just back of the hospital. The same old story. Jets dive bombing, rockets from smaller planes and all kinds of small arms fire. Kept up til about 5:30. Since then it has been relatively quiet and right now it is deathly quiet.

This morning the USAID nurses flew back into town. Had a brief talk with the head nurse, and she said that they had returned because "they" had decided it was foolish to do all this running back and forth between Quang Ngai and Danang. Later she said to Joe that they had come back "for good." Knowing how increasingly upset the nurses have been when they were pulled out of here during fracuses, I suspect the nurses themselves rose up in protest and insisted on coming back. They all looked much happier this morning in contrast to the almost guilty mood they were in when they left. I can well understand how they feel. We are sure glad to see them back!

Tonight Michael Jutras (the Canadian doctor) is staying with us here. I haven't had a chance to talk to him to see how badly hit the Canadian Hospital was. But apparently one of their big x-ray machines was destroyed, as well as much of the building.

March 1, 1969, 8:30 p.m.: "Saturday night is the loneliest night in the week . . ." So the song goes but over here in Quang Ngai it is anything but an isolated existence we lead on Saturday nights! In fact, there are usually far more people hanging around than we would like. And all of them carrying arms!

As near as we can tell, tonight isn't going to be any different than most of the past Saturdays and already the mortar across the street has started its yammering. Last night was a bad one and we don't look forward to another four hours of the same tonight. After taking stock of last night we can only believe that there must be a special Quaker Angel in residence here, and he was working overtime last night.

Last night I decided to not write another letter since the night before had been relatively quiet. A few letters had finally filtered through from home, so I just spent the early evening soaking up the news and reading the newspaper clippings that had come. By 10:30 I had gone to bed; still looking for that uninterrupted night's sleep. At 1 a.m. a tremendous explosion rocked Pixton Hall; knocked things off the tables and brought me up into uncomprehending wakefulness. A second explosion immediately followed the first and brought full awareness, as I dove under the bed; dust, gravel and shrapnel raining down on all the buildings here. There was no doubt about these being "incoming" mortars! Investigation this morning showed that one of them had hit at the north-west corner of Pixton Hall. There is a tiny open spot of ground between Pixton Hall, the big well and some refugee shacks back of us, and only some heavenly power could have guided that shell into that small space. No one was hurt! The area into which it fell couldn't have been much bigger than five square feet. The shacks and the back wall of Pixton Hall were liberally sprayed with fragments, but no real damage except for some frayed nerves. The second explosion was in the banana plantation right behind us and that was the first of many shells landing back there last night.

Following the first two explosions there was dead silence. After about five minutes of this I picked my bloodied nose up out of the dust under my bed and crawled stealthily to the door. Nothing going on, so I got braver and stood up. Still nothing, so decided that it might be the wisest thing to go down to the bunker just in case there was more to come. A wise decision but just a little too late. As I stuck one foot out the door, I got a face full of gravel from another series of blasts. Like a turtle I withdrew and there was never another chance (that I cared to take!) all that night to get down to the bunker. Eric was in the same boat downstairs in his room. He also started out the door and got hit in the leg with a piece of flying "something or other." No damage to either Eric or me, but we were both trapped for the rest of the night which was wild.

Apparently the Rural Development Cadre headquarters right across the street was the target in this area, and the Vietcong moved right in here through the hospital grounds as usual. After the fracas got well under way we couldn't distinguish any more between the incoming and outgoing shells. The RD fellows were firing their mortars, grenade launchers, rifles, etc., from the street right outside the house, and the incoming fire was dropping right in on top of them—and us. They eventually brought up three of the ARVN tanks and they parked right in front of our gate with motors running and lights out. They were firing their cannons through the open spaces between the houses. Just like Tet last year. The racket has all of us a little deafer than usual today.

Lou and some of the fellows who were watching the battle from upstairs in the main house saw one of the tanks go up towards the hospital where heavy fighting was going on. It crept up Phan Boi Chau about 500 feet, and an NFL soldier threw a grenade in front of it. Lou said that tank turned around on a dime and came streaking back to join the other two huddled together in front of the RD cadre place. It never went near the hospital again.

Everyone except for Eric and me spent the night either in our bunker or upstairs watching the fighting raging up and down the street. About 6:45 a.m. Roger and Joe decided it was quiet enough and with all fingers crossed they walked up to the hospital to assess the damage to QRC if, indeed, there was still a QRC. What they found was an intact QRC, but with numerous holes punched in the brand new roof over the brand new storeroom that Roger and Joe had just finished last weekend. It wasn't until later in the morning that they made the discovery that turned all of us a pale sickly white. They went up on the roof to find that a mortar had made a direct hit on the storeroom roof but had hit one of the sandbags first! That sandbag had taken the brunt of the explosion and the fragments had ripped up the roofing a bit but that was all. The ruins of the old MILPHAP warehouse next door to QRC had taken a few more hits. Apparently a number of shells had hit the hospital grounds although the structural damage was minor.

Elsewhere in Quang Ngai, we understand that some 20 houses between VNCS house and the big bridge were burned and that the VC broke into one house and shot an old man who was supposed to have a lot of money.

Here we had a houseful of people. Michael Jutras was here for the second night in a row, and Barry Fleming, the representative of Oxfam of Canada, was here, along with a young Vietnamese fellow who works at the Buddhist School of Youth for Social Service in Saigon. Barry had said as he came in from the airport that he'd like to see a little real action, as Saigon had been too tame for him, I guess. He certainly got his wish. He was only here 24 hours but he got to see the Prison, the CDCC, the Rehab. Center, the Hospital and the new refugee (Thien An) camp out on the Tra Khuc. He was a somewhat subdued man by the time he left this afternoon. Things are in incredibly bad state right now. There are somewhere over 680 patients in the hospital and you will remember that it only has 400 bed spaces. By Monday I'm sure there will be more than that.

Surprisingly, there were few casualties that came in this morning. We opened up the Rehab. Center and had a very busy day although none of the outpatients arrived. I find on days after close attacks like this, the hospital patients seem more eager than usual to come over and carry on their usual routines. I think it represents a certain amount of security for them to know that this is one place and one activity they can count on.

So we go into the 7th day (or is it the 8th) since the attacks started and while they have abated at times, they are still flaring up with their original intensity. The patients at the hospital are frightened and tired, as are most of the rest of the Quang Ngaians. I find it hard to know what to say to them as I leave QRC for the night. Our house is comparatively safe. We have a bunker and food and water and toilets, and each of us has a bed to himself. It is only being realistic to know I may never see them alive again. These people are living in double jeopardy and have been for a long time. Most people only have one death in a lifetime to worry about but Vietnam is a land of a thousand deaths, and individual peril is served up on a daily basis.

Enough for now. Once again, I am going to bed and hope for a few hours of sleep before the boys start up again. No work tomorrow. Hope to be able to get down to some personal correspondence and talk about something else but this holocaust here.

Take care of yourselves. Pray for some relief for these people over here soon. Do what you can to influence the right people in the right directions.

The team sends love to all.

DOROTHY WELLER.

THE CHARACTER OF THE PRESENT GREEK REGIME

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there appeared in the Sunday Times of London on May 4 an article smuggled out of Greece written by one of the leading musicians there, Mr. Mikis Theodorakis. This article gives an insight into the character of the regime now in control in Greece and a regime with which we are associated. I think it is important that the Members of the Senate be aware of our policies in this regard. Personally, I suspect that such policies are not unrelated to the turmoil that is so widespread in our country today. I ask unanimous consent that the article and an editorial from the Northwest Arkansas Times regarding the ROTC be inserted in the RECORD.

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

[From the London Sunday Times, May 4, 1969]

"MY LIFE IN EXILE," BY THEODORAKIS—SMUGGLED OUT OF GREECE WITH THE AID OF SUNDAY TIMES REPORTER JOHN BARRY

(NOTE.—Mikis Theodorakis' own account of life in exile was smuggled out of Greece last week. The courier was John Barry, the Sunday Times Insight reporter who six weeks ago travelled to the remote mountain village of Zatouna to investigate the captivity of Greece's most famous composer. Now, his new material—photographs, letters, the score of some new music, and a long message tape-recorded by Theodorakis—reveals for the composer's own feelings, and the steps the regime is taking to tighten still further the conditions of his exile. This is an edited version of Theodorakis' messages.)

On April 21, we completed eight months in Zatouna. The village looks deserted, with only 20 families or so living here now. Our house is in the centre, on the main street. We have one large room, and a smaller one where Margaret and George [*his children*] sleep. They go to the village primary school.

Myrto [*his wife*] and I, we spend our days in this room. Sometimes I play the piano; sometimes we read. We occupy ourselves a lot with the children.

Myrto gets out very seldom. But twice a day, I have to go to the police station. It is up a hill, and I often get tired climbing up there. But when I decided to stop it, I was subjected to tremendous pressures. I just had to give in, because I had no possible weapon but a hunger strike. When the worst comes to the worst, though, I will start a hunger strike.

Day and night, two guards are posted in front of our door, while a third patrols the road. As soon as I leave the house, one guard falls in on my left and the other on my right. The same thing happens even in the village coffee house.

And I may only speak, and then only about trivial things, to two or three villagers whom the police trust. I cannot speak to anyone else—whoever gives me "good morning" is questioned.

Theodorakis makes it clear that the regime is tightening its pressure.

At first, I was free to go out whenever I liked. Now, I have to be indoors 20 hours a day; I am allowed only four hours' exercise. On the Tuesday before Greek Easter (*April 8*), the restrictions became for a time even harsher: 22 hours a day indoors. And I walk only in the village. I am not allowed even 10 metres beyond it.

But frequently even these "privileges" are cancelled and they shut me in with no ex-

planation. I have absolutely no rights, absolutely no way of defending myself and my family against the arbitrariness of the authorities. "When I see you," I told an officer, "I hear inside me the sound of jungle drums. To me, you represent the law of the jungle."

In recent weeks, three new guards have been drafted into the village.

My guard now consists of a corporal, a sergeant and 13 gendarmes. And the local civilian armed units [*roughly, the territorials*] have special duties as well. No foreigner is allowed to pass through Zatouna. For days now, they have been stopping all the local buses in the Zatouna area. The passengers have to get out and be searched.

When the Council of Europe's sub-commission on Human Rights was due to arrive in Zatouna [*around the middle of March*] there were special precautions. I was ordered to be ready for secret transfer to another village; they would have hidden me there. They even had a special squad ready to blow up a big rock [*on the single precipitous road into Zatouna*] and thus cut off access.

Theodorakis, it seems deliberately, avoids talking of his own health, which is known to be declining. Instead, he concentrates on the effect of exile on his family.

When we first came here, a guard forced my nine-year-old son George to put up his hands, pushed him against a wall and then stripped him naked in the middle of the village. George had a nervous breakdown. He came home in a state of shock, with fits which continue even now. He cries continuously.

On the Monday [*April 7*] before Greek Easter, we sent the children to Athens because George was so disturbed. He is now being treated by a psychiatrist. Two days later, Myrto wanted to phone to hear news of his health. They would not allow it. I shouted at them from the balcony: "They are not Christians, not Greeks, not even humans."

That night the governor of Arkadia [*the province*] came. He asked me about my threatened hunger strike. Yes, I told him, that is my last weapon. "What's your opinion?" he asked Myrto. "When my husband dies, I shall kill the children and myself," she replied. "Then we will give you the satisfaction of four bodies." They let us phone.

The tragic irony is that the worst restrictions follow attempts to penetrate the regime's fictions about life in Zatouna:

The first measures were imposed after the visit of German television in November 1968. [*The film was shown last month.*] They have reached their peak after the marvelous report of John Barry in The Sunday Times.

For days after that, there was a general alert in the region, with arrests and interrogations and great nervousness everywhere.

At first, they completely cut off my telephone, and all the telephones of the villages around. They shut me in. They forbade books and magazines. Finally, they took our transistor radio. Our last link with the outside world was cut.

Now, after the announcement by the B B C that my Songs of Zatouna will be broadcast on Monday, there is great nervousness, even fear. Possibly we face new measures. They might take away the [*hidden*] tape recorder. They might take away my piano. So, finally, they would achieve silence.

Yet Theodorakis has regained at least some of the confidence he lost so painfully through the long winter.

It was unnecessary, I imagine to say that all these restrictions, far from disturbing us, fill us with joy. Not, of course, because we are masochists. But because they are a sign that what our friends who love us are doing has an impact abroad.

In the midst of these conditions, our morale and our faith, far from weakening, is on the contrary being sharpened and strengthened.

And first of all, as an intellectual performing my duty, I have composed here in Zatouna six cycles of songs. I call them "Arkadies." And I dedicate them—these songs I have written yesterday, and those songs I shall write tomorrow to all men who believe in man, who believe in life, in justice, in democracy and in freedom. And who have the will to fight to defend these ideals.

[From the Fayetteville (Ark.) Northwest Arkansas Times, Apr. 30, 1969]

ROTC DECISION

It appears increasingly likely that the ROTC program at the University will become a voluntary one next year. The University Senate Council (faculty) has voted (10–3) to recommend such a step to the Board of Trustees. The Trustees generally follow such recommendations.

This decision appears to us to be a reasonable one. Those opposing the program's mandatory nature can now look forward to a pursuit of education unmolested by threat of non-graduation.

All of this seems eminently in keeping with the appropriate processes of higher education.

Amid the ruckus of recent protest and demonstration at the UA concerning ROTC, it was inevitable that some of the "victims" of the system would be pushed forward to illustrate alleged grievances. One such turns out to be a Phi Beta Kappa pre-med student who will not win a degree this spring because of non-compliance with ROTC requirements.

Under ROTC rules the student, as we understand it, was wrong. He declined to have his hair cut to military specifications and his instructor could hardly have done otherwise than to penalize him. The important issue in this instance—particularly since graduation is not a requirement for entrance in med school—is not hair, but rather how far Americans are prepared to allow the military to invade the conduct and procedures of a civilian society.

An ROTC spokesman, commenting on the matter, emphasized that the military today is "big business," and needs everything from data processors to doctors and lawyers. And he is right. The Pentagon's budget includes enormous annual expenditures for pure academic research, on many of our nation's campuses. The military, in fact, is such a major economic influence on research and development in this country that its whims have a very real effect upon the financial welfare of many college campuses.

This sort of thing shapes up as a dangerous trend, we think (at least it holds the potential of a dangerous threat to academic freedoms), and because of this any sort of mutually agreeable separation of military and civilian pursuits, particularly on campus, should serve the national purpose in good fashion in years to come.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have just been told that an article in, I believe it is, this week's Look magazine deals also with the conditions in Greece.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT REPEAL INVESTMENT CREDIT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a few weeks the Senate will debate whether or not we should repeal the investment credit. As the only Democratic member of the Joint Economic Committee to oppose repeal of the investment credit, I hope the Senate will think carefully about the consequences before it acts to eliminate a provision of our tax laws that has done a great deal for our economy in the past 7 years.

This provision was enacted in 1962, suspended in 1966, made effective again in 1967. To end it now would be a mistake for a number of reasons.

The principal drive behind its repeal is the conviction on the part of many economists that the present sharp rise in capital spending is highly inflationary—which it certainly is—and that the investment credit is a principal reason for the high level of capital spending, and it is.

The difficulty is that the repeal of this provision of our tax laws will not slow capital investment until some time next year. By the time the slowdown occurs we may very well need the capital investment in order to keep the economy moving.

Much more important, Mr. President, is the fact that capital investment is essential in holding down prices in the long run. Over the years the increasing efficiency of American productive facilities is the real reason why we have been able to pay higher real wages to tens of millions of Americans.

Along with education, and the basic stimulation of our competitive economic system, capital investment—in modernizing our factories, providing automation, sharply increasing productivity—is at the very heart of America's economic strength.

For this reason I call attention to a brilliant analysis of the benefits of the investment credit in this morning's Wall Street Journal.

I hope Members of this body will read it and ponder it before they make up their minds to vote to repeal the investment credit. This column by John O'Riley makes a persuasive case that such a vote would be a serious mistake.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the front page of the Wall Street Journal in the column, "The Outlook," entitled "Appraisal of Current Trends in Business and Finance," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

You hear a lot of talk about capital spending by industry these days. The talk notes that it is very large. And from there debate swings about the wisdom of withdrawing a tax-credit incentive for spurring such spending. The credit proviso has been on the statute books since 1962. It is bad and should be dropped, it is claimed, because the big industrial spending it helps induce is inflationary. Maybe the immediate effect of this expenditure is indeed inflationary. But the record of history makes one thing clear: Over the long pull, no force on earth has done more to hold down the prices of things people buy than has capital spending.

This money goes for factory machinery. And machinery, substituting for human hands, is the thing that gives maximum production at minimum cost. New and better machines come out every day. The new must replace the old. If they didn't, the soaring cost of human labor would push the prices on manufactured products into the sky. This is readily demonstrable. Factory wages in this decade have risen more than three times as fast as producer prices on finished consumer products.

The table below tells the story. Figures on

prices of consumer durable and nondurable goods are official Labor Department indexes. Average hourly manufacturing wages are also compiled by the Labor Department.

Year	Consumer goods prices		Hourly wages
	Durable	Nondurable	
1960	100	101	$2.26
1962	100	101	2.39
1964	99	101	2.53
1966	100	104	2.72
1968	103	109	3.01
1969	116	108	3.14

It will be noted that in the first half of the decade the machines held the prices at a standstill—despite rising labor costs. Big wage gains of the past few years, though, have pushed prices up some despite all the machines could do to hold them down. Even so, the record since 1960 shows prices on the two categories of manufactured products up 16% and 7% respectively—and the wages up 39%.

It is one of the prime ironies of our inflation-plagued time that the finger of blame is so often pointed at prices on manufactured products—the very sector that is doing most to hold the overall cost of living down. If manufactured product prices were up as much as other things, the "C of L" would be staggeringly higher.

Take, for example, the cost of home ownership. Its runaway cost elements lie not in prices of such things as beds and television sets that go into the house, but rather in things that manufacturing efficiency can't put a brake on—land prices, mortgage interest, real estate taxes, insurance and maintenance and repairs.

The official home ownership cost index has jumped nearly 10% in the past 12 months alone. Over the same span, manufacturers prices on all finished consumer goods have risen less than a third as much, or only 2.9%.

The massive impact of modern factory machines is most dramatically mirrored in the changing ratio between the number of men it takes to run them and the amount of goods they turn out. Figures on factory production workers below are in thousands. The factory output index is that of the Federal Reserve Board. The 1957-59 average number of workers is used because that is the base for the production index.

Year	Production workers	Factory output
1957-59	12,596	100.0
1962	12,488	118.7
1964	12,781	133.1
1966	14,273	158.6
1968	14,485	166.8
1969	14,778	171.6

The number of men in the factories has increased only 17% since 1957-59. The physical volume of production has soared 71%. A proportionate rise in the number of men would have called for over 21 million workers in the factories today—instead of 14 million. And at today's $3.14-an-hour wages, it is not hard to see what those extra 7 million paychecks would do to prices on everything from TV sets to toothpaste.

As everybody knows by now, of course, the relative shrinkage in factory jobs has spelled no decline in overall employment. In an economy growing more diverse daily, today's labor supply market is drum tight.

In striving to produce more things at minimal cost, this country is not an island unto itself. Technology is global. Never have so many modern factories in Europe and Japan poured such a flood of merchandise into world commerce. It beats in mounting waves on American shores. Today's Yankee mouse trap maker who does not make that better trap, and at a competitive price, finds others halfway around the earth not only making it but delivering it to consumers across his backyard fence.

Here's how the industrial production indexes of half a dozen lands have jumped in the past decades. The 1957–59 average is used as a base of 100 in each case.

Country	1957-59	1969
Japan	100	402
Italy	100	236
West Germany	100	190
Canada	100	184
France	100	180
United Kingdom	100	137

Much of this production is consumed overseas, of course. But import figures show vividly how much finds buyers in this country. Imports of manufactured goods into the U.S. as recently as 1961 were valued just over half a billion dollars. Last year they topped $1.7 billion. This is not a moderate increase—it approaches a fourfold increase.

It is easy to attribute this lightly to U.S. prosperity. But only a head-in-the-sand observer can fail to realize that a major factor is simply that a great many foreign producers are offering the American consumer more for his money.

The foreign factory operator has always had the advantage of cheaper labor—with his American rival depending on better machines, better equipment. But now the foreigner has good production machines too. And he spends briskly on better ones. It is hard to see how American industry can fail to do likewise.

—JOHN O'RILEY.

THE F–111 "BRAIN": HOW ITS COSTS SOARED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in the Washington Post for Sunday, May 11, there was an article by Mr. Bernard Nossiter on the huge cost overruns for the avionics equipment of the F–111 airplane. For those not steeped in Pentagon jargon, avionics is the word used to describe the radar, navigation equipment, and the computer on the plane. In this case, the avionics equipment and the contract was known as the Mark II.

HUGE OVERRUNS

As usual, Mr. Nossiter makes clear the details of what may seem to be a highly complex matter.

The facts are that the cost of the "avionics" for the F–111 under the Mark II contract soared from $145 million to at least $357 million. This was first brought out at the hearings before the Joint Economic Committee's Subcommittee on Economy on Government last January. In testimony before the committee in January, which was released last week, Mr. Robert H. Charles admitted that the costs could go as high as $360 million.

But Mr. Nossiter has dug beyond these facts. His article is unique in the description of, as he puts it:

How generously the Air Force dealt with its contractor, suggesting to the military-industrial world that an agreement may be only a scrap of paper when it threatens any firm with a loss.

SHOCKING PRACTICES

There are at least four practices revealed about this contract which are shocking, to say the least.

First, is the massive cost overrun, in this case an increase from $145 million to at least $357 million.

Second, is the refusal of the Air Force to enforce the contract which could have saved the Government, according to the article and the Air Force memo on which it is based, at least $100 million. Under the contract, after taking into consideration legitimate changes, the company was clearly responsible for at least those costs in excess of $172 million. But the Air Force let the company off the hook and loaded the excess costs onto the backs of the taxpayers.

The third point was the apparent willingness of the Air Force to allow this equipment to be installed in the planes even if it did not meet the specifications of the contract.

PYRAMIDING PROFITS

Finally, the article details the system of pyramiding costs and profits by means of what is called the "burden." This is a method whereby the prime contractor for the avionics equipment adds a fee to the costs of the subcontractor before calculating profits.

Then when the completed avionics equipment is shipped to the builder of the airplane, this company, too, adds a burden or a fee before figuring its profit.

To the degree that a prime contractor has to supervise the subcontractor, run tests, provide personnel, check on data, and so forth, these are legitimate costs. But absent such specific prime contractor activity a markup, such as Mr. Nossiter details, merely added to costs before the profit is figured, is clearly wrong. It is improper to allow a prime contractor to add a fee to the costs of the subcontractor for costs not involved or for services not performed. This practice should end.

PRACTICES ENFEEBLE DEFENSE

I commend Mr. Nossiter's article to the Senate. It is one more in a list of a dozen or more examples of huge cost overruns on major weapons systems which cannot be justified either under proper accounting practices or as a means of defending the country.

Such practices will enfeeble rather than strengthen this Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Nossiter be inserted in the RECORD.

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

F–111 "BRAIN": HOW ITS COSTS SOARED—PROJECT EXCEEDS ESTIMATES BY MORE THAN 100 PERCENT

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

This is the story of the contract for the Mark II, a piece of electronic gadgetry for the F–111 plane that is running far more than 100 per cent above its original cost estimates.

The runaway costs, however, are only part of the story. More important is how generously the Air Force dealt with its contractor, suggesting to the military-industrial world that an agreement may be only a scrap of paper when it threatens any firm with a loss.

Buried in this story, too, is a warning from a responsible Pentagon official that the Air Force would risk the lives of its pilots by giving them "degraded" equipment to sup-

port a "selling" job within the Pentagon and on Capitol Hill.

Much of the story is told in a long memorandum written by an official in the office of the Secretary of Defense. This man, who prefers not to be otherwise identified, had an almost unparalleled view of the events surrounding the Mark II until the Air Force last summer pulled down a curtain to hide the embarrasing sequence from the Secretary of Defense. The memorandum has been supplemented by a few other observations from those connected with the program.

The central theme of the memo is contained near its end. It says:

"If it fails to enforce the contract, the Air Force and the entire Department of Defense can count on many more years of misleading promises from contractors and failures to meet contractual requirements. On the other hand, enforcing the Mark II contract can be advent to a more realistic, business-like period in defense contracting."

A pencilled note tells what happened. It says:

"Charles overturned this position (enforcing the contract) in August 1968. He felt that Autonetics could not be forced to suffer a loss."

Charles is Robert H. Charles, the Air Force Assistant Secretary for procurement whose name has already figured in the C–5A affair and the contract termination of the F–111B. Autonetics is the Autonetics Division of North American Rockwell Corp., contractor for the Mark II.

The Mark II is the avionics of black-box electronics for the F–111, the swing-wing fighter-bomber already described as a "fiasco." The avionics includes the plane's radar, navigating equipment and the computer to make the calculations extracted from and guiding these instruments.

Its predecessor, the Mark I, did not promise the precision that the Air Force thought it could achieve. This led to a call to the industry to design Mark II.

Several firms bid on the project and North American's Autonetics was chosen the winner although some 600 defects were found in its design. The memo from the Pentagon official notes that J. L. Atwood, president of North American, assured the Air Force in the spring of 1966 that Autonetics "did not anticipate any difficulty" in correcting those flaws.

PRICE BAIT

The company won the contract, estimating its costs for some 210 Mark II's at $132 million. Allowing 10 per cent for profit, its "target price" was $145 million and any costs above $172 million, the "ceiling," were to be borne entirely by Autonetics.

Actually, Autonetics figured its costs at $183 million, but knocked off $38 million as a "management reduction" or special price bait.

The Air Force was pushing Autonetics to produce in a hurry, the memo relates. This was a costly program and if it was to be justified, Mark II's had to be rushed into F–111's before too many wings were equipped with Mark I's.

Indeed, the speed-up was so intense, "production go-ahead was required before the first RDT&E unit was integrated." That is, Autonetics was told to produce Mark II's before the research and development had been fully completed on test units.

Test flights were hurried, too, and "from this schedule," it was obvious at the start that test results could not be used in improvement of initial production units."

By September, 1966, just two months after it signed the contract, Autonetics was telling the Air Force it could not meet the contract's specified performance requirements and new less rigorous ones were drawn up.

How "degraded" the new specifications were is a classified matter. But it is evident from the Pentagon memo that the Air Force was now allowing the black boxes to break down more frequently than the original contract provided.

A few months later, in March, 1967, Autonetics was saying that its original cost of $132 million was unrealistic, that the first batch of Mark II's would run $357 million, almost three times the original amount.

However, on April 15, the North American division said it would ask the Air Force to pay only $297 million. It knocked off $22 million for a poorer performing Mark II and $38 million as that special "management reduction."

The Air Force, at this point, said, in effect, "We have a contract with you. We will only pay more if you can show us that the increased costs result from changes we ordered."

The president of Autonetics, Fred Eyestone, said that this was "impossible", the memo relates.

So an Air Force team of analysts went to work. They found only $20 million of increased costs that could be traced to the Government's demands. Thus, the office of the Defense Secretary reasoned that Autonetics was now entitled to a new "target" of $196 million.

This touched off a great internal debate. If Autonetics was held to its contract, it would lose $170 million and the end was not in sight. If relief came, what was the point of a contract?

From another memorandum written Oct. 20, 1967, it is learned that Robert Anthony, the Defense Department Comptroller, wanted the Air Force "to hold the contractors' feet to fire." He instructed his aides to draw up an order from Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to the Air Force insisting on just this.

Moreover, this second memorandum discloses, Anthony had won the support of Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Nitze for another idea, a "should cost" study of Autonetics' operations.

This scheme, developed by a veteran Navy negotiator, Gordon W. Rule, was to save the Government more than $100 million on a contract with Pratt & Whitney. It involved sending Government cost specialists into a contractor's plant and showing him the inefficiencies that were running up costs.

The second memorandum, however, observes that Charles, the Air Force buying chief, opposed a "should cost" study of Autonetics because "it reflects poorly on past and current Air Force procurement practices and the Air Force always does a form of 'should cost'," anyway.

In any event, Nitze ordered the Air Force to make the "should cost" examination. About a year later, when these men were soon to leave office, Nitze asked Air Force Secretary Harold Brown what had happened. Brown is said to have answered that the study was never made because it would not have produced any useful results.

At the Pentagon during 1967 and 1968, the argument continued over how tough to be with Autonetics.

UNREALISTIC

According to the memo written by the official in the McNamara entourage: "The Air Force does not want to have one of his principal suppliers lose over $100 million and, on the other hand, it does not have the facts to justify a higher (cost) position . . . Considerable feeling can be found in the Air Force that Autonetics is an innocent victim of a system which is changing from oral promises to written agreements. People with this viewpoint feel Autonetics should be 'left off the hook.'"

However, the Pentagon official observed:

"With important programs being cut back by a lack of funds throughout the Government, these funds are vitally needed elsewhere. The implicit notion that the money is more important to North American than it is to the Government, while finding a considerable sympathy within the Department of Defense, is a fallacious one. The money itself is an important reason to hold Autonetics to the contract."

The memo goes on:

"Both the contractor and the Air Force were unrealistic in assessing the ultimate cost of the system. It appears the contractor knew very well what he was getting into but was so anxious to win the competition that he was willing to 'buy in' by quoting a low price."

Then, "the contractor pursued a strategy of using change notices (blaming higher costs on Government-ordered changes) as a means of 'getting well' . . . Autonetics has operated effectively with this kind of strategy for some years in the Minuteman program."

As for the Air Force, it "was also guilty of lack of realism, probably because it was anxious to 'sell' the program to OSD (Office of the Secretary of Defense) and to the Congress. No independent estimate was made of Mark II costs at the time of source selection and, as a result, the Air Force was forced to depend upon the contractor's estimates."

There is a further and deadlier warning in the memo. It says:

"Given the Air Force's desire to get the planes operational it may be willing to accept the aircraft with deficiencies with a view to modifying them at a later date. This would be a mistake for two reasons. First, the dangers of crashes through failure and-or combat losses will be greatly increased if the equipment does not operate satisfactorily. Second, this strategy would mean that the Air Force would not be enforcing the contract."

Moreover, the memo from the Pentagon official predicts:

PROBABLE FAILURE

"Judging from past experience, it is likely that the Air Force will permit GD/FW (General Dynamics, Fort Worth, the prime contractor and builder of the airframe) to install the Mark II equipments in the (deleted) wing of planes even if they do not meet all specifications. These planes will then become operational with the intent of making the necessary retrofits at a later date.

"However, there is a high probability that these aircraft will not function properly in all modes and will experience a high loss rate. Such has been the experience with the F–111A/Mark I aircraft although its avionics is much less sophisticated."

As far as is known, none of the 11 Air Force F–111s that have crashed so far, with six officers and men missing and one dead, have been equipped with the Mark II black boxes. These, it is thought, just now are being installed.

Apart from the cryptic observation that Autonetics' Air Force sympathizers won out, the memo contains few further details on the outcome of the struggle. Those once close to the program say that Autonetics is getting a new "ceiling," near its costs of $3 million, thereby relieving it of its contractual obligations and sparing it from losses.

General Dynamics has been given the uncomfortable job of tracing additional cost increases of change allegedly directed by the Government in order to upset the earlier Air force findings and provide a rationale for the movable "ceiling."

The memorandum notes this is not the end. The Air Force once had a plan to buy 600 more of the Mark II's, a program since cut back substantially because the F–111 has been cut back. One measure of how Autonetics ballooned its costs can be gleaned from this table in the memo, a summary of the changing costs estimates for the full Mark II program—About 800 units:

[In millions]

June 1966	$610
December 1966	850
June 1967	1110
January 1968	1510
November 1968	2510

In other words, the estimated costs when last checked had risen by $1.9 billion or more than 300 per cent.

The Pentagon official who wrote the memo says that his estimates are not precise. The Air Force began bunching together all cost on the F–111, including its avionics, to hide the Mark II spiral.

Another complication for the office of the Defense Secretary was outright misinformation coming from the Air Force. A pencilled note in the memo observes:

"Costs were intentionally understated (in April, 1967) by $385 million in order to 'sell' the program. This includes an 'error' of $170 million and an omission of $215 million."

The "omission" refers to an Air Force device of dropping from embarrassing cost estimates the rising cost of necessary auxiliaries. This is the device invoked to hide the 500 million overrun on spare parts and engines for the C–5A.

The "error" refers to what is believed to be an "honest" mistake. The Air Force at that point had simply "forgotten" $170 million.

The error and omission were turned up by cost analysts working for the Defense Secretary.

There is one more instructive section of the memo, a lucid explanation of why the Air Force pays 60 per cent more than is necessary because of pyramiding profits and burdens.

In a hypothetical example, a subcontractor supplies a $100 component to Autonetics. Autonetics takes a "burden" fee of 25 per cent, raising the cost to $125. It then takes its "normal" 10 per cent profit, lifting the cost to $137.50.

The prime contractor, General Dynamics, then adds on 7.5 per cent "burden" and the cost is now $147.80. GD, of course, also takes its 9 percent profit, lifting the final cost to $161.10.

The memo observes that the Government could have bought the item directly, supplied it to General Dynamics, and saved $61.10.

What the final cost of all the Mark II black boxes will be is a secret till buried with the Air Force and Autonetics. That it will be a rising figure, like that for the first batch of 210, is evident from the memo.

It says: "Although the contract contains firm option prices for the follow-on buy, the Air Force is not planning to use these prices because of the large increase in actual costs which has already occurred."

There is still one more feature to the upside-down economics of the Mark II. Normally, the more of an item you produce, the cheaper are your costs per unit.

In Pentagon jargon, this is graphed as a "learning curve." For an economist, it is the familiar, downward sloping unit cost curve.

For the Mark II, however, the memo remarks:

"The revised estimates show that the forecasted learning curve effect of costs decreasing with quantity will not be realized. In fact, the first year follow-on costs per unit will actually exceed the cost of the units already on contract. In informal discussions, Autonetics officials concede that the prices have been intentionally set high to enable the company to recoup potential losses on the existing contract."

GOVERNMENT SPENDING BY HUNCH, PORK BARREL, AND A PRAYER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Louis Cassels, of United Press International, wrote a series of articles recently based on a month-long investigation of Federal budgetary practices. His conclusions showed very clearly that the taxpayers' money is spent with an almost cavalier disregard for any standards there may be for "value received." Mr. Cassels reported on the basis of well-informed estimates that some $20 to $30 billion of the taxpayers' money is annually wasted or spent ineffectively because of "haphazard spending policies." That is almost as much as we are spending on the Vietnam war each year. It comes down to spending—as the headline on the first Cassells article proclaims—by hunch, pork barrel, and a prayer.

Mr. Cassels' articles are "must" reading for every Member of Congress and I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

GOVERNMENT SPENDING BY HUNCH, PORK BARREL, AND A PRAYER

(By Louis Cassels, UPI senior editor)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Government is wasting huge sums—at least $10 billion a year and probably much more than that—by spending money blindly.

That is the conclusion of a month-long investigation of Federal budgetary practices by United Press International.

The inquiry, which ranged from the White House to Capitol Hill and into numerous departments and agencies, disclosed that:

Little progress has been made in applying to civilian agencies the system introduced in the Pentagon by former Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, under which program decisions are supposed to be based on objective analysis of costs and results.

Even in the Defense Department, systematic analysis thus far has been applied mainly to new weapons systems and has had very limited impact on the bulk of military spending.

As a result, most Federal spending decision—military and civilian—are still being made on the basis of hunches, hopes and pork barrel politico rather than hard facts.

Costly programs, once launched, are continued or expanded year after year, without sufficient effort being made to determine whether they are actually achieving their supposed objectives.

The Government's left hand often doesn't know—or care—what its right hand is doing. It is not unusual to find 8 or 10 different agencies working in the same field with little or no coordination. This leads to overlapping and duplication of programs, and in some cases to such spectacles as one Government agency spending money ($30 million) to subsidize tobacco farmers while another Government agency is trying (with $8 million) to discourage cigarette smoking.

In military procurement particularly, and to a lesser extent in social program, the Government gets locked into long-term commitments running into many billions of dollars through "foot-in-the-door" programs that cost little at first but a great deal later. In some cases, Congress legislates without demanding adequate information about ultimate costs. In others, it is misled by flagrant underestimates of what certain programs or weapons systems eventually will cost.

It is impossible for anyone to tell exactly how many of the taxpayers' dollars are being wasted—or spent ineffectively—because of haphazard spending policies.

"The horrible truth," said a high career official of the General Accounting Office, "is that neither the President nor Congress nor anyone else really knows enough about what the Government is doing, and what results its programs are achieving, to speak with certainty about how much waste there is in our $200 billion a year Federal budget."

Pressed for an estimate, he said $20 billion to $30 billion a year would be a "realistic guess."

Phillip S. Hughes, Deputy Director of the Budget Bureau, said it would be "extremely conservative" to estimate that at least 5 percent of the Government's expenditures are redundant or ineffective. He indicated he would not boggle at an estimate of 10 to 15 percent. Five percent of the present budget is about $10 billion; 15 percent would be nearly $30 billion—as much as the Nation is spending annually on the Vietnam war.

Rep. George Mahon, D-Tex., Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, thought these figures were too high, but conceded in an interview that "there is substantial waste" that could be eliminated by a more rational approach to spending decisions.

The more rational aproach was supposedly introduced throughout the Government in August, 1965, when President Lyndon B. Johnson announced, with considerable fanfare, that he had ordered all major Federal agencies to adopt the so-called "programing-planning-budgeting" (PPB) system which McNamara pioneered at the Pentagon.

Johnson said the new approach to budgeting "will enable us to fulfill the needs of the American people without waste . . . Because we will be able to make sounder decisions than ever before."

Under the PPB system, Federal agencies are supposed to follow a series of analytical steps in determining how much money they need from Congress. Step number 1 is to identify an objective as clearly and precisely as possible. Step number 2 is to consider alternative ways of achieving the objective, comparing them in terms of their relative cost and effectiveness. Step number 3 is to choose the alternative which promises to accomplish the most for the money. Step number 4 is to follow up a program after it is in operation, to measure its actual results and make sure it's working out as expected.

Advocates of PPB have developed some rather sophisticated techniques for analyzing the "cost-effectiveness ratio" of an existing or proposed program. However, the reliability of these techniques is a subject of dispute among economists. Some critics, such as Prof. Frederick C. Mosher of the University of Virginia, contend the system will never work well because many Government decisions entail considerations that cannot be reduced to quantitative terms.

Others, such as Alain C. Enthoven, former Assistant Secretary of Defense who is now vice president of Litton Industries, assert that systematic analysis is the only way to make sure that Government decisions are based on a reasoned judgment of the public interest rather than the jockeying of political and military pressure groups.

Because PPB would bring under analytical scrutiny all Federal activities—even the sacred cow programs dearest to bureaucrats and politicians—the introduction of the system into civilian agencies has not been hailed with universal glee in Washington.

A survey of 25 major Federal departments and agencies showed that all of them now have at least some machinery for systematic analysis.

But the survey turned up only three civilian agencies which are making more than token use of systematic analysis in planning, reviewing and revising their programs. These are the Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW), the Agriculture Department and the Labor Department. Even in these agencies, PPB is still in its infancy.

OVERLAP, DUPLICATION, AND CONTRADICTION

The biggest single cause of Government waste, in the opinion of many administration and congressional officials, is the long-standing practice of drafting appropriations bills on an agency-by-agency basis.

Until very recently, no serious attempt was made at the White House or Congress to look at Government spending on a functional basis—that is, to examine simultaneously and critically all of the things that are being done by all Federal agencies in a particular field.

This lack of overview may not have been a particularly serious matter in years past, when society was simpler, the Government less active, and the lines of responsibility more clearly drawn.

Today, however, there is scarcely a single major Government function that does not cut across department or agency lines. A recent survey by the Senate Government Operations Committee showed that 10 agencies are involved in manpower programs; 18 agencies are conducting programs to improve the natural environment; and 20 have something to do with health.

Daniel P. Moynihan, President Nixon's chief adviser on urban affairs and a veteran of two Democratic administrations, says the Government now has so many programs spread through so many agencies it is hard for policy makers "just to keep up with what is going on," let alone achieve any kind of true coordination.

As a freshman Member of Congress, Rep. William V. Roth, Jr., R-Del., was profoundly shocked last year to discover that no one in Washington could tell him how many Federal aid programs are currently in operation.

He set out to make his own list. After eight months of patient interrogation of individual agencies, he managed to identify 1,050 separate programs under which Federal money is given or loaned to States, cities, institutions or individuals.

Roth has neither the staff nor the authority to determine how much overlapping and duplication there is in this welter of Federal activity. But he figures there's bound to be a lot when—to cite just one field as an example—15 agencies are dispensing funds through 211 separate programs to support higher education.

Specific cases of overlap, duplication and even direct contradiction between Federal programs come to light often enough to indicate that Roth has sound grounds for this suspicion.

Item: The House Appropriations Committee, investigating the Government's marine science activities (on which 11 agencies spend nearly $500 million a year), found the Coast and Geodetic Survey preparing to explore underwater manganese deposits which had only recently been extensively and expensively studied by the Geological Survey.

Item: The Department of Health, Education and Welfare will spend $8 million this year on efforts to discourage smoking, while the Agriculture Department will spend $30 million to subsidize the growing of tobacco.

Item: The Air Force is spending about $600 million a year on its "manned orbiting laboratory" project which is strikingly similar to the spacecraft program of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Critics charge that the manned orbiting laboratory was put into the budget solely to gratify the Air Force's desire for a piece of the action in space research.

One of the cardinal principles of systematic analysis is that spending decisions should be based on a careful calculation of what a program will cost over the long run, rather than during its first year or two of operation, when it is just getting under way.

"This principle is being widely ignored," said Robert Haveman, professor of economics at Grinnell College, Iowa, who is currently on leave to help the joint congressional economic committee investigate how "PPB" is working in Federal agencies.

Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis., vice chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, charged that the armed forces have persistently misled Congress about the ultimate costs of new weapons systems, such as the antiballistic missile (ABM) now under consideration.

Proxmire said in an interview his committee's hearing have established that the Air Force's new C15 airplane "will probably cost the American taxpayer $2 billion more than the original contract ceiling of $3 billion."

Nor is that an unusual case, Proxmire said. "About 90 per cent of the major new weapons systems adopted by the military end up costing at least twice as much as was originally estimated."

Proxmire said the Pentagon's "notorious" readiness to permit a military contractor to double or triple his original price tag has encouraged the price of "buy-in bidding" which a firm deliberately enters an absurdly low bid in order to obtain a defense contract, and then puts in a whopping claim for "unexpected" extra costs.

Proxmire said the Pentagon could stop "buy-in bidding" in a hurry if it began slapping severe penalties on contractors whose costs run far higher than the original estimate. But no move in this direction has been made, he said, because "the connections between the military and the major industries which supply it are very close and very cooperative."

Efforts are being made, both in the administration and in Congress, to provide Government decision makers with more of the kind of information they must have to make sound choices about spending.

The Budget Bureau has instituted an "overview" system under which activities will be grouped for Bureau review by function rather than merely by agency. This means, for example, that manpower programs of all agencies eventually will be examined by one section of the Bureau, all education programs by another, and so on. This operation, however, is quite new and still a long way from being full effective.

The House Appropriations Committee chairman, Rep. Mahon, has introduced a resolution that would require every congressional committee, when recommending creation or expansion of any Federal program, to submit cost estimates for the first five years of its operation. This could help Congress avoid getting mousetrapped by "foot in the door" programs.

Rep. Wilbur Mills, D-Ark., chairman of the House Ways and Means committee, wants Congress to establish a "Government Program Evaluation Commission." It would be similar to the Hoover Commission, Mills said, but would study the substance rather than just the efficiency of each Federal activity, seeking to identify redundant and ineffective programs.

The degree to which systematic analysis becomes a significant tool in budget making in the years ahead will depend on how much support it gets from President Nixon and his new Republican team. Indications to date are that Nixon is sympathetic to the concept but he has been too busy with other problems to give it much attention.

One major step toward increased emphasis on analytical budgeting was taken at the Pentagon last month. Defense Department Comptroller Robert C. Moot ordered the Armed Forces to apply the techniques of cost/effectiveness analysis to all military spending programs, including decisions on such matters as whether to shut down a base, or when to recap aircraft tires.

The new secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Robert Finch, also has displayed a keen interest in putting decisions on a sounder basis. He believes at least 1 percent of all funds appropriated for educational and societal programs should be earmarked for objective evaluation or how the programs work in practice.

All of these initiatives will encounter quiet but formidable opposition from people, in and out of Government, who fear that rational analysis might lead to drastic cutbacks or even elimination of their pet programs. This opposition, being intense and focused, is likely to prevail over the rather diffuse public interest in reducing waste—unless or until the long-suffering American taxpayer really sees red.

THE CREDIT BUREAU BUGABOO

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 19 my Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Banking and Currency Committee will begin hearings on a bill I have introduced designed to protect consumers against some of the abuses of credit reporting agencies.

There have been numerous excellent articles in recent months describing some of these abuses. One of them—by John E. Simonds, of the Gannett News Service—sums up in very able and succinct fashion the problem we will be trying to get at it in the hearings next week.

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

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

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle, Feb. 16, 1969]

RATING FIRMS—CREDIT'S ANONYMOUS BUGABOO

(By John E. Simonds, Gannett News Service)

WASHINGTON.—A recent applicant for a $300 bank loan here was surprised when, after waiting three weeks, he was politely told that a routine credit report failed to verify two other bank loans he had listed as outstanding debts. The prospective borrower was furious. "Who made this investigation?" he demanded.

"I'm sorry, I can't tell you that," the bank official said. "We have a credit rating service that handles these things, and they tell me they can't find any record of your loans at those other banks."

"That's like saying I filed a phoney application!" the man steamed. "I listed all those debts to give you an honest picture. If I had left them out, nobody would have looked for them, and I probably would have got the loan right away."

Finally the bank official agreed to make the $300 loan when the angry man brought in his books of payment stubs for the two loans to show that he actually owed money to the other banks.

"I can't understand it," the bank officer marveled. "If I were you, I wouldn't bother to pay them, if they aren't keeping any records of it."

The banks, of course, were keeping records. But somewhere along the streamlined avenues of computerized financial investigation someone had failed to make a note of the debts, or had been in too big a hurry.

But this man's problem was a minor inconvenience compared with others. Consider the case of a California man who wrote to Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis.

"He was falsely arrested and convicted of a felony in 1962 on a case of mistaken identity," Proxmire told the Senate recently. "In 1963 the real criminal confessed. Despite his innocence, the man has never been able to obtain any credit since even though he is a successful real estate broker."

A Pennsylvania woman complained to Proxmire that an insurance company refused to issue her a major medical policy on the basis of a credit report that she was an alcoholic. "In actual fact," said Proxmire, "the woman had never consumed more than a dozen drinks in 20 years of married life."

A Florida insurance man with 20 years' experience in such matters told Proxmire that "credit investigations are frequently characterized by hearsay evidence, inaccuracies, incompetent investigators and snide insinuations."

What is happening, say Proxmire, Sen. Philip A. Hart, D-Mich., and other members of Congress concerned with privacy and consumer protection, is that a vast network of raw information about the lives of millions is forming and flowing faster than society can manage it.

"While the growth of this information network is somewhat alarming," said Proxmire, "what is even more alarming is the fact the system has been built up with virtually no public regulation or supervision."

The Associated Credit Bureaus of America (ACBA) have more than 2,200 member bureaus serving 400,000 creditors in 36,000 cities and towns in the nation. They keep files on more than 110 million people. In 1967, Proxmire notes, they issued 97 million credit reports.

Among the major firms in the field, the Retail Credit Co. of Atlanta has 1,800 offices in the United States and Canada, and supplies 35 million reports a year to 40,000 customers, specializing in insurance and employment queries.

"Their files include dossiers on 45 million individuals and contain information on drinking, marital discords, adulterous behavior as well as a person's general reputation, habits and morals," Proxmire said.

A typical investigation by the firm has been estimated at 30 minutes, "with much of the information coming from neighbors," he added.

Other fast-growing firms in the area include Hooper-Holmes of Morristown, N.J., with files on nine million people, and Credit Data Corp., of California, which has 20 million credit files on computer tape, is adding 50,000 new files a week and expects within five years to have a file on anyone who has ever applied for credit.

"Credit reporting agencies are absolutely essential in today's credit economy where consumer debt has passed the $100 billion mark," agrees Proxmire. But what is needed, he says, is a system for preventing innocent people from suffering at the hands of careless or insensitive employes and from information that is either inaccurate, irrelevant, outdated or incomplete.

To install some protective controls, Proxmire, chairman of the Senate Banking Committee's financial institutions subcommittee, has proposed legislation that would require credit rating firms to:

Provide a chance for individuals to correct inaccurate or misleading information in their files.

Inform individuals whenever they enter a derogatory item about them in their credit file.

Keep information current and destroy obsolete material.

Limit information released to relevant material, and maintain procedures to insure the confidential treatment of the information and to reduce its currently widespread release to government agencies, market researchers and prospective employers.

The Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and other federal agencies frequently draw on commercial credit rating firms for information on private citizens, the FHA when it is determining whether to grant a home loan, and the FBI and Internal Revenue Service in their law enforcement duties.

"We have considered our voluntary cooperation with these agencies to be in the public interest," an official of the Retail Credit Co. has said. The president of Credit Data Corp., however, says his firm refuses to give such information to government agencies unless it is subpoenaed.

Another part of the Proxmire legislation requires the bank or other firm requesting the credit check to notify the person involved that there is a problem with his credit rating. It also would require the bank to release the name and address of the credit reporting firm to the subject of an unfavorable report.

Thus, the man trying to borrow the $300 would have to be told the name of the credit rating firm, which could not find the record of his two outstanding bank loans. As it now stands, that man's credit rating is in the hands of some nameless, faceless organization which has challenged the accuracy of his credit picture. There is no legal way he can retrace the credit checking system to challenge its report on him.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I am about to introduce a bill. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes, in order to make the presentation properly.

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

S. 2120—INTRODUCTION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I introduce an important bill, the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969. Joining me in sponsoring this measure, which incorporates the administration's recommendations for extending and improving the programs under the Older Americans Act, are the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER).

This is a most urgent piece of legislation since several provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965 will expire this year if Congress fails to act promptly.

The Older Americans Act has only been in existence for 3½ years, but it has already demonstrated that it is a highly effective mechanism for stimulating a national awareness of the need for programs and activities for the increasing numbers of people in this country living in retirement, who too often seem to be the forgotten group.

Mr. President, there are 19 million Americans over 65 in the United States today. By 1971, the number of persons over 65 is expected to increase to over 21 million, and by 1985, the number will reach 25 million. California is proud of the fact that we have the largest senior citizen population in the country. Approximately 1,882,000 citizens over 65, which exceeds the population of 19 individual States, reside in California, and the number of senior citizens in our State grows by 100 a day.

In the city of Los Angeles alone, the present population of seniors is 370,000 and the number is increasing at the rate of 10 percent each year. The seniors living in the city of Los Angeles exceeds the population of two of our smaller States.

The Older Americans Act created the Administration on Aging to serve as the focal point of concern for older persons in this Nation. In just 3½ years, the Administration on Aging, through title III has been instrumental in the creation of State agencies on aging in all but three States. The title provides grants to the States for community planning and projects. By the end of this fiscal year, over 1,000 community projects will have been funded under this title through the State agencies.

In my judgment, title III is the most important title of this very important act. This is the title of the act that is reaching retired citizens and providing services for them at the local level. Federally and State supported, State directed, and locally operated, title III has forged a partnership of all levels of government and private citizens and groups. Under title III, over 660,000 older Americans of all economic, social, and ethnic levels have been well served.

The bill I am introducing today, Mr. President, in addition to extending title III for 3 years, makes various and necessary improvements. First, it amends the provision for Federal sharing of project costs to provide that grants for local community projects will no longer be limited to the 3-year period. Under present law, Federal sharing of project costs is limited to a 3-year period with a maximum of 75 percent for the first year, 60 percent for the second, and 50 percent for the third. This new provision, at the discretion of the States, would allow extension of Federal support for the fourth and subsequent years. This will give the State agencies additional and needed flexibility to plan and to continue good projects. This is a desirable provision, for in some cases, solid programs are in existence that are not yet ready to be financed at the local or community level. This amendment will prevent these programs from going out of existence when the State agency feels that an extension of Federal support is in everyone's best interest.

I am familiar with two programs in California, Mr. President, and I am sure there are others, not only in my State, but in every State throughout the country that will welcome this flexible approach. In both south central Los Angeles and in east Los Angeles, senior groups are having difficulty producing the funds needed to carry out their operations through the fourth year. Under the new proposal, if the State agency deems it wise, Federal funds under title III could be continued. Further, other new title III provisions are aimed at strengthening the State agencies. The provision of State plans would now include statewide planning, coordination, and evaluation of programs. A separate authorization of appropriations for these functions underscore their importance. The Federal sharing for these activities would be increased to a 75 percent Federal, 25 percent State sharing formula.

These amendments will enable State agencies to better direct programs of services to older people in communities and to give the leadership essential to achieving maximum effect. Greater coordination with all agencies involved in activities directly affecting older people is the objective and should be the result.

Mr. President, the California Commission on Aging, ably directed by its chairman, Mrs. A. M. G. "Bonny" Russell, and its executive director, Charles "Chuck" Skoien, Jr., is providing outstanding leadership in developing a statewide plan. Spurring the development of programs for senior Californians throughout the State, their goal is the development of a statewide network of services for seniors. The degree of cooperation that the State agency has achieved is evidenced by the fact that presently 58 counties and 401 cities in the State of California have designated individual citizens to work closely with the California State Commission. This network is well on its way.

The foster grandparent program, administered by the Administration of Aging under contract with the Office of Economic Opportunity, has proved a boon to hundreds of older persons as well as to emotionally deprived and institutionalized children. The stories of success engendered by these programs are heartwarming.

Mr. President, I am pleased to be able to say that finally here is a program that is working so well that the results are amazing even to those of us who supported it at the outset.

The foster grandparents program has been very successful and well received in California. The program is most practical. It recognizes that many neglected and deprived children and youngsters in our institutions and related settings are starving. This is not from lack of food or material wants, but from those intangible needs that really, after all, are what life is all about. It recognizes that many senior citizens have these precious intangible commodities—love, understanding, faith, and time in abundance. Grandparents have been able to offer a much-needed ear, hand, and heart in the specific way that only grandparents have in meeting the very special needs of these young people to change attitudes and to help their aspirations. Thus, in a small but important way they are helping to change America for the better. Mr. President, in examining a 1968 foster grandparent project report of the California Youth Authority, I came across a rather moving letter from a youngster who left home. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

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

DEAR FOLKS: Thank you for everything, but I am going to Chicago and try and start some kind of new life.

You asked me why I did those things and why I gave you so much trouble, and the answer is easy for me to give you, but I am wondering if you will understand.

Remember when I was about six or seven and I used to want you to just listen to me? I remember all the nice things you gave me for Christmas and my birthday and I was really happy with the things—about a week—at the time I got the things, but the rest of the time during the year I really did not want presents, I just wanted all the time for you to listen to me like I was somebody who felt things too, because I remember even when I was young I felt things. But you said you were busy.

Mom, you are a wonderful cook, and you had everything so clean and you were tired so much from doing all those things that made you busy; but, you know something Mom? I would have liked crackers and peanut butter just as well if you had only sat down with me a while during the day and said to me: "Tell me all about it so I can maybe help you understand!"

And when Donna came I couldn't understand why everyone made so much fuss because I didn't think it was my fault that her hair is curly and her skin so white, and she doesn't have to wear glasses with such thick lenses. Her grades were better too, weren't they?

If Donna ever has children, I hope you will tell her to just pay some attention to the one who doesn't smile very much because that one will really be crying inside. And when she's about to bake six dozen cookies, to make sure first, that the kids don't want to tell her about a dream or a hope or something, because thoughts are important too, to small kids even though they don't have so many words to use when they tell about what they have inside them.

I think that all the kids who are doing so many things that grown-ups are tearing out their hair worrying about are really looking for somebody that will have time to listen a few minutes and who really and truly will treat them as they would a grown-up who might be useful to them, you know—polite to them. If you folks had ever said to me: "Pardon me" when you interrupted me, I'd have dropped dead!

If anybody asks you where I am, tell them I've gone looking for somebody with time because I've got a lot of things I want to talk about.

Love to all,

YOUR SON.

Mr. MURPHY. In addition, I ask unanimous consent that various letters describing the benefits of the foster grandparents program be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MURPHY. The bill I am introducing today would add to the Older Americans Act a new title VI, authorizing and making permanent a foster grandparent and senior companion program. The President, in his economic opportunity message to Congress, indicated that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare would take over the foster grandparent program. Since the Department already administers the foster grandparent program, this means placing the funding for it and having the complete responsibility in one agency.

The new senior companion program builds on the successful experience of our foster grandparent program by extending these special, personal and human relations to older persons who are in institutions or who are homebound. Under both the foster grandparents and the senior companion program, preference is given to projects in which priority is given to older persons of low income who are no longer in the regular work force. In keeping with President Nixon's call for volunteer efforts, senior citizens, other than those of low income, can take part in the foster grandparent and senior companion programs as voluntary participants. Such volunteers, however, may only be compensated for incidental expenses such as transportation and meals during their service.

That senior citizens are interested in giving of their time, energy, and ability can be illustrated by the Senior Californian Service Corps. This volunteer program has attracted thousands of senior Californians in local community projects throughout the State. In one of these programs with which I am familiar, senior Californians voluntarily contributed 31,213 hours of service to their community last year. I am referring to the 164 senior Californians of Walnut Creek. Their contributions ranged from the stuffing of more than 60,000 letters for the March of Dimes to the staffing of the community's Hospitality House 7 days of the week. They have a visiting service for the bedridden, have worked at the Veterans' Hospital in Livermore, and made 42 dolls for the distribution at the Napa State Hospital at Christmas. I ask unanimous consent that an article describing the Walnut Creek volunteers be printed following my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the special grants for research, development, and training provided under titles IV and V of the Older Americans Act are pointing the way to new and effective approaches to many of the problems of retirement. The results of title IV research are just beginning to come in. For example, in the April 27 Sunday newspaper supplement, "Parade," a study by the University of Southern California, on the development of exercise programs for senior citizens and for senior centers is most interesting. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in full at the end of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in summary, the bill I introduced today would strengthen the State agencies, allow greater flexibility for the States under title III by extending the period of Federal support, establish and make permanent the foster grandparent and senior companion program, and extend the various titles of the Older Americans Act for a 3-year period. The Older Americans Act has developed an effective Federal-State-local partnership. It enjoys almost unanimous and bipartisan support in the Congress. I am hopeful that this kind of support will continue because this act focuses on those citizens in our country who have done so much and contributed so much in building our great Nation. The Older Americans Act has enabled us to utilize the many talents and abilities of our senior citizens and has provided our senior citizens with an opportunity to be productive and cre-

ative and to maintain their dignity and self-respect.

Mr. President, I believe prompt consideration and enactment of this legislation will help move forward our efforts on behalf of the older citizens of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that three project profiles depicting activities in California under title III be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, in addition, I ask unanimous consent that various articles describing some of California's senior citizens who have been cited by the California State commission for "service to others" be printed in the RECORD.

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

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the full text of the bill and a summary of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2120) to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration, to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that act introduced by Mr. MURPHY (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. 2120

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 "Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969".

EXTENSION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 2.(a) The second sentence of section 301 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3021) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary for each of the next 3 fiscal years".

(b) The second sentence of section 603 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3053) is amended by striking out "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law" and inserting in lieu thereof "such sums as may be necessary for each of the next 3 fiscal years".

EXTENSION OF DURATION OF PROJECT SUPPORT

SEC. 3.(a) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, the last sentence of section 302(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended:

(1) by inserting "such percentage of the cost of any project as the State agency (designated or established pursuant to section 303(a)(1)) may provide but not in excess of" before "75 per centum";

(2) by striking out "the third year of such project" and all that follows down to but excluding the period and inserting in lieu thereof "the third and any subsequent year of such project".

(b) Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 303(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3023) of such Act is amended by striking out "after termination of Federal financial support under this title".

STATE PLAN REQUIREMENTS FOR PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION

SEC. 4. Effective with respect to appropriations for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 303(a) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3023) is amended by striking out ", and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible" in clause (3); by redesignating clauses (4) through (8) as clauses (5) through (9), respectively; and by adding the following new clause after clause (3):

"(4) provides for statewide planning, coordination, and evaluation of programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary after consultation with representatives of the State agencies established or designated as provided in clause (1);".

GRANTS FOR STATE PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

SEC. 5. (a) Effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969, section 304 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3024) is amended to read as follows:

"PLANNING, COORDINATION, AND EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

"SEC. 304. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next 2 fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for making grants to each State, which has a State plan approved under this title, to pay such percentage, not in excess of 75 per centum, as the State agency (established or designated as provided in section 303(a)(1)) may provide, of the costs of planning, coordinating, and evaluating programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act and of administering the State plan approved under this title.

"(b)(1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under subsection (a), the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa shall each be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum or $25,000, whichever is greater, and each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to 1 per centum of such sum.

"(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

"(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this section shall be equal to the sum of the amounts allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2); except that if such sum is for any State, other than the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa, less than $75,000 it shall be increased to that amount, the total of the increases thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing such sum for each of the remaining States (except the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa), but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent such sum for any of such remaining States from being reduced to less than $75,000.

"(c) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year which the Secretary determines will not be required for meeting the costs in such State referred to in subsection (a) shall be reallotted from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in meeting the costs referred to in subsection (a) for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (b) and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts for meeting such costs during the period for which the original allotment was available. Such reallotments shall be made on the basis of such need and ability, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (b).

"(d) The allotment of any State under subsection (b) for any fiscal year shall be available for payments pursuant to this section to State agencies which have provided reasonable assurance that there will be expended for the purposes for which such payments are made, for the year for which such payments are made and from funds from State sources, not less than the amount expended for such purposes from such funds for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969."

(b) Subsection (a)(3) of section 302 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended by striking out "title" and inserting in lieu thereof "section". Subsection (b) of such section is amended by striking out "for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title" and inserting in lieu thereof "for grants with respect to projects in the State under this title".

REALLOTMENT

SEC. 6. The first sentence of section 302(b) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3022) is amended by striking out "the State notifies the Secretary will" and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary determines will".

EXTENSION OF CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS AND TRAINING PROJECTS

SEC. 7. (a) Section 401 of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3031) is amended by striking out "any such agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "any agency".

(b) Section 501 of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3041) is amended to read as follows: "The Secretary is authorized to make grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution, and contracts with any agency, organization, or institution, for the specialized training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act."

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS AND SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

SEC. 8. The Older Americans Act of 1965, is further amended by redesignating title VI as title VII, by redesignating sections 601 through 603, and references thereto, as sections 701 through 703, respectively, and by inserting after title V the following new title:

"TITLE VI—FOSTER GRANDPARENTS AND SENIOR COMPANION PROGRAM

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR PERSON-TO-PERSON SERVICE PROJECTS

"SEC. 601. (a) The Secretary shall carry out a program of grants and contracts in accordance with this title. There are authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and each of the next 2 fiscal years such sums as may be necessary for grants to or contracts with public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations to pay not to exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the development and operation of projects designed to provide opportunities for persons

aged sixty or over (to be known as 'Foster Grandparents' in the case of services described in clause (1) and 'Senior Companions' in the case of services described in clause (2) or (3)) to render personal services on an individual relationship basis—

"(1) to children receiving care in hospitals, homes for dependent or neglected children, or other establishments providing care for children with special needs;

"(2) to older persons receiving institutional care in hospitals, nursing homes, intermediate care facilities, or homes for the aged; and

"(3) to persons in need of special personalized assistance because of physical infirmities or other special circumstances.

"(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

"CONDITIONS OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS

"SEC. 602. (a) The Secretary shall not award any grant or contract under this title for a project in any State to any agency or organization unless, if such State has a State agency established or designated pursuant to section 303(a)(1), such agency is the recipient of the award or the project application has been submitted to such agency for review and recommendations.

"(b) In administering this title the Secretary shall—

"(1) give preference to projects in which priority will be given in the enrollment of participants to older persons of low income who are no longer in the regular work force;

"(2) award a grant or contract for a project only if he determines that the project will not result in the displacement of employed workers or impair existing contracts for services;

"(3) award a grant or contract for a project proposed to be undertaken in (and to be limited to) a single community served by a community action agency only if—

"(A) such agency is the recipient of such award or has been afforded a reasonable opportunity to apply for and receive such award; and

"(B) in cases in which such agency does not receive such award, the application contains or is supported by satisfactory assurance that the project has been developed, and will to the extent appropriate be conducted, in consultation with, or with the participation of, such agency;

"(4) award a grant or contract to any agency or organization for a project in which older persons other than those of low income (as determined in accordance with criteria prescribed by the Secretary) are to be enrolled as participants only upon reasonable assurance that such enrollees will not receive reimbursement or compensation from such agency or organization with respect to such participation except for incidental expenses such as transportation and meals.

"(c) The term 'community action agency', as used in this section, means a community action agency established under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

"INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

"SEC. 603. In administering this title, the Secretary shall consult with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Labor, and any other Federal agency administering programs related to the program under this title with a view to achieving optimal coordination of the program under this title with such other programs and shall promote the coordination of projects under this title with other public or private programs or projects carried out at State or local levels. Such Federal agencies shall cooperate with the Secretary in disseminating information about the availability of assistance under this title and in promoting the identification and interest of older persons whose services may be utilized in projects under this title."

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

SEC. 9. For the purpose of section 701 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, payments made to or on behalf of any person under a project (of the kind formerly carried on under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) assisted under the title VI of the Older Americans Act of 1965 added thereto by this Act shall be deemed to be payments made to or on behalf of such person under title I of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

EVALUATION

SEC. 10. The title of the Older Americans Act of 1965 herein redesignated as title VII is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

"SEC. 704. Such portion of any appropriation under title III or VI or section 703 for any fiscal year ending after June 30, 1969, as the Secretary may determine, but not exceeding 1 per centum thereof, shall be available to the Secretary for evaluation (directly or by grants or contracts) of the programs authorized by this Act and, in the case of allotments from such an appropriation, the amount available for such allotments (and the amount deemed appropriated therefor) shall be reduced accordingly."

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

SEC. 11. (a) Sections 102(3) and 302(a)(1) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3002, 3022) are each amended by inserting "the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands," after "Guam,".

JOINT FUNDING OF PROJECTS

SEC. 12. The Older Americans Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof (after section 704, added by section 10 of this Act) the following new section:

"JOINT FUNDING OF PROJECTS

"SEC. 705. Pursuant to regulations prescribed by the President, where funds are advanced for a single project by more than one Federal agency to an agency, organization, institution, or person assisted under this Act, any one Federal agency may be designated to act for all in administering the funds advanced. In such cases, a single non-Federal share requirement may be established according to the proportion of funds advanced by each Federal agency, and any such agency may waive any technical grant or contract requirement (as defined by such regulations) which is inconsistent with the similar requirements of the administering agency or which the administering agency does not impose."

The summary, presented by Mr. MURPHY, follows:

SUMMARY OF OLDER AMERICANS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1969

DURATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS

1. Extends authorization of appropriations for allotments to States for projects for community planning, services, and training for 3 years beyond the present fiscal year 1969 expiration date, without any dollar ceilings.

2. Similarly extends, without dollar ceilings, authorization for grants and contracts under title IV[1] for research, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects and under title V[1] for training projects.

DURATION OF FEDERAL SUPPORT FOR PROJECTS

Removes the present 3 year limitation on the duration of Federal financial support for community projects under title III,[1] with the maximum Federal share continuing at the present third year maximum of 50% of the cost of the project (present first year and second year maxima retained at 75% and 60%, respectively).

STATE PLAN REQUIREMENT ON PLANNING

Adds new requirement for approved State plans under title III[1] that the State plan must provide for State-wide planning, coordination, and evaluation, in accord with Federal criteria, of programs and activities related to the purposes of the Older Americans Act.

GRANTS FOR STATE PLANNING AND ADMINISTRATION

Authorizes separate appropriations (of such sums as necessary) for grants to States to pay up to 75% of the costs of planning, coordinating, and evaluating programs and activities related to the purposes of the Older Americans Act of 1965 and of administering the approved State title III[1] plan. Three year program authorized.

(a) This substitutes for present provision under which States may use up to 10% or $25,000, whichever is greater, to pay up to ½ of the cost of State plan administration.

(i) Would allot appropriations among States on basis of relative number of persons aged 65 and over, after basic allotment to each State of 1% (½% or $25,000, whichever is greater, in case of the Virgin Islands, Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and American Samoa), but with minimum allotment of $75,000 for States eligible for the 1%.

(ii) Provides for reallotment to other States if Secretary determines a State will not need all or part of its allotment.

(iii) Conditions State's eligibility under this provision on maintenance of its FY 1969 fiscal effort for the same purposes.

REALLOTMENT

Amends provision on reallotment under title III[2] relating to community projects for planning, services, and training so as to provide for reallotment if Secretary determines the State will not need all or part of its allotment—presently provides for reallotment only if State notifies Secretary it will not need its allotment.

CONTRACT AUTHORITY FOR RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, OR TRAINING PROJECTS

Authorizes contracts for research, development, demonstration, or evaluation projects under title IV[2] and for training projects under title V[2] to be made with private profit-making organizations and persons, as well as (now provided under existing law) with public or nonprofit private groups and persons.

FOSTER GRANDPARENTS AND SENIOR COMPANIONS

Authorizes appropriations (of such sums as necessary) for grants and contracts for public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations for paying up to 90% of the cost of development and operation of projects providing opportunities for foster grandparents and senior companions to render personal services on an individual relationship basis. Three year program authorized.

(a) Services to be provided by—

(1) "Foster Grandparents" to children in hospitals or homes or other establishments providing care for children with special needs.

(ii) "Senior Companions" to older persons receiving institutional care and to other persons in need of special personalized assistance because of physical infirmities or other special circumstances.

(b) Projects to be awarded only to State title III[2] agency or after review and recommendation by that agency.

(c) (1) Preference required in awarding

[1] Of Older Americans Act of 1965.

[2] Of Older Americans Act of 1965.

grants or contracts to projects giving priority to low-income persons no longer in regular work force.

(ii) Project must not displace employed workers or impair existing service contracts.

(iii) In case of a project in a single community with a community action agency (under the Economic Opportunity Act), such agency must have reasonable opportunity to be the recipient of the award or the project must have been developed, and be conducted with appropriate consultation or participation, of such agency.

(iv) Non-low-income participants in project may receive only reimbursement for incidental expenses such as transportation and meals.

(d) Federal interagency consultation and cooperation provided for in administering this program, as is coordination of projects under it with other State or local projects.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Provides that, for purposes of section 701 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (relating to disregard of parts of payments under provisions of that Act is determining need for assistance under approved State public assistance plans), payment to participants under foster grandparents projects of the kind formerly carried on under that Act shall be treated like payments under title I of that Act.

EVALUATION

Authorized up to 1% of appropriations for title III [4] (community planning, services, and training) or title VI [4] (foster grandparents and senior companions), or for research, development, demonstration, evaluation, or training projects, to be used by the Secretary for evaluation of the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act of 1965.

TRUST TERRITORY OF THE PACIFIC ISLANDS

Extends Older Americans Act of 1965 to Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

JOINT FUNDING

Authorizes single Federal agency to Act for several where they advance funds for a single project of an agency or organization aided under the Act and provides for certain other simplification of requirements in such a case.

EXHIBIT 1

COMMENTS REGARDING THE FOSTER GRANDPARENTS PROGRAM TAKEN FROM CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY REPORT

DEAR MR. BRINSON: I just take pleasure in writing you these few lines to express my opinion as well as my gratitude of the Foster Grandparent Program. I think it's just wonderful and me and my husband enjoy working with the boys so very much. We are both so much in love with children, we never had any of our own. We enjoy talking with them and giving them things such as: soda water, candy, koolaid and other little items. It also has been a great financial lift, it has helped us catch up on many of our bills and also our taxes was way behind and we have almost caught up with them. So may God bless this program and I hope and pray it will spread all over every where and help more senior citizens.

Sincerely,

MRS. BIRDIE OLIVER.

DEAR MR. BRINSON: When I applied for this job I was quite depressed over the loss of my husband and my dear mother. Getting this job has brought me out of my depression and I am doing the kind of work I like—with boys and children.

Seeing these boys I realized they had more problems than I had, they need help and loving care, which I am trying to give them. I think I am giving this to them not only from my hall but from other halls. When I am passing over to my hall, other boys call "Hi" Grandma Anna. On Sundays the boys from other halls come over and talk to me.

I had a Foster grandson who was transferred to Preston, from whom I got a Easter card, a letter and a Mother's Day card. I am keeping up my correspondence with him and telling him to keep up his good behavior.

From this Project I got myself a washing machine and paid off some debts.

MRS. BIGALL.

To: Mr. Lowell Brinson, Grandparent Program Supervisor, Northern California Youth Center.

From: Mr. Lue Flake, Academic Teacher, Fresno Hall, O. H. Close School for Boys, Department of the Youth Authority.

DEAR MR. BRINSON: I wish to express my appreciation at this time for the Grandparent Program.

For some ten months or better, I have had the privilege of having the grandparents as Aides within the classroom. They have been very useful and have filled a void for many of the boys on our Hall that could not have been filled otherwise.

At present, I have two members from the Grandparent Program assigned to my classroom and am desirous of keeping them as they are giving me exceptional service. The boys look forward to their appearance each morning. Through their influence, many worthwhile lessons not contained within the textbooks have been taught these boys by their Hall Grandparents.

Thank you, through your assistance with the Grandparents, for Fresno Hall.

LUE FLAKE,
Academic Teacher, Fresno Hall.

To: Mr. Brinson, Project Coordinator, Foster Grandparent Program.

From: Louis Puente, Superintendent, Karl Holton School for Boys.

DEAR MR. BRINSON: The Foster Grandparent Project at the Karl Holton School has increased in effectiveness during the past few months to a degree that special comment seems appropriate at this time. The regular staff and wards are most appreciative of the contributions the grandparents are making with their varied talents in the rehabilitation of juvenile delinquents noteably in the fields of counseling, tutoring, crafts teachers, assistant shop instructors and teacher's aides in the academic classrooms.

The minority group grandparents have been able to relate and motivate negro and mexican-american youth to work toward a change in attitudes and improved values. Many of these boys have not been influenced in the past to change their delinquent behavior because of cultural and communication barriers existing between them and the regular staff. Even where regular staff were capable of relating to minority groups, they did not have enough time to give these boys the attention they needed to bring about any changes in their behavior. The grandparents have, or take enough time to work with the total needs of the boy in the most effective type of sub-professional casework methods.

The fifteen grandparents at Karl Holton have proven that sub-professionals can develop a high degree of effectiveness in dealing with delinquent youth in less than one year and do contribute immeasureably of their varied experiences and talents to helping institutionalized boys prepare for their return to the community. The generation gap is being bridged between many of the wayward boys and their foster grandparents in the institutional setting.

We hope that additional grandparents will be made available to us as we increase our population from 200 to 400 boys in the near future.

LOUIS PUENTE,
Superintendent.

MR. LOWELL BRINSON,
Coordinator, Foster Grandparents Project, Northern California Youth Center.

DEAR MR. BRINSON: I want you to know how much I value and support the Foster Grandparent Project of which you are the coordinator. For the past year, I have been privileged to watch the project's growth in increased impact on the wards of my hall.

Mr. Lewis Wilson, foster-grandparent on Butte Hall, has been teaching lapidary arts in a small rock shop set up in a corner of my arts and crafts shop. The relationships and skills that he has given to the boys who have come under his care and guidance has added immeasurably to their feelings of self-worth and sense of accomplishment. The example that he sets for the wards of honesty of feelings, independence and strength of character serves as a model for them to emulate.

Needless to say, I am very pleased with the success of Mr. Wilson and the Foster Grandparent Project. I selfishly wish for a hundred more like him. I thank you for making him available to my shop program. Without him the program would not be nearly as effective.

Yours sincerely,

SEIGI KUGE,
Arts & Crafts Teacher, O. H. Close School For Boys.

EXHIBIT 2

THESE SENIOR CITIZENS ARE TOO BUSY FOR ROCKING CHAIRS—CONTRIBUTIONS TO COMMUNITY BRING STATE HONORS FOR FIVE

Take five people, retired, with time on their hands.

Set them down in a community that cares.

And everyone benefits—as witness the 5,135 hours of time contributed by Florian Stark, Harry Babcock, Mrs. Minnie Verrey, Mrs. Florence Million and Mrs. Nellie Cook during the year 1968 to the community of Walnut Creek.

If there is any kind of a job that a retired person can do for the community, one of the quintet has done it along with other members of their club . . . stuff envelopes for charity, make kits for the Red Cross, help under privileged children, knit sweaters for orphans, prepare bandages for the children's hospital . . . the list goes on and on.

Why do they do this?

Because the community has done so much for them and their fellow members (the community that cares) and they figure that by contributing their time, talents, and abilities through their Walnut Creek Senior Citizen Center they can repay the community for the money, the building, the personnel that has been marshalled in their behalf.

The State of California Commission on Aging asked Walnut Creek for permission to cite some of its Seniors as examples of how it is to the mutual benefit of a community and the Seniors to have an organized program, based on sincere personal interest, in behalf of the town's retirees.

The Commission's executive director, Charles W. Skoien, Jr., said in his Sacramento office:

"Work with Seniors is not a 'social program.' Rather, it is that of a community family, where the older person is looked on as a Father or Mother, and all efforts are bent towards making their retirement years as pleasant as possible.

"It is to show what can be done on the grass-roots level, in the community itself, that we are directing attention to this wonderful group of five from Walnut Creek and their fellow members.

"This can be duplicated anywhere in the State of California . . . first by organizing a formal county committee or commission on aging, followed by the forming of city committees, and ultimately, neighborhood committees so that every Senior Californian has a place to go or someone to talk to.

"Walnut Creek has found it pays. Even if we were to analyze the contributions by the

[3] Of Older Americans Act of 1965.
[4] Of Older Americans Act of 1965.

dollars and cents yardstick, the return would be tremendous. It is estimated that 165 Seniors contributed 45,382 hours to Walnut Creek during 1968. The community's dollar investment in plant, facilities, programs and personnel to serve the Seniors is estimated at $8,470.00 for the year.

"But, the dollar is not the measure when it comes to respect for our elderly," Skoien said, "It is the demonstration that we care—that we cherish them as Mothers and Fathers and Friends."

Florian Stark, born in Montana, was a supervisor with a Chevrolet Process Laboratory. He favors the center's "friendly visit" program, going to hospitals, taking magazines, running errands, and doing what he can to brighten the patients' day.

Florian Stark has 1125 hours to his credit for the year, which is approximately 22 hours a week.

He is active in his church, serves as public relations for the Senior Citizen Club, visits the ill and crippled, gathers clothing for the needy and helps with transportation.

During the year he took charge of collecting over 10,000 magazines and books, saw that they were separated and distributed to the Red Cross, hospitals, convalescent homes and veterans hospitals. He collects stamps for overseas children, writes for the Senior Citizen Bulletin and also attends meetings for the Club.

Harry Babcock, born in New York State, was in recreation and education and has a project that tugs at the heart, helping underprivileged children. He and Mrs. Babcock have one son, a doctor, three grandchildren and two greatgrandchildren; hence, their compassion for children.

Harry Babcock has given 1302 hours during 1968, which is approximately 25 hours a week.

Babcock spends many hours patterning a brain damaged child, helps to prepare and serve City Council dinners at the Hospitality House, visits sick members and welcomes new ones. He buys supplies for the Senior Club meetings and represents the club at various meetings.

He also helps in a book store, baby-sits and provides transportation for those who don't have transportation when needed.

Mrs. Minnie Verrey, born in Arizona and a retired telephone company employee, is chairman of the Walnut Creek Hospitality House Committee, specializing in helping lonely Seniors meet other Seniors, getting them on committees which staff the house seven days a week.

Minnie Verrey has accumulated 967 hours for the past year, approximately 18 hours a week.

These were spent in arranging for Hosts and Hostesses at the Hospitality House and also seeing that the Hospitality House is well supplied and in good condition. She is also ready to help with any work the city or recreation department might send to be done.

She attends various meetings for the club and also helps in other organizations.

Mrs. Florence Million, who admits to being a youngster of 82, born in New Mexico, belonged to several organizations which qualified her as "Sunshine Chairman" for the club. She visits the sick and sends get-well cards to those she cannot reach. She also sends birthday cards to each club member to celebrate their "special" day.

Florence Million has 721 hours posted for 1968 and is Club Sunshine chairman. She is responsible for seeing that each member receives a birthday card and also sends cards to those who are ill.

She works on the phone committee, is active in her church and several other organizations and brightens the lives of underprivileged children with colorful crafts.

Mrs. Nellie H. Cook, born in Illinois and soon to be 80, is decorator chairman in charge of a committee of 10 and respected for being a "doer" rather than "talker." She has "two families"—the Seniors and her own family of two children, six grandchildren and 16 great-grandchildren.

Nellie Cook, with 1020 hours averages 19 hours a week. She phones and visits the ill and lonely, helps with a crafts class, prepares material for the Recreation Pre-school classes, works as Hostess in the Hospitality House, helps with city work (assembly bulletins, etc.), buys supplies for parties and still finds time for church work and other organizations. "The hands of these five are representative of the hands of Seniors throughout the State at California, extended to help other hometown Seniors," Skoien said. "A Senior not knowing the location of a Center in his local area is invited to write for information to the California Commission on Aging, 1108 14th Street, Sacramento 95814, contact the local recreation department.

EXHIBIT 3

HOW TO GROW YOUNG

(By Andrew Hamilton)

LAGUNA HILLS, CALIF.—For many years, Clarence Dayton, a jeweler in Huntington Park, Calif., suffered from excruciating migraine headaches. He felt as tense inside as a tightly wound watch.

"I ate aspirin tablets like peanuts," he said, "but nothing seemed to deaden the pain."

Last year at age 67, he started on a program of prescribed exercises, and within six weeks the headaches vanished. Physiological tests showed that his nervous tension had virtually disappeared.

"In my whole life, I'd hardly ever worked up a good sweat," he admitted. "But the routine I follow today makes me feel so good I exercise out-of-doors even when it's raining."

Stocky Charles Jamieson, a former Detroit dentist who confesses to being "over 60," says that body conditioning helped him to lose weight and to sleep better.

William Kinsey, 87-year-old retired president of the Union Theological Seminary in the Philippines, repeats a jogging routine (200 running steps, ten walking steps) three times a week.

"Jogging," he said, "has made a much younger man out of me."

Dayton, Jamieson and Kinsey are among 150 oldsters who are taking part in a unique, long-range, scientific study. It seems to indicate that men in their 60's and 70's can retain much of the vigor and physical functions of their 40's. The secret: carefully planned exercise.

This research is being conducted at Leisure World, a plush retirement community in Laguna Hills, Calif.—50 miles south of Los Angeles. In charge is husky, quiet-spoken Dr. Herbert deVries of the University of Southern California's Gerontology Center, which is zeroing in on problems of the aged.

MIND AND BODY

It is generally agreed that exercise promotes a feeling of mental and physical well-being.

But what kind of exercise?

And how much?

Is exercise more effective in preventing serious health problems or in treating them?

Can it slow down aging?

Dr. deVries' research is one of several projects in American universities and hospitals seeking to answer these basic questions. The U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare is supporting his program with a grant of $46,763.

The deVries study was launched about a year ago. He and his assistant, Dr. Kenneth E. Lersten, recruited a small staff, purchased a mammoth green-and-white trailer, and equipped it with instruments that measure heart rate, oxygen consumption, blood flow, body fat and carbon dioxide production. They parked the vehicle behind Leisure World's Medical Center and ordered a sign painted on it, Mobile Laboratory for Physiology of Exercise and Aging Research.

Before long, curious senior citizens began to drift in. One of the first was 68-year-old Raymond Halldorson, retired oil marketing expert. "Can't hurt anything," he said. "Might do me some good."

Like all who joined the program, six-footer Halldorson underwent a head-to-toe physical examination by his own doctor. Then came four tests, developed by Dr. deVries, that stretched over a three-week period: (1) a physiological efficiency profile, or PEP for short; (2) a second PEP plus an oxygen intake test; (3) a telemetry test in which Halldorson's heart was monitored by a short-wave device strapped to his belt while he ran up and down on the sidewalk outside the mobile laboratory; and (4) a cardiac output test while he pedaled a stationary bicycle.

"In the beginning I was a bit apprehensive," said Halldorson. "I had a lurking fear Dr. deVries might find out something about my heart or lungs I didn't want to know."

But Halldorson was pronounced fit. Out of 150 participants, ranging in age from 52 to 87, only about 20 have been eliminated because of heart irregularities.

Halldorson was then assigned to a 25-man exercise group that met three times a week. This was the crux of the experiment. *Would exercise be beneficial to the oldsters?*

Starting off slowly, they worked into a four-part huff-and-puff schedule: (1) a modified version of the Royal Canadian Air Force calisthenics; (2) a jogging program, alternately running and walking; (3) a static stretching routine to limber up joints and muscles; (4) swimming—"the fun part."

When they gathered on the grassy lawn near the Leisure World Medical Center, the exercise groups looked like a platoon from Coxey's Army. Walking shorts, sweat suits, ski sweaters. Baseball caps, yachting caps, Panama straws—and occasionally, a beret. Tennis shoes, basketball shoes, leather sandals.

"We do a lot of kidding amoung ourselves," said Halldorson. "One group dubbed itself Leisure World Olympic Team of 1968."

But results that began to show up in before-and-after group averages were not at all funny. Statistics indicated dramatic improvement in physical conditioning. Tested at the end of 6, 18 and 42 weeks, the Leisure Worlders showed this kind of group-average improvement:

Diastolic blood pressure lowered by 6 percent.

Body fat decreased 4.8 percent.

Maximum oxygen consumption, the best single measure of an individual's vigor, increased 9.2 percent.

Oxygen pulse, a measure of cardiovascular function, improved 8.4 percent.

Arm strength increased by 7.2 percent.

Other indicators of working capacity: gains of 7 to 9 percent.

"One of the most significant changes that occurred as a result of the exercise program was the startling drop in nervous tension," pointed out Dr. deVries.

"In the first 41 experimental subjects, we saw a reduction of about 15 percent in nervous tension—as compared with a control group of non-exercisers. Tension is often a neglected area of health and physical education, yet it poses a serious health hazard to the middle-aged and elderly."

AGING SLOWED DOWN

Though his research is not yet completed, Dr. deVries is convinced that exercise has both preventive and therapeutic value. On the basis of health benefits produced in the Leisure World participants, Dr. deVries offers

the hypothesis that exercise may prolong human life by slowing down the aging process.

One of his long-range goals is to develop a "pharmacopoeia of exercise." This would be a reference book that doctors could use to look up the kind and amount of exercise that an individual, after a physical examination, should have.

"The time is not too far away," he says, "when it will be possible to prescribe exercise with the same scientific detail and exactness as that now employed in writing a prescription for drugs or medicine."

Dr. deVries is collecting detailed information for such a pharmacopoeia, which would be combined with results from many other laboratories.

Thousands of individual statistics are fed into a typewriter terminal in his mobile laboratory and flashed to an IBM System/360 Model 50 computer in Santa Ana, 20 miles away. There, the tiny bits of information are sorted, evaluated and stored to build a model for prescribing exercise.

Dr. deVries agrees with his friend Dr. Kenneth H. Cooper, U.S. Air Force physician and author of the best-selling book, *Aerobics*, that the best kind of fitness is "endurance fitness." This is the ability to do prolonged work without fatigue.

"It has to do with the body's overall health—the health of the heart, the lungs, the entire cardiovascular system and the other organs, as well as the muscles," Dr. Cooper wrote.

"The key to the whole things is oxygen. The best kind of exercise, therefore, is that which demands oxygen and forces your body to process and deliver it. Even if you've been inactive or sick, exercise may be good therapy."

CYCLISTS LEAD ALL

One scientific authority claims that the most efficient hearts are to be found among professional cyclists. Then, in descending order: long-distance runners, amateur cyclists, cross-country skiers, boxers, handball players, gymnasts, wrestlers and weight lifters. Isometric exercises may help make your muscles bulge, but they do little for your heart and lungs.

Dr. Paul Dudley White (who favors cycling as the best exercise) long ago convinced medical men and laymen that exericse is good for the heart. It was he who treated President Eisenhower during his heart attacks and put him on a regimen of exercise.

"Heart disease before 80 is your fault, not God's will," he told a meeting of the National Association of Retired Persons.

What about the man who slacks off during his middle years? Is it safe for him to crank up to full vigor again? The answer is yes, according to a study made by Dr. John O. Holloszy of the U.S. Public Health Service with 15 men aged 35 to 55 who had gone soft from modern living.

The blood of all who participated contained high levels of serum triglycerides which some doctors consider more dangerous than cholesterol. After six months of running exercises they lowered their heartbeats an average of 15 per minute, cut their time in the mile run from nearly 9 minutes to 7½ minutes, and reduced the serum triglycerides in their blood from an average of 205 milligrams to a healthy 105.

Exercise is being used to treat a wide variety of ailments. Hospital bed rest is almost obsolete, and many patients are made ambulatory soon after operations for hernia, appendicitis and even fractures. But each health problem requires a certain kind of exercise. The wrong kind, or too much of the right kind, can be dangerous.

Here are some examples of ailments that respond to exercise:

Emphysema

At the National Jewish Hospital and Research Center in Denver, exercise constitutes almost the entire therapy program. First, patients are taught a series of exercises to bring up mucous from their lungs to their throats where it can be coughed out. Then they are taught to breathe a new way: by using the large rib muscles to do the work that the lung tissue cannot; finally, they are taught body-building exercises.

Asthma

Similarly in the treatment of asthma, younger patients at the National Jewish Hospital exercise daily by playing softball, football, basketball or soccer. Even though they compete on fields where the pollen count may be high, no patient has ever suffered a serious attack that could be attributed to the exercise.

Diabetes

Exercise burns up excess sugar in the blood and reduces the need for insulin. Diabetics are taught that "exercise is the pleasantest remedy"—provided it is regular and in about the same amount each day.

Orthopedic problems

One of the first branches of medicine to recognize the value of exercise was orthopedics. Physical deformities and disfunctions resulting from accidents, birth defects and strokes respond to exercise therapy.

Low back pain

Dr. Hans Kraus, the New York doctor who helped to develop the Hans-Weber tests for physical fitness, preaches that exercise helps low back pain—a complaint of 28 million sufferers. Exercise helps to strengthen weak back muscles, relax those that are tense.

Arthritis

Exercise is particularly helpful following a "flare"—a severe inflammation of an affected joint. Tissues loosen during a flare and sometimes tighten up again in the wrong position. Before this can happen, a doctor will often prescribe the rhythmic flexing and relaxing of muscles—to pull the tender joints into normal alignment.

Business and industry are paying closer attention to the health of their employees. A study of 900 management executives by Dr. Robert L. Fleck, chief of NASA's preventive medicine section, turned up the fact that about 2 percent had defective hearts. In a similar Georgetown University project, the rate was even higher—7 to 8 percent.

This has led a number of large companies to institute "exercise breaks." Such firms as the American Can Company, Standard Oil of New Jersey, North American Rockwell and others have even set up small gymnasiums where employees can work out during the day.

Dr. Bernard Sandler, director of Rehabilitation Medicine of the Kingsbrook Jewish Medical Center in Brooklyn, is planning to start a program similar to that of Dr. deVries at Leisure World. Out-of-shape men and women will come to the hospital regularly for programmed exercise to improve their physical fitness.

"They'll be a little overweight, a little arthritic, perhaps a little diabetic," he said. "We aren't interested in making musclemen out of them, but in improving their hearts and lungs. We hope that the majority will learn to run an eight-minute mile."

Dr. deVries makes these suggestions if you are determined to launch a do-it-yourself physical fitness program:

1. For anyone over the age of 25 or 30, a thorough physical examination is essential.

2. Start slowly and perform only mild exercises at the start.

3. Seek skilled supervision and companionship—in a YMCA or YWCA, a night school class, or a university.

"From the accumulated results of several research programs, it begins to appear that exercise can contribute to maintaining health and assisting with recovery when we are sick," said Dr. deVries. "The 60- and 70-year-olds of the Leisure World Olympic Team have shown that exercise may lengthen the life span. Can it be the best medicine of all?"

EXHIBIT 4

OLDER AMERICANS ACT, TITLE III: PROJECT PROFILE, ASSISTANCE LEAGUE OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

A JOB OF SKILL AND PATIENCE

There are individuals in our communities for whom even the past can bring no relief. There are people who must find strength in the smallest rewards, who must progress under conditions marked by few advantages. To help men and women whose lives have become desperate, who are no longer able to fully control their feelings or reactions, is a demanding task, a work of love and satisfaction. It requires infinite skill and patience.

Yet it is being demonstrated that the job can be done, and that the added difficulties sometimes in evidence with older persons do not represent insuperable barriers.

Operating with Older Americans Act funds administered through the California Commission on Aging, the Assistance League of Southern California Family Service Agency in Los Angeles helps older people with their problems through counseling and referral. Professionally trained social workers and volunteers at the agency provide assistance in many difficult areas, supporting their clients with the unique empathy found almost exclusively in the truly concerned, well-trained individual. Their exemplary work is helping to create a new image for the older citizen.

The goals are far-reaching. Evidence of this is the staff's frequent work with clients' families. It has been found that an ambitious program will often derive solutions from intense study of individuals' backgrounds, including contemporary relationships to in-laws. For this reason the Agency Service is also available to relatives in behalf of Senior Californians.

CONSIDERATION OF THE INDIVIDUAL

Referral to appropriate community resources has been proven to be the natural concomitant to Agency help. Accordingly, health problems, housing, legal questions, opportunities for volunteer work, transportation and many other related areas of concern are dealt with under the auspices of the Agency's referral service.

The tenor of the organization is one of purpose and careful design. Procedures are worked out to protect the older person. Clients are worked with exclusively as individuals, and while the time element has been one of normal concern, results have been so gratifying that the Agency's efforts seem well justified. While "efficiency" evokes thoughts of production lines and numbers, and it is true that staff workers have increased client load, with the attendant increased pitch of activity they have been able to assume an even more meaningful posture in relation to their cases.

PROBLEMS ARE SOLVED

Consideration of problems confronted helps to enlighten the observer as regards the myriad difficulties brought to the Agency. An elderly woman with an alcoholic daughter is confused and unhappy. She is unable to gain the perspective necessary to help her daughter. They live together in a state of tension and distrust. Counselled together they are instilled once again with their natural abilities to reason with one another intelligently and attack their mutual problems with the advantage of sound compassionate understanding. Foundations such as these are not easily re-established. In many cases it is clear that meaningful change could not occur without Agency assistance.

A 73 yr. old woman has signed a document without fully understanding the inten-

tion of the contract. She is soon confronted with the prospect of paying for articles which she does not need and cannot afford. She is a widow with serious heart trouble, and when her payments are not made she receives stark letters threatening suit. The sum is small but she does not have it. A door to door salesman, two terse letters, and a phone call: these ingredients are all that is necessary to create fear and seemingly hopeless anguish. In desperation, the woman contacts the Agency. Within an hour the problem is solved. A polite visit to the office of the caller, an explanation of the circumstances, and a considerate retraction on behalf of the business involved.

Advances are made, some with lasting results, others bringing to light chronic difficulties. The work may be arduous, it may be light; it is always satisfying and always needed.

A strong Advisory Committee of professional and lay community people work with the program. Churches in the area are very much interested and participate on the committee and provide volunteers.

It seems certain that sufficient local support is developing to continue to expand the program at the termination of federal funding as administered through the California Commission on Aging.

SENIOR CALIFORNIAN: DMV TO ISSUE ID CARDS TO NONDRIVING SENIORS

Is driving a car becoming too much of a chore? Anybody who feels that way need not tax his nerves and energies to renew a driver's license just for its value as identification. He can ask for an identity card instead.

Under a measure lauded by the California Commission on Aging. California's seniors will soon have their choice of two wallet-size documents to use when they need to prove who they are: either a driver's license if they drive, or an identity card if they don't. DMV will begin taking applications for the plastic-encased cards in January, 1969.

DMV WILL ISSUE

They are to be issued at local offices of the DMV for a $3.00 fee and will carry the holder's photograph and current address. Each is good for four years, renewable on the holder's birthday. A person can have either card, but not both.

Mrs. A.M.G. Russell, chairman, and Charles W. Skoien, Jr., executive director of the California Commission on Aging said the issuance of the new identity cards is another of the many steps being taken in California in service to its senior residents.

Mrs. Russell pointed out that there are several million Californians who, because of age or physical disability, are unable to obtain a driver's license, and are deprived of the kind of identification they need to cash old age assistance checks, pension checks, or otherwise prove their identity.

Governor Ronald Reagan commented on signing the identity card bill into law. "This legislation recognizes a very important fact of life. Ever since California driver's licenses with the bearer's photograph became commonplace following their authorization in 1958, they have been the most freely accepted prima facie identification card a person can carry. The California driver's license has become the document which anyone wishes to cash a check finds he is almost always asked for. A person who can't produce a driver's license where he isn't well known is at a great disadvantage. This situation will soon be corrected."

The program was developed through the influence of Verne Orr, director of the Department of Motor Vehicles. The Department was considered the logical agency to process the cards because it already has the photographic and most other equipment in its several local offices throughout the state. It is also set up to process and file identifications rapidly with electronic equipment.

NO AGE LIMIT

California's cooperative attitude towards its seniors is indicated by the fact that the state has no upper age limit for driver's licenses and by figures which show that 800,000 residents over the age of 65 are licensed to drive.

SAN FRANCISCO DOWNTOWN SENIOR CENTER

One initially critical and hard-to-reach person said recently, "You know, this center is making a difference in the whole neighborhood. I never go into a store now without somebody saying 'hello'—someone I've met at the center."

In the downtown residential hotel area of San Francisco decisive steps are being taken to help economically and socially deprived hard-to-reach older people. The Multi-Service Program for socially isolated older persons put to work knowledge gained through a recent demonstration project on "reaching out" conducted by the San Francisco Senior Center.

Funding for the Multi-Service Program is arranged by the California Commission on Aging through the administration of an Older Americans Act Title III grant.

PROJECT'S WORK

The project's work includes training of personnel: professional, subprofessional and students. Also, the program strengthens a Community Coordinating Committee currently being developed to insure better coverage for the isolated in all census areas of the city, and to serve as a clearing house for programs being organized in order to eliminate overlapping of such services.

Designed originally as a drop-in center, the facility has widened its perspectives and learned through experimentation. Initially, older men and women came to enjoy the nutritional and delicious noon "soup snack" (with recipes provided by a masters student from the University of California department of nutrition), to read magazines and newspapers, play table games, and to talk—to one another, and to staff members, all of whom were readily available to converse on a one-to-one basis. Personal problems could be discussed with the caseworker, and a job counselor was present two half-days a week. It was thought that small groups would appeal to those who came. Soon, however, those who participated became more gregarious and less reserved. While partial to those scheduled activities which provided intellectual stimulation, parties became the most popular events of all.

MORE ACTIVITIES

Hand crafts continued and opportunities for group discussion-participation developed with the introduction of informal speakers to those who gathered at the center. Bus trips were soon added to the schedule, and members were encouraged to acquaint themselves with the advantages of inexpensive bus travel around the city. A series on "Good Nutrition," "Exercise," and "Release from Tension" was presented, and will continue on a yearly basis.

The Health Series is presented by a psychiatric caseworker from the Health Center. Problems are brought up and dealt with very directly by the caseworker. The wide variety of personalities and backgrounds represented by the group is delightful, and the wealth of material they bring to the discussion insures significant relevance and interest.

Frequently a major concern for those who attend is area residents who sit and do nothing in local hotels. Impatience and anger are often expressed. The consensus of opinion suggests that the majority of those who refuse to seek social involvement are victims of severe physical handicaps. Concern for their depression and inertia is as widespread as in other segments of the population.

Administratively, referral procedures are constantly reviewed and revised through meetings with representatives of other agencies. It is hoped that a Home Health Aides program can be instigated for handicapped persons in hotels. This important work would allow isolated older individuals to visit the Downtown Senior Center, to be engaged in Center activities, and to take advantage of other services with which they would otherwise have no contact. Other group meetings of leaders from various local organizations are held to discuss such crucial problems as transportation for the handicapped.

The project caseworker continues to maintain daily contact with neighboring hotels. She works from hotel to hotel (there are 133 of concern in the area) to involve managers and hard-to-reach residents with the center's activities and services. Activities schedules are distributed to over 800 persons each month.

INVOLVEMENT VALUABLE

Involvement of individuals in the presentation of programs helps to overcome the most prevalent problem: loss of memory. With part of the responsibility for the success of a discussion an individual will take special precautions to insure his presence at the center on a certain day. Such events as the Fire and Earthquake Commemorative Program have involved many older citizens in this manner. Fascinating stories were told in this instance by those who had lived through the disaster.

The spirit of friendship is growing at the center. At first many sat in silence, although they had lived within a block or two of each other for years. Now one must ring a bell in order to make announcements. In the noon soup program the hoped-for and worked-for "family" atmosphere and feeling of fellowship amongst older people from many different socio-economic backgrounds is being achieved.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT, TITLE III: PROJECT PROFILE, PARADISE MULTIPURPOSE ADULT CENTER

VITAL VITALITY

If one word could describe the activities at the Multi-Purpose Adult Center in Paradise it would be "vitality." And perhaps the second word would be "vital." For the work is vital. The Center serves the needs of older persons in the community in many ways.

The Project is co-sponsored by the Paradise Recreation and Park District and the California Commission on Aging, which provides funding through the administration of an Older Americans Act Title III grant.

Seven prominent community agencies and facilities serve in an advisory capacity, and twelve area resources provide direct services to project clientele.

A great variety of recreational and leisure activities are conducted on a regular basis. These include knit and crochet instruction, slim-trim class, horticulture class, shuffleboard tournaments, rugmaking, armchair travel films and slide shows, and many others. Sightseeing bus excursions carry participants to Lake Tahoe, Shasta Caverns, Oroville Dam and other selected places of interest. This has proved extremely popular. It meets a need of a broad cross-section of older adults: both for those of limited means who have no other travel opportunity and those who prefer the convenience and advantages of such travel. Companionship is certainly a prime consideration.

PROGRAM PLANNING FOR SENIORS

The Community Committee on Aging has been reactivated and under its aegis many new people have become interested and involved. The Committee is well motivated and assists in program planning and presenta-

tion. Recent scheduled sessions have included "The Importance of a Will and Estate Planning," "Publicity Workshop," "Stretch Your Food Dollar," "Common Health Emergencies," "Social Security and You," and "The California Driving Privilege," providing information on licensing procedures and restrictions, given by a Department of Motor Vehicles representative.

The Adult Activity Center has also sponsored, in cooperation with the Paradise Committee on Aging, a Driver Improvement Course. The "Defensive Driving" classes have provoked intense interest, exploring a variety of professional driving concepts with films, charts and other teaching aids that help older persons to visualize the significance of potential dangers. The purchase of the instructor's kit was made possible by a local association. An important outgrowth of this work has been the addition of "behind-the-wheel" driver training.

Club events at the Center are extensive. The Newcomers Club introduces many older people to the program, and from there on it's up to individuals' tastes and interests. There is even the opportunity to play the French horn, or any other instrument, with members of the instrumental group.

The center provides a central agency for the dissemination of information about specialized services for the older adult. It stimulates and conducts workshops on community leadership, care and maintenance, and pre-retirement. Group discussions regarding civic, national and international problems are held. Volunteer services are organized for those with special interests related to nursing homes, hospitals and the care of shut-ins. The Friendly Visiting Program has been a great success. Local family care homes for former mental patients are also visited regularly, and home operators bring groups to the center weekly. This provides opportunity for more community contact for these persons as a further step in their recovery and develops interest and understanding on the part of the community. The commitments of older persons have been essential to this design. It would be difficult to emphasize adequately the striking potential represented by the participation of our older adults in this challenging area. Their role may well define one of the foremost elements necessary for significant change: patient and regular communication and contact. The reciprocal satisfactions require no explanation.

Actual participation is the final proof of a project's success. Monthly attendance has reached 2500 at the Paradise Adult Center, and in one eight-month period total attendance was nearly 15,000.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 26, 1969]

DOLLS NOT JUST FOR CHILDREN

(By Barbara Riker)

VAN NUYS.—Mrs. Joseph Jacobson has reaped unexpected success in career and retirement from a chance encounter with the art of millinery some 60 years ago.

When her Russian family sent her to Paris to learn French, she became interested in the skills of seamstresses there.

The sewing arts she learned led her years later to a job as head milliner for the Metropolitan Opera Company in New York.

MEMORIES LINGER ON

And she has made such constructive use of her skills in her retirement years in the Valley that she has been cited by California Commission on Aging as an example of how senior citizens can lead satisfying lives.

Even after Mrs. Jacobson moved thousands of miles from the Met, memories of the melodies and magic of its operas lingered in her thoughts.

So, she recreated 22 opera figures in miniature and dressed them in exact copies of the original costumes, duplicating even the embroidery on the pantaloons under the elaborate gowns.

DOLLS COME ALIVE

She copied the jeweled robes of a Russian czar and princess, the exotic silks of Scheherazade, and even the tiny painted fingernails and embroidered facial expressions of the opera stars.

Each doll seems to come alive when the white haired woman takes it from the display case and tells the story of the opera it represents.

Once a week Mrs. Jacobson weaves the magic of opera for a group of women recently released from Camarillo Hospital.

"I can see their eyes light up when I tell the tales of love and adventure from the operas," reports Mrs. Jacobson. She read of the need for volunteers to work with the Camarillo women in the involvement opportunities column in The Times.

She shows her dolls and lectures on them for large benefits. The collection has been exhibited at Los Angeles Public Library.

One day it will be her legacy to her granddaughter, now 13, for whom she has compiled a scrapbook of her life starting with graduation from high school in 1904. The Jacobsons came to America in 1929 and have lived in the Valley since 1954.

As well as using the collection for community causes, she employs her sewing skills to teach old people what they can do for others.

"I tell them to turn off their televisions and put down their cards and help people who need them," said the octogenarian as she hopped over a hassock to answer the telephone.

TEACHES DOLL-MAKING

She was given a diamond pin for contributing more than 1,000 volunteer hours with the residents of California Home for the Aged at Reseda.

Now she teaches the women of Van Nuys Senior Citizens Club to make dolls and toys to be donated to needy children.

"One of the ladies even sews buttonholes in the doll clothes," said Mrs. Jacobson with delight.

She buys the pretty beads and gay flowered fabrics which the women use for the doll clothes and craft items.

ASSISTS ORT

Mrs. Jacobson makes items to be sold to raise money for such groups as Women's Organization for Rehabilitation Through Training (ORT). She earned $110 for its vocational schools throughout the world.

This is a group dear to her because she was the first teacher in one ORT School in Russia, where she met her husband, a music teacher. She also makes items to support Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital (CARIH).

Formerly a member of National Council of Jewish Women, she has given her skills to aid a toy library for needy youngsters and to make layettes for unwed mothers.

PAID IN SATISFACTION

"People ask me why I do not take money for my work, but I have received more than I have given because I know what I have done has meant something to others," she said.

"No amount of card-playing can give as much satisfaction as seeing the faces of those you help light up at seeing you."

[From the Downey (Calif.) Live Wire, Mar. 27, 1969]

HE "RETIRED" HIMSELF BY HELPING CITY OF HOPE

It's such a simple statement to make:

"I collect money for the City of Hope."

Behind it is a story, the story of Abe Cohen, retired.

He was a lamp manufacturer in his day; now he wholesales sunshine to brighten the lives of a number of Senior Californians in the Long Beach area.

His story is one of thousands being written up and down the state by folks of retirement age who have found that by doing something for others they have "re-tired" themselves, they've gotten new running gear to carry them along the highway of life.

He lives in Long Beach and he started collecting for the City of Hope more than 15 years ago.

In the words of Executive Director Charles W. Skoien Jr., of the California Commission on Aging:

"Mr. Cohen appreciated a great deal the help that City of Hope gave to his grandson, and he set out to do what he could in his way to show his gratitude.

"Gradually, his visits widened, until he now experiences a new, full life.

"There are many like him in California. We call them the Senior California Volunteer Service Corps, all Seniors who do things in their communities, either for organizations or for people, just for the sake of the doing.

"Their reward is personal. . . . the very act of the doing is the reward."

Cohen is well known in restaurants, stores, businesses of Long Beach as he carries out his project: "I collect money for the City of Hope."

This involves going from one place to the other, emptying the blue bank containers of the small coins and sometimes large ones. City of Hope's charitable works.

The time isn't great—some 10 hours a week—and it helps fill the day with something worthwhile.

Mr. Cohen comments:

"I have visited many of the sick people in hospitals, homes, nursing homes. I have driven people to doctor's offices, helped ill people with their shopping.

"My rewarding moments come when people tell me that they get well faster because of what I am able to do for them. They tell me it is good to know that someone cares."

He spent most of his adult like in Ohio and California. He and Mrs. Cohen have been blessed with two children, five grandchildren and one great-grandchild.

And all of them are generous in supporting him in his project, especially his wife.

She joins him in the philosophy:

"We all dream dreams, and as we grow older our dreams turn away from ourselves to others. We would like to see an end to war; we would like to see a world where people help each other, and take care of each other."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Progress, Mar. 5–6, 1969]

TELLING THE STORY OF "OLD GLORY"

Retired electrician Arthur B. Chase of San Francisco is using his knowledge of photography and tape recording to fill his retirement days with a unique project—telling the story of glory of the nation to school children.

He does it with slide shows, in color, with synchronized tape recordings of the story about the place involved.

The stories the youngsters enjoy the most are those of the Ghost Town of Calico in California, the historic city of Williamsburg, Virginia, and of Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan.

Chase, who lives at 39 Tacoma St., gave one of his "Glorious America" travelogues at San Francisco's McKinley Elementary School and as he watched the youngsters react to the beauty of the scenes he thought what a fine thing it would be to tell them the story of Old Glory.

So, in a two-month trip in the fall of 1968, he started gathering slides, musical tapes or records, and patriotic sayings to weave into a

fitting tribute to the nation's flag that he can show at schools, service clubs, or youth groups.

He has faith in the youth of America . . . active faith, as evidenced by his interest in the Boy Scouts, which he joined when as a youngster and served six years as a member, followed by 49 years as a leader.

Chase was born January 20, 1899, in Galesburg, Ill., and on his 70th birthday this year he scheduled a demonstration on slide show planning for the Galileo Adult Evening School class on photography.

The State of California Commission on Aging learned of Chase's retirement activity and has commended him for using his hobby for the benefit of others, especially young people. The Commission's executive director, Charles W. Skoien, Jr., said Chase has qualified for membership in the commission's honorary organization, Senior Californian Service Corps, whose members devote part of their retirement time to doing something worthwhile for others without thought of reward.

Chase has been a journeyman electrician 49 years, 26 of them in San Francisco.

He and Mrs. Chase like to travel, and say it is nothing for them to start out and be gone from three weeks to three months at a time.

As they travel about the country, they try to practice the old scout law "Do a good turn to someone every day," and "if one wants to have friends, it is necessary to be a friend."

They have been in virtually every state in the union, and it is to tell the story of the glory of the flag and the history of the nation that Arthur B. Chase is dedicating his retirement years.

[From the Wilshire (Calif.) Press, Oct. 17, 1968]

MRS. MABEL FISCHER—LADY DYNAMO PROMOTES HAPPINESS FOR SENIORS

Mrs. Mabel Fischer decided to do something about her "old age retirement loneliness" by joining a Senior Citizens Club.

Now, she's a 15-hour-a-day dynamo, ranging all over Los Angeles City and the southern part of Los Angeles County promoting programs to make retirement living more interesting for others.

Her phone is ringing at 7 in the morning, to start a day that sees her talking with lonely pensioners on one hand and high government officials on the other. She attends conferences, addresses meetings, advises committees, during the day; and when she gets home in the evening, goes back on the phone.

She started as a club member, went on to the presidency, and did so well that she became Community Representative for the California Commission on Aging to assist in coordinating the efforts of state and local agencies in determining the needs and resources of the community for the aging.

In this, she has little time for reverie, but she does express the dream "that some day no one need sit alone in a rocking chair and wait for the Man Upstairs to beckon."

Towards that end, she has hopes for wider use of Senior Californian facilities for other than purely recreation programs. She would like to see expansion of employment opportunities for seniors.

She is sincere in her belief that no Senior Californian live in helplessness and she is highly pleased with the growing Senior Californian Service Corps whose members seek out other retired people and do things for them, such as read to the blind, take physically handicapped to the doctor, or contact the right agency to help them solve problems.

High praise of her concern for others has come from two highly-placed state leaders, Charles W. Skoien Jr., and Mrs. A. M. G. Russell who are, respectively, Executive Director and Chairman of the California Commission on Aging.

Skoien said: "Mrs. Fischer is a sound example of our unique Senior California Service Corps, who are receiving more and more recognition for voluntarily giving their time and ability to organizations and people in their communities. Not only is she benefitting herself, but she is leading others back into the mainstream of life so that retirement is a time to enjoy."

Mrs. Russell is regarded as one of the outstanding volunteers in the field of the aging in the United States and she commented: "No more how little or how much a volunteer does, as shown by Mrs. Fischer, the reward is always the same . . . a sense of satisfaction, of belonging, of living again. She understands the feminine view, and it is so gratifying to see other women follow her lead into what they can do for others. All these little bits add up to a lot."

Mrs. Fischer lives at 627 S. Normandie Ave., coming to California in 1962. She was born in Chicago, and received her Bachelor of Arts degree from Chicago University as a major in English Literature.

She married in Cleveland, raised two children, became active in politics, and served as a precinct committeeman. She drove a Red Cross truck in World War I, and sold $100-000 in war bonds in World War I and World War II drives.

Mrs. Fischer had a business career as assistant buyer of coats and suits in the May Company.

On her retirement, she "sat until twinges of loneliness set in" and responded to an article in a neighborhood newspaper inviting Seniors to attend a meeting of the Normandie-Wilshire Senior Citizens Club, whose president, Mrs. Jessie Smith, soon put her to work.

She took a leadership class at Lafayette Park and served as a volunteer worker in helping build interest in all projects for the aging. For seven weeks she was director of Medical Alert at Lafayette Park, working with 17 paid seniors over 65 uncovering as well numerous welfare cases.

Mrs. Fischer is president of Lafayette Park Senior Citizens Club, chairman of Employment for the Aging for the Hollywood-Wilshire Community Committee, and community representative for the California Commission on Aging.

Helping seniors get jobs gives her tremendous pleasure. Her visits and speaking engagements throughout Los Angeles County have brought her a wide circle of friends so that she is readily recognized and called by name at many places.

Many doors are open to her, especially those of John Walker, County Director, Department of Senior Citizens Affairs; Tom Murphy, Director of Los Angeles City Recreation and Parks; and Domingo Delgado, Director of Los Angeles County Recreation and Parks.

Los Angeles City Councilman Tom Bradley and John Ferraro are often contacted regarding problems facing aging, as are Robert Oppenheimer and Dorothy Mergie of the State Employment Service, and Irene Gunckel, assistant director of United Crusade's Central Division.

She works with them in furthering county and city programs they have launched, such as civic participation, tours and special days for seniors, or the annual fund drive for United Crusade.

Mrs. Fischer is thinking way ahead: She has helped organize new pre-retirement clubs for Young Seniors from 40 up, working with Mrs. Carolyn Cohen, her daughter.

[From the San Mateo (Calif.) Times, Oct. 17, 1968]

BUSY WORLD OF RETIRED MATEAN

Earl Rodda retired three years ago, and has been going full blast almost every day since then, busier now with Senior Californian projects than he was during his 41 years with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

He was at loose ends, those first few weeks after getting out of the traces, and was driving his wife to distraction. She knew about San Mateo's Senior Citizen programs, and she shooed him out of the house to find out about them. Now, he's glad she did. And so are hundreds of San Mateo residents, young and old.

Their feelings are best expressed by one of the nation's experts in the field of the aging who lives right in Rodda's area, Mrs. A. M. G. Russell of Atherton, who is chairman of the California Commission on Aging. She said: "Mr. Rodda is a graphic example of what is happening in our little-publicized but highly-important Senior California Service Corps of men and women who are winning recognition for the way they are voluntarily doing things for others in their communities, whether they be individuals or organizations. We find that Service Corps members almost always say the greatest reward is that they have found something worthwhile to do, and their influence is bringing more and more Senior Californians back into the mainstream of life. Rodda's influence is far greater than any of us realizes."

The Roddas live at 2830 Flores, Apartment 5, San Mateo, and from there he sallies forth every day on a schedule that would make a successful salesman look to his laurels.

It was in the fall of 1966 that he joined San Mateo's largest Senior California club, the Keenagers, and in a short while was elected President. In quick succession he became active in chairman of the various committees, and in December of 1967 was elected president of the Association of Senior Clubs of San Mateo County.

Then, in the summer of 1968, he was named Community Representative in San Mateo for the California Commission on Aging, an assignment that puts him in daily contact with a wide range of people in the community, from leaders of civic clubs to elderly people who want to become alive again.

They gave him some of the most pleasurable moments he has had. As he says: "The pleasures of this job? First of all, the many, many friends I have made. Then, to see the faces of shut-ins and hospital patients light up when visited. Utilizing the tremendous talents of so many of the Seniors in the accomplishments of projects, challenging the timid to come out of 'the shell' and their own surprise at doing things they did not think they could, radiating enthusiasm and joy and making people feel it is 'catching.' Stimulating optimism when pessimism seems to be rampant, and enlisting cooperation in reaching new heights in accomplishments!"

Rodda comes naturally by his leadership abilities. He was born and raised in Omaha, Nebraska, and was graduated from high school but for various reasons did not enter university even after enrollment.

He was active in church and Young Peoples work, played basketball until he was 32, then a lot of golf, which he caddied as a youngster.

He worked in a bakery and then in a drugstore during his high school years. He entered government service in the Department of Agriculture in February of 1924 as a clerk at $1,000 per year, was married in August of 1924. He received promotions in his work rather regularly and was transferred several times to such cities as St. Paul; Thomasville, Georgia, Des Moines; Cincinnati; Denver.

He kept studying and climbing and in 1944 went to St. Joseph, Missouri, as officer in charge.

Then came the big one, in 1955, to San Francisco as Western Area Supervisor for 13 Western States, a post he held until his retirement in 1965.

Mr. and Mrs. Rodda have two sons, one in the army as a career, and one a minister in Topeka, Kansas.

Much of his business life was in public relations, dealing with livestock stockyards, commission men, cattlemen's associations, wool growers' associations, meatpacking plants, Farm Bureau, and similar farm groups.

The average day starts about 8:45 a.m., with two or three phone calls inquiring about certain activities of the Keenagers, the Association, Forum . . . or to make suggestions concerning programs that are in progress.

Paper-work takes a while, such as agenda for the Association Presidents' meeting, work on the Keener News, or plan the coming Keenager meeting.

Rain or shine, he goes out for a few sick calls or to attend a club meeting, or contact community leaders, such as Dr. C. S. MacKenzie, pastor of First Presbyterian Church and member of the Human Relations Committee. Or Dr. C. A. Kircher, the Presbyterian Consultant is so helpful in enlisting people in an orientation class.

Superintendent Willard Shumard of the San Mateo Recreation Department is on his regular call list, and Rev. Elmer Andersen, manager of Pilgrim Plaza, a retirement home, and active in Lions, prisoner rehabilitation, and Senior Californian projects.

It is by enlisting the cooperation of such men as these that Mr. Rodda has been able to develop the Senior Californian program. He credits Dr. MacKenzie with every successful work at his church and in the Human Relations Committee.

Shumard is responsible for outstanding recreational center programs as well as setting up arts and crafts not only for youngsters through middle age, but also for Seniors; and gives considerable time to the Advisory Council of Senior Citizens.

To bring the word of Senior programs to all in San Mateo county, Rodda is planning a weekly radio program entitled "Three Score Plus" over KCSM 90.9 FM, plus weekly columns in the area newspapers to report the activities of various clubs.

Some day, he doesn't know when, he would like to develop the Keenagers into an everyday center, with a full time director, arts and crafts, and . . . but this is in the future!

[From the San Bernardino (Calif.) Sun Mar. 22, 1969]

TOP SENIOR CITIZEN IN VICTORVILLE IS JUST TOO BUSY FOR A ROCKING CHAIR

State-wide recognition came to Mrs. Viola Norris of Victorville this week as the State of California Commission on Aging cited her activity in her retirement years as an example for other senior Californians.

Mrs. Norris makes egg carton tray favors for St. Mary Desert Hospital, for rest homes and for some sick or shut-ins at their homes.

She makes cheer baskets for sick members of the 1st Christian Church (Disciples of Christ) and knick-knacks for the house; artificial flowers; and even raises prize-winning vegetables in her garden.

Executive Director Charles W. Skoien Jr., of the State Commission on Aging, prevailed upon Mrs. Norris to tell her story to encourage other seniors to look upon "service for others" as a means of filling their leisure days.

He said, "Mrs. Norris is proving that the rocking chair theory of retirement is as outmoded as the Model T Ford on a superhighway.

"Through her hobby, she is helping assure herself of the fulfillment of these basic needs: security, recognition, belonging, self-expression, and adventure.

"Security—of health, added income and a place in society.

"Recognition—as an individual with her own capacities, achievements, and personality.

"Belonging—as a member of a social group and the community.

"Self Expression—from developing her abilities and talents in new areas and at new levels.

"Adventure—of new experience, new sights and new knowledge."

Skoien pointed out that with Mrs. Norris age is no barrier—she was 82 on Feb. 23—and being young in heart and in mind has kept her young in body, too.

The State executive said the commission has found such retirees as Mrs. Norris extremely helpful in convincing others to "get out and live" and for her spirit the commission is enrolling her in its Senior California Service Corps, whose members are dedicated to serving their communities or other individuals simply for the sake of doing something worth while, rather than for the reward.

Mrs. Norris was born and reared in Mayview, Mo., and came to California about 60 years ago. She and her husband, Arthur, who is now 90, retired in Victorville about 10 years ago. They operated a small cafe.

They now live at 15564 4th Street.

A friend gave Mrs. Norris an egg carton "Idea Booklette" and she talked things over with a sister at St. Mary's Hospital. There she started making the favors.

Mrs. Norris is just completing 70 pixyish rabbits and 90 ducks, all made out of old egg cartons, to put on patient's trays at Eastertime at St. Mary Desert Valley Hospital.

Each includes sequin eyes, ribbons and bits of discarded imitation flowers. She's made more than 400 rabbits in the past three years, as favors for shut-ins, invalids, patients at rest homes, etc., and for Sunday school students.

"Rabbits go real fast. It takes a little longer to make a duck," she says.

Today, she plans to teach a group of physically handicapped persons to make the little animals. They'll be distributed on Easter Sunday at Victor Valley Hospital, Victorville.

"I make 29 different kinds of animals," she says, including a cat and mouse, a bull, a bear, an elephant, a soldier boy, a donkey, and Uncle Sam, among others.

Her day has no room for self-sympathy. Her husband is blind, and she enjoys reading most of three daily papers to him.

Then, she turns to her cartons, her garden or some activity in the Christian Women's Fellowship; a day per month sewing at church; two days a month at Victor Valley Federated Women's Club; and whatever time is required at the Victor Senior Citizens Club.

Mrs. Norris tithes, pays for all her supplies in her handicrafts project and has resolved that anything that is good and wholesome in life is now sufficient for her. As she says:

"I just take God with me at all times. He guides and keeps me; with His help I do the things I wish to do."

[From the Paradise (Calif.) Feather River Times, Apr. 1, 1969]

PARADISE SENIOR FILLS DAYS BY HELPING OTHERS

Feeding the disabled elderly.

And helping in the school library.

They're such simple things to do, yet they give interest to the retirement days of Miss Jeannette W. Rutledge of Paradise, whose experience has been selected by the California Commission on Aging as an example of how a retired professional person can fill her days.

Miss Rutledge is now nearing 80 and lives at the Paradise Hotel.

She found time heavy on her hands and asked Mrs. Patricia Rellaford of the Paradise Adult Activity Center for ideas on what to do.

When Mrs. Rellaford found that Miss Rutledge was a retired Librarian, and knowing that Paradise Elementary School needed help, it took but a phone call to match them up . . . and all are happy.

Then, Miss Rutledge started going to a training class in "friendly visitors." The hospitals asked for volunteers to help the staff in feeding the disabled.

So, every day, weather permitting, at four o'clock, she goes to the hospital and helps feed a woman who can use only one hand, and that very little; and also has trouble speaking.

As she points out, "These two things are not really 'projects.' They are just something which need doing that I can do."

This spirit is typical of so many Senior Californians who have searched out Senior Centers, looking for worthwhile things to do, and so much good has come of it that the California Commission on Aging is energetically promoting the philosophy through a volunteer group identified as Senior Californian Service Corps.

The Commission's Executive Director, Charles W. Skoien, Jr., said from Sacramento there are many little things that need doing, and so many Seniors who can do them. The Senior need only to go to a center for the matching-up process.

He commented: "Miss Rutledge gets enjoyment out of helping others. She isn't bound to endless days in a rocking chair in front of a TV.

"Part of the day she is matching wits with bright 7th and 8th graders. And in the afternoon, she is performing a deed that is doing because it needs doing. This is the spirit so manifest throughout California, and we hope it spreads, to brighten the days of all Seniors."

Miss Rutledge isn't hardset in her ways. She points out there is a saying: "Look up and not down; Look out and not in; Look forward and not back; and Lend a hand."

But she finds it wise to "look back" at times in order to understand the present, the people around her, and to avoid getting upset when difficulties arise.

That's the reason she understands young people, like the young boy at the school library who asked her for "non-fiction, but not biography," and accepted a book on shoemaking before the days of machinery, saying happily, "It has only 40 pages".

[From the Paradise (Calif.) Post, Feb. 21, 1969]

KATE PRICE IS ACTIVE SENIOR CITIZEN

Kate Valentine Price spent Friday baking cookies for local servicemen even though she was celebrating her 75th birthday on that date.

Sending cookies to local men serving in Vietnam is a project that Mrs. Price started two years ago and since then she has sent numerous boxes to Paradise men who are members of St. Nicholas Episcopal Church. They share the goodies with others in the war zone.

She made some 20 dozen cookies Friday and had two boxes ready to ship Monday.

Mrs. Price is a native of Scotland. She grew up in England and was one of the members of the original Girl Guides in that country in 1910.

She has always been interested in youth work and at one time she was leader of four different Girl Scout troops. The troops of varying ages met at her home once a week.

She has served 52 years as a Sunday school teacher and is an active member of the Episcopal Church here since moving to Paradise six years ago.

Prior to retiring she was a 13 year member of the Bentley School faculty in Berkeley and was serving as dean of the school when she retired.

Her own family includes three children and nine grandchildren.

The State Commission on Aging recognizes senior citizens who are living full lives during the retirement years. Mrs. Price was added to the rolls by Charles W. Skoien Jr., executive director.

[From the East Side Journal and Belvedere Citizen]

SENIOR CITIZEN SERVICE CENTER DEDICATION IN MAY

The familiar face of Mrs. Helen Colima will greet users of the new East Los Angeles Bilingual Senior Citizens Center on its dedication at 2 p.m. Sunday afternoon, May 4, at 3864 Whittier Boulevard, East Los Angeles, Mrs. Colima, Supervisor Ernest E. Debs and other distinguished guests will participate in the dedicatory ceremonies.

Mrs. Helen Colima, project director of the center, was born of French and Dutch parents in Shenandoah, Penna., 66 years ago.

Today, she is blessed with 13 grandchildren and 14 great-grandchildren, and thousands of friends.

She knows how to get along with people and as Project Director of the Senior Citizens Bilingual Center she is helping tremendous numbers of older Mexican-Americans find something worthwhile to do in their leisure time.

And she is helping many, too, who have serious problems.

Mrs. Colima started helping other Seniors because she wanted to fill her own idle hours, and she has done so much so well that she has been selected by the State of California Commission on Aging in Sacramento as an example of how a senior citizen can find new life by going to a Senior Center and getting acquainted.

Almost every day she is at the Center, phoning, visiting, helping.

Even at home, in Montebello, she is on the phone.

Executive Director Charles W. Skoien, Jr., of the State Commision on Aging, said:

"I remember when Mrs. Colima first started with the Center, and how a small grant from the Older Americans Act made it possible for the Center to continue serving seniors of Spanish heritage."

NEW CENTER

"At the new center they can do so many things, and I encourage everyone living in the vicinity to use it . . . even if they do not live in the vicinity, but have language problems, then use the center anyway.

"The center is there to help people. In Mrs. Calima, the seniors have someone anxious to help them."

She is Founder and Ex-president of the Latin-American Women Senior Citizens Club, member of Madres Mexicanas, former Secretary of St. Benedict's Latin-American Club of Montebello, member of Mexican-American Women's League, and former secretary of the East Los Angeles Committee on Aging.

For her efforts in these organizations, and many more, she has received many awards, as well as being named Mrs. Senior Citizen of East Los Angeles.

NEED TRANSPORTATION

One of the great needs she would like to see filled is transportation for shut-ins . . . a small station wagon and driver to take shut-ins to the doctor, to Senior Citizens Clubs, and Recreational Activities.

This dream is not for herself, but for others. Somewhere, there is an auto dealer or a family with a station wagon to spare!

Mrs. Colima has assisted many Spanish-speaking people in solving a wide variety of problems. She commented:

"Our Field Assistant, Ralph Calzada, met a man who could use only one arm. He was a lonely and depressed man.

"Mr. Calzada, after a second visit, convinced him to joint a Senior Citizens club. We helped him get started, and now he has many, many friends.

"We sent him to an agency where he received a part-time job that does not interfere with his handicap. Now, he has a new outlook on life.

"In September, a 75-year-old man came to our office.

"He was depressed because his wife had passed away a week before, and he did not know where to turn because a daughter was coming into his home and taking away furniture and personal belongings of his deceased wife.

"He said he could not afford a lawyer, so we sent him to a neighborhood Legal Aid Society.

"A week later he came to our office. This time he was all smiles. Not only did Legal Aid stop the daughter from removing any more articles, but made her give back everything she had taken."

HOME EMERGENCIES

"In another matter, we followed up on a phone call to a home where there was an emergency, with the husband very ill.

"Our Mrs. Emma Quen called an ambulance, accompanied the wife to the hospital, stayed with her while the husband was admitted; and then learned the family was in serious financial trouble.

"Mrs. Quen contacted the Department of Social Service and Department of Public Assistance to help this husband and wife in their distress."

It is understandable why Mrs. Colima's project helpers, her family, and the thousands of Spanish-speaking people of Los Angeles love her.

It is for them she lives, guided by this credo:

"I pray every morning before I leave home that God grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change;

"The courage to change the things I can;

"And the wisdom to know the difference."

If you are a senior with problems, and need a friend who understands your language, remember Helen Colima of the East Los Angeles Bilingual Center at 3864 Whittier Blvd., East Los Angeles.

The East Los Angeles Bilingual Center was established by the Greater East Los Angeles Committee on Aging which has recently established the Greater East Los Angeles Senior Citizens Foundation with Mrs. Max Offenberg as president.

SENIORS ROLL ALONG IN NEW BUS

Little House has taken to wheels. In an effort to meet the transportation problems of older persons, the senior citizen center in Menlo Park sponsored by Peninsula Volunteers, Inc. (PVs) has leased a bus.

The 12-passenger vehicle will pick Little House members up and take them along a scheduled route so that they can participate in the center's activities.

As part of "Operation Reach-Out," plans also call for using the bus to take Little House craft and recreation programs to residents unable to leave convalescent homes and for bringing other senior citizen groups to special programs at Little House.

It took more than two years to get the project rolling, according to PV Mrs. James L. Sammet of Atherton. First, it became increasingly evident that transportation was one of the prime problems of the older person, she says.

Those who had cars tended to let their licenses lapse when they no longer felt able to drive safely. Some never owned cars and relied on family and friends for their mobility. Some were unable to make connections with public transportation.

For these reasons, in December of 1967, the PV's Community Services Committee was given the task of solving the transportation problem for Little House members. This committee was composed of Mrs. Charles Dye of Palo Alto, Mrs. R. Cree Pillsbury of Los Altos, and Mrs. Sammet.

After sending a questionnaire to Little House members to establish interest in the project and a proposed routing pattern, the committee began investigating all public and private transportation in the area.

Herbert, who taught the teachers of the Red Cross "Safety First" program for many years.

Herbert agreed to prepare 10 Little House members to drive the bus. Once a week for an entire summer, he drilled his class on the information needed to pass the license test.

Next, the cost of the complete medical and visual examinations for the drivers was found to run about $75 per person.

This hurdle was overcome when a Palo Alto ophthalmologist and a retired internist agreed to donate the examinations.

Seven out of the ten over-50 drivers passed all of the medical, written and practical tests and obtained their licenses.

On Thursday, the bus finally got rolling.

Pickup points include Stevenson House, Mitchell Park, Midtown (Colorado Avenue), Community Center, Drop-in Center at Hamilton and Cowper, the Southern Pacific depot in Redwood City, Marsh Manor, Flood Park and Alameda-Valpariso.

Times are subject to change and are posted daily at Little House.

The entire project is being underwritten by the McCarthy Foundation of San Francisco.

CHURCHES PRAISED FOR SOCIAL WORK

One of the material gifts of the Church that is giving great spiritual benefit to thousands of men and women of all faiths is the gift of the parish hall, for use as a senior center for all people in the neighborhood.

This is the summation of a Christmas message by Charles W. Skoien, Jr., executive director of the California Commission on Aging with offices in Sacramento.

Skoien said the past year has seen a surge of interest in the state's senior population, with churches taking a strong lead.

Not only are the churches making the educational halls available, Skoien said, but the parishioners with leadership ability have been generous in setting up programs which range from purely social and recreational, to the very serious assistance with health and housing problems.

The programs have bridged the generation gap . . . high school teenagers have gone out to visit shut-ins in homes or hospitals under auspices of the Legion of Mary, the Marian Visitors, high school clubs.

Just as the senior centers serve members of all faiths, these young people are helping all in need of help, regardless of religious belief.

"This", points out Skoien, "is in keeping with the spirit of sacrifice, the commencement of a life on Christmas Day dedicated to serving all mankind, even to the Supreme Sacrifice.

"The church is offering a rare gift in extending its facilities, a gift which all Senior Californians will cherish upon receiving."

THE ANSWER FOR SENIORS: "LAFAYETTE, WE ARE HERE"

If you lived almost your entire life in the East and came out to California to retirement . . . and loneliness . . . then Gladys M. Kieley is a lady you want to meet.

She understands what it means because she went through it.

It's all in the past now, and if you're at a loss for something to do in your retirement days, go out to the Lafayette Center and look

her up. Trade stories with her, she'll help you out.

Mrs. Kieley is 70 and lives at 320 S. Gramercy Dr. She was born in Beloit, Wisconsin, and was reared and spent most of her adult life in Rockford, Illinois.

She was a professional musician, pianist, and she found the jolt of retiring to possible loneliness real tough, spotlight to oblivion!

But this needn't be, she points out, because you are at a loss for things to do, then go to a Senior Center to see what things are like there.

Mrs. Kieley met her match . . . they asked her to help with programs, and her old professional training stood her in good stead.

Now, she's living again, as Choral Director for the Lafayette Senior Center. They're putting on a new show every month, and that takes plenty of rehearsals.

Between Senior Citizens, the Troupers Club, and the Comedy Club, as well as playing the piano for Senior Citizen afternoon dances, she has a busy life.

A long-time friend praises her for seeking out this busy life. He is, Charles W. Skoien Jr., Executive Director of the California Commission on Aging, who first became acquainted with her when he was Director of Senior Citizens Activities for the City of Los Angeles.

Skoien commented:

"Gladys Kieley holds forth this encouragement to all Seniors who are lonely. Go to a Senior Center or to a Senior Club just to see what it is like. They'll help you."

People who know her tell her that as she grows older she gets younger looking, and to anyone with five grandchildren and three great-grandchildren, that is nice to hear.

Music is what does it, and she hold that true happiness comes through music and song.

It is her hope that all the Senior Centers and Senior Clubs will give even greater emphasis to music. Two of her strong advocates bless her for this. Miss Elsa Carrow of the Mayor's Committee on Aging and Tom Murphy, Supervisor of the Los Angeles Recreation and Parks Senior Citizen's Division.

For, as they say, music washes away from the soul the dust of every-day life . . . whether you're young or old.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of legislation embodying the administration's recommendation for extending and improving programs to meet some of the pressing needs of older Americans under the Older Americans Act.

As you know, I have often come before the Senate to argue for the 22,000,000 Americans who are aged 65 or over. I think all of us realize that the needs of these forgotten Americans are both economic and psychological. The purpose of the Older Americans Act is primarily to assist in determining, articulating, and meeting the psychological needs of older citizens, who merely because of their age are often left out of the mainstream of our society.

In all candor, I think that all of us would agree that to date the Older Americans Act has only achieved very limited progress toward fully meeting the needs of our older citizens. Nevertheless, we should take heart in the fact that some progress has been made. I am personally convinced that the changes in the program suggested by the administration's bill will enable the Administration on Aging to accelerate and expand the progress which has been made to date.

One of the most significant features of the bill is the provision to transfer the foster grandparents program to the Administration on Aging. As you know, in the past I spent considerable time and effort in studying the effectiveness of the war on poverty. Time after time one program stood above all others when the test of program effectiveness was applied. That program was the foster grandparent program which costs so little money, but reaped such great rewards, not only for the thousands of older Americans who gave their time and services, but also for thousands of young people who often for the first time in their lives had a friend and companion.

This bill not only makes the logical transfer of the program from OEO to the agency which in fact has been administering it since its inception, but it also expands the program so as to permit older Americans to participate by providing companionship and assistance to other older Americans.

Finally, Mr. President, I am particularly pleased that the administration suggests that the grant formula under the act continue at a level which will insure that States already having programs will not be faced with program termination for lack of funds. Along this same line, I am pleased to see that President Nixon's concept for joint funding of projects is contained in this bill. I personally am convinced that the streamlining of Government-grant programs by placing responsibility in the primary agency whenever more than one Federal agency is involved in a project at the State or local level will remove much of the confusion and redtape surrounding so many Federal-grant programs.

As a member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I look forward to early action on this bill.

S. 2122—INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL IMMUNITY WITNESS ACT

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on January 15, 1969, along with 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." The Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, of which I am chairman, subsequently held 4 days of hearings on S. 30 and a series of related measures. During those hearings, Congressman RICHARD POFF of Virginia, appearing in his capacity as vice chairman of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, a Commission on which Senators ERVIN, HRUSKA, and I are also privileged to serve, testified in favor of the enactment of a general immunity statute along the lines of that proposed in title II of S. 30, but which would also codify existing immunity law and procedure.

In order that the subcommittee might have the specific language of such a general immunity bill before it when it considers title II of S. 30, Senator ERVIN, HRUSKA, and I are today introducing the "Federal Immunity Witness Act," which was prepared by Congressman POFF with our collaboration, to effectuate the recommendation of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. I assume that this new measure will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and then to the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures.

As my colleagues and I have repeatedly stated, we are not committed to the words of the bills now pending before the subcommittee. We will weigh the advantages of this new general immunity proposal against the retention of specific grants of immunity—the practice currently followed. If the general immunity approach is adopted, there will, of course, be no need for a specific immunity title in S. 30, and it may well turn out that the best course of action to follow will be to substitute the language of this proposal for that of title II. This was suggested to the subcommittee by the Attorney General, John H. Mitchell in his comments on S. 30 of May 8, 1969.

Mr. President, this new bill is a part of our continuing efforts to improve the administration of criminal justice in our Nation. We are grateful for the able efforts of Mr. POFF and the Commission in this worthwhile endeavor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the bill and a letter of March 17, 1969, from the Honorable Pat Brown, the chairman of the National Commission on the Reform of Federal Criminal Laws, to the President of the United States, explaining the Commission's proposal, printed at the conclusion of my remarks. Finally, I add that the President, in his message on organized crime of April 23, 1969, "commend[ed] to the Congress for its consideration" the proposal contained in this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2122) to amend title 18, United States Code, to prescribe the manner in which a witness in a Federal proceeding may be ordered to provide information after asserting his privilege against self-incrimination and to define the scope of the immunity to be provided such witness with respect to information provided under an order, 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. 2122

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Immunity of Witnesses Act."

TITLE I—IMMUNITY OF WITNESSES

SEC. 101 (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after part IV the following new part:

"PART V.—IMMUNITY OF WITNESSES

"Sec.
"6001. Immunity generally.
"6002. Court and grand jury proceedings.
"6003. Certain administrative proceedings.
"6004. Congressional proceedings.
"6005. Definitions.

"§ 6001. Immunity generally.

"Whenever a witness refuses, on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination, to testify or provide other information in a proceeding before—

"(1) a court or grand jury of the United States,

"(2) an agency of the United States, or

"(3) either House of Congress, a joint committee of the two Houses, or a committee of either House, and the person presiding over the proceeding communicates to the witness an order issued under this part, the witness may not refuse to comply with the order on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination. But no testimony or other information compelled under the order (or any information directly or indirectly derived from such testimony or other information) may be used against the witness in any criminal case, except a prosecution for perjury, giving a false statement or otherwise failing to comply with the order.

"§ 6002. Court and grand jury proceedings.

"(a) In the case of any individual who has been or may be called to testify or provide other information at any proceeding before a court of the United States or a grand jury of the United States, the United States district court for the judicial district in which the proceeding is or may be held shall issue, upon the request of the United States attorney for such district, an order requiring such individual to give any testimony or provide any other information which he refuses to give or provide on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

"(b) A United States attorney may, with the approval of the Attorney General (or the Deputy Attorney General, or any Assistant Attorney General, designated by the Attorney General), request an order under subsection (a) when in his judgment—

"(1) the testimony or other information from such individual may be necessary to the public interest; and

"(2) such individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or provide other information on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

"§ 6003. Certain administrative proceedings.

"(a) In the case of any individual who has been or who may be called to testify or provide other information at any proceeding before an agency of the United States, the agency may issue an order requiring the individual to give any testimony or provide any other information which he refuses to give or provide on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

"(b) An agency of the United States may issue an order under subsection (a) only if in its judgment—

"(1) the testimony or other information from such individual may be necessary to the public interest; and

"(2) such individual has refused or is likely to refuse to testify or provide other information on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

The agency may issue such an order no earlier than ten days after the day on which it served the Attorney General with notice of its intention to issue the order.

"§ 6004. Congressional proceedings.

"(a) In the case of any individual who has been or may be called to testify or provide other information at any proceeding before either House of Congress or any committee of either House, or any joint committee of the two Houses, a United States district court shall issue, upon the request of a duly authorized representative of the House of Congress or the committee concerned, an order requiring such individual to give any testimony or provide other information which he refuses to give or provide on the basis of his privilege against self-incrimination.

"(b) Before issuing an order under subsection (a), a United States district court shall find that—

"(1) in the case of a proceeding before either House of Congress, the request for such an order has been approved by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Members present of that House;

"(2) in the case of a proceeding before a committee of either House of Congress or a joint committee of both Houses, the request for such an order has been approved by an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the full committee; and

"(3) no earlier than ten days prior to the day on which the request for such an order was made, the Attorney General was served with notice of an intention to request the order.

"(c) Upon application of the Attorney General, the United States district court shall defer the issuance of any order under subsection (a) for such period (not longer than twenty days from the date of the request for such order) as the Attorney General may specify.

"§ 6005. Definitions.

"As used in this part—

"(1) the term 'agency of the United States' means any Executive department (as defined in section 101 of title 5), a military department (as defined in section 102 of title 5), the Atomic Energy Commission, the China Trade Act registrar appointed under section 143 of title 15, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Federal Maritime Commission, the Federal Power Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Transportation Safety Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Subversive Activities Control Board, or a board established under section 715d of title 15;

"(2) the term 'other information' includes any book, paper, document, record, recording, or other material;

"(3) the term 'proceeding before an agency of the United States' means any proceeding before such an agency with respect to which it is authorized to issue subpenas and to take testimony of witnesses under oath or affirmation; and

"(4) the term 'court of the United States' means any of the following courts: the Supreme Court of the United States; a United States court of appeals, a United States district court established under chapter 5 of title 28, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, the United States Court of Claims, the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, the Tax Court of the United States, the Customs Court, and the Court of Military Appeals."

(b) The table of parts for title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"V. Immunity of Witnesses.....6001".

TITLE II—CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. The third sentence of paragraph (b) of section 6 of the Commodity Exchange Act (7 U.S.C. § 15) is amended by striking out "of section 12 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended and supplemented (U.S.C., 1934 ed., title 49, secs. 12, 46, 47, and 48), relating to the attendance and testimony of witnesses, the production of documentary evidence, and the immunity of witnesses" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "of section 12 of the Interstate Commerce Act and of the Act of February 11, 1893 (49 U.S.C. 46), relating to the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of documentary evidence".

SEC. 202. Subsection (f) of section 13 of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (7 U.S.C. § 499m (f)) is repealed.

SEC. 203. (a) Section 16 of the Cotton Research and Promotion Act (7 U.S.C. § 2115) is amended by striking out "(a)" and by striking out subsection (b).

(b) The section heading for such section 16 is amended by striking out ": SELF-INCRIMINATION".

SEC. 204. The fourth sentence of subsection (d) of section 10 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. § 1820(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 205. The seventh paragraph under the center heading "DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE" in the first section of the Act of February 25, 1903 (32 Stat. 904, 15 U.S.C. § 32) is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That" and all that follows in that paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 206. The Act of June 30, 1906 (34 Stat. 798, 15 U.S.C. § 33) is repealed.

SEC. 207. The seventh paragraph of section 9 of the Federal Trade Commission Act (15 U.S.C. § 49) is repealed.

SEC. 208. Subsection (c) of section 22 of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. § 77v(c)) is repealed.

SEC. 209. Subsection (d) of section 21 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 (15 U.S.C. § 78u(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 210. Subsection (e) of section 18 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (15 U.S.C. § 79r(e)) is repealed.

SEC. 211. Subsection (d) of section 42 of the Investment Company Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. § 80a—41(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 212. Subsection (d) of section 209 of the Investment Advisors Act of 1940 (15 U.S.C. § 80b—9(d)) is repealed.

SEC. 213. Subsection (c) of section 15 of the China Trade Act, 1922 (15 U.S.C. § 155 (c)) is repealed.

SEC. 214. Subsection (g) of section 307 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. § 825f(g)) is repealed.

SEC. 215. Subsection (b) of section 835 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out the third sentence thereof.

SEC. 216. (a) Section 895 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 42 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 895.

SEC. 217. (a) Section 1406 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 68 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 1406.

SEC. 218. Section 1954 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking out "(a) Whoever" and inserting in lieu thereof "Whoever" and by striking out subsection (b) thereof.

SEC. 219. (a) Section 2514 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 119 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2514.

SEC. 220. (a) Section 3486 of title 18, United States Code, is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of chapter 223 of such title is amended by striking out the item relating to section 3486.

SEC. 221. Subsection (e) of section 333 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. § 1333(a)) is amended by striking out ": *Provided*, That" and all that follows in that subsection and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 222. (a) Section 4874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of part III of subchapter (D) of chapter 39 of such Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 4874.

SEC. 223. (a) Section 7493 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is repealed.

(b) The table of sections of subchapter (E) of chapter 76 of such code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 7493.

SEC. 224. Paragraph (3) of section 11 of the

Labor Management Relations Act, 1947 (29 U.S.C. § 161(3)) is repealed.

SEC. 225. The third sentence of section 4 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide that tolls on certain bridges over navigable waters of the United States shall be just and reasonable, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935 (33 U.S.C. § 506), is repealed.

SEC. 226. Subsection (f) of section 205 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. § 405(f)) is repealed.

SEC. 227. Paragraph c of section 161 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (42 U.S.C. § 2201 (c)) is amended by striking out the third sentence thereof.

SEC. 228. Subsection (c) of section 12 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (45 U.S.C. § 362(c)) is repealed.

SEC. 229. Section 28 of the Shipping Act, 1916 (46 U.S.C. § 827) is repealed.

SEC. 230. Subsection (c) of section 214 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. § 1124(c)) is repealed.

SEC. 231. Subsection (l) of section 409 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. § 409(l)) is repealed.

SEC. 232. (a) The second sentence of section 9 of Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 89) is amended by striking out "; the claim" and all that follows in that sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 233. The third sentence of section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to further regulate Commerce with foreign nations and among the States", approved February 19, 1903 (49 U.S.C. § 43) is amended by striking out "; the claim" and all that follows in that sentence down through and including *"Provided,* That the provisions" and inserting in lieu thereof ". The provisions".

SEC. 239. The first paragraph of the Act of February 11, 1893 (27 Stat. 443, 49 U.S.C. § 46) is repealed.

(b) Subsection (a) of section 316 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. § 916(a)) is amended by striking out the comma following "part I" and by striking out ", and the Immunity of Witnesses Act (34 Stat. 798; 32 Stat. 904, ch. 755, sec. 1),".

(c) Subsection (a) of section 417 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. § 1017 (a)) is amended by striking out the comma after "such provisions" and by striking out ", and of the Immunity of Witnesses Act (34 Stat. 798; 32 Stat. 904, ch. 755, sec. 1),"

SEC. 235. Subsection (i) of section 1004 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. § 1484(i)) is repealed.

SEC. 236. The ninth sentence of subsection (c) of section 13 of the Internal Security Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. § 792(c)) is repealed.

SEC. 237. Section 1302 of the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (50 U.S.C. App. § 643a) is amended by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

SEC. 238. Paragraph (4) of subsection (a) of section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes", approved June 28, 1940 (50 U.S.C. App. § 1152(a)(4)), is amended by striking out the fourth sentence thereof.

SEC. 239. Subsection (d) of section 6 of the Export Control Act of 1949 (50 U.S.C. App. § 2026(b)) is repealed.

SEC. 240. Subsection (h) of section 14 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. § 717m(h)) is repealed.

TITLE III—EFFECTIVE DATE

SEC. 301. The provisions of part VI of title 18, United States Code, added by title I of this Act, and the amendments and repeals made by title II of this Act, shall take effect on the 60th day following the date of the enactment of this Act. No amendment to or repeal of any provision of law under title II of this Act shall affect any immunity to which any individual is entitled under such provision by reason of any testimony or other information given before such day.

The letter, presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN, is as follows:

THE NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: This is the second interim report by the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws and the first recommending a specific reform for consideration by the President and Congress. The reform relates to the matter of granting immunity to a witness in order to compel him to testify despite his assertion of the privilege against self-incrimination.

As noted in our first interim report (of November 4, 1968), we are primarily engaged in drafting a new code of federal criminal laws, defining offenses, defenses, and sentencing authority. Since it is to be an integrated and systematic code, our work does not usually lend itself to severable recommendations. We have been prompted to move ahead with the recommendations here, however, not only because the need is manifest but also because it can be met by provisions which are independent of the other reforms upon which we have been working.

We annex to this report statutory provisions recommended for reform of immunity, together with a report on federal immunity prepared for us by Professor Robert G. Dixon, Jr., of the George Washington University Law Center. The report includes appendices consisting of a list of existing federal immunity laws and some samples of them.

Upwards of 50 different statutes now authorize the granting of immunity in federal matters. They vary in a number of respects. The proposed reform would replace them with a single set of provisions having the following features:

1. The scope of immunity would be converted from immunity of the witness from prosecution for all matters related to his testimony to immunity from use of the testimony, or its fruits, against the witness in a criminal case.

2. The witness would have to claim his privilege in all cases before the immunity could be granted, unlike some existing statutes which confer immunity automatically when a subpoenaed witness testifies.

3. Instead of the authority to grant immunity being confined to inquiries having a specified subject, which leaves some matters of interest outside the compulsory testimony power, the immunity authority would extend to *all* court, grand jury, and Congressional proceedings, and to those administrative proceedings designated by Congress. Authority to determine when the need for information warrants an immunity grant would be vested in responsible officials to the extent of their jurisdiction.

4. To meet the concern that immunity may be improvidently conferred, a centralizing role is given to the Attorney General. He, or another high Department of Justice official, must approve grants to be authorized by a United States Attorney; and he must be given notice of grants to be conferred in Congressional and administrative proceedings. The proposal requires notice but does not give a veto-power to the Attorney General because the likelihood of his being able to persuade the Congress or department or agency officials that a particular immunity grant would be unwise makes it unnecessary to face difficult constitutional or policy issues arising from a requirement that he approve it.

5. Since on many occasions it can be anticipated before a witness appears to testify that he will assert his privilege, the proposal permits a contingent grant of immunity by the responsible official, to become operative when the privilege is asserted. This procedure should permit avoiding inconvenience, delay, and unnecessary ritual.

6. Although we make no recommendation as to which official or what body within a department or agency should be granted the authority to confer immunity in administrative proceedings, we do provide a standard provision for the exercise of such authority once the Congress has determined by law who should have it.

We are satisfied that our substitution of immunity from use for immunity from prosecution meets constitutional requirements from overcoming the claim of privilege. Immunity from use is the only consequence flowing from a violation of the individual's constitutional right to be protected from unreasonable searches and seizures, his constitutional right to counsel, and his constitutional right not to be coerced into confessing. The proposed immunity is thus of the same scope as that frequently, even though unintentionally, conferred as the result of constitutional violations by law enforcement officers. The change from absolute immunity to a use-restriction supports our recommendations that Congress no longer confine immunity authority to inquiries regarding a limited range of legislatively-specified subjects. At the same time this change in the scope of the immunity avoids the concern, which has arisen as the result of recent Supreme Court decisions, regarding the impact of federally-compelled information on state prosecutions. State prosecutions would be thwarted only if the evidence upon which they are to proceed has been derived directly or indirectly from the federal compulsion.

The provisions we propose could appropriately be placed in Chapter 223 of Title 18 of the United States Code; at the same time the immunity provisions in Sections 895, 1406, 1954(b), 2514, and 3486 of that Title should be repealed. We further recommend that, except for Section 2424 of Title 18 (dealing with the filing of a statement required under the White Slave Act) and Section 5848 of Title 26 (dealing with registrations under the Gun Control Act of 1968), the immunity provisions of the other laws listed in Appendix A of the immunity report be repealed; at the same time legislation should be enacted naming the appropriate person or body in the various federal departments and agencies authorized to issue a direction to testify, as required by section 3 of our proposal.

Directions to testify under Section 2 of the proposal (court and grand jury) and under Section 4 (Congress) can be enforced through existing provisions. When testimony is required by court order, refusal would be contempt under section 401 of Title 18, United States Code. When testimony is required before Congress, refusal would be a misdemeanor under Section 192 of Title 2, *United States Code.*

The adequacy of existing law to deal with enforcement of directions to testify under Section 3 (formal administrative proceedings) will depend upon which officials or bodies Congress determines should have the immunity-granting authority. Existing provisions applicable to certain agencies now make it a misdemeanor to "refuse . . . to answer any lawful inquiry" of the agency. See, for example, first paragraph of Section 50 of Title 15, United States Code (Federal Trade Commission); subsection (c) of Section 78u of Title 15, United States Code (Securities and Exchange Commission); last sentence of Section 46 of Title 49, United States Code, Interstate Commerce Commission).

The Commission has under consideration a provision which would make it an offense to intentionally fail or refuse to comply with a direction to testify, lawfully issued under the provisions proposed here; but until it is

forthcoming as a part of our complete code, we are satisfied with existing laws dealing with unlawful refusals to testify.

Respectfully submitted for the Commission,

Edmund G. Brown, Chairman; Don Edwards, George C. Edwards, Jr., Sam J. Ervin, Jr., A. Leon Higginbotham, Jr., Roman L. Hruska, Robert W. Kastenmeier, Thomas J. McBride, John L. McClellan, Richard H. Poff, Donald S. Thomas, Theodore Voorhees.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REFORM OF FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS—PROPOSED IMMUNITY PROVISIONS

SECTION (1). IMMUNITY GENERALLY

(a) A witness who asserts his privilege against self-incrimination before either House or committee of either House or a joint committee of both Houses of Congress, or a court or grand jury of the United States, or in a formal administrative proceeding may be directed to testify or produce other information as provided in this article. He shall not thereafter be excused from testifying or producing other information on the ground that his testimony or other information required of him may tend to incriminate him. But neither the testimony nor other compelled disclosures of the witness, nor any information or evidence derived therefrom, shall be used against the witness in any criminal case, except r. prosecution for perjury or any other offense constituting a failure to comply with such direction.

(b) A direction to testify or produce other information authorized by this article may be issued prior to the witness's assertion of his privilege against self-incrimination; but the direction shall not be effective until the witness asserts his privilege against self-incrimination and the person presiding over the inquiry communicates the direction to him.

(c) As used in this article "other information" includes any book, paper, document, record, recordation, tangible object or other material; and "formal administrative proceeding" means any proceeding for which an agency of the United States is authorized to issue subpoenas and at which testimony of witnesses may be taken under oath.

SECTION (2). IMMUNITY BEFORE COURT AND GRAND JURY

When the testimony or other information is to be presented to a court or grand jury, the direction to the witness to testify or produce other information shall be issued by the United States District Court upon application therefor by the United States Attorney. The application may be made whenever, in the judgment of the United States Attorney, the witness has asserted or is likely to assert his privilege against self-incrimination and his testimony or other information is or will be necessary to the public interest, and the application has been approved by the Attorney General or a Deputy or Assistant Attorney General designated by him.

SECTION (3). IMMUNITY IN FORMAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEEDING

When the testimony or other information is to be presented in a formal administrative proceeding, the direction to the witness to testify or produce other information shall be issued by the person or persons in the agency concerned to whom such authority has been given by statute. The direction may be issued whenever, in the judgment of such person or persons, the witness has asserted or is likely to assert his privilege against self-incrimination and his testimony or other information is or will be necessary to the public interest, but no sooner than ten days after service of notice upon the Attorney General of an intention to do so.

SECTION (4). IMMUNITY BEFORE CONGRESS

(a) When the testimony or other information is to be presented to either House or a committe of either House or a joint committee of both Houses of Congress, the direction to the witness to testify or produce other information shall be issued by a United States District Court, upon application therefor by a duly authorized representative of the House or committee concerned, and subject to the requirements of this section.

(b) Before issuing the direction, the court must find that application was authorized, in the case of proceedings before one of the House of Congress, by affirmative vote of a majority of the members present of that House, or in the case of proceedings before a committee, by affirmative vote of two-thirds of the members of the full committee.

(c) Notice of the application for issuance of the direction shall be served upon the Attorney General at least ten days prior to the date when the application is made. Upon request of the Attorney General, the court shall defer issuance of the direction for not longer than thirty days from the date of such notice to the Attorney General.

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

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Arkansas for his leadership in this field and for introducing this particular measure, the Federal immunity witness bill. We hope it ripens into an act soon. This measure is another link in the important chain of events being formed in the battle against organized crime. That chain consists of many component parts and the Senator from Arkansas has taken a prominent part in all of them: the wagering tax bill, the Illegal Gambling Control Act, the Wiretapping Act and the Electronic Surveillance Act, which extend to fields other than organized crime, and the revision of grand jury procedures. These matters are important if the battle is going to be waged successfully.

Therefore, I express my appreciation for the efforts the Senator has expended and I also wish to extend my appreciation to the Chairman, the Commissioners, and the staff of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws. They have laid a good foundation for the bill. I am confident that when the hearings are held, they will be persuasive for immediate action.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. I may say that I think the outlook at this session of Congress is good for enactment of additional laws to strengthen law enforcement in this country and to provide the additional tools which are much needed by law enforcement officials. There are good prospects that such legislation will be enacted. I feel greatly encouraged about it and about some of the progress we have made so far. There are no indications of serious conflict. I do not mean by that that every bill before us will be acted on favorably, but there is a spirit of cooperation, and a real bipartisan effort is being made to weigh all of the proposals and to insure that the committee will soon bring recommendations to the Senate floor for the enactment of legislation, which is so sorely needed, in our judgment, and will be of great assistance in the war on crime.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for the splendid contributions he is making. We are also glad to have Representative POFF join us, and to have the counsel and recommendation of the National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Law. They are making a good effort and the result of their labors will be very helpful to us.

I thank the Senator from Nebraska very much.

A NEW KIND OF STUDENT DEMONSTRATION IN IOWA—GOOD WILL, HELPFULNESS, COOPERATION, AND SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, not a day goes by without new reports of new college demonstrations, new takeover of college buildings, and new campus violence. The latest example of student thoughtlessness and selfishness occurred at Zap, N. Dak., where an entire community's hospitality was abused by wanton violence and destruction.

At one college in Iowa, there are also demonstrations occurring—but not of the violent kind that make the headlines. As the Sioux City Journal of March 30 reported "the demonstrations are of good will, helpfulness, cooperation and services to the community."

What the students at Morningside College are doing should be a lesson to students throughout the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Morningside College Students Employ New Type of Student Demonstrations," be printed in the RECORD.

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

APPROBATION—MORNINGSIDE COLLEGE STUDENTS EMPLOY NEW TYPE OF STUDENT DEMONSTRATIONS

Students at Morningside College are demonstrating, but there are no headlines.

There are no street scenes, no campus riots, and no seizing of Main Hall.

The demonstrations are of good will, helpfulness, cooperation and service to the community.

Among the "activisms" are these:

Through the collegians' volunteer efforts, youngsters of the Mary J. Treglia Community Center at 900 Jennings St. have companions who often fill the void of a fatherless or broken-home situation.

Lads of the Boys Club of Sioux City, situated in the old Armory at Ninth St. and Grandview Blvd., enjoy group singing under the direction of musical men of the college.

Morningside's three sororities, Alpha Omicron Pi, Alpha Delta Pi, and Delta Zeta have numerous projects marked by community helpfulness and awareness of the needs of unfortunate people.

Morningside students have proved they are alert to community need, as in the current flood threat situation when the collegians helped in sandbagging operations to prepare for high water in the menaced areas.

Many Indian families are provided transportation to and from St. Paul's Episcopal mission on Sioux City's West Side. They ride on a bus purchased by a group of Morningside students who also help with the mission's Sunday School program and in other phases of mission work.

Underprivileged and retarded children of the Sioux City area enjoy holiday parties provided by Morningside fraternity men.

A 9-year-old South Vietnamese boy whose father was killed in military action near Saigon receives monthly support money from a Morningside fraternity.

Starving children in wartorn Biafra received $630 in relief money from a two-day fast conducted by hundreds of Morningside students.

The March of Dimes and the Heart Fund benefited from two basketball games, a benefit dance and door to door canvassing by students.

The Red Cross blood bank will receive donations of blood from the six Greek-letter organizations on the Morningside campus. The blood drive is scheduled for Saturday, April 26.

AND MORE PROJECTS

Additional humanitarian projects are in the planning stage.

Jayne Yates, executive director of the Mary Treglia Community Center, warmly praised the group of Morningsiders, who go to the center by pairs every week night, mingle with the children and lead recreational activities.

"Many of these children need individual attention, particularly male leadership," said Miss Yates. "They need an 'older brother' or replacement for a father who for various reasons is absent from the home or who is so deeply involved in earning a living that he does not have time to devote to the children. Young men of Morningside College are doing a wonderful service in providing such companionship."

"If children can have attention on what we call a one-to-one basis, they feel that someone is interested in them," she added. "Believe me, our youngsters look forward to the nightly visits of the Morningside College men. We can count on them—seldom do they miss. We are most appreciative of their services."

Current leader of the group that provides this unique service at the Community Center is Morningside junior James Pease of Huron, S.D., who is president-elect of Circle K, which is affiliated with the Morningside Kiwanis Club. The work was started when Robert Banwart of Adel, Iowa, was president.

"Circle K has 52 members," Pease said, "and every one of them has gone down to help at the Community Center at least once, many of them numerous times. We just make ourselves available to the children and help with whatever they want to do in the recreation area. One night we took 17 of the Community House children to a college wrestling match and they were very enthusiastic about it, especially when the action became hot and heavy.

MUCH ENCOURAGEMENT

"One of the side benefits of our working with youth is that they see how Morningside College men act and live, and hopefully that will encourage them to continue with their education."

Two music students, Gary Besley of Freeport, Ill., and Wendell Williams of Milford, Iowa, go to the Boys Club (affiliated with Boys Clubs of America) every Wednesday night and help with group singing.

"The boys are likely to clam up if we try to teach them to sing individually," said Williams, "but they come out of it when we work with a group. We've had especially good results with a male quartet, which has appeared several times before clubs and service organizations."

Circle K's work at the Community House gives the college men a "personal satisfaction that they are helping somebody," Pease said. "It's a deeper feeling than just an emotional thrill over doing something different."

Circle K men also assist with the work of the Sanford Center on the West Side by sending members to the center every Wednesday evening. They help with the physical education program, providing coaching, and participate in varied recreational activities.

Sororities are far more than coed organizations stressing fun and games, for the three Morningside sororities Alpha Omicron Pi, Alpha Delta Pi and Delta Zeta conduct many projects that show comparison for less fortunate people everywhere.

Alpha Delta Pi has adopted a Korean war orphan, 11-year-old Tam Wai Sang, to whom they send money every month and gifts on special occasions. The college women also write letters regularly to Tam, who writes back and thanks the Morningside coeds for their thoughtfulness. The Korean girl attends an Apostolic Faith Church, and the Korean relief work is managed by the Christian Children's Fund, Inc., in Hong Kong.

READY FOR FLOOD

Members of Alpha Delta Pi also have offered their services in the event of a flood in Sioux City and have agreed to work eight-hour shifts helping with the cooking, caring for children, and performing any work that needs to be done for flood refugees during the emergency. The sorority girls for several years have assisted members of Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity at Christmas parties for handicapped and underprivileged children, and have donated clothing and toys to needy families in the Sioux City area during the Yule season. Janice Stevenson of Sioux City is president of the Alpha Delta Pi group.

Members of Delta Zeta have several projects that prove their concern for the welfare of others. In one of these projects, the college women contribute gifts that are sent to needy members of the Navajo Indian tribe at Gallup, N.M. The coeds also hold an annual bake sale, profits of which this year were given to the National Association of Hearing and Speech Agencies. Delta Zeta members also have canvassed door-to-door for the Heart Fund and the Cerebral Palsy Fund. At Christmas time, the college girls cooperate with the Morningside Sociology Club in donating food and clothing to needy Sioux City families. Elaine Satten of LaGrange Park, Ill., is president of Delta Zeta.

Alpha Omicron Pi members hold annual Christmas parties for retarded children and follow up that humanitarian activity by corresponding with retarded children in this area. These children write back, and Cheryl Kovarna, president of this sorority, said 'their responses are heart-warming." Letters and cards go out to the retarded youngsters on every special occasion, such as birthdays, Christmas, Halloween, Thanksgiving, Easter, Valentine's Day and even St. Patrick's Day. Alpha Omicron Pi members joined in the recent Morningside fast for starving people of Biafra, sent contributions to the National Foundation, and made donations to The Sioux City Journal Goodfellow drive. "Every month we try to have something going that will help others," said Miss Kovarna.

GET BUS FOR CHURCH

The Morningside group that obtained a bus for St. Paul's Indian Mission has won warm appreciation from pastor Rev. Philip Allen and the Rev. Robert Lucent, associate vicar of St. John's.

"The bus that Morningside men obtained for us means that we're able to expand our program by enabling us to transport more people to the mission church," the Rev. Father Allen said. "There's an almost unlimited opportunity to help the Indian people and assist them to establish themselves more firmly in the community. The Morningside group has performed, and is performing, a wonderful service."

The 54-passenger bus is used not only to transport Indian families to church worship services on Sunday, but also takes them to church-related events on weekdays.

Paying for the bus posed a big problem for the collegians, but they put the fund over the top by holding an ice cream social.

The $630 which the Morningsiders raised for the stricken people of Biafra went to the Biafran Relief Services Foundation which disburses such funds. It was made certain that the money would go directly to the starving people and would not be used to buy military supplies. Decision to hold the Biafran fast was made by vote of the Morningside students who take their meals at the Commons. The students missed three meals during the fast.

The South Vietnamese boy assisted by members of Sigma Phi Epsilon fraternity is Huynh Lang, who comes from a poor and needy family. His mother, although working, has not been able to earn enough to provide necessities for her needy family since her husband was killed. Kenneth Smith of Colo, Iowa, a fraternity member, assisted in arrangements for the child's care.

MEANINGFUL THINGS

Tau Kappa Epsilon fraternity sponsored the March of Dimes and the Heart Fund benefit basketball games.

Members of the Sigma Phi Epsilon were hosts at a Christmas party for retarded children at the fraternity complex. The fraternity men were assisted by members of Alpha Omicron Pi sorority, headed by Joy C. Johnson of Fort Dodge, Iowa. It was the third such annual event. Tau Kappa Epsilon staged a similar Yule party for underprivileged children in the 5-to-10 age bracket in the fraternity's quarters. Dennis Henrichs of Jackson, Minn., who headed the group's spirit and service committee at that time, directed arrangements and said "the kids had a ball." A downtown department store provided gifts which were distributed to the children.

Thus, Morningside College students are "demonstrating."

Jim Pease summarized when he said: "Whoever thinks present-day students are indifferent to the needs of others does not know the facts. I'm amazed at the number of students who are willing and eager to give of their time and ability to help underprivileged people have a richer life."

PROPOSED INSTITUTE ON TRANSPORTATION, TRAVEL, AND TOURISM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, of the many suggestions for the use of former Glasgow Air Force Base, the huge multi-million-dollar installation in northeastern Montana recently closed by the Department of Defense, none is more intriguing than that simply called "TTT."

Conceived by Rabbi Samuel Porrath, now head of a department bearing these initials at Niagara University, in New York, it relates to "transportation, travel, and tourism." Specifically, it calls for creation of an institute to give college-level training in these fields. Such training is now given at Niagara University. But a drawback there is that laboratory facilities are limited. This is where Glasgow comes in.

A similar program at Glasgow could utilize that base's magnificent aviation facilities, and could lead eventually to development of the base as a gateway to western United States for foreign tourists flying the polar route. "TTT" students would process them, arrange their itineraries, and do all the other tasks incidental to their visit. In time, the same services could be extended to possible cargo flights.

Montana government officials are excited about the concept. Avco Corp., the lessor of the base facilities, is exploring it. Proponents advance several arguments in support of Glasgow as a "gateway to the West." One is the great desire on the part of Europeans to see the land of "cowboys and Indians." As last summer's jam-ups proved, air space difficulties over eastern airports are reaching crisis proportions. Glasgow's modern facility and 13,500-foot runway, coupled with a lack of air congestion, would lend itself fast, safe handling of tourists and cargo. Glasgow lies equidistant between Tokyo and Rome. Because of this unique position at the apex of polar routes from both Europe and the Orient, it is a gold mine waiting to be tapped.

There are other obvious benefits. They relate to American Indians, to a boon to the economy of the western United States, to an influx of tourists and relief for our balance-of-payments problem, and to more trained workers for the transportation and tourism industries.

Mr. President, the concept is discussed more thoroughly in an article written by Jerry Holloran and published in the Butte, Mont., Standard, of April 24, 1969. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Butte (Mont.) Standard, Apr. 24, 1969]

GATEWAY TO OLD AMERICAN WEST—GLASGOW BASE ENVISIONED AS TRANSPORTATION LAB

(By Jerry Holloron)

HELENA.—Glasgow Air Force Base Could become a "gateway" to the old American West for Europeans and a student "laboratory" for transportation, tourism, and travel under a proposal that has caught the enthusiastic eye of Gov. Forrest H. Anderson.

The intriguing idea, which has far-reaching implications for the $100 million former Strategic Air Command base and for Montana, is being considered seriously by two New York educators and is far beyond the "pipe dream" stage, according to Gordon R. Bennett, executive director of Montana's Unemployment Compensation Commission.

"The governor has been convinced this is the brightest, most promising plan for Glasgow AFB," Bennett told the State Bureau. The UCC official has been asked by Anderson to head up state efforts to find greater uses for Glasgow facilities but emphasized that Anderson himself is the "shotgun" behind the present proposal.

Key to the plan is the institute of transportation, travel and tourism at New York's Niagara University, which offers bachelor of science degrees with specialization in "TTT." Simply stated, the institute gives college-level training in the social, operational and technical aspects of the rapidly growing fields of transportation, tourism and travel.

Bennett said the institute was "created in the mind" of Rabbi Samuel I. Porrath, its present chairman, to help meet the pressing demand for trained personnel in the TTT fields.

But Porrath has been searching for a "laboratory" for his students—a place where they could receive actual on-the-job training in tourism, transportation and travel.

After consultation with Federal Aviation Agency officials, Montana's congressional delegation and a visit to Montana last week, Porrath has decided that Glasgow AFB would be a near perfect place for such training.

But such a "laboratory" obviously would require the three T's—transportation, tourism and travel. And Porrath has a proposal for that, too.

Bennett explained that many Europeans who visit the United States list "cowboys and Indians" and the Old West as the top attraction.

Porrath, who is a very direct man, says why not bring them directly to where the cowboys and Indians are," Bennett said.

That's where Glasgow fits in. It offers 13,500-foot reinforced runways that could handle huge 747s and SSTs and the clear approaches and unloading facilities that those huge planes require.

"It's a reliable place to get in and out of with these heavies," Bennett noted.

Once the tourists arrived at Glasgow, the institute students could arrange their travel and tours. Included might be bus tours of the Old West, camping trips throughout Montana, and final arrangements to return to Europe either directly or via the East Coast.

"Washington, D.C., is the number two attraction after cowboys and Indians," Bennett said.

Location of the TTT lab in Montana could do more than attract and handle European tourists, he pointed out, because the institute offers training in the transportation of freight, as well as of passengers.

Thus, because Glasgow already is capable of handling the huge planes of the future, it might be a logical transportation point between Europe and the United States. Again, the institute could provide a trained cadre to handle the freight shipments.

In addition, Bennett sees the possibility of using Glasgow as a training base for pilots of the SST and the 747—a possibility that would be enhanced by the location of the institute there.

But at this point, everything hinges on whether the New York institute decides to expand its operations into Montana. Porrath and Robert S. Dyer, academic director of the institute, visited Glasgow, Helena and Billings last week to see what cooperation they could expect.

In Glasgow they conferred with community leaders and officials of the Avco Corp., which has a $2.6 million Army contract at the base now. In Billings, they met with Kampgrounds of America, Inc., officials to discuss the possibility of utilizing some of the corporation's camping facilities for the proposed tours.

The Helena visit included conferences with Anderson and other state officials. Bennett explained that Porrath sees the proposed Glasgow laboratory as a facility separate from the Niagara institute and one that could attract students from the West and possibly be tied in with a Montana university or college.

"Nothing is holding him up but money," said Bennett. "It's very simple."

So Porrath and Dyer have returned to New York to investigate financing possibilities, which include federal help and aid from private tourism-related industries such as airlines.

"EISENHOWER—SONNET ON HIS DEATH"

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, Dr. Amado M. Yuzon, president and chairman of the United Poets Laureate International, Quezon City, Philippines, was a great admirer of the late President Eisenhower. The late President's great friendship for the Filipino people inspired Dr. Yuzon to write a sonnet about our late beloved President. It is entitled "Eisenhower—Sonnet on His Death." I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

EISENHOWER—SONNET ON HIS DEATH

(By Amado M. Yuzon)

Like Washington, he was the war-and-peace
Titan of Presidents all—as a whole;
While Lincoln emancipated the black race,
He led the hosts of freedom in his days
And freed all Europe from the Nazi rule.

Unlike the Jacksons and the McKinleys
Who had pushed far and wide the nation's
border,
He flew the flag with nothing to increase
But the empire of human liberties
In yet the greatest, costliest world disorder.

Now he is dead—the soldier, President,
And may his God rest him in peace sublime. . . .
Leaving behind as deathless monument
Democracy—this monarch of his time!

QUEZON CITY, PHILIPPINES, *April 3, 1969.*

HIGH-PRICED OIL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last week I placed in the RECORD the first of a series of articles concerning the oil industry which are to be published in the National Observer. As the Observer points out, this industry is perhaps unrivaled in the kind and number of arrangements that protect its members from free market forces and, often, from each other.

Today, the second article exploring the oil industry's "singular position and prerogatives in America" appeared in the National Observer. This excellent article examines in depth the complex and wasteful State regulations which serve primarily to keep the price of domestic oil at an artificially high level by protecting inefficient operators from competition. Like the import program, these regulations result in enormous costs to the American consumer. Moreover, they channel new exploration away from the most efficient potential and threaten to undermine the incentives to search for new reserves.

I hope that Senators will read the article with care. 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:

FUELING THE FIGHT OVER MACHIASPORT: HOW HIGH-PRICED OIL GETS THAT WAY

(NOTE.—This is the second of several articles that explore firsthand and in depth the oil industry's singular position and prerogatives in America today. The articles were prepared by staff writers August Gribbin, Michael Malloy, and Patrick Young and senior editor Edwin A. Roberts, Jr.)

Finding, producing, transporting, processing, and selling oil is a paradoxical business. On the one hand, competition can become almost hysterical; on the other, the industry is perhaps unrivaled in the kind and number of arrangements that protect companies from free market forces—and often from each other.

Competition at the retail level is loud and clear. Filling stations in many areas have become mini-casinos in which bally-hooed giveaways and games of chance are used to

sell products that, whatever the brand names, are, and perhaps must be, essentially similar. At the other end of the system, the race to find oil deposits is a breathless one, and oil companies watch and track each other much in the manner of hostile nations.

But because the risks are great, companies often conduct their explorations in partnership with one or more competitors. And once oil is found, it is immediately locked into a production system that protects its price.

Price protection. That is at the heart of the Machiasport controversy and the import-quota system. It is also at the heart of the intricate structure of production controls established and enforced by the nation's chief oil-producing states. These controls force the American consumer to pay an artifically high price for oil products. They also encourage inefficiency and waste on a grand scale.

Inefficiency and waste. These terms are heard whenever critics of the oil industry level their guns at the industry's unique assortment of protections—prorationing, import quotas, and special tax privileges. To understand the dimensions of these protections, which tend to be interwoven, it's necessary to understand exactly how oil is produced.

The system of prorationing is part of the story of the Machiasport plan, which was explained in detail in The National Observer of May 5, because it is prorationing, among other things, that keeps domestic oil prices 60 per cent higher than world prices.

Proponents of building a huge refinery—using foreign oil—in the tiny Maine village of Machiasport argue that their plan will revitalize industry in northern New England, reduce the home-heating and gasoline bills of New Englanders, provide the nation with a new deep-water port, among many other benefits.

Opponents of Machiasport, and they include practically all domestic oil producers, fear that if the Maine facility were permitted to import huge quantities of foreign oil, the American oil market would collapse, national security would be endangered, and the country's oil-producing regions would suffer great economic hardship.

President Nixon has said he will decide next fall whether a free trade zone will be established in Maine (a prerequisite for the Machiasport refinery because of the current restrictions on oil imports) and whether a license to import foreign oil will be granted to Occidental Petroleum Corp., the company that proposes to erect the Machiasport facility.

Unlike the import-quota system and oil's myriad tax shelters, controls on domestic production are not now under serious review. But it is impossible to see the oil industry plain and whole, to appreciate its remarkably privileged status, unless one understands the process known as "prorationing." And to understand prorationing, it's first necessary to consider the nature of the commodity itself and the way it is extracted from the earth.

Oil is believed by most scientists to be the residue left by countless little animals that died and sank to the bottom of ancient seas many millions of years ago. The creatures became part of the deep layers of ooze on the ocean floors. These layers were covered with harder rock as the seas dried and the earth's crust moved and folded. The great pressure of the surrounding rock reduced the organisms to oil.

Because it was formed in this way, oil is typically found in the pores of sedimentary rock like sandstone or limestone. It can flow through such rock like underground water in response to gravity or other forces.

Oil trapped in the earth is responsive, for instance, to the pressures of gas and water. It is always found mixed with gas, just as soft drinks are mixed with carbonation. When a hole is drilled in the oil-bearing rock, pressure on the gas is released and a mixture of oil and natural gas fizzes to the surface, in the manner of a just-opened bottle of soda pop.

Sometimes a part of the gas content is freed from the oil underground, and it accumulates in pockets above the oil-saturated rock. When a well is drilled into the rock, the pressure of the gas speeds the oil to the surface.

Another kind of pressure is that caused by water, often salt water that remains from the ancient sea in which the oil was formed. Being heavier than oil, water may accumulate at the bottom of an oil deposit, and exert an upward pressure on the oil. Or the water may squirt to the surface like an artesian well and carry oil with it.

These various kinds of pressure are the causes of gushers and naturally flowing wells in new oil fields. If an operator has a good understanding of the layout of an oil reservoir and the pressures within it, he can extract most of the oil with one or two strategically placed wells. But if he and others drill holes all over a pool, they exhaust the natural pressures and invite underground water to invade the field. By overdrilling, they also waste money, partly by drilling so many unnecessary wells and partly by having to pump the oil that nature would have sent to the surface if the pressure had not been destroyed.

Such chaotic exploitation was once the standard procedure, thanks to human ignorance and greed and the peculiar legal status of oil. Lawyers call oil a "fugacious" mineral, from the Latin *fugere*—to flee. It is treated like a fugacious animal, such as a deer. English common law, dating back many centuries, declares that a landowner has the right to any wild animals he catches on his own property. And so an American landowner today has the right to any wild oil he can capture under his land.

This has been true even if the oil is flowing onto his land from somewhere else, or even if it is being sucked from a neighbor's land toward his by a well he has drilled.

This principle resulted in an absurd amount of overdrilling when the oil industry was young. A man who didn't drill a well on his own property was surrendering the oil beneath it to his neighbor who did. The more wells a man drilled, the more moving oil he might capture. Lawyers, in fact, refer to oil as being subject to the "law of capture," and so property owners dared not dally in their drilling. They were like children drinking from the same soda bottle with many straws, each trying to get the most.

Some of the most dramatic examples occurred in the East Texas field, the richest in the United States, when it was discovered in 1930 by C. M. "Dad" Joiner. Residents of nearby Kilgore hastened to drill as many wells as possible. Derricks were built so close together that their legs crossed. It was commoplace to drill two wells on the front and back halves of a 25-foot-wide city lot. As a result, Kilgore, a city of 12,000 people, now has 1,000 oil wells in an area that could adequately be served by a few dozen. One downtown business block alone contains 32 wells. Indeed the community is a maze of rusty derricks that the town fathers decorate like trees at Christmastime.

Most of the money that went into the forests of derricks was wasted. Economist Paul T. Homan estimates that 10 to 15 times as many wells were developed in the East Texas field as were needed to drain the reservoir. The overdrilling destroyed natural pressures, and it led to a glut of oil just as the Depression was settling upon the nation.

The East Texas field lacked the pipelines to handle the oil extracted from so many wells, and anyway the market for oil had collapsed. Nevertheless, operators continued to pump out all the oil they could—just to keep it from their neighbors—and the oil was dumped into open, earthern pits to evaporate while the owner searched desperately for buyers.

Small, independent refineries skimmed off valuable gasoline from the little oil they bought, and the remaining heating-fuel oil was poured into creeks.

In the early 1930s the price of oil fell so low that a saloon on the Texas-Louisiana line advertised beer at "10 cents a glass or one barrel of oil."

Out of this era of waste and confusion grew the state production controls of today. The governors of Texas and Oklahoma started out with direct methods, calling forth the militia to see that the new restrictions on output were not ignored. Gradually the system of production limitation became more sophisticated, but its purpose remains the same.

"Prevention of waste" is the official justification in the laws of almost every oil-producing state for regulating output. But a dozen of the most important oil states define waste, among other things, as the Texas statute does: "The production of crude petroleum in excess of . . . reasonable market demand."

These "market-demand states" limit the oil they produce to the quantity they can sell at current prices. Officially, they deny that their aim is to hold prices at a high level, and it is true that the state regulatory bodies do not consider price directly when they calculate each month's production quota. But by making certain that supply never exceeds demand, they ensure price stability.

Such a neat arrangement would not be possible if the big oil companies could buy all the oil they needed elsewhere, but the market-demand states of Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, and New Mexico have always produced the lion's share of American oil, and even today Texas produces more than a third of U.S. oil and Louisiana almost a fourth. Needless to say, the market-demand states are casting a fretful gaze at northern Alaska, whose fields may one day destroy the Texas-Louisiana primacy.

Despite the assertion of the market-demand states that output controls don't keep prices up, the U.S. Justice Department in a generally friendly report in 1963 said: ". . . the states controlling the bulk of production have directly stabilified prices by limiting the amount of new production which will be permitted to enter the market." The report declared that market-demand laws are "most emphatically direct factors in national price and supply balance." But the Justice Department also concluded that price stabilization of this kind is not illegal.

Market-demand prorationing does more than limit production. It "prorates," or rations, output among all the wells in a state. And it does this in a manner that systematically directs production toward the less efficient wells and away from the more efficient ones. Given a choice between a barrel of oil that costs $3 to produce and a barrel that costs $2, the prorationing system will give the nation the three-dollar barrel every time.

The system works this way: Purchasers of crude oil submit an estimate each month of the amount of oil they expect to buy in the particular state in the month to come. At the April prorationing hearings in Louisiana, for instance, every interested refining company from Southwest Gas Producing Co., which wanted 10 barrels, to Texaco, which wanted 475,000 barrels, submitted an official "nomination" for the amount wanted to state Conservation Commissioner J. M. Menefee.

The total of all these nominations, which covered anticipated May purchases, was slightly more than it had been for the previous month, so Mr. Menefee raised the state-

wide production quota for the month of May. The state-wide quota is then divided among all 31,000 wells in the state.

But the quotas bear no relation to the capacity of each well. If production is cut back, say, 30 per cent from the total output possible, all wells in the state are not cut back 30 per cent. All of the reduction is concentrated on the most efficient wells.

The so-called marginal, or stripper, wells are never cut back at all. These are wells that cannot produce more than 10 barrels a day. About half of all the oil wells in Texas are of the stripper variety, but they produce only 15 per cent of the state's oil. This oil usually costs more on a per-barrel basis because it takes so many more wells to produce a given amount. This more expensive oil is produced without any limitation, and the more productive wells are given reduced quotas to make room for it.

The remaining 85 per cent of production in Texas is then parceled out among the wells capable of producing more than 10 barrels a day. But again there is a formula that concentrates production among the least efficient of these wells. This formula gives each well a "top allowable" or "yardstick allowable" that limits the number of barrels it will be permitted to produce on any given day.

The market-demand states all set this allowable by relating the depth of the well to the size of the tract that it drains. Under rules adopted in Texas in 1965, for instance, a 2,500-foot well would get a top allowable of 22 barrels a day if drilled on a 10-acre tract, and of 74 barrels a day if drilled on a 40-acre tract. If the well was 10,250 feet deep, it would be allowed 48 barrels a day on a 10-acre plot, and 192 barrels on 40 acres.

The system sounds complicated and it is, but that is not necessarily a fault when technology and economics become intertwined. On the other hand, the complexity of extraction rules does not make any more reasonable those provisions that are unreasonable on their face.

For instance the ability of a well to produce oil depends on the quantity and richness of the "oil sands" that it has tapped. Acreage is only roughly connected with production, and depth has nothing at all to do with it. Therefore, a well with a top allowable of 100 barrels a day may be capable of producing 1,000 barrels a day. A company with such a 1,000-barrel-a-day well would have to drill nine identical wells to qualify for the 1,000-barrel quota. And the average 5,000-foot well drilled in the United States costs $65,000.

But many wells are unable to produce the "top allowable" determined by depth and acreage. Some wells with a top allowable of 100 barrels a day may never produce more than 50. Yet the system works to take as much oil out of such a well as out of one with 5 to 10 times the capacity.

When the Texas Railroad Commission, which handles oil prorationing in Texas, or Louisiana's Mr. Menefee decide how much oil their respective states will produce the following month, they express their decision as a "percentage of allowable." They take the amount of production they have calculatd to equal the demand, deduct the output of strippers and certain other exempt wells, and then cut back all other wells to a percentage of their top allowable.

The Texas Railroad Commission in March, for instance, decided to increase Texas production for the following month by allowing wells to produce 49.9 per cent of their top allowable instead of 45.6 per cent as in March. In other words, a well with a top allowable of 100 barrels a day would be permitted to increase production from 45.6 to 49.9 barrels.

This means that a well with a depth-acreage allowable of 100 barrels, and a genuine capacity of 50, would be allowed to produce all the oil it could. It would also mean that a well with a capacity of 1,000 barrels and the same depth-acreage formula would be restricted to less than 5 per cent of its potential.

"You are using your most expensive oil today and saving your cheaper oil for the future," concedes William J. Murray, who served for 16 years on the Texas Railroad Commission and became one of the most articulate defenders of market-demand prorationing. Mr. Murray's point is that nobody would produce the higher-priced oil if operators could produce all they wanted from their more efficient wells.

Mr. Murray and most oilmen see this as a good thing, because the higher priced wells would otherwise be closed down and their small reserves lost to the public. Most economists agree that the system forces the public to use high-cost instead of low-cost oil, but they insist that producing it is a waste of manpower and money.

"A perennial criticism of existing proration is not that it restricts output, but that by favoring higher-cost marginal and exempt wells, it causes the restricted output to be produced at a much higher cost than necessary," says oil economist Dr. Henry Steel of the University of Houston.

Counters Mr. Murray: "I'm for getting energy wherever it's cheapest, but I'm willing to pay extra for national security. For security reasons, you have to have the ability to produce more than the nation is going to consume."

He adds: "The states that used market-demand prorationing conned the producers into drilling more wells than they needed, but the industry owes it to the country to have this extra capacity."

Mr. Murray says further that market-demand prorationing increases the amount of oil produced in the long run, by making producers develop their fields most intensively. He declares that about 82 per cent of the oil beneath the heavily overdrilled East Texas field is being withdrawn, partly because of high prices and a rationing system that compels companies to take part of their purchases from each well there. A recovery rate of 25 to 50 per cent is far more common, and Mr. Murray says the 82 per cent rate makes East Texas the most "efficient" oil field in the world.

In the long run, contends Mr. Murray, the price stabilization brought on by prorationing makes oil cheaper, or at least no more costly, than would a free market. He asserts that sharp ups and downs in price would average out at a higher level than that chieved by the smooth path of stabilization. Producers would otherwise be forced to spend more on storage facilities during lean times, he says, and their financing would cost more because of the increased risk.

"When you don't prorate, the consumer pays more and the producer gets less," according to Mr. Murray.

These are the major arguments for prorationing. They are heard wherever oil producers gather to criticize the critics of the system. And the term "national security" seems to grace every other sentence. But the prorationing arguments are subject to formidable rebuttal.

If national security indeed requires the existence of surplus wells, it would be more sensible, and perhaps cheaper, for the Federal Government to pay a bonus for this extra capacity, rather than for the Texas Railroad Commission and Mr. Menefee to work it out as a side effect of the rationing system.

Higher-cost oil, moreover, is higher-cost oil, whether the price is stable or not. If the rationing system were biased in favor of efficient, instead of inefficient, wells, the price could still be stable but at a lower level.

The current system causes unnecessary wells to be drilled, and a large amount of money to be spent needlessly. The best-known book to deal with the subject. *Economic Aspects of Oil Conservation Regulation,* by Paul T. Homan of Resources for the Future, Inc., and Wallace F. Lovejoy of Southern Methodist University, puts it this way:

"The oil that is *not* produced is invariably the oil that could be produced at the lowest marginal cost. This phenomenon is merely a secondary feature of a system that permits far more wells to be drilled than are necessary for efficient drainage and protects their profitability. It is, however, a popular feature, since there are far more poor wells than rich ones, and the vested interests that it creates stand as the most formidable barrier to progress toward a more economically rational structure of production. Progress in that direction requires a drastic reduction in the well population. Rapid progress would require the deliberate extinction of masses of existing wells, a task that no state agency has cared, or dared, to propose."

Messrs. Homan and Lovejoy warn further that "present regulatory rules contain the danger of slowing down, if not actually halting, the growth of the industry by undermining the incentives to search for new reserves."

This is an important point that is stressed by almost all economists not affiliated with the industry, and yet it is one that industry spokesmen refuse to concede. Prorationing has a double-edged effect. It guarantees that someone who develops a third-rate well will receive a large enough quota to make a profit, but it also guarantees that someone who brings in a first-rate well will still get only a third-rate return.

It is not even certain, at least in the short run, that prorationing is needed to stabilize prices. Mr. Menefee, for instance, doubts that there would be many changes in the price structure if he stopped issuing monthly quotas.

"Even if you eliminated 'market demand,' there wouldn't be more oil produced," he says. "The pipelines can carry only so much. We have reached the point that refineries are practically operating about 100 per cent of capacity.

"The oil companies have a tremendous investment, and they are prudent. My opinion is that if we didn't have any allowables at all, they would not produce any more. There would be no material difference over a 12-month period."

What Mr. Menefee is saying is that the companies themselves would keep production stable if the state didn't. The history of the oil industry before prorationing, however, does not support that opinion. And if such a co-operative, mutually protective arrangement were worked out by the oil companies themselves, it might quicken the interest of antitrust specialists in the Justice Department.

"What we are doing," adds Mr. Menefee, "is just a matter of fair distribution of production among each landowner and royalty owner and producer. People who talk about price fixing don't know what they're talking about."

The matter of fair distribution is one aspect of prorationing that would seem to make some such system necessary.

Harold Vance, a veteran oil operator in Houston, underscores this point with the story of Monte Michael, an independent oil man who hit a gusher during the Mexican oil boom just before World War I. The major company that dominated the surrounding acreage, and was the only possible purchaser of Michael's oil, simply ignored him, and took its oil from its own wells. Michael went broke, even as his well produced thousands of barrels of oil. Michael was driven by this experience into a new career as robber of

oil-company payrolls and was finally shot to death by company guards.

"That's what happens without prorationing," says Mr. Vance.

Without some form of state-controlled, per-well production, the big oil companies would almost surely use all the oil possible from their own wells, and the thousands of small producers would soon be out of business.

There have been some attempts lately to modify the prorationing system's traditional absurdities.

Since 1967, for instance, Texas has permitted producers to shut down some surplus wells and concentrate their production on others. Prior to 1967, however, these companies were compelled to operate 8 or 10 wells on tracts they knew could be efficiently drained by 1 or 2 wells. But even the new rules don't cover all the wells in Texas.

Officials of the major companies, which lose the most because of the system's peculiarities, have managed to have them changed over the years. They are proud, for example, that the state now permits them to regularly space new wells on tracts of 40 acres each, whereas before the standard spacing between wells was 5 acres. The movement to change the spacing from 5 to 10 to 20 to 40 acres represents years of arduous lobbying—lobbying that still continues.

The three members of the Texas Railroad Commission are elected state-wide for six-year terms, and thus they are responsive to political pressures from the literally millions of people who own tiny interests in individual wells.

"The royalty owner wants to see as many wells as can be drilled on a tract of land," says Mr. Vance. "The producer wants to drill only the number of wells that will make the most profit."

The regulatory bodies seem on the whole to have favored the interests of the royalty owners in the past, and this is one reason why the United States has 550,000 wells compared to about 1,500 in the entire Arab world.

The market-demand system is being steadily liberalized because of the growing demand for oil. As demand increases inside the protected American market, state authorities allow production to rise. Oklahoma raised production to 100 per cent of allowable in March of this year, and Texas is exceeding 50 per cent in May for the first time since the 1967 crisis in the Middle East.

The commissions also are taking a more reasonable attitude toward producers who want to use fewer wells to extract the same amount of oil. An agent representing one of the major oil companies at Texas Railroad Commission hearings says that he now spends almost two-thirds of his time on pollution control and genuine conservation, instead of working full time on seeking allowables as he once did.

But making production controls more reasonable today doesn't extirpate the unnecessary drilling and investment that marks the industry's past. So when oil companies argue—and they constantly do—that their return on investment is no higher than that of other industries, they are including the current returns on investments that perhaps should not have been made in the first place.

A protected domestic oil industry is primarily justified by pleas for national security. The derivatives of crude oil are so many and so essential that neither the military nor civilian sectors of society could function without them. So it is that oilmen stress the need for greater and greater oil reserves.

In early April, the American Petroleum Institute estimated that proved reserves in the United States, not including the recent big find in Alaska, stood at 30.7 billion barrels at the end of 1968. This is 670,000,000 barrels less than a year earlier.

But "proved reserves" are not what most laymen think they are. Proved reserves generally include only the oil that can be produced profitably with the equipment presently installed. A known deposit of economically recoverable oil is not part of the proved reserves if the owner has not yet installed the necessary extraction equipment. Oilmen refer to proved reserves as oil that is "on the shelf," and the amount of oil on the shelf is as dependent on the industry's investment decisions as it is on the amount of oil that is actually underground.

The oil that lies in its natural state is known as "oil in place." The U.S. Geological Survey estimated in 1965 that oil in place under the continental United States originally totaled 1.6 trillion barrels. It later estimated that 400 billion additional barrels lay under Alaska and the continental shelf out to a water depth of 600 feet. Only 85 billion of this 2 trillion barrels has been recovered in the entire history of the oil industry. So there is no danger that the United States will "run out of oil."

How much of this 2 trillion barrels that is recovered will really depend on how much the public wants to pay for it. The amount of oil definitely located so far totals 400 billion barrels. About 85 billion barrels of this has been removed, and the American Petroleum Institute (API) says that 31 billion additional barrels can be extracted profitably with the equipment now in place.

The API said in its 1967 yearbook that another 7.4 billion barrels could be economically extracted if the proper equipment were installed to increase the pressure under certain fields. The Interstate Oil Compact Commission, a kind of information clearinghouse composed of representatives from oil-producing states, estimates these real, but unofficial, reserves at 17.5 billion barrels. It also calculated that 21.5 billion more barrels could be removed with conventional methods of restoring pressure—but not necessarily at current prices. The IOCC estimates that 40 billion additional barrels could be extracted by newly developed methods.

The point is that reserves increase as much with improvements in technology as they do through discovery. The Interior Department reported in 1968 that "on the basis of past experience, it is estimated that identified oil fields as of January 1, 1968, may eventually yield at least twice the 31 billion barrels in proved reserves with which they were credited by the American Petroleum Institute on that date."

So the oil available to the United States depends on the amount of money devoted to extracting it. This is what the oil people are complaining about when they bemoan the "shrinking" of reserves. They mean that beyond a certain point there isn't enough profit in oil to make it worth-while to develop new sources.

And they can make a case. The recent price rises of about 20 cents per 42-gallon barrel of oil are the first since the late 1950s. Oil now sells for between $3 and $3.50 a barrel. Harold McClure, president of the Independent Petroleum Association of America, calculates this price to be the equivalent of $2.15 a barrel in 1956 dollars. Their failure to keep up with inflation is the main reason cited by independent oilmen for the reduced drilling done by independent operators.

Dr. Steele in Houston estimates that it costs about $4 today to find and extract a barrel of oil. If he is right, then present prices can't possibly support the development of reserves as fast as oil is used.

Mr. McClure would like to see a rise in prices of one cent per gallon, or 42 cents per barrel, as a solution to dwindling reserves. But it is very likely that oil would then reach a price that would make competitive various synthetics as well as oil extracted from shale. Some big companies have been looking into both of these lately.

In using shale they are up against a most peculiar problem of waste disposal, because a cubic yard of oil shale produces more than a cubic yard of ash when the oil is withdrawn.

"These questions may become moot if the Alaskan discoveries are as big as some people think they are," says Dr. Steele, who thinks they are very big indeed. He has been studying oil-shale economics, and he says the big companies' enthusiasm for it has abated since they started hearing from their geologists in the Arctic.

Oil geologists are normally conservative about estimating the size of new finds, yet the estimates of 5 to 10 billion barrels under Alaska's Prudhoe Bay field are based on the development of only two wells, drilled seven miles apart.

That is what makes the prospects of further drilling so exciting, not just in Alaska but in the MacKenzie River Delta and on the Arctic islands of Canada, where the surface geology is said to be almost identical to that of the Arab Middle East.

Should the Arctic finds prove to be as gigantic as many experts believe them to be, and if the formidable transportation problems are worked out, then a new era in the domestic oil industry will be at hand. And the present prorationing system, so long dictated by the states of the Southwest, may well become just another curious chapter in the remarkable history of the oil business.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) recently delivered a speech in Chicago to the Great Lakes Conference of the Maritime Trades Department, Maritime Port Councils.

Senator BAYH's speech was a timely and thought-provoking analysis of the St. Lawrence Seaway as the seaway celebrates its tenth anniversary. As a member of the Great Lakes Conference of Senators, Senator BAYH has been in the forefront of those who have sought to have the seaway live up to its tremendous promise as the vital link between America's "heartland" and the rest of the world.

Senator BAYH astutely points out that the shortage of American-flag shipping in the seaway and the Great Lakes has been one of the principal reasons for the failure of the seaway to live up to its full capacity. The fact that American-flag lines generally do not possess ships which can physically transit the seaway is largely to blame. Congress has been appropriating money for years to subsidize ship construction. It is time that serious consideration be given to a specific set-aside for building ships that are designed for seaway travel.

Senator BAYH's speech deserves the attention of every Member of the Senate. 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:

It is a distinct pleasure for me to be able to come to Chicago today to join with you in this very important seminar.

This has really been a flying visit for me—I attended an important meeting in Washington this morning on the restructuring of the Democratic Party so that it will continue to be a responsive and responsible voice in our society—and as soon as I finish visiting with you I have to jump back to Wash-

ington for some equally important weekend meeting on some of the vital international and domestic matters that are engaging the attention of the Senate.

I tell you this—not to gripe about a Senator's lot—but to let you know that I considered that this Port Council conference had high priority—high enough to warrant a little schedule juggling in order to be here.

I must say, at the outset, that I am impressed by the fact that the labor movement on the Great Lakes—both North and South of the border—are providing leadership for developing the maximum potential of America's fourth—and newest—seacoast.

As most of you are aware, I am privileged to be one of the members of the Great Lakes Conference of Senators—a bipartisan grouping in the United States Senate which is devoted to the same principle.

So we have a lot in common—and there is much that we can do together to make certain that the Great Lakes—and the St. Lawrence Seaway which links this inland coast to the rest of the world—serve as an economic stimulus to this area which is the heartland of the North American continent.

We meet here today on a rather significant date—the 10th anniversary of the opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

It was on April 25th, 1951, that the first ships began moving through this long waterway—which for the first time made it possible for ships of 27-foot draft to continue from Montreal into Lake Superior.

Up to the time that the Seaway was opened, this waterway was an important *inland* artery—now it is our link to the entire world around us.

The Seaway has been a long time coming.

Back before most of us were born—or at least before I was born—the whole idea of a deep-draft seaway had been conceived and recommend to the governments of the United States and Canada.

It was in 1895 that a joint Canadian-United States Deep Waterway Commission was created to study the matter—and it was in 1897 that the Commission reported favorably on the idea of a deep waterway that would put the Lakes within reach of ocean-going vessels.

But it took more than half a century of development and debate before the project was implemented so that today's vessels which call at the major ocean ports of the world also call at Chicago, Detroit, Duluth, and the other port cities on the Lakes.

Mid-America has always been well served by domestic forms of transportation—Chicago, for example, has thrived as the railway hub of the United States.

Yet it has long been obvious to us that—rail and truck and air service, notwithstanding—this heartland of our continent could reach its full development only if there also existed the capability for maximum water transport—particularly deep-sea transport.

This mid-continent area is an integral part of America's economy—it serves not only the bread-basket of our people but their industrial complex as well.

From this area, the grain from our vast midwestern farms—the corn, rye, oats, soybeans and wheat which feed our own people and a hungry world—have to be moved to the four corners of the globe.

From this area, as well, are shipped the products of our vast industrial empire—transportation equipment, non-electrical machinery and fabricated metal products, to name just a few—which are produced in such abundance.

In point of fact, the Great Lakes area is distinguished by the fact that it exports more than any other section of the United States.

But commerce is a two-way street—in this area we are importers, as well as exporters.

To keep our giant industries operating we need raw materials—iron ore and chromite for our steel mills, bauxite for our aluminum plants, lead and copper, manganese and columbite, and a host of other materials—and we need them in ever-increasing quantities.

Beyond that, this area imports huge amounts of other products—coal, petroleum, rubber and the like—to keep the wheels of our industry turning.

Sea transport of the things we grow and the things we make—and sea transport of the raw materials that go into our productive capacity—is vital.

In building the St. Lawrence Seaway—and in opening the Great Lakes to ocean-going vessels—we put this area on the doorstep of the world, and we brought the world into our own backyard.

But it seems to me that we have not done enough in terms of our water potential—and the reason why I say this is that so much of the goods moving between this area and the rest of the world move, not on American vessels, but on foreign vessels.

To the extent that this has happened, we have developed this area's economy unevenly—and, equally important, we are contributing to a continued deficit in our balance of payments as long as we utilize foreign vessels with foreign crews to move so great a percentage of our cargo.

The deep-sea American merchant fleet faces massive competition from foreign carriers—these companies build their vessels with low-cost labor in foreign shipyards, and they crew their vessels with low-wage seamen drawn from a variety of nations.

The result is that they can carry goods at rates that are not profitable for American vessels.

This, however, is not a new development—it has existed for years, and it has its roots in America's standard of living which is unparalleled in the rest of the world.

Nor is this situation unique with the American merchant marine—the same thing can be said for every other American industry—namely that it cannot compete, without some protections, in the open market.

Yet as far as the merchant marine is concerned, we have devised a maritime program that is only minimally protective—and that we then proceed to fund inadequately, thus making it next to impossible to develop our full maritime potential.

For example, we have a program to provide assistance in the construction of vessels for the American-flag fleet so that U.S. shipowners can buy American-built ships at the world market rate—yet we have extended this program to only 14 out of the hundreds of American shipping lines—and for years we have provided little or no funds to make this program possible.

This year, for example, the budget presented to Congress calls for constructing only 10 new ships to be divided among these 14 companies—at a time when all objective indicators show we should be building many times that number in the face of the serious obsolescence of our fleet.

We also have a program to help defray the operating cost of American vessels so that they can carry imports and exports at precisely the same rate as foreign-flag vessels—yet, again, this assistance is limited to only 14 companies which, together, operate only one-third of the ships in our fleet.

These defects in our maritime program affect all of our merchant marine—they have a particularly devastating effect on the development of our maritime strength here on the Lakes.

When the Seaway operations began, there was an effort made to encourage at least some of the subsidized American lines to operate between other world ports and the Great Lakes.

But in 1967, the lines abandoned this operation on the ground that it was "unprofitable"—although how the shipping companies arrived at that conclusion is, quite frankly, beyond me, in view of the fact that foreign shipping interests have made a success out of operating into this area.

I think an analysis might show that what the subsidized lines really were saying was that operating exclusively out of East Coast ports was *more* profitable.

I don't wish to get into any sort of public dispute with the subsidized lines—I don't want to polarize this situation and make it any more difficult to work out—but I do want to see some resolution to the problem we have here on the Lakes in terms of upgrading American-flag participation in this ever-increasing carriage of imports and exports.

The Great Lakes Conference of Senators has expressed itself on this subject before—and the unanimous views of its Republican and Democratic members deserve to be stressed again.

It is our considered view that—whether the government's appropriations for operating subsidies are large enough or not—and whether they are equitable or not—that a stated portion of these subsidies be earmarked for American-flag vessels operating between this area and the rest of the world.

We have not asked for an inordinate sum—out of the $200 million which is allocated for operating subsidies each year, we have requested that only $8 million be set aside to meet the threat of foreign competition here on the Lakes.

If it makes sense to meet foreign competition elsewhere in the maritime area, then it makes particular sense to meet that competition here, because foreign-flag operators have moved into the mid-America market even more strongly than they have anywhere else.

There is less than 4 percent American-flag participation in this rich and growing trade here on this new seacoast—and it is our contention that this share should be sharply increased so that we derive the maximum economic benefit.

After all, citizens of the Great Lakes area—through their taxes—are helping to underwrite the subsidies which are handed out to these American-flag carriers—and it's about time they received some direct benefit.

The Great Lakes Conference of Senators has also proposed that part of the money being allocated for ship construction subsidies—even though the sums are too small and the distribution within the merchant marine too limited—that a part of these sums be set aside for building ships that will be able to traverse the Seaway.

It is an irony that in the face of our need for newer, speedier and more efficient shipping in this area, the government's money is going toward the building of ships that are too wide to negotiate the Seaway.

We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to open up this area to ocean-going shipping—and now we are abdicating this trade to foreign-flag ships because of our short-sightedness in building ships which physically can't get through the Seaway.

Again, with reference to the tax dollars from this area which are involved, the citizens of the Great Lakes area are being asked to finance themselves out of business in terms of modern American-flag vessels, paying American taxes and employing American crews.

This doesn't make sense.

But while we have problems in terms of American shipping is concerned, we also are making progress.

The Great Lakes Conference—through the efforts of its chairman, Senator William Proxmire—has been instrumental in correcting a situation within the Department of Defense which discriminated against the use of Great Lakes ports for the carriage of military cargoes from this area.

For years, the Defense Department was using a method for figuring terminal costs that was unrealistic and discriminatory as far as our port facilities were concerned.

Under this arrangement, the government was assessing the highest possible "terminal costs" against the Great Lakes ports, and the lowest possible costs against East Coast ports.

Senator Proxmire described this once as a "chicken-and-the-egg" dilemma—as long as the rates remained high, American ships wouldn't bid for cargo—and as long as American ships wouldn't bid for the cargo, the rates remained high.

The Defense Department has now removed this artificial standard—and this should mean the increased movement of military cargo from this area by ship—instead of moving it by rail to East Coast ports and by ship from that point outward.

This is one small victory—but it gives us hope that we can continue to make progress in terms of greater shipping activity—and, equally important, greater American-flag participation in this shipping activity—here on the Lakes.

I commend the AFL–CIO Maritime Trades Department—and I particularly commend the officers and members of all the Port Councils around the Lakes—for their continuing efforts to upgrade America's maritime efforts here in mid-America—as well as elsewhere around the globe.

For your part, you can count on my continued support for all of your efforts which are aimed at making our fleet more dynamic competitive—not only on the Lakes but everywhere that American ships carry our goods—and the American message—to the world.

Thank you very much.

SIXTIETH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF MR. AND MRS. ANDREW F. ARMSTRONG, OF GLASGOW, MONT.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, rarely do we have the occasion to extend congratulations to a husband and wife who have lived together for 60 years. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I do so today. Mr. and Mrs. Andrew F. Armstrong of Glasgow, Mont., are celebrating their diamond jubilee with almost 100 members of their family and numerous friends and neighbors in north central Montana. I am pleased to join in extending congratulations to the Armstrongs in behalf of the Montana congressional delegation. This is a joyous occasion, and we only regret that it is impossible for us to be in Glasgow today to participate in the festivities. The Armstrongs came to Montana in 1915 and except for two brief periods have lived in either Glasgow or Billings, Mont. They homesteaded and farmed in the area and were then forced to sell their property during the depression of 1921. Mr. Armstrong was employed at the Fort Peck Dam during its construction and later entered the Glasgow police force, from which he retired as chief of police late in 1951. They have nine children and enjoy their numerous grandchildren. Again, I wish to say how pleased I am that two people have had the opportunity to live together these many years.

CAMPUS DISORDERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, with all of the campus disorder and lawless rioting that we have been witnessing in recent months, one of the most overpowering questions of all is why university and college officials and administrators have not taken more positive action to see that order is maintained.

It is strange indeed that unruly and rabblerousing students have been allowed to go about fometing strife with virtual impunity. In very few instances have they been expelled from college, or even suspended. Moreover, although tremendous property damage has been suffered and even human life endangered by student insurrection—some of them armed with deadly weapons—arrests and prosecution have been the exception rather than the rule.

At the same time, it is wondered how an abject minority of students, sometimes numbering only a few hundred out of many thousands, are permitted to totally disrupt the education of an overwhelming majority of hard-working and conscientious college students who want no part of the revolution and who are endeavoring to the best of their ability to get an education. The well-known syndicated columnist James J. Kilpatrick asked these questions in his column in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, May 8. Mr. Kilpatrick makes the point, with which I am in total agreement, that the power to expel disorderly students should have been invoked long ago, and it should constantly be invoked today.

The first line of defense against campus rioting and disorder and the initial responsibility for maintaining order rests with the university or the college. It is they who must take the first step. Unless they are willing to totally succumb to anarchy, it is they who must take action to enforce their own rules—in the interest of the overwhelming majority of their students and in the interest of preserving the integrity of higher education.

To bring Mr. Kilpatrick's column to the attention of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Evening Star, May 8, 1969]

WHY AREN'T RINGLEADING STUDENTS EXPELLED?

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

NEW YORK, N.Y.—The student riots go unchecked, and the questions go unanswered. For the time being—but at a fearful price—some of our great institutions are quiet. But Columbia was violated again last week, and two campuses of the City University of New York had to be closed in the wake of violence.

A number of difficult questions will not yield to simple answers: What motivates the radical students? Where is the ultimate blame for revolution to be lodged? But one elementary question continues to baffle the ordinary layman: Why aren't the ringleading students expelled?

It is beyond comprehension. When students clearly are guilty of outrageous conduct—of violent and criminal conduct—why aren't they summarily tossed out of school? When non-students trespass upon private property, why aren't they prosecuted to the limit of the law?

Such a direct reaction, on the part of the university administrations, would appear to be automatic. Yet it almost never happens. In one instance after another, on college campuses across the country, student militants go scot free and non-students rarely get arrested.

It is not a matter of "due process." No question arises of "insufficient evidence." At Cornell, everyone knew precisely which black students were involved in the seizure of Willard Straight Hall. Their photographs appeared in every paper in the land. There they were, bandoliered with ammunition, bearing guns, glowering their defiance of the law. Why weren't these students expelled?

At Queens College last week, 40 black students marched through three buildings, smashing windows and overturning furniture. It is beyond belief that these students were not identified. Of coursey they were identified. Why, then, were they not booted out?

At City College on May 1, a band of black militants overturned card catalogues and broke windows in the faculty dining room. At Brooklyn College on May 2, student hoodlums broke down the door of the dean of faculty, Harry Albaum. "The handful of staff members inside locked desks and files and surrendered the building to the students." What is wrong with the college officials? Why weren't the students first expelled, then arrested, and then sent to jail?

Time after time, names are named. This from Cornell:

"In a show of contempt for President James A. Perkins and the trustees of Cornell University, members of the Students for a Democratic Society entered Barton Hall last night, taunted Army Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets at drill, and then broke into a restricted area to paint peace slogans on a three-inch Navy destroyer deck gun. . . . Some entered an R.O.T.C. office and tore military maps from the wall. They openly defied arrest. Charles S. (Chip) Marshall 3d spoke from the gun turret. . . ."

That was last Friday night. Why wasn't Charles S. (Chip) Marshall 3d expelled on Saturday morning?

The same questions cry out for answers at Columbia. An estimated 100 students and a handful of non-students seized and occupied Mathematics and Fayerweather Halls. Thirty of them were swiftly, positively identified. When they finally were ousted, Dr. Andrew Cordier, acting president, made an inspection tour.

Did Dr. Cordier institute expulsion proceedings at once? No, indeed. "It's most regrettable," he said, "that students see fit to mess up a hall this way. It's obvious they don't know the first rules of good housekeeping."

It is equally obvious, or so it seems to some of us, that Dr. Cordier and his fellow administrators don't know the first rules of keeping order. When it comes to summoning police, or to asking for help from troops, questions of judgment doubtless arise. Reasonably minded men may disagree on matters of timing and necessity. But the power to expel a disorderly student is something else. It should have been invoked long ago; and it ought constantly to be involked today.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER—A MEMORIAL ADDRESS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the late Dwight D. Eisenhower was revered not only by our people who knew him so well, but by people all over the world.

Mr. President, a friend of mine has sent me the address delivered by the Rev. Erwin P. Ruklic, pastor of the International Church of Bangkok, Thailand, during a memorial service honoring General Eisenhower. The service was attended by a number of ambassadors from the various embassies in Bangkok and a

large number of leaders from the Thai Government. The American community in Bangkok was also well represented.

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

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

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER: A MEDITATION

(An address by the Rev. Erwin R. Ruklic, pastor, at the Memorial Service in the International Church of Bangkok, Thailand, on March 31, 1969; United States Ambassador Leonard Unger presided)

Dwight D. Eisenhower—soldier; statesman; university president; national hero; world leader.

These are the facts of the soldier of war who became a crusader for peace.

When we recall his name we remember the common touch of his humanity.

His grin and nickname—Ike—were the trademarks of a humble but human figure of mankind.

The qualities that revealed the stature of the man will long be remembered:

"His virtue was modesty.

"His character was honesty.

"His life was service.

"His leadership was trusted."

Though he began his career as a soldier he finished his life as a civilian—the President of the United States.

The highest honor came to him without Solicitation or desire.

He did not covet the life of a politician; it was the politicians who needed him.

And the people of his country paid him the highest compliment—not once but twice—by electing him as their President with the largest margin of votes.

His nation gave him the blessing of trust, confidence and encouragement.

He brought the country together at a time when it needed to be strengthened and sustained.

The American people enjoyed a climate of unity because he gave them his unqualified trust.

His immense influence for public morality, personal integrity, and civic responsibility was the beach head of his presidential office.

He gave himself unselfishly and unreservedly to this highest office of public service.

And whenever he made his periodic treks to the greens, the American public was ever so happy to see their President relax.

And in mood of jest, one quipster remarked: "I'm not sure whether Ike is a full time President and a Part time golfer, or a Full time golfer and a Part time President."

However, none of his constituents criticized him on taking leave for a long weekend.

They loved him the more for it.

Few other Presidents had so caught the imagination of the people as this man.

Deeply concerned about world peace, he visited 31 countries during his presidency in an effort to strengthen and stabilize the nations around the world.

The words of an earlier President, Thomas Jefferson, so aptly described him:

"When a man assumes a public trust, he should consider himself as public property."

Indeed, this man—was the people's President.

For the greatness of the man was in the goodness of the man.

And the strength of the man was in the character of the man.

Nothing can surpass the qualities of integrity and honesty; commitment and compassion—for these outlast and outshine all others.

Few people remember that it was not until after he entered the White House that he made one of the most important decisions of his life.

For the first time in his life he became a Christian and united with the Church. He always made it a practice to nurture his faith and put his faith to work.

He took it upon himself to worship with others and made it a regular habit to do so wherever his duties took him: in the nation's capital or Augusta, Ga.; in the United States or in his travels abroad.

In his book, Waging Peace: The White House Years, he tells this personal account of his visit to Rome:

Having worshiped at St. Paul's Episcopal Church, he went to make a scheduled call on the Pope—John 23rd. Pope John, bright and active at the age of 78, had the vivacity and zest of a young man.

They had met years before when both served in Paris: Their conversation included reminiscences, observations of the cold war; some hope for the future, and cheerful banter about their respective careers and present positions.

"You were a general and became President," said Pope John jokingly, and I was a sergeant and became Pope."

The people's President met the people's Pope.

A nation has lost a warrior—a warrior for truth and justice: humanity and peace.

A world mourns his passing and pays tribute to a greatness that is rooted in goodness; a life that reflects its Creator; and a death that knows not the end but marches forward valiantly and triumphantly in the name of the Master, Jesus Christ, his Lord and his Saviour.

Dwight David Eisenhower.

THE CALIFORNIA FLOOD DISASTER

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, in many respects the actions taken by the Federal Government to challenge the disastrous consequences of the California floods are notable and satisfying. More than 15 Federal agencies played a part in giving prompt aid to the property and to the people who were forced to seek help by the unfettered waters which swept across the California landscape. The Office of Emergency Preparedness has detailed these procedures and I am pleased to know that both damaged property and displaced people were assisted.

At the same time, I am greatly concerned for one area of flood damage which appears to be unaided and unnoticed by those Federal disaster relief programs we have devised.

Our programs provide that people immediately displaced and made homeless can obtain help from many sources. The Red Cross provides shelter. The Department of Agriculture furnishes tons of food. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare sends funds and personnel for sanitation and other health programs. The Office of Economic Opportunity offers varied assistance, from clothing to sandbags.

Yet all this aid, all these good things are done only for the temporarily displaced, the people who can soon return to the future security they anticipated before the floods disturbed them. I heartily endorse the aid we have given them. The helping hand of our Federal disaster assistance marks these as honorable and worthy programs.

But there are people in California injured by the water on our land for whom no provisions of the law bring the special and extra relief we associate with disaster aid. I refer to those who work on our lands, the farm laborers.

By soaking the soil of California for weeks on end, the floods have denied or postponed those agricultural tasks California farmworkers depend on for subsistence for their families. Tractors and planters cannot make much headway in a flooded field. Cotton seeds cannot be planted under water and would not thrive if they could. Grains cannot be harvested when the harvester is up to its wheel tops in mud. When the planting is delayed the jobs that follow planting are delayed.

Take just one major agricultural area of California, the Tulare Lake Basin. There are three major crops: cotton, barley, and safflower. Two-thirds of the barley crop was ruined by the rains. Safflower, which must be planted in the late winter, simply will not get into the ground. It was too wet, too late.

The cotton prospects are brighter, although the continuing rains into April delayed the planting beyond its regular cycle.

Some land which normally would be planted will not be in production this year. Some land is still under water. The consequences of the floods on farms vary from area to area, from crop to crop. But everywhere they bring a change in the routine by which the farmworker maintains his yearly income. And all too often that change spells deprivation and hunger for agricultural labor.

Unfortunately, the deprivation and hunger usually go unrecorded and even unnoticed, for they are a part of the undramatic aftermath when the floods are yesterday's news.

Thus while State and county officials have advised that they are aware of an increase in cases receiving public assistance as a result of the floods, I have found none who keep records of aid or assistance given because of the disaster. For example, the farm labor office of the California Department of Employment was not able to supply figures on the number of people made jobless as a result of the floods. The office did, however, report that the estimated average employment of seasonal agricultural workers during the first 2 months of 1969 was down 8 percent in the San Joaquin Valley and down 28 percent in the south coast counties from the same period in 1968.

Mr. Reed K. Clegg, welfare director of Fresno County, reported to the Fresno County Board of Supervisors on April 10, 1969, as follows:

Requests for food over the years have paralleled weather conditions and have been particularly influenced by the amount of rainfall. When the weather is favorable and work is available, our 35 years of experience indicates that the majority of people prefer employment to assistance with food. We experienced unusual numbers of requests in the years 1952 and 1967 when rainfall was above normal. In the current 1968-69 perior when rainfall has broken all established records requests for food have exceeded those of any previous year.

Newspapers throughout the State have reported that the floods and consequent unemployment have accentuated the perennial need for food and shelter among our rural poor.

In most other occupations, men made jobless by natural disaster can obtain the benefits of unemployment insurance to carry them through the crisis. But not farmworkers, who are usually not covered by unemployment insurance. Here, as in so many other areas of social legislation, the agricultural workers is the forgotten man of American labor.

Mr. President, when floods engulf our farmlands, we know that the men and women who depend on those fields for their livelihood may suffer for weeks and sometimes months thereafter.

Surely it is as worthy to give them aid as it is to restore the homes and businesses wrecked by the disaster. I urge the Committee on Public Works which is considering legislation to bring relief to California, not to forget the need for assistance of these deprived families.

One specific proposal I would suggest is that after a Presidential determination that there is a major disaster, the President be authorized to provide supplemental Federal aid in the form of food stamps to be distributed to those made jobless during the period of their unemployment. Our food aid during floods can be unrealistic when the rural poor are expected to travel great distances to food commodity distribution points.

While the floodwaters are high and people are stranded, the distribution of food itself may be the only hunger aid feasible.

But after the floods have receded and the weeks of joblessness trail on, food stamps can be a preferable tool for aiding the destitute victims. I believe that the food stamp option should be authorized.

Careful advance planning for emergency relief invariably alleviates the hardship disaster brings. I ask today that aid to relieve the economic plight of the farmworker denied work on flood drenched farms be made a mandatory part of our disaster relief programs.

THE 10TH OF MAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this year as we commemorate the 10th of May celebration, we recall the history of the Rumanian people and the unhappy events which for so many years cruelly tested their faith and courage. Rumania's current struggle to express its national identity with independent action engages the attention of the world. Yet the people of Rumania know that their well-being is of great concern to us all and that they will never be forgotten by their friends in other nations.

THE PRESIDENT'S REORGANIZATION PLAN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I commend President Nixon's recent action concerning the reorganization of Government service systems.

It is an action that is long overdue. The current organizational plan of many Government departments and agencies is very much like Topsy: they just grew. Over the last 40 years the Federal Government has grown tremendously under the pressure of a rapidly changing society. The immediate necessities for action have all too often taken precedence over good organizational planning. This situation has been recognized as a problem for over 20 years, and I am very much heartened to see that President Nixon has taken steps to rectify the situation.

The power of the Federal Government is very great. However, it is power that must be transmitted via a lever. The length of the lever and the position of fulcrum are the determining factors as to how much power can be exerted at a given distance from Washington. Currently, the local and regional offices of the Federal bureaucracy, which are the fulcrums, are too close to Washington, and there is too much waste and inefficiency. This is the situation that President Nixon is aiming to correct: to make the Federal representatives in local areas more responsive and responsible to the areas in which they operate.

I know that we in Alaska will benefit greatly from such a reorganization. In a gigantic State such as ours, when a message or a request may take as long as a week or more just to reach the State Capitol, we desperately need closer contact with the Federal Government. This has always been the problem with the Federal Government: the distance between the area of action and the decisionmakers has developed an unfortunate gap between Federal and local authorities.

Lack of faith in the Federal Government has not been a traditional American attitude. We do not want to foster an unthinking dependence on the Federal Government; however, those things that the Government can and should do on a local level should be done well. This is the aim of President Nixon's reorganizational plan—not to expand the sphere of Federal activity, but rather to insure that the already existing functions of Government are carried out in as efficient and effective a manner as is possible.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK—MAY 11–17, 1969

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I am sure that Senators are aware of the long interest I have had in all forms of transportation. Going back to my early days in this body, I had occasion to help to formulate the Interstate Highway System. In more recent years my attention has been directed toward adequate aircraft to meet the needs of the 1970's, and even more recently I have been focusing attention on the need for improved intercity rail lines and urban rapid transit systems.

It is against this background that I am most happy to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that we are now in the midst of National Transportation Week. In addition Friday, May 16, has been proclaimed National Defense Transportation Day.

President Nixon has officially proclaimed both Transportation Week and Defense Transportation Day, and in my own State of Colorado, Gov. John Love has issued a similar proclamation.

Since Colorado is without a doubt the keystone State for the Rocky Mountain region in America's vast transportation system, it is indeed fitting that all of us from Colorado should salute those involved in the affairs of transportation. My State is ably served by excellent railroads, airlines, trucking companies, urban, suburban, and interurban bus operations, and pipelines.

Each of these modes makes a significant contribution toward our economy and the welfare of our Nation's citizens.

During this week, then, I hope that all Coloradans and all other Americans will reflect on the invaluable contribution our men and women in transportation make during every minute of every day. To them we extend congratulations for continuing their outstanding work.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, during this month, as we commemorate one of the greatest events of Polish history, the adoption of the historic 3d of May constitution, we should rededicate ourselves to the causes of justice and peace. We should recall the continuing struggles of the Polish people for true liberty. Let us commit ourselves to these ideals and pledge that our deep concern will endure until that glorious day when all men will be free.

THE GREAT ODOMETER RAID

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in February I introduced a bill, S. 1185, to protect the public from the practice of some used cars dealers of turning back the mileage readings on odometers.

My office has received a considerable amount of mail on this subject, and the public has shown interest in the odometer problem.

The May issue of Consumer Reports contains an article, entitled "The Great Odometer Raid," in which the editors of Consumer Reports detail some of the difficulties which State authorities have faced in trying to curb the practice of turning back odometers.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE GREAT ODOMETER RAID

Last summer, 12 investigators from the Massachusetts Attorney General's Division of Consumer Protection made consumer protection history. They staged an odometer raid.

The plan of attack was simple. Working in pairs, the investigators fanned out through the Commonwealth, selected 24 new-car showrooms at random, sauntered in, flashed their badges, and said they were conducting a "routine check" of cars on display in the dealers' used-car lots. For the next several hours they inspected hundreds of used cars and pored over dealers' records for possible

evidence that odometers might have been rolled back from original trade-in mileages to lower, more salesworthy figures. Mainly on the basis of educated guesswork after comparing the odometer readings with the appearance of the cars, the investigators listed about 250 vehicles open to suspicion of odometer tampering.

The next step was to try locating the former owners of the suspect cars. About 70 per cent of the owners could not be traced at all because the dealers had purchased the cars from wholesalers, or because former owners couldn't be located. A few former owners, when located, refused to cooperate. But 70 persons did reply to the inquiry, and 20 of them said the reading on their odometers when they traded in their cars was much higher than the readings found by the inspectors. On average, between 20,000 and 30,000 miles had been subtracted. One man said his odometer reading had been pared from 90,000 to 45,000 miles.

PENANCE OF A SORT

Assistant Attorney General Robert L. Meade at length decided he had strong cases against six of the biggest new-car dealerships in his state. Massachusetts is one of four states with "little FTC laws" patterned on the antideceptive practices provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act (the others are Washington, Vermont, and Hawaii). Acting under his state's laws, Mr. Meade succeeded, after several months of polite armtwisting, in convincing three of the dealers to sign an assurance of discontinuance. That meant, simply, that they filed in Superior Court an agreement saying they would not offer "for sale any vehicle upon which the odometer has been adjusted in any manner . . . so that it does not disclose the . . . true mileage. . . ." As in consent orders filed with the FTC, assurances of discontinuance in Massachusetts are carefully worded so that the signer does not admit to having used certain specific deceptive sales practices in the past, but, nevertheless, agrees *not* to use the same deceptive practices in the future.

Those who signed were Charles Chevrolet, Inc., and The Harr Motor Co., both of Worcester, and State Plymouth, Inc., of Springfield. At this writing, the state was still negotiating with two of the other dealers. Mr. Meade took sterner action against the sixth dealer on his list, North Ford, Inc., of West Medford. Saying it had flatly refused to cooperate, he filed suit for permanent injunction against North Ford.

All things considered, the Great Odometer Raid might have been a very bitter pill, indeed, for any auto dealer to swallow had it not been for a high-level decision to sugarcoat the pill with secrecy. As far as CU has been able to learn, little news of the raid ever reached the people of Massachusetts. The Attorney General's office could have given the names of the dealers to the newspapers, but it decided not to—this time. The only excuse offered by a state official was that it would have been "unfair to ruin these guys when everyone else is doing it, too." Of course, the names of the dealers thus far cited went into public court records (where CU eventually looked them up). But by not alerting the press, the state deprived itself and the public of a most effective enforcement tool in consumer protection cases—the glare of publicity.

Nevertheless, the Massachusetts Division of Consumer Protection deserves some credit for the first organized attempt to stamp out the ancient, odious and widespread practice of odometer tampering. And, Mr. Meade assures us, it won't be the last assault on what is, regrettably, a standard operating procedure of many used-car dealers, who know perfectly well that a high-mileage car is nothing but a drag on the market.

PICKERS AND SPINNERS

Technically speaking, odometer tampering is all too easy to do. The favorite technique in the trade is called "picking" because most operators use a homemade assortment of specially shaped ice picks. With a certain degree of skill and a modest capital investment, an odometer picker earns anywhere from $3.50 to $25 a car. The procedure takes only a few minutes. The picker simply reaches into the odometer drum—after first removing the instrument panel lens or boring through a partition behind the speedometer—and manipulates the digits mechanically, usually only the ten-thousandth place. If the picker is skilled, his handiwork is rarely detectable by a used-car shopper.

With less skill but much more patience, an odometer tamperer can spin the speedometer cable with a high-speed electric motor to the desired low reading. But since it can take hours to spin off just a few thousand miles, spinning is most commonly used by the amateur.

The simplest way to falsify an odometer is by disconnecting the speedometer cable. Dealers will sometimes do that on a new car to be used as a demonstrator or to be driven cross-country to the point of sale. In California last year a fairly strict state law against odometer rollbacks was weakened by an amendment expressly permitting dealers to reset new-car odometers at zero, provided they give the buyer a statement of the true mileage. But law or no law, you can't always be certain that the mileage on the odometer of a "factory-fresh" car recounts is true history.

Wisconsin *requires* that the odometers on all used cars be reset at zero. Arizona tried that, too, then changed its mind (CONSUMER REPORTS, June 1968). And in Florida dealers are permitted, but not required, to roll odometers back to zero. The idea is fine, of course—for the dealer. He can then disavow any knowledge of a car's true mileage and still be on the side of the angels. But the car buyer is deprived of the only base he has on which to add mentally the 20,000-or-so miles the dealer has subtracted mechanically. In states where antitampering legislation is pending, the back-to-zero idea is apt to be pushed hard by the dealer lobby.

Besides California, only Delaware, Kentucky, Massachusetts and New Jersey have laws making it illegal to tamper with an odometer. Several other states, including Hawaii, Maryland and Georgia, have similar laws under consideration. Unfortunately, state laws specifically aimed at odometer rollbacks are generally regarded as difficult to enforce and are therefore rarely invoked. "In order to convict under these statutes," says Paul J. Krebs, director of New Jersey's Office of Consumer Protection, "you practically have to catch these guys in the act."

Bearing him out, Massachusetts chose not to use its criminal statute against odometer tampering to prosecute suspects in the Great Odometer Raid. Although enforcement under the state's little FTC law proved possible, the act provides for no fines to penalize violators and no redress for victimized consumers unless they can sue privately and win an award for damages. The legislature is considering an amendment with stiffer penalties, but meanwhile the most the Attorney General can do is get an injunction ordering the unrepentant violator to stop his fraudulent practices. That has more muscle than an assurance of discontinuance, since anyone in violation of a court injunction is also in contempt of court.

WHO GYPS WHOM?

Massachusetts' Assistant Attorney General, Mr. Meade, while pleased at the results of his raid asks, "Why hasn't the Federal Trade Commission itself declared odometer tampering an unfair trade practice?" He argues that the problem is, after all, interstate in scope, since so many used cars are sold to wholesalers, particularly in the South, and then auctioned off to dealers from all over the country. Therefore, the solution must be national in scope. The FTC, on the other hand, told CU the agency views odometer tampering in used cars as primarily a local rather than an interstate problem.

"We have no evidence to support the idea that it is being done by the wholesaler," said an FTC attorney. "If we did, we'd certainly investigate, but in my opinion, it's done at the retail level, the level at which the automobile is sold to an unsophisticated buyer. The wholesaler would have nothing to gain by resetting an odometer. He's certainly not going to fool the dealer, who doesn't buy on the basis of the odometer reading, anyway."

Still, he was willing to make at least a hypothetical concession: "I could visualize a dealer *requesting* the wholesaler to turn back an odometer for him, especially if it's illegal in his state, and I'm sure the wholesaler would do it. But, as I said before, we have no information on this."

Perhaps FTC doesn't, but evidence of a sort is apparently plentiful right across the Potomac River from Washington. The office of Virginia's Senator Harry F. Byrd, Jr. told CU: "The Automobile Trade Association of Virginia tells us that 90 per cent of all odometer rollbacks are done by wholesalers. They say it's a routine part of the 'reconditioning' process. Naturally, the dealer doesn't pay any attention to the odometer reading; he only buys a car on the basis of what he thinks he can sell it for. And when he buys from a wholesaler, he knows he is getting a product he can palm off with little or no risk because the former owner will be very difficult to trace."

The dealer can blame the wholesaler, and the wholesaler can blame the dealer, but it's obvious that neither could tamper with odometers on any large scale basis without the direct knowledge or the implied consent of the other. Few swindlers, after all, fall for their own swindle.

Senator Byrd has therefore taken up the cause of a Federal law against odometer tampering. The Byrd bill (S. 1185) would make odometer tampering subject to a stiff fine. It would also require used-car dealers to give their customers a statement signed by the last *private* owner of the vehicle certifying the mileage that was on the car when he sold it. Meanwhile, on the other side of the Hill, New Jersey Congressman Henry Helstoski has resubmitted his bill of last year (H.R. 4163), also prohibiting odometer tampering in interstate commerce. The chances for passage of either measure during the current session of Congress may be hard to assess, but it's not very encouraging to note that, even in the proconsumer atmosphere of the previous Congress, a bill sponsored by Senator William Proxmire to require auto manufacturers to install tamperproof odometers in all new cars died in the Senate Commerce Committee.

The need for effective legislation is obvious. Norman Polovoy, chief of the Maryland Consumer Protection Division, puts it this way: "I know of no rational or reasonable justification for an automobile dealer setting the odometer back other than to try to convince the purchaser that the automobile has substantially less mileage on it than is in fact true."

According to one report, in 1967 alone Americans bought nearly 20 million used cars and paid an estimated $20 billion for them. The trade journal *Automotive News* reports that prices start falling off sharply after a car has traveled 30,000 miles; and beyond that distance, a two-year-old car loses about $10 of value for every 1,000 miles

on the odometer. Assuming that only half of the used cars sold in 1967 were two years old or older, and that only half of them had 20,000 miles picked or spun off their odometers, it doesn't seem unreasonable to estimate that consumers are being misled on used-car lots to the tune of $1 billion a year.

But the cost must be assessed in terms of safety as well. Even with the best of care, a car with 75,000 miles on the odometer is not the car it was at 25,000 miles. The prudent owner knows this and is less likely to take his steering or wheel bearings or exhaust system for granted. But the owner of a "low-mileage" used car may be lulled by the odometer. Until the critical moment, he may have been completely unaware that his car was dangerously in need of repair—a menace to himself and to others.

The National Highway Safety Bureau agrees, and in 1967 it proposed a safety standard requiring tamperproof odometers on all passenger vehicles, including buses, trucks and motorcycles. The idea was assigned to an administrative pigeonhole, however.

"Other proposed safety standards had a higher priority," a bureau spokesman told CU, "but this is not to say we won't have such a standard later on."

WHAT'S TAMPERPROOF?

But at the same time, the bureau questions whether it is possible to design a really tamperproof odometer, and except for General Motors, the auto industry has yet to market anything resembling one. GM's 1969 models have odometers that cannot be spun backward. But there is no way for the used-car buyer to detect whether the mileage reading has been spun forward beyond 99,999.9 to zero and then to some youthfully low second-time-around setting. Also, in GM cars made after January 1, the odometer will exhibit a telltale color separation between the numbers if it has been picked. But, a GM spokesman admits, the buyer would have to be "a knowledgeable individual" to recognize the evidence. Despite those refinements, the new GM odometer cannot therefore be described as truly tamperproof. And whatever its positive virtues, the GM odometer will be of little use to the buyer of a used *Ford, Plymouth, Ambassador, Volkswagen*, etc., or, for that matter, to the buyer of a pre-1969 GM model.

CU's automotive engineers give a qualified Yes to the question of whether a tamperproof odometer is feasible. While anything Yankee know-how can put together, Yankee know-how can probably take apart, our engineers say a much less accessible odometer unit, one sealed in plastic perhaps, is certainly possible. But for the unit to be completely tamperproof, the speedometer cable would have to be sealed in two places—where it connects with the speedometer head and at either the transmission or the front wheel connection, depending on the car. (Some car rental companies seal odometers, for obvious reasons, and a spokesman for one of the biggest says sealing is highly effective.)

What about repairs? Would it be possible to fix a broken but tamperproof odometer or install a new one without breaking the seal? Probably not, but mechanics could be required to reseal the unit and verify the original mileage. Enforcement might be difficult—but no more impossible than any other weights-and-measures regulation. If it is important to protect the consumer from the butcher who cheats a few cents on the hamburger, it's at least as important to protect him from the odometer "artist" who chisels a few hundred dollars on a used car.

TITLE LAWS

Title registration laws could help, too, and 41 states already have them. Not only are they an effective weapon against auto theft, they also assure the car owner a clear title to his automobile by requiring that the chain of ownership be established to the satisfaction of motor vehicle authorities. (And possibly the mileage to the satisfaction of the consumer; see box above.) Such a title law is pending in Massachusetts, but the Massachusetts Consumers Council further proposes that the identity of the former owner become a part of the certificate of title the state gives the new owner. But even if the measure sailed through the Massachusetts legislature, it would be truly effective only if most other states passed similar laws.

It will be difficult but not impossible to make the used-car mile more nearly approximate the statute mile. For example, auto makers could develop better odometers; the National Highway Safety Bureau could require them; the FTC could compare notes with Sen. Byrd; states could pass uniform title laws; and, above all, Congress could pass meaningful antitampering legislation.

Meanwhile, there is something to be learned from Assistant Attorney General Meade's historic venture: Even weak laws *can* be enforced. His Great Odometer Raid certainly hasn't stamped out odometer tampering, but it has made the practice a good deal riskier in Massachusetts.

NEED FOR FEDERAL COORDINATION ON HUMAN RIGHTS MATTERS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the United States should improve its record with regard to the ratification of human rights conventions. We have ratified only two of the more than 20 of its human rights conventions which have been proposed since the establishment of the United Nations. Those two are international resolutions on slavery and the status of refugees. Pending before the Senate are conventions on genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

One of the major recommendations of the President's Commission for the Observance of Human Rights Year of 1968 was the need for greater cooperation and coordination of human rights activities. This cooperation is needed both within the Federal Government and among State and local groups. I invite attention to an article entitled "Human Rights Aide for Nixon Proposed," published in the Milwaukee Journal, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

HUMAN RIGHTS AIDE FOR NIXON PROPOSED

(By Frank A. Aukofer)

The federal government needs better coordination of its human rights activities, President Nixon was told last week.

In its final report, the president's commission for the observance of human rights year asked Nixon to appoint a special assistant who would advise the president on all domestic and international human rights matters.

MILWAUKEE MEMBER

The special commission was established Jan. 30, 1968, by President Johnson. It was directed to work to enlarge people's understanding of human rights principles during 1968—the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations.

The commission's chairman was W. Averell Harriman, former United States ambassador at large. One of its members was Milwaukee Atty. Bruno V. Bitker.

One of the commission's major findings was that the federal government had no interdepartmental mechanism to coordinate, report and advise on all aspects of human rights.

Such a mechanism, the report said, could help in planning and dispensing information and could speed state department reports to the UN on human rights questions.

Each federal department has a person or section charged with making certain that equal rights and opportunities are taken into consideration in the department's programs. But the level of responsibility varies.

ANOTHER PROPOSAL

The report said that departments and agencies with programs that had a significant impact on human rights issues should have a high level officer to make policy and co-ordinate responsibilities in this area.

The special commission said also that there should be better co-ordination of federal human rights activities with local and state agencies.

There are many excellent human rights organizations at the state and municipal levels, the report said. "However, they often lack knowledge of each other and of federal government programs. They would benefit from a sense of common purpose and federal support for their activities," the report said.

The commission said that one of the "grave problems" facing the United States was the "crisis in human relations, which results from the failure of many Americans to recognize and respect the legitimate aspirations of their fellow Americans."

SENSE OF COMMUNITY

"This crisis," the repport added, "has attracted attention to the need for creating among the American people a greater sense of community—a sense of unity, mutual respect, social justice, and common purpose indicative of a progressive and just society.

"Essential in achieving such a sense of community are an understanding of human rights standards and a willingness to commit the necessary resources to their attainment."

The commission said that the "community" to which it referred went beyond national boundaries, and that human rights affected questions of peace and war, international exchange, growth and development. It said human rights needed to be continually reviewed in a global context.

NIXON'S HELP ASKED

The commission asked Nixon to give his personal support to international human rights conventions, or agreements. It noted that the United States had ratified only two of the more than 20 human rights statements drafted since the establishment of the UN.

The United States has ratified international resolutions on slavery and the rights of refugees. Pending before the senate are conventions on genocide, the political rights of women and forced labor. Another, on racial discrimination, has not yet been submitted to the senate.

TOM PILLIFANT, ALASKAN

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, recently a close friend of mine as well as a fine Alaskan died. He was Tom Pillifant, and he had been with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the last 3 years. I can only offer my sincerest sympathy to Tom's family and all of his friends throughout the State of Alaska.

I think the depth of feeling for Tom Pillifant can best be shown by an editorial published in the Anchorage Daily

Times of April 28, 1969, and in an excerpt from a letter I received from Tom's mother. The two items speak far more eloquently than I ever could about how the people of Alaska felt about Tom.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of these two items be printed in the RECORD.

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

WAUKEGAN, ILL.,
April 29, 1969.

Hon. TED F. STEVENS,
U.S. Senator from Alaska, Senate Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR STEVENS: To Alaska: I have known "of" you all the 67 years of my life, but I "discovered" you only this week. Prior to that time I had thought of you as a great expense of land where it was always colder than it was warm—where my dear son Tom lived—where there were other people and places, of course, and that you were one of the states of our great Nation.

Upon landing at your airfield I learned of the death of my son whom I had come a great distance to see and to bid goodbye. My first thought was "Oh, how I wish I could take him back where he was born, where he lived so long, and where he can be with his people."

Within a few hours I had changed my mind. I found he belonged to Alaska and I was at peace when I left him there with you along with a great piece of my own heart, because I discovered Alaska's heart was as great as its expanse of land and as loving and as warm as the people I had the privilege to meet there, and that the warmth of that love transcended any coldness of climate.

Thank you, Alaska, for your love for my son and for the great honors you paid him. I know he had a great love for all of you and that he found peace and happiness with you. Truly, you were his people, too!

He needs no monument of stone—you have given him a monument, unsurpassed by any earthly one that could ever be erected.

My love and appreciation to all of you.

HIS MOTHER.

[From the Anchorage (Alaska) Daily Times, Apr. 28, 1969]

THOMAS H. PILLIFANT

Alaska had Thomas H. Pillifant for only three years, but the people who knew him—and there are many—will remember for a long time the gentle, compassionate man who cared so deeply about human dignity.

He didn't just talk about it; he really cared. And that's why it hurt his friends so much to watch helplessly as cancer weakened him and finally took his life.

Pillifant was especially interested in improving the living conditions of Alaska's native people. As a practical man, he knew part of the answer was in settlement of the native land claims and in jobs and better housing in the villages.

Native leaders responded to the depth of his concern. They made him an honorary chief in the Alaska Federation of Natives, an honor he deeply cherished.

He has left behind the warm memories of a vigorous man who devoted his life to comforting the afflicted and afflicting the comfortable.

HARPER'S BAZAAR ARTICLE SUPPORTS SECRETARY OF PEACE BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the bills introduced by Representative SEYMOUR HALPERN and myself in February for the establishment of a Cabinet-level Secretary of Peace and a Department of Peace continue to draw interest and support across the Nation.

The current issue of Harper's Bazaar contains an article, entitled "How To Win the Human Race," written by Natalie Gittelson. The author specifically ties our proposal to efforts being made by a large women's organization for revitalizing Mother's Day as an occasion for stress by the Nation's mothers on the need for peace. She urges support by the magazine's readers for the leadership efforts of the 55,000-member organization "Another Mother for Peace" as a spearhead of support for the Peace Department we have proposed.

However, I wish to note one inaccuracy in the account, which states that "21 Congressmen joined to sponsor the legislation." As a matter of record, 15 Members of the Senate cosponsored my own bill, S. 953, and there are now 65 cosponsors of the House bill, H.R. 19650, five having been added since its introduction.

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

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

HOW TO WIN THE HUMAN RACE

(By Natalie Gittelson)

May means a lot to me. My husband's birthday and our son's both occur in this radiant month as the earth quickens with new life. And Mother's Day blossoms forth on May 11th. It has always seemed a rather charming, personal configuration of the planets that the birthways of the two men in our family fall so close—almost on top—of that day which purports, at least, to celebrate maternity. But my pleasure in it has been somewhat marred in recent years. As a woman and a mother, I have begun to feel slightly sold out, slightly disappointed, slightly ill-at-ease by the innocent mindlessness of May 11th.

Now don't get me wrong. I love festivals. I love parties. And I love presents. I dig right down to the ground the bibelots and other tokens of tribute that come snowed under mountains of white tissue in those pretty Bergdorf and Bendel boxes on Sunday morning. I dig breakfast served by loving hands, and the carefully coddled egg, and the fresh pink carnation on the tray. In fact, after lo, these many years, all that sweet pomp and circumstance can still bring tears to my eyes.

But in recent times I have not wept gently. I have wept with rage, with frustration and with horror. For, as I write these words, we are still engaged in the longest war in America's history. And no woman can confront her own motherhood on the happy, close and carefree family holiday of May 11th without grieving for tragic, careworn parents all over the world whose children have been lost or, perhaps worse, wounded beyond recognition; and for those many more young whose lives and wholeness hang in the balance every moment that war continues.

It goes without saying that this is not a political, but a visceral response—independent of party, of partisanship and even of nationhood. For (sophisticated theorizing about the sameness of the sexes notwithstanding), I believe that the reverence for life must live especially in female loins. Each child who dies, each child maimed physically or psychologically in the final obscenity of war, is lost by every woman who has ever borne a child—and by all those women who have not, but whose maternity is no less vibrant.

Martha Gellhorn, the war correspondent who was married to Ernest Hemingway, wrote recently from Vietnam: "To aid your passion for stopping this war, I enclose one little photo." (It is of two young teenagers with ghoulish non-faces, so shocking that one does not permanently recover from the sight of it.) "I thought it was two boys in ghastly Halloween masks, but not so. These are Binh and Bao, two children I know: at the ages of nine and eleven, respectively, they were tending their uncle's buffaloes far from the village where they were napalmed; all buffaloes dead and two tiny boys left burned beyond belief.

"They spent some two years lying on beds in a provincial hospital; God knows how they survived; and were brought to London two years ago perhaps more, yes more, by Terres des Hommes; they are now sixteen and fourteen. Note their lack of hands as well as faces. And they are astoundingly remodeled after more than thirty operations each; but both nearly blind, nearly fingerless, and frightening as you see. And they are perfectly adorable human beings; I've seen them in and out of hospitals; gay and gallant, gentle, kind, quick-minded . . ."

This is not a pretty sermon for Mother's Day. Perhaps it seems sickeningly, even perversely misplaced among the pink carnations and the kisses and the careless joy. But it does dramatize the reason why our national vision of Mother's Day has lately struck a hollow chord within me. As women meticulous in our regard for life, should we not demand more seriousness, and higher purpose, on this single occasion of the year that presumes to celebrate our human capacity to deliver life into the world?

Not surprisingly, I am not alone in my instinctive longing for a radical revamping of the meaning of Mother's Day. This year, 55,000 women (at last count) will "re-dedicate themselves to action for peace" on May 11th. The first act on their collective agenda: to flood Washington with all the Mother's Day cards and messages that they themselves receive, forwarding them to government leaders—the President and/or their own Congressmen—with a personal plea for Peace Now. The slogan of these women is a simple one: "War is not healthy for children and other living things." It appears in bold black type on the letterhead of their organization; on notepaper, peace posters, bumper stickers and in media advertisements purchased of course at their own expense. They wear it inscribed on golden medallions lit by golden sunflowers, strung on thin golden chains around their throats. "And we shall continue to wear it until there is peace," says Mrs. Paul Newman (who is, professionally, the actress Joanne Woodward). "Not a time between wars, but peace."

Mrs. Newman, and at least 54,999 more women, are members of a non-political, nonpartisan, non-militant group called Another Mother for Peace. (It is an impossible philosophical contradiction, they believe, to act militantly in behalf of non-violence.) The roster of their membership includes many novices who are by nature nonactivists and some "old pros" who have stood up against war again and again in this shattering decade: Donna Reed Owen, the movie and television star who is co-chairman of AMP; Felicia Montaleagre Bernstein who, with her husband, Leonard Bernstein, launched AMP's first Christmas Card campaign two years ago; Gloria Vanderbilt Cooper, painter and patron of the arts; Bess Myerson Grant, Commissioner of Consumer Affairs in New York City; Barbara Rush, the young actress whose great-great-great grandfather, Benjamin Rush, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence.

On the 10th of May, at an all-day con-

ference in Southern California, AMP will honor Mr. and Mrs. Paul Newman, for their unceasing dedication to the cause of nonviolence, as peace parents of the year. Conference theme: This Age Demands A Meaningful Mother's Day. The organization will call once more for a cease-fire in Vietnam and the withdrawal of American troups (if by then this has not occurred); for the elimination of the production of war toys by industry; for the reduction of violence in television, especially during those hours when children watch; and, with particular ardor, for "a strong, vocal constituency for Department of Peace legislation in Washington."

Last February 10th, the AMP-advocated Secretary of Peace bill, was introduced to the Ninety-first Congress by Senator Hartke of Indiana, Hatfield of Oregon and Yarborough of Texas. The goal of this bi-partisan measure, H.R. 19650, is, as Hartke told the Senate, "to establish a Department of Peace as an executive department of the Government . . . in the advancement of our existing peace programs . . ." Twenty-one Congressmen joined to sponsor the legislation. Professor Frederick L. Shuman, Woodrow Wilson Professor of Government, Emeritus, at Williams College and now Professor of Political Science, Portland State College, Oregon, wrote a long, coldly reasoned, warmly inspired treatise called "Why a Department of Peace?" setting forth his conviction that neither the Department of State or Defense nor the United Nations can carry the burden of responsibility. "We who have reached the moon," Schuman said, "must now begin the imperative journey toward a peaceful earth." This "modest proposal" for a Department of Peace was defeated in Congress. It was not the first time that the voices of life in this regard had fallen on ears both deaf and dead. In 1945, Senator Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin said in the Senate, for the second time within two years, "I crave for my government the distinction of being the first Government on earth to establish a Secretary of Peace. The establishment of such a secretariat would be heralded throughout the world . . ."

Twenty-six years later, the world still waits. AMP does not. Its members will continue to lobby, seeking support from the McCarthys, the McGoverns, the Kennedys, the Muskies, the Fulbrights, the Ribicoffs, and the Mansfields on the Hill to help make operative, through H.R. 19650, President Nixon's inaugural appeal to this nation: "Let us take as our goal: Where peace is unknown, to make it strong; where peace is temporary, to make it permanent."

If this is your goal too; if you would like to add one more feminine voice to, in Donna Reed Owens' words "the cry in the world for a new philosophy; a philosophy of the priorities of life over the priorities of death"; and to participate in "the search for a usable future," for the children of the world write to Mrs. Owens now. Her address: Another Mother for Peace, 407 North Maple Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210.

THE NEGLECTED ALASKAN NATIVES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, the Washington Post recently published an editorial concerning the native people of my State and the complex and significant land problem which confronts Alaska.

I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

OUR NEGLECTED ALASKAN NATIVES

The complex Alaskan lands problem appears to be getting careful attention both in the Interior Department and in the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. This is a hopeful sign, for the problem has been grossly neglected ever since Alaska became a part of the Union. The result of this neglect is acute poverty among most of the native Eskimos, Indians and Aleuts living in that potentially rich land.

Gov. Keith H. Miller told the Interior Committee the other day that the average life span of these natives is just over 34 years and that all but 400 of the 7,500 native houses in Alaska are in need of replacement. The Government has fluctuated between a policy of assimilating the natives and a policy of protecting their separate way of life. While their strong moral claim to the lands they have occupied or used for centuries has been generally recognized, no settlement has ever been worked out and the resulting confusion has worsened the natives' plight.

Even now one of the main incentives to legislation is lifting of the land freeze that has been imposed until the native claims have been settled. Alaska sees its economy in a strait-jacket until a solution can be found. Be that as it may, much careful work has been done and at least there is hope of a solution on the horizon.

An extensive study of the complex social, legal and political aspects of the problem was made by the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska. On the basis of that admirable study a bill has been drawn by the Department of the Interior, and Secretary Hickel and other witnesses have submitted their comments to the Interior Committee. Without committing himself to all of the detailed provisions of the bill, Senator Jackson, the chairman, is trying to push the controversy to a satisfactory conclusion.

The native groups have shown good judgment in seeking a legislative solution instead of pursuing the slower and more dubious route of judicial action. Their legal claims are vague and uncertain; their moral claims and their right to a share in the expanding American economy are more secure. A strong consensus seems to be emerging that Congress must treat them with fairness and respect for the way of life they prefer to follow.

The Field Committee concluded that any fair settlement must confirm the rights of the village people to the lands they use for homes, business, hunting, fishing and the like; safeguard their access to fish and other wildlife resources; and compensate them for land taken by the Government for military bases, national forests and so forth. To compensate the natives for their aboriginal land claims, the Field Committee would create a Development Corporation belonging to the natives and give it a share of the return from potentially rich oil and mineral lands as they are developed.

Secretary Hickel contended that this would involve excessive risks for the natives, although it might, by the same token, provide handsome returns. He recommended instead a fixed sum of $500 million to be appropriated over a period of 20 years. The Secretary would also double the land allotment which the bill provides for the native villages, on the reasonable assumption that they will continue to rely heavily on the land for their sustenance.

However these differences may be resolved, the obligation on Congress to act promptly and generously is clear. Poverty is never quite so unjustified as when it is directly related to the Government's own neglect in meeting its obligations.

THE AFRICA TREK FOR DEVELOPMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Saturday, May 17, an important and worthwhile project will take place in Washington, D.C. It is called "The Africa Trek for Development," and it is a joint project designed to raise funds for Operation Crossroads Africa and the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation.

I know that many Senators are familiar with Operation Crossroads Africa, a nonprofit organization which sends young North Americans to live and work in various African nations during the summer.

Begun in 1958 by a New York City minister, Rev. James H. Robinson, Crossroads was described by the late President Kennedy as the "progenitor of the Peace Corps." Its goal is "building bridges of friendship" between Africa and the United States through a series of service projects.

The American Freedom From Hunger Foundation was initiated in 1961, in response to President Kennedy's challenge:

> We have the ability, we have the means, and we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth. We need only the willingness.

Freedom From Hunger aims at mobilizing private technical, economic, and manpower resources to augment Government efforts to eliminate the causes of hunger. Among its accomplishments have been educational projects on nutrition, a day care center, and several community centers, both rural and urban.

The coalition of these two somewhat different organizations into the Trek, a cooperative effort, has grown out of a basic trend in the thinking of many young Americans today.

This is a generation which is undoubtedly service-oriented; proof lies in the vast number of young adults who are involved in the Peace Corps, VISTA, poverty and civil rights groups throughout the Nation, and in various phases of international service.

This generation is also international, indeed universal, in its outlook. This fact is illustrated by such phenomena as the growth of student interest in the war, the yearly increasing number of students in international affairs and area studies programs, and, particularly among young blacks, the revival of the Afro-American movement.

Many students and young adults who wish to turn to international service, however, are faced with a deep-rooted conflict: can they turn their backs on the poverty and strife in their own country in order to serve the people of another area of the world? This conflict was heightened, slightly more than a year ago, when virtually the entire Nation erupted into violence. America's social and economic ills became all too apparent.

"Africa Trek," an attempt to raise funds for these two worthy organizations, is one solution to the conflict. It is based on an interrelation between domestic and international service; funds will be allocated accordingly.

Forty-two percent of the money raised will go toward an inner-city project in the District of Columbia. A youth committee, composed of representatives of

schools and other area organizations, will choose the project from among existing self-help programs, such as Junior Village.

Forty-two percent of the funds will go to Operation Crossroads Africa to send 12 Washington area high school students to Africa this summer.

Freedom From Hunger will also send three graduate students in nutrition from Howard University on a Crossroads project to improve nutrition programs in Liberia, the Congo, and Ghana.

The final 15 percent will go to the Freedom From Hunger Foundation for its national education program on the problems of hunger at home and abroad.

The format of the Africa Trek for Development is a 25-mile hike through Rock Creek Park. Adult sponsors will pledge a certain sum for each mile that one or more participants walk. Similar hikes in Canada have raised more than $4,000,000 since 1967 for various community organizations.

Commenting on the Trek, Mayor Walter Washington said recently:

Your program is uniquely capable of offering real understanding of the firm ties that bind the African continent and the United States together. At the same time your capability of assisting to relieve hunger in Africa and to apply the experience gained abroad in work in the inner-cities of our own country comes at a time of critical need.

Mr. President, the Africa Trek for Development represents the kind of innovative and constructive activity in which so many of our young people have involved themselves. But their effort and interest need our encouragement.

I commend the coordinators of this fine program, and wish them the greatest success.

I ask Senators to lend their active support to the trek when the opportunity presents itself.

AMERICAN FRIENDS SERVICE PROPOSAL TO END VIETNAM WAR

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the American Friends Service Committee white paper on ending the war, published on May 5, 1969, offers an enlightened perspective on the current situation in Vietnam and proposes a solution to this tragic dilemma. The white paper represents a comprehensive study of the war in Vietnam today and draws upon the firsthand experience of field workers who have conscientiously served the people of that land. The committee supports an immediate unilateral withdrawal by U.S military forces in view of its findings based on 15 years of experience in Vietnam.

I ask for unanimous consent that the text of the pamphlet be printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM 1969

THE LAST YEAR

It has been more than a year since the rhetoric of peace began in Vietnam. During this time scores of thousands of men and women and children have died in the fighting. They continue to die today, and every evidence in Vietnam is that they will continue to die tomorrow unless there is an unparalleled demand from the American people that the slaughter be halted. The American Friends Service Committee calls for a halt—now.

Like millions of others the world over, we felt a sense of relief a year ago that our country was at last moving toward a Vietnam settlement. We welcomed the initiation of the Paris talks, the halting of the bombing of North Vietnam, and, more recently, the reports of an Administration decision to undertake some form of U.S. military disengagement. We have hoped these steps would lead to a ceasefire and our country would begin to right its distorted priorities that require spending billions on destruction while our cities decay and our poor despair. But hope has not been enough. Little has really changed in the year that has passed.

PRESENT ILLUSIONS

We believe U.S. military and government leaders are fostering illusions in regard to Vietnam. Our own experience in Vietnam is so at variance with official interpretations that we cannot reconcile what we have seen with what is officially reported. Americans are under the impression that the war is all but over; it is not. They are being told that the U.S. military policy is one of restraint in the interest of progress in Paris; it is not. They are encouraged to think that the Thieu-Ky government is becoming more acceptable to the Vietnamese, that it is politically more secure, more resolute in carrying on the war, more ready to institute reforms, more competent to carry on with diminishing U.S. help. We find no evidence that these things are so.

In our judgment, the human situation in Vietnam today is worse than it has ever been; the cumulative result of U.S. involvement (on top of 25 years of warfare) borders not on Vietnam's salvation, but on its death. An entire nation is being physically, morally, and spiritually destroyed—and the tempo of destruction has increased, not decreased, since the beginning of the Paris talks and the bombing halt.

AFSC QUALIFICATIONS TO COMMENT

Our judgment on these matters is based on 15 years of relationship with Vietnam, the last four with full-time staff stationed variously in Saigon, Vung Tau, My Tho, Danang, An Khe, Pleiku, Hue, and for the last two years, Quang Ngai. As far back as June 1954, we urged the U.S. not to follow the French example of trying to deal with Indo-China's problems in military terms, insisting that "nothing but disaster lies down that road."[1] Since the U.S. military involvement escalated in 1965, our field staff, speaking Vietnamese and living as closely as possible among the people, have regularly reported to us on the conditions around them. These reports make hard reading, chronicling as they do a tide of destruction that has gradually engulfed a people and torn apart the fabric of their lives. Here is what these reports have recorded:

REFUGEES

Four million people—one-third of the rural population of this rural nation—have fled their homes and become refugees in a country where land and village roots have an importance unknown in western culture.[2] Most have fled to the cities, which are quite unprepared to cope with the influx. Saigon's population has swelled to 2,800,000, making it the world's most crowded city. with more than twice the population concentration of Tokyo.[3]

Footnotes at end of article.

DESTRUCTION

Physical destruction is enormous. Hundreds of thousands of acres have been defoliated, countless villages have been razed, and bomb craters pockmark the countryside. B–52 raids alone have torn 2½ million holes 45 feet in diameter and 30 feet deep[4]—holes that are now filled with water and serve as breeding grounds for malarial mosquitoes and other insects. More tons of explosives have been dropped on this tiny country than were dropped on all the Axis powers in all of World War II, and with every month that passes the loads are bigger and the bombs heavier.[5] In December 1968, the U.S. for the first time began using in Vietnam 10,000-pound bombs that had been stored in military depots for 15 years.[6]

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF WAR

The basic economy of the country has been destroyed, and only heavy imports of consumer goods from the U.S. and Japan keep inflation from assuming explosive dimensions. Corruption is epidemic. Vietnam's ancient Buddhist culture, with its village roots, its veneration of ancestors, its reliance on the extended family, has been torn apart by the impact of having quartered in its midst a half million foreign troops who know nothing of its ways or sensibilities. Prostitution and black marketing are rampant.

SUFFERING

In all of this the suffering of the Vietnamese has reached levels that would appall the American people if they could see it. Many thousands have been forced from their homes on short notice, incarcerated in tent cities and then after weeks or months been permitted to return to their villages—their homes destroyed, their animals dead, and their fields mined.[7] More thousands are caught under the bombs or between the contending forces, and the result is carnage.[8] Even before the 1968 Tet offensive it was estimated that there were from 150,000 to 200,000 civilian casualties annually.[9] Provision for caring for the victims is hopelessly inadequate. Provincial hospitals today have few doctors, poor facilities, and often a shortage of medical supplies and even pain killers.[10] The American Friends Service Committee, which has been involved in the relief of war suffering for more than half a century, has rarely encountered such misery as is found in Vietnam today.[11]

U.S. ESCALATION SINCE NOVEMBER 1, 1968

The United States, while it is publicly committed to a search for peace, has in fact stepped up its military activity since the bombing of the North was halted on November 1, 1968. Consider the following:

1. There are more U.S. troops in Vietnam today than there have ever been since the war began. On March 15 this figure was 540,-500, in addition to 45,000 in Thailand and 35,000 in the Navy offshore.[12]

2. The number of battalion-sized operations initiated by the Allies and in progress during each month has grown steadily since the bombing halt. In November the figure was 800; in December, 956; in January, 1077.[13] The actual figures for less-than-battalion-sized operations in this same period are still classified, but it is known that they, too, reflect a steady increase. Enemy-initiated actions in both of these categories are substantially lower than allied actions during these months, which indicates that it is the allies who have been pressing the fighting.[14] Indeed, the North Vietnamese withdrew 30,-000 to 40,000 troops from South Vietnam after the bombing halt.[15] The inclusion of small scale terrorist activity by the NLF forces does not significantly alter the picture. These actions remained relatively constant through December at a level of approximately

100 a month, involving the deaths of from 350 to 450 civilians monthly.[16]

3. Despite the cessation of missions over the North on November 1, the total tonnage of bombs dropped on Vietnam has increased every month since then, except for a slight decrease in the shorter month of February. In November 115,000 tons were dropped; in December, 127,700; in January, 129,700; in February, 115,800.[17] The January figure represents the highest monthly tonnage dropped since the war began.[18]

4. Since October the war has been carried into ostensibly neutral Laos with greatly increased intensity. Before November 1 there was an average of 150 bombing strikes daily over Laos in 1968.[19] By the end of January the U.S. had 300 to 400 planes a day over Laos, or more than double the number being used before the November 1 bombing halt.[20] U.S. commanders have also been permitted to cross the border and carry ground fighting into Laos when they have felt the military situation required it.

5. U.S. battle deaths—always the inexorable barometer of the level of military action—offer final confirmation of the validity of the preceding statistics. These show a rise every month since the bombing halt: 600 American men lost their lives in October; 703 in November; 749 in December; 795 in January; 1073 in February; 1265 in March.[21] Renewed military initiatives by the NLF and DRV forces did not begin until the last week of February.

Where is there evidence in these statistics of a scaling down of allied operations?

U.S. AIMS IN VIETNAM

Americans are assured that U.S. goals in Vietnam are limited ones. Earlier talk of victory has ceased as the death toll has risen and as the decimation of Vietnam has become apparent. Today the apologists for continued U.S. military action argue that our commitment will be fulfilled if our forces can achieve a reasonably pacified countryside, a reasonably stable government, and a reasonably effective Vietnamese army, capable of defending itself against its opponents. The American people are being assured that progress toward these goals is being made.[22] On the basis of our experience, however, and without considering whether these are appropriate goals for the U.S. to be seeking, we do not believe they are in fact attainable:

1. Pacification efforts have repeatedly failed over a ten-year period, and they will continue to fail. The Hamlet Evaluation System, a U.S. introduced, computerized measurement of territorial security, may show the country to be a 75% secure, but all who know the Vietnamese countryside dismiss such figures out of hand. They are worthless because the sources of data are biased, and the definition of "security" is slippery. As the recent Tet offensive has shown once again, the NLF can still move with impunity into any part of Vietnam, even into the very centers of U.S. military power. Despite the contrived reports of the computers and despite the billions of dollars spent on pacification, there is today no part of Vietnam that is truly secure. Neither the U.S. nor Saigon is "winning the minds and hearts" of the Vietnamese. The countryside has not been pacified; it is less secure in 1969 than it was in 1965. Even the major cities, though ringed with fortifications, are vulnerable to attack and infiltration.[23] Quaker workers and Vietnamese sources report to us that anti-American feeling has never before been so intense as it is now.

2. The Thieu-Ky government does not offer any promise of future stability. The government in Saigon is a military dictatorship propped up by U.S. power, despised by the Vietnamese and notoriously corrupt. Freedom of speech is suppressed. No one knows exactly how many Vietnamese political prisoners languish in Vietnam's prisons, but the figure is certainly in the thousands, and includes many of the country's leading intellectuals: university professors, religious leaders, lawyers, students, newspaper editors, politicians—anyone who has dared to advocate political initiatives to end the war. Many of the leading figures in the present Saigon government fought for the French against their own countrymen. They represent an old and vanished order. Whatever the outcome in Vietnam, they will be swept away the moment the Vietnamese regain control of their own affairs. They are too weak a reed on which to pin any U.S. hope for future political stability.[24]

3. The South Vietnamese armed forces will never successfully take over the military burden now carried by the United States. It is not hardware or training that is lacking in Saigon's armies. It is will, the one ingredient the United States will never be able to provide. Thieu's soldiers have no heart for this struggle and have not had any for years. Indeed, one of the most striking phenomena of the war is the contrast between the contending forces: a Vietnamese dressed in the peasant garb of the NLF is one of the world's most formidable fighting men; the same man in the uniform of Saigon is one of the world's poorest. Why? Because one believes he fights to drive the foreigner from his soil while the other fights only to sustain the power of a corrupt military clique.

WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD WITHDRAW

If, therefore, as the American Friends Service Committee believes, a continuing U.S. military presence in Vietnam will not result in any genuine pacification of a warweary and embittered countryside, and will not make palatable a government that is not palatable, nor an army fight that has no will to fight, it becomes useless to pursue further a course that is leading nowhere. It is useless to stay on even for the purpose of a bargaining position in Paris, because we find no reason to think that time will serve to strengthen the U.S. position. This is why we believe that the only viable option left for the U.S. in Vietnam is to withdraw from the whole tragically misconceived adventure.

This is something the U.S. can do. Our military can cease all offensive action, all search-and-destroy missions, all air and sea attacks, and withdraw U.S. troops to port areas for repatriation. This action would have the paramount advantage of returning the future of Vietnam to the Vietnamese, where it belongs. Questions of reunification and political settlement are questions for the Vietnamese to answer, because the Vietnamese, whether they live in Hanoi or in Saigon, are still a single people. They were divided by foreign fiat at Geneva; they have been kept divided by U.S. preoccupation with anti-communism; but fiat and power do not undo the history of a thousand years. The Vietnamese remain one people and not two. They are presently torn by strife between North and South, and between contending forces within South Vietnam, but these struggles can only be resolved by the Vietnamese themselves.

As the only foreigners in South Vietnam, the U.S. and its allies have nothing to negotiate but the rate and manner of their withdrawal. If our leaders were to acknowledge this and move to act on it, it would at once open up a whole new range of possibilities for the good offices of other nations to be used in mediation and in arranging for sanctuary or amnesty for those open to reprisal. This in itself would be a hopeful development.

There will be suffering and turmoil if the U.S. leaves. There may be a government in Saigon led by Ho Chi Minh; there may not be. Withdrawal does not mean that justice will be done. It does not insure fair elections or well-protected freedoms. It does not even insure that urgently needed resources will at last be released for use in America's cities, since the Pentagon has plans to use any savings for its own new weapons projects. But whatever happens, or fails to happen, will, in our judgment, be preferable to going on with the present agony of death and destruction that is literally destroying Vietnam, undermining our own domestic social fabric, and damaging our country's name in the world community.

The real problem for the United States in unilateral withdrawal is not in the military consequences in Vietnam, but the political consequences at home. We do not underestimate their magnitude, or the courage that would be required to face them. The President is under great pressure, and it may seem safer and wiser for him to pursue a less drastic course. But we believe that both the American people and the world at large would respond to forthright leadership to withdraw our country from this war, especially if it were made clear simultaneously that the U.S. stood ready to assist generously in the task of economic reconstruction. We are not calling for the United States to abandon Vietnam, but only to replace a destructive American presence with a constructive one that will act in concert with an international effort to provide such economic help as may be requested by the Vietnamese.

This approach would give us a whole new position in Southeast Asia. At the very least, it would change the present tragic image of the United States. Every day sees the armed forces of the world's most powerful nation raining bombs and chemicals and napalm on the rice fields and bamboo huts of one of the poorest and most defenseless countries. As long as this continues, millions must wonder whether the Americans have indeed become the New Barbarians.

Let us therefore order a cease-fire and withdrawal from Vietnam, unilaterally and immediately. Let us get on with what is really important: the rebuilding of their country—and ours—and the lifting of the burden of poverty from the backs of Vietnamese and Americans alike. These are tasks in which Americans can join with enthusiasm.

GILBERT F. WHITE,
Chairman.
BRONSON P. CLARK,
Executive Secretary.

FOOTNOTES

[1] June 8, 1954, Public Statement issued by the Board of Directors of the American Friends Service Committee.

[2] Report of the Subcommittee to Investigate Problems Connected with Refugees and Escapees, Senator Edward Kennedy, chairman, May 9, 1968. The same report indicates that 80% of these refugees fled because of U.S. bombing. In our Quaker experience, this percentage is a conservative estimate.

[3] The Vietnam Guardian, March 22, 1969: "Saigon: The World's Most Crowded City." Average density of Saigon is reported as 148 persons per acre; Tokyo, the second most densely populated city in the world, averages 63. Densities in Saigon are up to 830 persons per acre.

[4] The Nation, April 21, 1969. Report from Professors E. W. Pfeiffer and G. N. Orians of the Society for Social Responsibility in Science, as quoted in editorial, "Ravaging Vietnam."

[5] November, 6.94 tons per sortie; December, 7.00 tons per sortie; January, 7.55 tons per sortie; February, 7.55 tons per sortie. These estimates were computed on the basis of figures on total tonnage and total number of

Footnotes at end of article.

sorties provided by the Southeast Asia News Desk, Directorate for Defense Information of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs), March 26, 1969.

[6] Washington Post, December 27, 1968: "10,000-Pound Bombs Used to Clear Viet Landing Zone." These bombs, too big for conventional fighter-bombers, are reported as being dropped from C–130 cargo planes or flying crane helicopters.

[7] In one such removal, during Operation Bold Mariner in January 1969, 12,000 peasants from the Batangan Peninsula were taken to a waterless camp near Quang Ngai over whose guarded gate floated a banner saying, "We thank you for liberating us from communist terror." These people had been given an hour to get out before the USS New Jersey began to shell their homes. After 8 weeks of imprisonment they were ferried back to what was left of their villages, given a few sheets of corrugated metal and told to fend for themselves. When asked what they would live on until new crops could be raised, the Vietnamese camp commander said, "Maybe they can fish."

[8] A Quaker worker, writing from Quang Ngai late in February 1969, describes the situation as follows:

"Several of us went to the roof about 3 a.m. The Americans unleashed the terrifying "Puff the Magic Dragon," a DC3 that spews forth 5000 machine gun bullets per minute. As I watched it circle overhead last light, silhouetted against the low clouds in the light of the flares, flinging indiscriminate bolts of death earthward, I could vividly visualize the scene below. Men, women, children and animals, caught like rats in a flood. No place to hide, no way to plead their case of innocence to the machine in the sky, no time to prepare for death. The beating the civilians are taking in this war is beyond adequate description.

"Sitting behind the others on the roof I felt tears welling up and was shocked as I became aware of feelings foreign to my conscious self, which surfaced under the indescribable strain of watching man slaughter man en masse. The cold, mechanical, compassionless way that monster circled around and around ruthlessly pursuing an unseen "enemy," stabbing viciously earthward again and again, probing, searching, killing and maiming all in its path. . . .

"We have survived, but a lot of Quang Ngai people didn't make it. And a lot more who are now clinging to life over at the hospital will not make it until morning. If only we could bring this horrifying scene of human devastation in its true dimensions home to the people who must know what it's like. The ones who are pulling the strings on this deadly puppet show. Man's inhumanity to man has reached its climax in Vietnam."

[9] Report of the Kennedy Subcommittee, cited above. These figures, the report notes, are prior to the 1968 Tet offensive, which greatly increased the rate of civilian casualties.

[10] In Quang Ngai's 500-bed provincial hospital, for example, there were in late February over 600 patients, the great majority war-related. Our Quaker team members were the only non-Vietnamese medical personnel available to care for this overflow load, and, with the exclusion of a single Vietnamese doctor, the only medical aid.

[11] Consider the following, taken from one of many recent reports from Quaker workers in Quang Ngai:

"How can I tell you what it was like! These people coming in filthy, with glazed looks, numb. Nobody talking, nobody crying and the sounds of furious battle not yet ended pursuing them in the door. The emergency room floor still covered with blood from yesterday's casualties, smelled in the heat of the day and was oppressive . . .

"One little fella of ten or so, shot in the face. Three bullet or fragment holes in the back and buttocks, one of which had exited through his abdomen, the others lodged somewhere. He, like most of the others, came in lying in a pool of blood. Feces and ground up bits of bone were flowing out of the buttocks wound. Vomitus ran from his mouth and mixed with the blood pouring from the face wound. We worked with him for a long time but his chances are slim. He was in shock (most of them were) and struggling to get up from time to time, at times opening his eyes wide to beg for water or complain of the pain in his belly and then lapsing into unconsciousness. His father stood by silently, grief written all over his face. A girl, maybe seven years old, with a head wound and skull fracture. Also major portions of one foot missing. Mother and grandmother crying quietly while trying to help us dress the wounds. A mother lying on a stretcher on the floor smeared with blood and with her infant lying silently on her chest. The baby also was covered with blood and I never saw it move.

"I've seen all this before! Why can't I get used to it?! Each lifeless form, every scream of anguish, each blank stare of those who have suffered too much strikes pain in the pit of my stomach. Are there really those who can look at a scene like this and not suffer with the people?"

[12] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

[13] Ibid.

[14] This is confirmed by the New York Times, April 18, 1969 ("U.S. Battle Let-Up Denied in Saigon") which reports that "American troops are continuing to follow a policy of maximum pressure against the enemy. Allied units are continuing to patrol and pursue the enemy aggressively." Later in the story an unidentified colonel is quoted as follows: "All our battalions and brigades are out and operating from one end of the country to the other, just as they've been doing for months. If the casualty figures are down, it's because the Vietcong didn't want to fight—not the United States."

[15] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Senator George McGovern, speaking on the Senate floor March 17, 1969, reports this withdrawal was of "22 full regiments." Sources differed as to the reason for the withdrawal. The military attributed it to the need of North Vietnam to rest its battered forces; Senator McGovern suggests it was in response to the bombing halt.

[16] South Vietnamese government figures, as reported by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969. Data available only through December 1968. These show 443 killed in October, 440 killed in November, 355 killed in December.

[17] Figures provided by the Pentagon's Southeast Asian News Desk, March 26, 1969.

[18] Representative Don Edwards (Dem., Calif.) in a speech on the floor of the House, March 26, 1969.

[19] New York Times, November 1, 1968. William Beecher, "Laos Route to Be Pounded."

[20] U.P.I., January 29, 1969.

[21] Pentagon figures, updated from those quoted by W. F. Ryan (Dem., N.Y.) in the Congressional Record, March 26, 1969.

[22] New York Times, January 3, 1969. Charles Mohr, "Major Gains Made by Vietnam Allies, Even Critics Assert." Reader's Digest, February 1969, an interview with Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., "In Vietnam the Enemy Is Beaten." When the NLF stepped up the fighting late in February 1969, the military made efforts to keep the vision of U.S. progress alive by downgrading these actions. See New York Times, March 11, 1969, Charles Mohr, "Field Checks in Vietnam Show Allies Understated Foe's Gains." The American Friends Service Committee can document this charge from its own experience as far as Quang Ngai is concerned, since the city has more than once since February 23 been subject to night ground attacks that have resulted in an occupation of at least 25% over a period of several hours. Yet, as far as we know, these actions have not been reported by the military briefers.

[23] Quang Ngai, as one provincial capital, for example, has over the past year been regularly infiltrated at night. In the weeks following Tet 1969, heavy street fighting erupted twice around our unarmed and unprotected Quaker compound, which is well within the city limits. Every house in Quang Ngai city has its sandbagged shelter to protect the occupants. This is the situation in a provincial city garrisoned by allied troops. Is this security?

[24] Estimates from our AFCS contacts in Vietnam suggest 20% as the maximum support that Thieu-Ky could claim, with 80% in opposition. Some U.S. government estimates use these same figures but in reverse. We find it difficult to understand the basis for the official U.S. optimism on this point.

NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT OF 1969

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, last month I introduced a bill S. 1832, the proposed National Timber Supply Act of 1969, which would authorize the establishment of a fund to receive receipts of timber sales from the national forests for redisbursement to these same forests for intensive management purposes.

This bill was prompted by a sudden realization by our Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee that, unless a positive and aggressive effort is made to increase the yield of our national forests, an extreme shortage of lumber for housing faces us in the future.

Since the introduction of the bill, I have received numerous letters supporting it, and I have also received supplementary information on the great potential for increased yield in America's forests, once a program for research and intensive management is adequately funded.

Two recent articles were sent to me from opposite ends of the country—one from the State of Washington and the other from the Southeastern area—describing the remarkable achievements that are being made in research on tree culture. The articles speak for themselves in demonstrating what can be done to increase timber yield through better seeds, improved reforestation, and more scientific use of fertilizers and a variety of other management tools.

I am particularly enthusiastic about the statement made by Mr. Keith W. Dorman, of the Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, of his success in breeding trees for high yields in the Southeastern area of the United States. He expects that the improved stock will increase gum yields four to five times the current average.

Similarly, an article by Mr. Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands of the State of Washington, indicates the increased yield possible through use of the latest techniques in electronic data processing equipment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous con-

sent that the articles be printed in the RECORD.

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

PLANNED PARENTHOOD FOR PINE TREES

(By Keith W. Dorman, Southeastern Forest Experiment Station, Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture)

"Only God can make a tree," wrote poet Joyce Kilmer long ago, but today foresters are taking an ever-increasing hand in the process. Through the science of genetics, foresters are making woodlands more productive by planned mating of trees to fill the maws of proliferating pulp mills.

How do they do it—the foresters and tree breeders?

The forest giant—roots deep in the soil—branches high in the sky—is not exactly an image of malleability or flexibility. Why try to improve a plant that grows as big and lives as long as a tree?

A pulp and paper mill is a mighty big collection of machinery and people and costs a mighty big pile of dollars. Foresters have to think big, too. A paper company may own a million acres of trees scattered over several states. The company forester grows trees the mill will chew up 30, 60, or 90 years from now. And when the mill needs them they had better be there. The 81 mills in the South used over 24 million cords in 1961, about 1,000 cords a day for each one. This is a lot of trees and these trees have to be replaced. To do it foresters plant about 700 million seedlings each year.

Good tree-growing land is getting scarcer. The more people there are in the United States the less space there will be for trees. Our population is supposed to double by the year 2000. And the amount of paper used by each person is increasing. Thus, in future years, we'll have more people, each using more paper.

Today it is not enough to grow just a little bit more wood than we're using—we should grow a lot more to have the large size, high-quality trees that can be harvested most economically when needed many years from now.

University, State, Federal, and industrial foresters and tree breeders are working together in a coordinated, Southwide plan of action to improve growth rate and quality of trees. They are finding the best genetic stocks nature has already produced so foresters can use their seed now. They are carrying out planned crossing systems for mating individual trees to create better and special tree types for use in the future.

For example, in trying to find nature's best trees, we have grown 67 species at our research station in Florida. These were species that grew naturally in warm climates of the United States and over the world. None grew faster than local trees, so this approach isn't very promising.

We've also raised trees from seed of the same species growing at different locations in the South. Foresters have known for a long time you couldn't take a good tree species from one climate and expect it to grow well in another. One new thing we're finding out is that within the same species, trees are sensitive to small differences in climate.

A lot of those brown paper bags you lug home your groceries in are made of loblolly pine wood, a tree that makes up half the pine timber between Maryland and Texas. Loblolly pine grown from Georgia seed isn't happy planted in North Carolina or Virginia and vice versa. And those unhappy trees grow slower—30 to 40 percent slower. The tree breeder calls this a racial difference.

Such information was real help for the foresters. Now when they get pine seed to produce 15 to 20 million trees on their company land each year, they collect or buy it in areas where the trees are to be planted. If local seed isn't to be had they go east or west to obtain it, not north or south.

In searching for good sources of seed the tree breeder took a hard look at the genetic differences between individual trees of the same species growing in the same geographic location and of the same race. Here too he struck pay dirt—rich pay dirt.

When he mated fast-growing, straight-stemmed, well-pruned, and small-branched trees with each other, most of the offspring were equally good, too. Trees with bad traits, such as crooked stems, forked stems, long branches, thick bark, poor pruning, and diseased parts—and there are a lot of trees like these in the woods—produced strikingly similar offspring. The tree breeder found that weight of wood and length of fiber varies between individual trees and are inherited traits.

This finding was a really big assist to the forester. In addition to the proper race of trees to plant he knows now which type of individual mother trees to get seed from each year. Also, company foresters and State Forest Services have planted hundreds of acres of seed orchards of grafted trees, using tiny twigs from the very best wild trees that could be found throughout the great southern pinery. These trees will cross with each other and produce seed for millions of improved trees. The first orchards planted just 6 or 7 years ago are producing small amounts of seed right now.

Tree breeders have done much in just the last ten years or so to help the industrial forester get better tree seed from nature's best trees to plant today. The tree breeders are working hard now in mating super individual trees of the same species and super trees of different species for super hybrids. We have progeny or offspring, still young, that are better than anything nature has produced in rate of growth, straightness of stem, ability to prune branches, resistance to diseases, ability to survive after field planting, and yield of "gum" or "pitch."

Results of breeding for high yields of the "gum" or "pitch" that supplies the rosin for paper size—480,000 drums were used in 1960—are startling. The U.S. Forest Service started this work in Georgia and Florida 20 years ago. Wild trees that produced twice as much gum a year as others, when mated, gave groups of offspring that produce twice average, and individual trees with yields 4 to 5 times average. These individual, powerful producers have now been mated and another breeding cycle started. Grafts have been placed in seed orchards from Florida to Louisiana to produce seed commercially.

Super strains are the hope of the future for the pulp and paper industry. It is hard and slow work for the scientists to create, grow, and test new tree strains, but every mill employee has a stake in this work.

SIXTH BIENNIAL REPORT SHOWS RECORD ACHIEVEMENTS, GAINS

(By Bert L. Cole, Commissioner of Public Lands)

You will find in this report and its statistical supplement, the biennial story of income and productivity of your public lands. Our management programs for these lands are producing record achievements in every field.

You will note that during this 1966–68 biennial period the gross income from these public lands has again reached the level of $38.3 million, this was about the same level reached during the preceding biennial period.

The Department spent $7,517,724 from our "20%" management accounts in financing the activities that generated this revenue. These management accounts financed current operational costs and the cost of long term improvements that will increase future income from our state-owned lands.

But it's the future that we look to with anticipation. Our studies of potentially irrigable farm lands in Eastern Washington; the increasing interest in commercial lease sites in the Puget Sound area, and our recently completed (1967) resource inventory put us at the threshold of a dynamically exploding "business" that challenges and stimulates our imagination. Our resource inventory, for instance, has identified and recorded some 90,000 stands having separate forest conditions on our nearly two million acres of state-owned forest land. We are now literally "up to our ears" in analyzing and calculating alternative forestry and economic models to help us improve our ability to make better decisions in maximizing long term net income.

As our electronic data processing equipment started "chewing up" our resource inventory data in answer to a multitude of "what if" alternatives, we were soon impressed with a renewed realization of the inter-dependence of timber growth, stumpage prices, and total forest revenue. In a free economy, more intensive forest management will be practiced only when timber prices are high enough to encourage greater investment and utilization in forest production.

But the rather exciting thing is that we, as managers of state-owned land committed to a sustainable harvest volume, know (1) that by committing more money to increasing timber growth, we can immediately—this year, today—increase our calculated sustainable harvest volume because our sustainable harvest volume is determined from both the present and the estimated future growth of our forest; (2) that we may be able to increase the sustainable volume by merely refining our technique of analyzing existing data and by improving our predictions of future growth. An increased sustainable harvest volume will in turn permit us to increase our annual timber sales immediately and, with high stumpage prices, we can recover our increased expenditure from the revenue generated by this very same volume increase and in addition, produce increased revenue for the state schools, institutions, and counties.

The important fact is that this increased revenue can start coming now! (or, in the instance of the state-owned forest, just as soon as the volume from the increased sales is actually logged), rather than having to wait until the particular acres planted, thinned, or fertilized are ready for harvest.

It is sort of like lifting yourself by your own bootstraps . . . but, if course, those straps can break if the planned investments are not initiated and continued, or if timber prices fall to the point where our Department's share of the gross receipts is not sufficient to finance the new level of forest management.

As the opportunity for increased harvest through investment emerged from our forest inventory data, it first seemed that our 20% management allowance from state-owned timber sale receipts would not be sufficient to capitalize on the opportunity awaiting us and that we might be coming to the 1969 session of the legislature requesting an increase in this 20% allowance. More recently it appears that the current high price of state-owned stumpage will make a reasonable increase (though probably not an optimum level) of growth possible as long as timber prices stay high.

While we have enough answers now to have made a substantial increase in our sustainable harvest volume, our staff is spilling over with additional "what if" questions to feed to the new electronic data processing system that we are installing. We believe that further analysis will permit

additional increases in our sustainable harvest within the next few years.

Perhaps the increasing importance of revenue from our state-owned lands can be judged in part by the fact that half of the total revenue from these lands (sale of land, timber, rental, and interest) since statehood in 1889, has been received in the 12 years since the formation of the Department of Natural Resources.

All this and forest recreation too!

NUCLEAR POWER IN NEW ENGLAND

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the New England River Basin Commission recently issued a statement on thermal powerplant siting in New England.

The commission's statement recognized the far-reaching effects on the environment of decisions concerning the site selection for electric generation plants. It was the judgment of the commission that existing procedures for public agency review and approval of thermal powerplant construction projects do not provide for adequate consideration of the effects of such powerplants on water-related land resources.

I shall shortly introduce legislation in the Senate which will provide for extensive consideration of these effects, but in the meantime, I hope that the Members of the Senate will note the concern of the New England River Basin Commission over this problem. With the help of the active interest of public agencies such as the NERBC, the public has reason to hope that its environment can be protected from unnecessary and irresponsible intrusions upon it.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement by the New England River Basin Commission be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENTS ON THERMAL POWERPLANT SITING BY THE NEW ENGLAND RIVER BASINS COMMISSION, BOSTON, MASS.

DEFINITION OF PROBLEM

Peak electrical power demand in New England is approximately 12,000 megawatts (mw.) at the present time. By 1980 the demand is expected to approach 20,000 mw. and by the year 2000, 70,000 mw. may be required. Current trends in New England power development indicate that a major block of the baseload power will be generated by nuclear fueled power plants. The remainder would be fossil fueled. Three significant constraints related to these facilities are that (1) the plants must be of high capacity (usually nuclear plant capacities exceed 500 mw.) in order to be economically feasible, (2) large quantities of waste heat must be dissipated to a coolant, usually water, and (3) exhaust gases may be toxic. Approximately one million gallons per day of cooling water are required per mw. of power plant capacity. Several unresolved environmental factors are associated with the siting of these power plants. These factors include: (1) the aesthetic aspects of siting adjacent to major bodies of water, (2) the ecological effects of thermal and nuclear waste disposal and (3) the health effects of toxic air pollutants.

In addition to the numerous fossil fuel thermal plants, seven using nuclear fuel have been completed, are under construction or firmly proposed in New England. Land acquisition for an additional plant has been publicly announced. By 1980 three additional plants will be required, and by the year 2000 the total for New England may approach 18.

The Commission considers siting of thermal power plants to be an urgent issue.

FACTORS AFFECTING SITING

The Commission recognizes the need for thermal power generating facilities in New England and the several unresolved environmental issues associated with the siting of these facilities. Recently the Energy Policy Staff, Office of Science and Technology in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Department of Interior, Federal Power Commission, Rural Electrification Administration and Tennessee Valley Authority published a report entitled Considerations Affecting Steam Power Plant Site Selection. Page VIII of that report lists 11 factors to be considered in thermal power plant siting. The remainder of the report substantiates these factors. The factors are as follows:

1. Comply with the safety criteria for nuclear plants as prescribed by AEC.

2. Comply with air pollution criteria and standards as established by the States and the National Air Pollution Control Administration of HEW.

3. Comply with the water quality standards for thermal effects as established by the States and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration of the Department of the Interior.

4. Develop the opportunities for public recreation at plant sites and avoid impairing existing recreational areas.

5. Consider aesthetic values and give adequate attention to the appearance of power plant facilities and associated transmission lines.

6. Recognize the rural development considerations in plant siting.

7. Consider the siting and lead-time requirements for reliability of service.

8. Consider the impact on defense preparedness of particular sites and power plant capacities.

9. Consider the routing of associated transmission lines and the problems of rights-of-way at various alternative plant locations.

10. Assure that the plant will be of sufficient size to meet regional loads including mutually agreeable arrangements for meeting the bulk power needs of the small utilities.

11. Consider prospects for combining power plants with other purposes such as desalting plants, industrial centers, and even new cities.

The Power and Environment Committee of the New England River Basins Commission has been intensively studying the subject of thermal plant siting. The findings of the committee are consistent with the comments on environmental factors of the study of the U.S. Energy Policy Staff. The Commission urges that all public and private organizations which propose, evaluate or approve thermal power plants consider those factors which relate to use of or effects on water and related land resources. Special attention should be given to themal pollution—to more precise determination of thermal effects, and to careful implementation of protective criteria in State and Federal water quality standards programs. The Commission notes that thermal plant siting factors should include compliance with State as well as Federal criteria.

It is the judgment of the Commission that existing procedures for public agency review and approval of thermal power plant construction projects do not provide for adequate consideration of the effects of such power plants on water and related land resources. The Commission will consider and recommend ways of improving procedures related to water and related land resources, and may offer recommendations for improvement of State and Federal review and approval of programs.

The Commission will, within existing authority, work informally during the months ahead to help evaluate sites proposed for early development from the standpoint of water and related land use. The Commission believes that a special region wide study of future sites from this standpoint is urgently needed, and will work with appropriate public and private institutions to attempt to get such a study underway.

Approved February 13, 1969.

WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, an excellent article entitled "Washington Opportunities for Women," written by Ann Schmidt, and dealing with a relatively new program of real value has recently been published in the Denver Post.

Among others who have wished long and arduously to get this program moving in a constructive manner is an extremely able woman who is a friend of many of us in Washington, Mrs. Wistar M. Janney.

The program is a volunteer effort to provide information on part-time work and study for the educated women of this area who have ability and energy and who, above all, desire to do more than they now find possible. I commend Mrs. Janney and Ann Schmidt for their efforts in conducting this program. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Denver Post, April 1969]

WASHINGTON OPPORTUNITIES FOR WOMEN

(By Ann Schmidt)

WASHINGTON.—What is a mother to do? If she is between roughly 30 and 50, her children are either married, in college, or old enough to no longer require her continual custodial care, and she's bored to the teeth wtih rounds of bridge playing and less than satisfying volunteer jobs—what is she to do?

Her college degree, if she has one, is probably completely out of date. It's highly possible that she hasn't punched a time clock for years and in the interim between now and her last paid employment a whole range of frightening new machines and procedures have come on the scene. Her family commitments preclude her taking a full-time job. But, if she looks at her community she sees an enormous need for qualified people in almost every field. There must be some way to put our hypothetical lady with her need for useful part-time employment together with the work that needs doing.

It was to fill this gap that an imaginative group of women put their heads together a few years ago and came forth with an extremely helpful booklet entitled "Washington Opportunities for Women." Its title page declares that it is "a guide to part-time work and study for the educated woman." Published in 1967, the booklet explores part-time job opportunities in the Washington area in professional and semi-professional fields. Clerical and stenographic positions have usually been available for part-time workers, and though the booklet points out that such jobs are often stepping stones to more rewarding positions, it concentrates its efforts on exploring possibilities in such fields as teaching, government, arts, law, communications and health and welfare.

More than 100 women volunteered to do the initial research necessary to produce the book—and many of them found themselves hired by the businesses they were investigat-

ing. It also quickly became apparent that in addition to listing part-time work, it would be necessary to create a clearing-house where interested lady and needed job could be united.

USED BY HUNDREDS

In 1966 Washington Opportunities for Women (the name of the organization as well as the booklet) was given a desk in the U.S. Employment Service where jobs were listed for professional placement. In 1967 a Labor Department contract was granted which provided the funding for a full-time director and an office from which she could operate. That contract was renewed in 1968. Over 1,300 women have thus far made use of WOW's services.

Kiki Nelson, the executive director, has the help of several dedicated volunteer workers. WOW is not an employment agency, though women who come through its doors are told what jobs are available in the fields in which they are interested. Often the lady looking for employment doesn't know what she wants to do, so here Mrs. Nelson and her volunteers help by exploring her past experience, her volunteer interests, her talents and skills. Sometimes a retreading housewife needs to become a part-time student before she becomes a part-time employe.

But helping the harried housewife find fulfillment in the world beyond her kitchen is only part of WOW's activity. Mrs. Nelson and her crew of volunteers are now working to develop new areas of part-time work in the critical region of the inner city, especially in the fields of teaching and social work.

The greatest underdeveloped source of qualified labor in the country today is the middle-aged educated housewife. What she lacks in youthful verve she makes up in common sense accumulated from having survived almost everything. She needs a meaningful use for her talents. The community needs her skill and experience. In Washington WOW is one organization that is helping the two get together.

NATURAL AREAS IN INDIANA AND THEIR PRESERVATION

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the attention of the Senate to a recent publication entitled "Natural Areas in Indiana and Their Preservation," which, although limited to one geographical area, has significance for all States. This important book, whose authors are Alton A. Lindsey, Damian V. Schmelz, and Stanley A. Nichols, is a pioneering study and analysis of the natural areas still extant in my home State of Indiana.

As these and other experts have told us, environmental degradation is, in part, a function of the severe alteration or destruction of a substantial portion of the landscape. This, in effect, means that components of the natural ecological system are being eliminated. We do this at great risk, knowing very little of the consequences of our altering the natural system. Just as it would be ill advised to tamper ignorantly with any complex system—for instance, a manned spacecraft—it is likewise foolish to change blindly the extremely complex, natural life support system of man—the biosphere. Because knowledge about the dynamics of the natural system is so limited, we must first develop programs and activities that will extract and preserve the information necessary to understand the system with which man must harmonize.

It is important to note that at least two current programs are aimed directly at the critical problems of man's relationship to his environment. One is the international biological program, a large-scale ecological research activity which holds much future promise. Related to this is Senate Joint Resolution 89, a joint resolution calling upon all U.S. departments and agencies to support this program, which has been introduced by the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) and 11 other Senators.

The other program, which is gaining momentum and of which this "book" is an important segment, is directed toward the identification and survey of major natural areas at the State level. It is designed to preserve natural areas which are representative examples of the many types of systems that together comprise the biosphere. Scientists point out that it is essential that areas such as these be established to provide, among other things, study areas and reserves of genetic material. The natural-areas concept is one that I strongly endorse; hopefully, other States will follow Indiana's lead in assembling data similar to that included in "Natural Areas of Indiana."

The research in Indiana and the publication of its results were supported by the Resources and Environment Division of the Ford Foundation. An informative preface to the book was written by the officer in charge of that division at the Ford Foundation, Mr. Gordon Harrison. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

NATURAL AREAS IN INDIANA AND THEIR PRESERVATION

PREFACE

For primitive man the notion of a "natural area" could have no meaning. Not only are all areas known to him natural but his world view makes no distinction between the economy of man and the regime of nature. It is civilization born of man's power to manipulate the rest of the living world and resulting in the increasing concentration of people in those artificial ecosystems we call cities that created the very concept of nature as something both alien and potentially lovable. A natural area in our world is by definition something outside the living space of man and something he values precisely because it is not routinely a part of his life. In the normal way he tends to value it more the rarer it becomes.

Why? The reasons are various: Some are so deeply personal that they can hardly be articulated except in terms of poetry; others have large social implications. Nature seen from the vantage point of the civilized life has for many people an esthetic appeal at least equivalent in spiritual values to great art and the vision of the wild as God's handiwork is quite sufficient motivation for many who wish to preserve it against the desecration of highways, power lines or subdivisions.

Beauty is often reason enough but it is not all even for those who respond to it. Remote as city man may be from nature, as attenuated as his direct dependence on other living things may become through technology, there are good reasons to believe that the human race can no more develop its human potential in isolation from the matrix of living creatures out of which it evolved than can a child grow to fulfillment withdrawn from people.

For one thing there are the requirements of understanding. The voyage of the Beagle was an expedition into the wild that discovered man. Biology which is ultimately a science of man could tell us little if it could not explore the life processes of other creatures. Nor is it enough to rear monkeys for the laboratory; the critical facts of life that we need to understand for the sake of our own survival are those to be observed in natural communities—that is to say the behavior of living organisms, their interactions with each other, their adaptations, their capacity to coexist in relatively stable self-regulating systems. It is ironic (and unless the enlightenment that underlies this book comes quickly to our political leaders it may be tragic) that we have only just come to recognize the crucial importance of living systems at that point in history when so many of them are in imminent danger of being squeezed to death by the encroachments of civilization.

As the intellectual excitement and practical significance of ecology attract more scientists, the need for natural areas representative of the whole range of natural ecosystems will grow. A rational first step toward preservation is such a detailed inventory as Dr. Lindsey and his colleagues have carried out for Indiana. It both provides a basis for assigning priority of purchase and protection and assures (or should assure) that the specially rare and precious communities of plants and animals will not be destroyed through inadvertence. We clearly need such inventories for the whole of the United States. While it will not be easy to duplicate the experience and devotion of Alton Lindsey, Damian Schmelz and Stanley Nichols, they have nevertheless demonstrated that this kind of job can be well done without exorbitant expenditure of time or manpower and at a modest dollar cost that state budgets could easily afford. It would be refreshing to find a highway department with the imagination to commission such a study—and use it!

Indiana passed a law in 1967 recognizing the importance of natural areas and giving them some protection against public works that would destroy them. Eight other states have similar legislation. Important as these laws are as official endorsement of the public value of natural areas, they can accomplish little, as this book makes clear, unless backed by both public and private action. Privately owned lands are particularly vulnerable. mechanisms must be designed and courageously applied to counteract economic pressures that force them at an ever-increasing rate into what we euphemistically call "development." In form this book is a simple description of what is left of undeveloped nature in one state intended as a guide for those who can save some of it. In spirit it is an appeal for a fresh sense of public values that speaks to everyone with an urgency corresponding to the frightening speed with which inventories like this in the automobile age can become obsolete.

GORDON HARRISON,
DECEMBER, 1968.

OMAHA YMCA DEDICATES NEW BUILDING

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on June 10, 1969, the Omaha Young Men's Christian Association will dedicate a new six-story building. This marks another step in the "Y's" commitment to offer the very best facilities for the citizens of Omaha.

The building contains such features as an AAU-size swimming pool three times larger than the old pool, a gymnasium which can seat 300 spectators, a banquet

room and food facilities for 400, a chapel and three floors devoted to housing. Besides emphasizing the physical programs the "Y" will continue its armed services work, encouraging participation by servicemen and their families. One of the most exciting areas in the "Y's" community activity is an expanded program for grade school children of the inner city. A special effort will be made to involve teenagers in the many educational opportunities offered at the "Y."

There will be something else quite special about the new Omaha "Y." The cornerstone to be laid at the dedication, will contain a box with memorabilia of historic interest. Among the mementos will be a copy of today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with this salute to the Omaha "Y" and to the tradition it so well represents.

Mr. President, emblazoned on the triangle insignia of the Young Men's Christian Association are the words "Spirit, Mind, Body." This motto symbolizes the earnestness and simplicity that are the hallmarks of this splendid organization.

From its earliest years, the YMCA has been interested in improving the spiritual and physical welfare of the citizens of our country. First it concentrated on religion, sponsoring Bible classes and revival meetings and sending evangelical preachers out on the streets and into the factories to spread the Gospel.

Later on, the "Y" began developing ways and means to improve its member's health through planned exercises and wholesome sports. In more recent years, increasing attention has been given to intellectual development, with adult education courses and the sponsorship of cultural events.

Being a YMCA member gives one a feeling of vitality, of being in a movement that is worldwide, serving all age ranges, a movement which is having its period of greatest achievement, after so many years of productive fellowship.

Fellowship is the byword of the "Y." Its influence has been so widespread that it is next to impossible to find an American boy who has grown up without making some contact with the "Y" and benefiting greatly from it.

For over a million young men who find themselves away from home each year, the YMCA offers a refuge and a source of inspiration and wholesome recreation.

This world would be a much better place to live in if more people adopted as their own the ideals and aspirations of the YMCA.

Mr. President, I wish to commend the Omaha "Y" on its years of growth and progress culminating in the dedication of a new and outstanding building. I predict for it many years of even greater achievement, and continued dedication to the service of young and old in Nebraska's largest city.

LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, President Nixon, in proclaiming April 20–26 as National Library Week, declared:

> Libraries are the banks of our educational system. . . . Never have we had greater reason than this year to celebrate National Library Week. For never have our libraries played a more prominent role in our campaign against ignorance and for fullness of educational opportunity.

Yet I find that in his proposed budget for library programs, President Nixon has eliminated entirely funds for library resources in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He has eliminated entirely funds for construction of new public libraries. He has reduced by one-half funds for library services.

When we in Congress enacted the Library Services and Construction Act in 1966, we did so with the express purpose to promote the extension of free public library services to areas without such services; to assist communities in the construction of public library facilities; to establish interstate or regional cooperative networks of libraries; to improve library service to the physically handicapped; to provide library services to State institutions.

In Maine our small rural communities have been unable to maintain adequate library service. With the aid of Library Services and Construction Act funds, eight bookmobiles served 133,000 rural residents in 1968 who otherwise would have had no access to public library services.

Mr. Edward Y. Blewett, president of Westbrook Junior College in Portland, Maine, recently wrote on the state of the public library in Maine. I commend his article to Senators and point out that without Federal funds the South Portland Public Library could not have been constructed; without Federal funds the model high school libraries of Waterville and Brunswick would not have been implemented; without Federal funds thousands of public and parochial school children in Maine would have been denied cultural and educational enrichment through books, visual aids, and recordings.

Mr. Blewett called to the Maine communities:

> What have you done to help your library lately?

I call to President Nixon:

> What have you done to help the Nation's libraries lately?

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Blewett's article, published in the Portland, Maine, Sunday Telegram of April 27, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

YOUR LOCAL LIBRARY: A HUB OR BACKWATER?

(By Dr. Edward Y. Blewett, president, Westbrook Junior College)

Probably you can remember, as I do, opening the door and entering a large room where sunlight came only from a distant window and the air was heavy with an atmosphere of circumspection and tiptoe quiet—this was the library.

The emphasis should be on the word "was". Because libraries, like so many of our other institutions, must reshape themselves if they are going to be meaningful in these times.

What is the new image? What constitutes the "new library"? For Maine, the answer lies in the model school libraries in Waterville and Brunswick. These students flock to the library. There, the library is an exciting place that "turns them on". There, virtually modern technology has been focused in the library. These tools help to reveal to many students the fact that education need not be dull; and that the advenures of the mind can be the most exciting of all.

Paperback books, filmmaking, photography, tape recording, microfilm, speed reading, informal discussions, filmstrips, movies, videotape recorder, graphic arts, loans of paintings, tapes and records, exhibits—the Waterville Senior High School Library uses these and many other modern tools to really reach the student and really involve him in the learning process. On the elementary and junior high school level the same type of effort is being made in Brunswick.

School libraries are not the only ones that are sensing the need for change. Public libraries are seeking to expand their services. In communities such as Freeport, Presque Isle and South Portland, new facilities reflect the new library image of informality, enjoyment and widespread use.

At the Bowdoin College Library a microfilm printer allows instant copying of any of the thousands of pages of periodicals compactly recorded on film. Today, even in remote parts of Maine; a request for a book can be telephoned directly from a local public library to the State Library, and from there relayed to the nine-library teletype network which makes more than two million volumes available to any Maine resident.

But I think we might stop and ask ourselves the very basic question, "What do we mean by a library?" It is too easy to get involved in comparisons of hours, staff size, buildings, equipment, number of books loaned and fail to answer the basic question "Why a community needs a library at all?"

Any library has two major and unique functions. First, it makes possible meetings of mind and idea which are not limited by normal boundaries of time, space, and social or economic level. An effective library allows us to use the power of our human awareness to become more than we were; to increase our individual stature; to add to our public effectiveness to move to the far side of the world, to the fifth Century B.C. or into the company of prophets and princes.

The library encourages the extension and active generation of ideas. The technical means may be a book, a tape, a film, a record, a print-out, a video-tape or some other system not yet invented.

Yet the emphasis must be on people and not on things. A library should not be defined by its space, equipment and collections alone; but by the adequacy of its people. In addition to technical and professional skills, the librarian must have skill with people. The librarian is a teacher whose subject is learning itself.

The public library is an essential social and educational institution in a community. It is a municipality's investment in popular education, in information services, in aesthetic values and in the recreation needs of its citizens. Its success is based on how well it fulfills three needs: (1) The need for skilled and sensitive people to staff it. (2) The need for bold and imaginative use of all available technical means. (3) The need for support from all sectors of the economy and every level of government.

I wish we were in the forefront in meeting library needs in Maine. Unfortunately we are not. The unpleasant fact is that Maine libraries do not adequately serve the needs of Maine people.

The following are just a few of the unpleasant facts concerning Maine libraries:

More than half of Maine's public li-

braries offer only token service. They are open less than 10 hours a week. More than 70 per cent of the public libraries are open less than 20 hours a week.

About half of the public libraries added less than 100 books to their collections during 1967 and 70 per cent added less than 200 books.

An average per capita expenditure of $4 is recommended but 45 per cent of the libraries spend less than $1 per capita and 75 per cent spend less than $2 per capita.

The libraries of the University of Maine are dangerously inadequate. The main library at Orono is seriously deficient in the number of volumes it should contain. The total shortage of books throughout the University system is 770,000 volumes. Only the Law School Library is up to par.

A Maine School Library Survey released in March reveals the "appalling" state of our school libraries. Libraries are either nonexistent or are largely under-staffed and under-equipped. For instance, the survey shows that only 59 Maine high schools and only 13 junior high schools have even one full time librarian.

This low level of library service in Maine results in substantial cultural and educational deprivation for half a million Maine people. We have failed in reaching to get across clearly the role that libraries play in a complete community; to show the need of all people of all ages for good library service; and to make clear the social and educational interest that can be reaped on each dollar invested in our libraries.

Yet the situation in Maine is not unusual in the nation, but typical. The Advisory Commission report to the President last October states:

"The public library reaches the entire population as does no other aspect of library service. For all men and women, it is the one place through which they may reach the world's collected informational and intellectual resources.

"Yet as important as the public library is, there are few social services so unequally provided to the American people. Residents of some cities can command the resources of enormous institutions holding many hundreds of thousands, or even millions of volumes. At the other extreme, some 20 million Americans, largely in rural areas, have no public library service at all, and some 10 million more have access only to very small libraries with very inadequate collections and little or no service from professional librarians.

"Even where public library service is available it is usually far below any reasonable standard of adequacy. More than two thirds of all public libraries fail to meet standards for size of collections and only one in 30 meet standards for per capita financial support."

These deficiencies which have "truly serious consequences for our entire system of education" were labeled a "national disgrace" by former Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel.

The recommendations of the National Advisory Commission on Libraries as well as numerous studies in individual states including New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts indicate a few of the answers to this state, local and national problem. Better communications systems, inter-library cooperation, regional libraries, more effective use of all technological changes, upgrading of staff in number and training, a higher level of financial support and numerous administrative and technical operational changes are among the recommendations.

The Maine National Library Committee is cooperating with the Community Betterment Program of the Department of Economic Development to help make more communities aware of the full value of their libraries as a vital social and economic resource. But all future library improvement rests on this base of citizen awareness. What have you done to help your library lately?

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—II

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the second of a two-part examination of the problem of pollution by pesticides has just been completed by the Conservation Foundation and printed in that organization's newsletter. The foundation's first report dealt with the extensive use of pesticides, their effects on wildlife, natural systems, and man himself. This second report outlines Federal and State government attempts to limit the dangers, the politics of pesticides, and alternatives for solving the problem.

For a number of years there has been considerable controversy over the use of persistent, toxic pesticides, particularly DDT. In the past, voices warning of the threat to wildlife and human health of these pesticides have received little notice, in part because of the lack of public knowledge about pesticides and in part because of the powerful forces opposing attempts to restrict the use of pesticides.

CF's report talks of the "well entrenched coalition," composed of pesticide users, bureaucrats, legislators, and manufacturers and distributors of pesticides, "which prides itself on the Nation's superlative agriculture—and generally opposes attempts to restrict the use of pesticides." These spokesmen claim that there are some safe uses and some unsafe uses for these pesticides, and that therefore a total ban on the product is not sensible.

However, pesticides are potentially dangerous to man. Researchers have found evidence that may link pesticides to cancer, adverse enzyme production and disturbances of the stomach and liver functions. Fish and wildlife have suffered heavy losses, and our natural systems have been adversely affected.

According to CF:

The Federal Government's regulation of pesticides is done on a piecemeal, or individual product-use basis.

At the base of all regulations is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act—FIFRA—passed in 1947. This law controls registration and labeling of pesticide products. It is supplemented by provisions of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 with an amendment which allows the Food and Drug Administration to set tolerance levels for pesticide residues in raw agricultural commodities, confiscate them if the pesticide content exceeds authorized levels, and initiate prosecution against violators.

FIFRA is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Pesticides Regulation Division. Applications for registration are reviewed by FDA if food is involved and by HEW's Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service under its mandate to protect drinking water and long-term environmental health, and by the Interior Department if a pesticide use might affect fish or wildlife.

However, despite all these steps available, the foundation points out that there is no formal followup procedure, and the laws are not adequately administered. Speaking of enforcement, one FDA official said:

Our programs are minimal in this area. They could be strengthened.

General Accounting Office reported that in fiscal 1966, the Agricultural Research Service found 750 product samples to be in violation of standards, but only 106 were seized.

On the State level, only two States lack registration laws covering pesticides distributed in intrastate commerce. Most State laws follow the plan of FIFRA and a uniform act prepared by the Council of State Governments.

However, the report notes:

Though FIFRA and these state laws govern labeling and prescribed use of a pesticide, these laws do not restrict actual use after a pesticide is sold.

Most States have their own tolerances for commodities sold intrastate, and they generally parallel the FDA's. There is no telling how much abuse or misuse of pesticides takes place, be it from misinformation, carelessness, or overzealousness.

Many States have enacted "use and application" laws which regulate specific uses, inspection of equipment, and licensing of operators, dealers and applicators, including aerial applicators.

In addition, the water quality standards program carried on by most States gives another opportunity for regulation of pesticides.

The CF newsletter cites 15 recommendations for solving or at least improving the complex problem of pollution by pesticides. Heading the list is natural or biological controls of insects and diseases, such as introducing the natural predators or parasites of the target insect. The "cultural" methods of control would include rotating crops and better timing of crops. Integrated pest control programs, those that combine the biological and cultural methods, also hold a great deal of promise.

Greater research and better communication of sound ecological knowledge already available are vital to effective regulation of pesticides. International food, health and development agencies are urged to investigate the problem. And of course, strong citizen interest and action is fundamental to all progress in setting meaningful regulations and enforcement procedures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this important report by the Conservation Foundation be printed in the RECORD.

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

A REPORT ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES FROM THE CONSERVATION FOUNDATION, MAY 5, 1969

(IN THIS ISSUE.—The second of a two-part examination of the problem of pollution by pesticides . . . The April 25 CF Letter dealt with the extensive use of pesticides, their effects on wildlife, natural systems, and man himself . . . This issue looks at government attempts to limit the dangers, the politics of pesticides, and alternatives for solving the problem.)

NEEDED: BETTER REGULATION OF PESTICIDES AND INTEGRATED METHODS OF PEST CONTROL

There is a large, well-entrenched coalition in the United States which prides itself on the nation's superlative agriculture—and generally opposes attempts to restrict the use of pesticides. The coalition is composed of farmers, bureaucrats, legislators, and, of course, the manufacturers and distributors of an estimated $1.7 billion worth of pesticides each year.

At the forefront is the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, based in Washington, D. C., and including in its membership the large pesticide makers. Its public position is crystal clear: there's nothing wrong with pesticides if they are handled and used properly.

"Our basic philosophy," says Parke C. Brinkley, NACA's president, "is that there are some safe uses for all the products, and some unsafe uses. We don't think a total ban on a product is a very smart way of doing it. It would not be in the public interest."

Why not? Because, it is insisted, there are particular uses and particular chemical compounds for which there is no good substitute. For example, DDT is considered cheaper and more effective to control many pests than other, less harmful or less persistent compounds. "These conventional insecticides," says Dr. Edward F. Knipling, director of the Department of Agriculture's Entomology Research Division, "have many advantages. They are positive and consistent in their effect in controlling destructive insects. Because of their rapid action, damaging infestations can be brought under control in a matter of hours. Individual action can be taken by farmers or property owners."[1]

Considering this, and the immediate potential savings to farm and forest owners, it is small wonder that they turn to pesticides with alacrity and that broad attempts to limit the use of pesticides are adamantly opposed.

But for all its seeming logic, this all too common approach presents a problem. For it is already clear that pesticides are dangerous. They often cause unintended and damaging side effects, including heavy losses of fish and wildlife. They adversely affect natural systems and they may even pose a threat to man himself. But with factual knowledge on most pesticides still to come in, how does society measure and balance the risks in the meantime? For those who seek to minimize the use of pesticides, it's slow, tough going. Each restriction usually requires painstaking research, public education, and legislative action.

FEDERAL REGULATION

Essentially, the federal government's regulation of pesticides is done on a piecemeal, or individual product-use basis. The backbone of this process is the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA), passed in 1947 and subsequently amended and interpreted at great length. This law controls *registration* and *labeling* of pesticide products. It is supplemented by provisions of the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act of 1938, also amended, under which the Food and Drug Administration (HEW) is empowered to set "tolerance" levels for pesticide residues in raw agricultural commodities, to confiscate them if the pesticide content exceeds authorized levels, and even to initiate prosecution. Both federal acts apply only to pesticides or food marketed in interstate commerce.

FIFRA is administered by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Pesticides Regulation Division. A manufacturer or shipper must apply for registration and labeling of a particular product to be used for a particular purpose. Although there are only 900 or so basic chemical compounds, there are some 45,000 pesticide registrations, including those for household use. An approved label will prescribe conditions of use, target, dosage, method and timing of application, etc., as well as pertinent warnings. Approved uses are determined by USDA, based on its own research and review of information and research data supplied by the manufacturer. This information deals with efficacy and toxic effects, among other things.

Applications for registration are reviewed by the FDA if food is involved, and FDA has the power to block approval if it finds the proposed use of the pesticide is likely to result in a residue in food or feed exceeding the tolerance level. Applications are also reviewed by HEW's Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service under its mandate to protect drinking water and long-term environmental health. And they are reviewed by the Interior Department if a pesticide use might affect fish or wildlife. Both CPEHS and Interior can only *advise* USDA; that is the limit of their authority.

(USDA first registered the insecticide lindane for use in vaporizers in 1951. Recently, the U.S. Comptroller General scored USDA for permitting this use of lindane in food-handling and other commercial and industrial establishments—despite the fact that the Public Health Service and other federal, state and private organizations have long contended it is dangerous to health and food.[2] On April 29, USDA cancelled the registration of lindane for use in vaporizers. USDA explained that "intensified" studies since the Comptroller General's report showed lindane vapors caused "undue risk to . . . health" and that simulated restaurant tests showed "illegal residues of lindane" in "practically all food, packaged and unpackaged," after five days' exposure.)

Officials of both Interior and USDA generally say that cooperation is good, and that Interior's recommendations are almost always accepted. However, Dr. Frederick H. Dale, chief of the Division of Pesticide Registration of Interior's Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, adds that there is no formal follow-up procedure and "we're never positive Agriculture hasn't disregarded our warning." Ned P. Everett, counsel to the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, says evidence shows that some labels recommended by Interior have been "toned down considerably" by Agriculture.[3]

A continuing effort has been made in Congress to *require* Agriculture to take Interior's labeling advice to prevent or minimize injury to fish and wildlife. In fact, the House on April 1, 1968 passed a bill containing such a provision. However, it did not emerge from the Senate Commerce Committee, where it was opposed by the National Agricultural Chemicals Association and the Agriculture Department.[4] A similar provision is contained in a new bill introduced this year, H.R. 1057.

Attempts to strengthen pesticides regulation do not normally fare well in Congress, where the four committees or subcommittees dealing with agricultural legislation and appropriations are heavily dominated by farm and pesticides-oriented congressmen. For example, bills to ban the interstate shipment of DDT have been referred several times to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee, which one observer calls a "dead end" for that kind of proposal.

Another example involves a bill introduced in several sessions by Senator Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut. It would give Agriculture more muscle by requiring a pesticide manufacturer to register his *establishment* and by permitting Agriculture to inspect it to see if proper materials, precautions and controls are being followed, and to inspect a warehouse or vehicle carrying pesticides.

But, as Brinkley reported to his NACA membership: "Through the understanding of Congress, and particularly Senator (B. Everett) Jordan of North Carolina (chairman of the subcommittee to which the bill was referred), we have been given some time to see if the situation might be improved without the necessity of federal intervention." Brinkley said this compromise was "entirely acceptable to us."[5]

Even as they stand, the laws are not necessarily administered well. Some observers give the FDA good marks for its system of residue tolerances on food. Others do not. Douglass F. Rohrman, an attorney formerly with HEW's National Communicable Diseases Center, says that a significant amount of work has never produced a truly complete set of standards.[6] Dr. Paul Ehrlich of Stanford University says that FDA tolerances are set "on the basis of short-term animal experiments and are set one poison at a time. Then, when it proves to be impossible to keep tolerances within limits, pressures are brought on the government, and the tolerances are conveniently raised."[7]

Speaking of enforcement, one FDA official says "our programs are minimal in this area. They could be strengthened." He also says that although there have been many seizures of food, he knows of no case of criminal prosecution.

The situation in the Agriculture Department is another story. Under FIFRA, the Pesticides Regulation Division, a branch of the Agricultural Research Service, can act against a pesticide product if it is unregistered, misbranded, or adulterated. In addition to the issuance of a written warning, the PRD has power to seize such products, cancel their registration, or ask the Justice Department to prosecute for criminal violations.

How has this regulatory program worked? Consider these blunt charges in a recent reoprt[8] by the government's watchdog General Accounting Office:

For 13 years, ARS never reported a violator of FIFRA for prosecution. This in spite of "repeated major violations" of the law. (A number of shippers were cited for between four and 20 major violations each.)

Shippers cited by ARS "did not take satisfactory action to correct violations," and in fact "ignored" ARS notification that prosecution was being contemplated.

"We found that, in taking action against products, ARS, with few possible exceptions, did not obtain product quantity and location data to determine whether other shipments of the same misbranded, adulterated or unregistered products were available to the public in other locations."

GAO reported that in fiscal 1966, ARS tested and reviewed 2,751 product samples and found 750 of these to be in violation (562, or about 20% of the samples, in major violation). There were 106 seizures.

The current chief of the PRD, Dr. Harry W. Hays, has promised stronger enforcement activities, while at the same time stressing voluntary industry cooperation and warnings to industry. "Citations are the backbone of our enforcement program," he is quoted in an industry magazine. "Effective enforcement should emphasize corrective action, rather than being strictly punitive in nature."[9]

Perhaps complicating the picture is the presence of several basically conflicting purposes within Agriculture. For one thing, the Department's principal responsibility is to the farmer and food production, and Congress wouldn't let it forget this if it wanted to. So there is a potential conflict of interest simply in having pesticide regulation within the Agriculture Department.

On the other hand, there exists a clear pesticide policy memorandum in the Agriculture Department, issued by former Secre-

Footnotes at end of article.

tary Orville Freeman on December 23, 1964. It expresses concern over the effects of pesticides and states that Department policy is "to practice and to encourage the use of those means of effective pest control which provide the least potential hazard to man and animals. When residual pesticides must be used to control or eliminate pests, they shall be used in minimal effective amounts, applied precisely to the infested area and at minimal effective frequency. Biological, ecological or cultural methods or non-persistent and low toxicity pesticides will be used whenever such means are feasible and will safely and effectively control or eliminate target pests."

But there is a generally cozy relationship between the agricultural industry and various branches of government, some of whose officials end up working for industry. This coziness is not exactly discouraged by Congress. Congressman Jamie L. Whitten of Mississippi, chairman of the House Appropriations subcommittee on agriculture, says that farmers must look to the Department of Agriculture to represent their interests. "If the Department does not appear on behalf of the farm producers at hearings (on pesticide residues) as to whether it is essential on the one side and to question whether it does any injury on the other side, we are in a bad way." [10]

Whitten has summed up his philosophy on pesticides this way: "The worst residue problem we have to face today is the residue of public opinion left by Rachel Carson's book *Silent Spring*." And Dr. George L. Mehren, former assistant secretary of agriculture, testified before Whitten's subcommittee in 1968: "I think we can validly say that the hysteria associated with the *Silent Spring* has quite effectively subsided." [10]

The economic pressures usually involved are illustrated by Whitten's description of a meeting he attended with key congressmen interested in cotton: "They were discussing the matter of failure to have sufficient cotton to retain our foreign markets. According to our hearings in prior years, about 30% of the average production of most farm commodities would be lost to insects and pests were not measures taken to prevent it. . . . So the ability to use pesticides is very important to the farmer." [10]

STATE REGULATION

All states except two have registration laws covering pesticides distributed in intrastate commerce. Most of these laws are modeled after FIFRA and a uniform act prepared by the Council of State Governments. But though FIFRA and these state laws govern labeling and the *prescribed* use of a pesticide, these laws do not restrict *actual* use after a pesticide is sold. The FDA's residue tolerances are indirect restraints on excessive use of pesticides.

They place a "natural restriction" on the farmer, says an NACA aide. "If he overuses, there will likely be an excessive residue on the crops and they'll be seized. A grower can't risk his entire crop that way."

But some question the impact of FDA's regulatory program. Ehrlich, for example, says that inspection of foods for residues is "completely inadequate," and that farmers have not infrequently sprayed beyond official tolerances "knowing that the chances of being caught were practically nil." [7]

Most states have their own tolerances for commodities sold intrastate, and they generally parallel the FDA's. There is no telling how much abuse or misuse of pesticides takes place, be it from misinformation, carelessness, or overzealousness. But dozens of cases have been cited and the comment of Dr. Dale is apt: "I hope there's not as much as I'm afraid there is . . . We can put a warning on the label, but . . . we can't hold his (the farmer's) hand and see that he uses it that way."

Dr. William A. Niering, director of the Connecticut Arboretum, says "it appears that not infrequently repeated spraying applications are merely insurance sprays and in many cases actually unnecessary." [11] Said Miss Carson: ". . . there remains the well-known fact that farmers very frequently exceed the prescribed dosages, use the chemical to close to the time of harvest, use several insecticides where one would do, and in other ways display the common human failure to read the fine print." [12]

A congressional report states that "substantial pressures are on the side of excess application"—although they are balanced by the farmer's natural desire to use pesticides as inexpensively and efficiently as possible. "The (county) agricultural adviser is the recipient of a constant stream of information from the chemical company salesman with new products and techniques every year. Chemical marketing efforts are directed at the farmer, too, by every means of advertising from billboards to personal visits." [13]

Directed specifically at misuse of pesticides are the so-called "use and application" laws which many states have enacted. These may regulate specific uses, inspection of equipment, and licensing of operators, dealers and applicators, including aerial applicators. In California, for example, the Department of Agriculture establishes rules and regulations for the use of several "injurious" or "restricted" categories of chemicals. Before using certain chemicals, the prospective user (farmer as well as commercial applicator) must obtain a permit from his *county* agricultural commissioner, who may include on the permit any conditions he considers necessary to assure safety. Before delivery, the seller must obtain from the purchaser a signed statement that the appropriate permit has been secured.

Some state laws are extremely limited in scope. Some deal only with herbicides, others only with "structural" termite control. Rohrman comments on these state laws in general: "There is a great divergence of coverage, unfortunately mostly inadequate." [6] Enforcement is a problem too, with effectiveness varying as much as the laws themselves. And as in all regulatory programs, enforcement is only as effective and vigorous as the people carrying it out.

Quite a few attempts are currently being made to pass new state laws, or strengthen those that exist, but progress can be difficult. As Brinkley reported to NACA's members on their organization's effectiveness in 1968:

"Though we had quite a bit of controversy in Arizona, California and Michigan, the issues were satisfactorily resolved for the current session. In California the bill to require licensing of salesmen was tabled in favor of an interim legislative study bill. In Michigan a bill providing for the establishment of a pesticide control board in the Conservation Department with the expressed purpose of completely prohibiting the use of persistent materials was tabled in favor of an interim legislative study committee of five members of the Senate and five members of the House. In Arizona a bill designed to unduly restrict the use of DDT was amended in such a manner as to be acceptable to everybody actively concerned." [5]

State legislatures and agencies, of course, are subject to the same economic and political pressures and dilemmas, the same latent conflicts of interest, as Congress and federal agencies. Almost all states have placed pesticide regulation under their agriculture departments. On March 14, discussing pending legislation in Minnesota to control pesticide use, the Minneapolis Star said it would like to see such regulatory powers vested in the pollution control agency rather than in the state's agriculture department. "Such pesticides must be regarded as the environmental pollutants they are, rather than only as an assist to agriculture," the paper said.

Sometimes there is even a reluctance to supply information on pesticide use. Recently, a Washington, D.C. city official simply declined to tell how much DDT was being used on the city's trees. [14] Kevin Shea, an entomologist formerly with the Agriculture Department, has noted how difficult it was to obtain a copy of a December 1967 report on pesticide injury to wildlife. The report was printed for limited distribution by the California Department of Fish and Game. When a university entomologist sought a copy, he was asked to wait a few weeks until the department had a chance to meet with the pesticide manufacturer. The reason for this, says Shea, was stated quite specifically in the report itself:

"An opportunity is available to demonstrate the effectiveness of cooperative action between the chemical industry and local government in solving problems without undue outside interference." [15] These are not the only examples—involving bureaucrats, scientists and others, state and federal—of a strange reluctance to let the public know what's going on in the field, not to mention the disturbingly close relationships between industry and government.

Still another opportunity for regulation of pesticide use is provided by the water quality standards program which states are carrying out in cooperation with Interior's Federal Water Pollution Control Administration. Most state standards, which have to be approved by Interior, generally require that waters remain free from toxic substances in concentrations harmful to man, fish or wildlife. Such language could presumably be used to control pesticide use. This, in fact, is the essence of the case now at issue in Wisconsin.

LEGAL REMEDIES

In addition to federal and state regulatory controls, there is a further restraint on excessive pesticide use—legal liability for damage to another's property. This is discussed at length by Rohrman. [6] There are often extremely complex problems of liability and evidence, but successful suits are not infrequent.

Some state fish and game departments receive frequent, usually small settlements for fish kills. Many states have set specific values on individual fish for such purposes.

"They can all recover one way or another—if they want to," says a Federal Water Pollution Control Administration official. "Some states make an effort to collect, some just don't at all." One state, for example, had 25 fish kills due to endrin in one year, but took no action. "In many states," he says, "the pressure of the chamber of commerce, or the manufacturers' association, is so great through the governor that they just don't get it done."

A broad-brush injunctive legal attack on behalf of the citizenry in general is the approach of the Environmental Defense Fund, Inc. and its attorney Victor J. Yannacone, Jr. EDF has taken pesticide use cases to court in an effort to establish a precedent that the citizen *has a constitutional right* to a clean environment. That argument hasn't been accepted so far, but EDF's court challenges have indirectly induced many local governments to restrict or ban the use of DDT. Yannacone is a firm believer in the court suit as an answer:

"A court of equity is the *only* place to take effective action against polluters. Only in a courtroom can a scientist present his evidence, free from harassment by politicians. And only in a courtroom can bureaucratic hogwash be tested in the crucible of cross-examination." [16]

Footnotes at end of article.

Alternatives for the future

There is no shortage of recommendations for solving or at least improving the complex problem of pollution by pesticides. Some possible solutions:

1. Natural or "biological" controls of insects and diseases offer what are undoubtedly the most promising ways of gradually replacing pesticides. These methods are of great variety and potential. Natural predators or parasites of the target insect often can be introduced in an area. There are many successes. A bacteria or virus which is ruinous to the target pest alone can be introduced. Males of some target species can be sterilized in vast numbers and then released. They mate with females, but produce no offspring. Because of the rapid reproduction rates of most insects, the population may soon be lowered dramatically. The outstanding example of this technique, developed by Knipling, is control of the screwworm, a destructive livestock pest.

Many insects are attracted sexually by substances that can be made synthetically. These attractants are used to trap, or confuse, the targets. Similarly, food attractants can be used to induce pests to eat poison. Sound and light can be used to either attract or repel insects. And light can be used, in minute exposures, to completely disrupt an insect's timing—making it think, for example, that spring has arrived and inducing it to emerge into a cold or hostile environment. There are also methods of genetic manipulation (even to the point of introducing into the population insects carrying lethal genes); and hormonal control (to promote excessive growth, disrupt the life cycle, etc.). A Czechoslovak chemist has reported the synthesis of a hormone-like substance that imparts sterility to some bugs—and is *contagious* to them.[17] Many crop varieties have been developed that simply resist attack from particular insects or disease.

The Agriculture Department, in fact, has shifted a major portion of its research funds over the years from chemical to biological controls. The chemical industry, of course, is not likely to do so. "For the most part," says a congressional committee, "biological control can only be considered a threat to some portions of the pesticide market." [13] In In fact, industry has been accused of shaping or dominating pest control research. Miss Carson noted that many of the best entomologists labor in the "more exciting vineyards" of *chemical* control. She suggested this was because major chemical companies were "pouring money into the universities to support research on insecticides." [12]

2. So-called "cultural" methods of control can also be useful. These include rotating crops and reducing areas of monoculture, to encourage more predators and fewer harmful insects; better timing of crops to avoid emerging insect populations; and more appropriate plant spacing, soil preparation and tillage, water and fertilizer management and sanitation.

3. Even when insecticides are used, techniques can often be improved. Careful timing and minimal applications can produce better results at less cost—both to the user and the environment. Pesticides can be used, or developed, that are more selective and cause minor damage to beneficial insects and fish or wildlife. One new technique is called ultra-low volume (ULV) aerial spraying. Undiluted insecticide is sprayed in a very fine mist. As little as one ounce per acre may be needed, and one plane load can cover a large farm or forest area inexpensively.

4. Many experts believe that the real answer lies in *integrated* pest control programs—those that make maximum feasible use of biological and cultural methods as well as selective application of pesticides when necessary as supplements.

5. Avoidance of economic loss does not necessarily require the *eradication* of a pest. Niering says the farmer is forced to seek total eradication "by those demanding from agriculture completely insect-free produce. This has now reached ridiculous proportions. Influenced by advertising, the housewife now demands perfect specimens with no thought of or regard for how much environmental contamination has resulted to attain such perfection." [11]

6. It has been suggested by many scientists and legislators that DDT, or *all* so-called "hard" pesticides be banned entirely. Thomas L. Kimball, executive director of the National Wildlife Federation, has urged this, adding that he would "never make such a strong suggestion if I thought that banning the chlorinated hydrocarbons would bankrupt the companies . . . throw thousands of people out of work, or ruin the farmers." [5]

Actually, there have been a number of steps in this direction. Some states and communities have banned DDT for certain uses, such as treating Dutch elm disease or mosquito control. Pending a study, Arizona has a one-year prohibition on DDT use in commercial agriculture; in Wisconsin a hearing is being held on a petition to ban DDT altogether; and Michigan has moved to make the sale and use of DDT illegal.

Sweden just became the first nation to declare an outright ban on DDT—for at least two years. This was apparently stirred in part by an international conference in Stockholm at which scientists stated they couldn't be sure DDT was *not* harming humans.[18] On April 1 Senator Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin again introduced a bill (S. 1753) to prohibit the interstate sale or shipment of DDT in the U.S. Congressmen Bertram Podell of New York and Joseph Karth of Minnesota have offered similar bills in the House.

7. Greater research is needed. The President's Science Advisory Committee has said that it is "well within the capacity of the chemical industry which annually screens some 100,000 new organic compounds as potential pesticides, to develop biodegradable pesticides of suitably narrow spectra of action." [19]

Little is known about the possible long-term threats of pesticides to man, including mutagenicity and carcinogenicity. But Dr. Wilhelm C. Hueper, former director of the National Cancer Institute, has warned: "The evidence on hand is sufficiently substantial for supporting the view that the rapidly growing exposure of the general population to pesticides of diverse chemical nature, of diverse biologic activity, and from multiple sources . . . should arouse concern and apprehension, should stimulate and justify comprehensive investigations, and should actuate thoughtful consideration of effective protective measures." [20]

8. Even the best information is of no use buried somewhere. "One of our major problems," says Niering, "is the communication of sound ecological knowledge already available . . . The problem really challenging man is to get this scientific knowedge translated into action . . ." [21]

The President's Science Advisory Committee believes "all data used as a basis for granting registration and establishing tolerances should be published, thus allowing the hypotheses and the validity and reliability of the data to be subjected to critical review by the public and the scientific community." [21]

9. The Science Advisory Committee has also suggested a more cautious approach to registration of pesticides: "Unless a pesticide proposed for registration is equally effective in a less hazardous way than methods already available, (we) believe registration should be considered conservatively. As a corollary . . . more hazardous compounds might well be removed from the market when equally effective and less hazardous substances are found." [21]

10. New or stronger federal and state laws governing registration and labeling, use and application could be enacted and enforcement could be improved. Among possible administrative changes is the transfer of pesticide functions from agricultural agencies to those concerned with health or the environment; and the creation of independent, policy-making pesticide review boards, which some states in fact already have. Also recommended by some is the regional approach illustrated by the four-state agreement between the natural resources agencies of Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin and Michigan, designed to stem the flow of persistent pesticides into Lake Michigan.

On April 14, Senator Nelson introduced a bill (S. 1799) to establish a permanent, 12-member National Commission on Pesticides. It would be responsible for evaluating the present usage of pesticides, reviewing existing use and labeling restrictions, recommending safety standards for pesticides in water, developing a monitoring program, conducting or initiating research of all kinds, and making recommendations to the President and Congress on the elimination or limitation of pesticide use.

11. Greater accountability has been suggested. For instance, Dr. Robert L. Rudd of the University of California, Davis, recommends that we "require public justification of any tax-supported control program and insist that this justification contain a clear description of the purposes of the control program, the methods by which it is to be conducted, the hazards inherent in it, and the economic or social gains that justify both costs and hazards." [22]

12. Broader training of commercial applicators and others is also needed. Rudd proposes a "user education" program "in which the full range of hazards of chemical use is explained." He says "it is not enough to seek to educate growers and appliers in the proper methods of handling toxic chemicals. They must also be told the biological and social consequences of continuing chemical use." [22]

13. The pesticides problem seems tailor-made for the kind of oversight, review and judgment which could be provided by a Council of Environmental Advisors—a highly qualified group at the top level of the Executive branch which is called for in several bills now pending in Congress. Control of pesticide pollution is a massive and complex problem; it involves both interagency and federal-state coordination; it requires the resolution of divergent scientific views; and it involves conflict between different economic and social interests.

14. On the international level, food, health, and development agencies could also take a new look at the pesticide problem. Pesticides are often exported as part of aid packages to tropical countries, where their impacts on complex and vulnerable ecological situations, and their side effects, could be and have been serious. International agreements to control the release of harmful chemicals into the world environment would be a great step forward.

15. Few if any improvements will be achieved without strong citizen interest and action. Traditional pesticide practices are cemented by traditional bureaucratic and political alliances, and by traditional scientific and economic considerations. Citizen and conservation organizations can play key roles in focusing public, legislative and administrative attention on the pesticides problem. The Michigan Pesticides Council does this. The Citizens Natural Resources Association's petition for a ban on DDT in Wisconsin is the subject of hearings now being held in that state. Similarly, the Michigan

Footnotes at end of article.

Audubon Society initiated a court suit in 1967 which led at least indirectly to restrictions on the use of DDT in that state.

ECOLOGICAL SURPRISE PROMPTS MOVE TO SET LIMIT ON DDT IN FISH

For the first time, the Food and Drug Administration plans to set pesticide residue levels for fish sold in interstate commerce. Until now this has apparently not been considered a serious problem, for the highest DDT residue level found in fish was 3.6 parts per million.

But several weeks ago, when FDA investigators in the midwest took samples of frozen Lake Michigan coho salmon for analysis, they found, much to their surprise, DDT residues of up to 19 parts per million. (Only 7 parts per million are tolerated in meat.) So on March 28, U.S. marshals seized 21,850 pounds of frozen coho from warehouses in Wisconsin and Minnesota. So far, it's a mystery how the level in the salmon got so high. "Shades of Rachel Carson," said one FDA aide. "It seems that some kind of monster has been created here."

FDA's seizure of the salmon produced political repercussions. Congressman Gerald Ford of Michigan, who represents a district in which some fish were packed, criticized the seizure. The Republican governors of five Great Lakes states met, concluded there was no health hazards, and asked HEW Secretary Robert H. Finch not to set pesticide tolerances on fish until further study was made. Finch said no, adding he was "very apprehensive" about the effects of pesticides on people. He also appointed a Commission on Pesticides and Their Relationship to Environmental Health, to report to him in six months with "specific suggestions." And on April 22 he set an interim residue level for DDT in fish of 5 parts per million, pending further study. (A major study of pesticides is also being completed by the Committee on Persistent Pesticides of the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council, under contract to the Agriculture Department.)

WHAT DID CONGRESS TELL YOU?

Since 1957 the government and various southern states have been attempting to eradicate the pesky fire ant. The cost: many millions of public dollars. Though the fire ant has a nasty sting, and builds large mounds which are a nuisance in crop fields, reputable scientists say that control is not worth the trouble. A National Academy of Sciences committee said the ant apparently does no significant harm to land values, agriculture production or health. The committee expressed "very grave doubts whether an attempt to eradicate it would be justified, even if it were shown to be feasible." The Agriculture Department has been soft-pedaling the program. But when it asked for $3.9 million for fiscal 1969, Congressman Whitten's appropriations subcommittee gave it $5 million. And when Agriculture held up spending, Whitten asked: "What did Congress tell you last year?" An Agriculture official replied: "They told us to get on with the program." To which Whitten answered: And you did not pay any attention . . . If you are not going to do what the Congress says to do, maybe we ought to cut down the money at your level, Doctor, and I am serious."[19]

FOOTNOTES

[1] FDA Papers, February 1969.

[2] *Need to Resolve Questions of Safety Involving Certain Registered Uses of Lindane Pesticide Pellets,* General Accounting Office, February 20, 1969.

[3] Hearings of House Merchant Marine and Fisheries subcommittee, March 14, 1968.

[4] Testimony before Senate Commerce Committee, May 17, 1968.

[5] NAC News and Pesticide Review, October 1968.

[6] *Pesticide Laws and Legal Implications of Pesticide Use,* National Communicable Disease Center, Atlanta, March–April 1968.

[7] *The Population Bomb,* Ballantine Books, 1968.

[8] *Need to Improve Regulatory Enforcement Procedures Involving Pesticides,* General Accounting Office, September 10, 1968.

[9] Agricultural Chemicals, January 1969.

[10] Testimony before House Appropriations subcommittee on Department of Agriculture and Related Agencies, March 1968.

[11] BioScience, September 1968.

[12] *Silent Spring,* Houghton Mifflin Co., 1962.

[13] *Interagency Environmental Hazards Coordination,* Senate Report No. 1379, Senate Government Operations subcommittee on reorganization and international organizations, July 21, 1966.

[14] Washingtonian, March 1969.

[15] Scientist and Citizen, November 1968.

[16] The New Republic, January 13, 1968.

[17] New York Times, March 30, 1968.

[18] Washington Post, April 5, 1969.

[19] *Restoring the Quality of Our Environment,* report of the Environmental Pollution Panel, President's Science Advisory Committee, 1965.

[20] Testimony to Senate Government Operations subcommittee, July 23, 1963.

[21] *The Use of Pesticides,* President's Science Advisory Committee, May 15, 1963.

[22] *Pesticides and the Living Landscape,* University of Wisconsin Press, 1964.

REEXAMINING OUR CHINA POLICY

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, it has long been evident that a major revision of U.S. policy toward China is required. Our present policy of excluding China from international organizations and conferences and erecting a diplomatic, economic, and cultural barriers between our countries has clearly become counterproductive.

We are told that one of the principal reasons for U.S. involvement in Vietnam is to contain China. We are told that the Safeguard ABM system is being proposed to protect against a possible Chinese nuclear attack. We are told that the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty may fail to halt the spread of nuclear weapons because of Chinese recalcitrance.

Yet we refuse to employ the diplomatic and economic means available to us to affect Peking's behavior. By so reducing our options in the Far East, we limit the potential effectiveness of our policy in this area.

At the National Convocation on United States-China Relations held in March of this year in New York, Theodore Sorensen, an adviser to the late President Kennedy, focused on the shortcomings of our present policy regarding China. Mr. Sorensen offered some sound, reasoned remarks on a subject which tends to generate much emotion. I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF THEODORE C. SORENSEN AT THE NATIONAL CONVOCATION ON UNITED STATES-CHINA RELATIONS, PANEL ON "THE UNITED STATES AND CHINA: POLICY ALTERNATIVES FOR THE FUTURE," HILTON HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 21, 1969

As the Soviets and Chinese confront one another across the Ussuri, the United States would do well to recall an old Chinese saying: "It is better to sit on a hill and watch two tigers fight."

I do not suggest that war between these two large and bitter adversaries is in our interest; no war anywhere in the world is in our interest. But I do suggest that it is *not* in our interest to take sides in this dispute, to appear to take sides, to permit ourselves to be used by either side, or to give either nation grounds for charging that we have taken sides. I am further suggesting that, if such a stance is the right one, we should no longer continue our policy of making a greater effort toward understanding and friendly relations with the Soviet Union than we do with Communist China. I will go still further and suggest that, contrary to the basic assumptions of our foreign policy for many years, *there is no foundation in fact or logic for our continuing to apply a double standard to our relations with the Soviets and the Chinese.* Peking may erect barriers that make impossible a relationship with the United States that is the equivalent of our relations with Moscow; but there is no reason for the United States to erect any different, extra or higher barriers between ourselves and the Chinese than we do between ourselves and the Russians.

We should be equally vigilant in our policies toward both nations. We should be equally realistic about the substantive as well as the ideological conflicts that divide us from both nations. We should be equally frank about our limited ability to intervene or otherwise influence events around the borders of both nations. *I am not advocating either a regression in our relations with the Soviet Union or a rush to make concessions to Red China—only an attitude that is equally cautious, equally forthcoming, equally suspicious or equally hostile toward both nations.* We can no more judge the merits or predict the future course of their feud than Shakespeare's Prince could understand the Montagues and the Capulets. *But whether our cry, like his, is "a plague on both your houses" or something a little more diplomatic, we should take care not to embrace one of these two gladiators while kicking the other.*

Some may reply that China is more hostile and Russia more friendly. It is true that Peking's *words* have been more hostile than Moscow's, and any overtures we make now may well be rejected. But Moscow's *deeds* have been more threatening than Peking's; and surely our policy (in terms of what we seek) should not place more importance on words than on deeds. *For it is the Soviets, not the Chinese,* who are the chief suppliers of weapons used against our troops by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. It is the Soviet Union, not China, whose forces pose a potential threat to our own at the Berlin Wall and in the Mediterranean. It was the Soviets who tried to establish nuclear missile bases in the Western Hemisphere, and who ruthlessly invaded their peaceful neighbor for merely aspiring toward a greater degree of independence.

There have been in recent years no comparable deployments of Chinese forces outside their own borders, nor even any very serious threats against those American forces stationed on territory claimed by the Red Chinese. Nor is there any longer good reason to believe that the North Koreans, North Vietnamese and other Asian Communists now giving us trouble on that continent are wholly owned and operated subsidiaries of the government of Mao Tse-tung. Propaganda from Peking may be far more harsh and belligerent than the anti-American propaganda emanating from Moscow; but China in fact cannot now match the Soviet Union's economic, industrial or military capability to sustain a major threat to this

country's very existence, and that difference in capability surely speaks louder than any difference in propaganda.

Some experts may cite the opposite justification for our present double standard—namely, that we need not pay as much attention to the Chinese so long as they pose less of a threat to our security than the Soviets. But that is not the reasoning that today motivates the general public's distinctions between the two; nor can our government afford to minimize in any way the implications of a long-range build-up in China of both xenophobic suspicion of the United States and a nuclear missile capability, a very dangerous combination.

I stress this point today at this Conference in the hope that placing U.S.-Chinese policy in the perspective of U.S.-Soviet policy may make possible a more logical attitude toward both nations on the part of American public opinion. Liberals and conservatives may rationally disagree as to where the lines should be drawn in our relations with the two Communist powers; but they ought to agree on a policy that seeks to draw the line in the same place for both of them. I do not believe the American people would be willing to turn back the Cold War clock to a point where we broke off diplomatic relations with Moscow, excluded the Soviet Government from the United Nations, forbade trade relations of any kind with the U.S.S.R. and refused to listen seriously to any of its disarmament proposals. But if they recognize that that would not serve the interest of world peace, it should not be impossible for the Nixon Administration to convince them that our present China policy does not serve the interest of world peace.

If the American people are willing to have our government offer an exchange of diplomats, businessmen, tourists and artists to Moscow despite Soviet actions in Europe and the Middle East, they should be willing to have a similar offer made to Peking. If they were willing to have three seats—three votes—in the U.N. General Assembly awarded to the Soviet Union and two of its subdivisions, they should be willing to find a formula by which both Taipei and Peking can be represented in the United Nations regardless of who ultimately controls Taiwan.

If they are willing to have President Nixon sit down with his Soviet counterpart the year after Czechoslovakia's invasion, why should they not want him to sit down with Mao Tse-tung as well? If American businessmen believe it is right to engage in the peaceful trade of non-strategic goods with the Soviet Union despite the arrest of Soviet intellectuals, how can they say it is wrong to trade with the Chinese? If Moscow is invited to the next round of disarmament talks, why not invite Peking? And if we do need (which I do not accept) an ABM system to safeguard our missiles, why shouldn't it be designed to deter the possibility of attack from either of the two leading Communist powers?

I realize that no two nations, no two situations, no two potential threats to our security, are ever identical. We need a U.S.-China policy wholly apart from our U.S.-U.S.S.R. policy, The difference in their responses will for some time make a difference in our relationships But let that be their choice. In the words of the now-rejected Supreme Court doctrine, *let our policies toward them be "separate but equal."*

THE ROLE OF THE ROTC ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, much has been said and written of late concerning the role of the ROTC on our college campuses.

The Los Angeles Times of May 12, 1969, published what I feel is an astute appraisal of this situation. I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by William F. Buckley, Jr., be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE PERSECUTION OF THE ROTC

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

The very first thing the president of the typical university does, upon announcing that henceforward ROTC students will receive no academic credits, is to assure his audience that the decision of the faculty was reached without any thought to the political situation, absolutely none at all.

That is of course sucker-bait, and the presidents know it, but they have become so much accustomed to dissimulation, which they practice upon the alumni as if they had Ph.D.'s in the subject, that they can manage to keep straight faces while saying such crooked things. Sure, anti-Vietnam sentiment had nothing to do with deciding to drop ROTC credits, and the New Hampshire primary had nothing to do with Lyndon Johnson's retirement. Sure, ROTC doesn't warrant academic respectability, but Eldridge Cleaver does . . .

Here are a few points which the college presidents have not treated. One of them is, why—if properly taught—shouldn't ROTC training earn credits? It is widely imagined that ROTC consists in marching up and down the quadrangle with rifles on one's shoulder. Sure, there is some of that. But much more is the classroom work. Now if the classroom work is unimaginative, and consists only in the rote-learning of drill manuals of one sort of another, then obviously academic credits are not in order.

But if that is the case, one wonders why the administration and faculty voted to give credits to ROTC in the first instance? It is not widely known that ROTC appears on campus not because the Pentagon, at some point in the past, dispatched a military expedition to the local college, posting nonnegotiable demands. A contract is negotiated and signed, and these contracts have called for the granting of academic credits. If university officials did not take the trouble to ascertain that the ROTC staff would devise a curriculum of academic consequence, then the dereliction is the university's.

Or are they saying that there is no body of knowledge presentable by an ROTC? That would be a strange position to take, particularly by those militants who hug to their bosom the collected works of Mao Tse-tung and Che Guevara and the gang, on the tactics and psychology of guerrilla warfare. If there is a body of knowledge to revolution, surely there is a body of knowledge to counter-revolution.

Why, if the subject is academically jejune, do we acknowledge the "science" of warfare? What of the related paramilitary subjects, concerning which some of the most interesting theorists of human behavior have addressed themselves, stressing diplomacy, public psychology, propaganda, and the rest?

Is it idle to study military history? Or geopolitics? Or strategic geography? Or the relation between the psychology of a culture and the relevance of the weapon? Couldn't a highly instructive semester—at the very least—be devoted to an examination, for instance, of the intellectual relevance of the arguments and the tactics of the North Vietnamese during the current war?

And then the other point. The movement now is not merely to deprive ROTC students of academic credit, but to ban ROTC from the campus. Why? I mean, why does the majority of the student body, or of the faculty, undertake to dictate to an individual student what he can do in his spare time? If he desires to drill with a master sergeant, or to otherwise satisfy Reserve Officers Training requirements, what business is it of the busybodies on campus, who prate about academic freedom—while designing a curriculum geared to their own neurotic lusts?

The ROTC—here is an interesting and, so far as I know, heretofore unpublished datum—has, at this writing, received not one communication from one college in America announcing the abridgement, or rescission, of an outstanding contract. That means that students, are entitled even to academic credits, until that contracts expires. What then? Is ROTC to set up shop, like Berlitz Schools, unrelated to the college in any formal way?

What, then, will the student and faculty do, in pursuit of their goal of unconditional victory? Ask that any student who spends his afternoon at the local Berlitz-ROTC institution be punished? Expelled? Publicly flogged? One weeps for the end of reason.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONE IN MAINE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, much has been written about the attempt to establish a foreign trade zone in Maine, the proposal to construct an oil refinery in the trade zone, and the request by Occidental Oil Co., for changes in the oil import regulations.

Those who oppose the refinery have claimed that a refinery constructed in a trade zone for the purpose of refining foreign oil would not be in the best interests of the national security. They argue that a removal of oil import controls would hinder domestic exploration for oil.

We who are in favor of the trade zone, construction of the refinery, and changes in the oil import regulations have, over the past few months, been presenting the facts as they are, using the results of our own investigations and research, as well as the work of others. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article published in the National Observer of Monday, May 5, 1969.

It is apparent that a great deal of study and work has been done by the authors to get the whole story on the Machiasport problem. They present an excellent history of the oil import program. The authors point out that the quota program has done what it was supposed to do, guarantee the domestic producers high prices for their oil, about 65 percent higher than the world price. The article describes in detail the need for cheap oil to provide cheap power to New England. It answers the questions raised concerning the use of the American-flag tankers for the transport of oil. It explains the reason for the high costs of oil products in New England as compared with other sections of the United States. This article is the first of several that the National Observer will publish that will explore the oil industry in depth. I recommend it as interesting, as well as informative, reading for all Senators.

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

VERY HIGH STAKES MAKE VERY ANXIOUS PLAYERS—WHY THE MACHIASPORT DEAL AND TAXPAYERS SHAKE UP AN INDUSTRY

(NOTE.—The oil industry occupies a unique position in America—a position that is at once colorful, contradictory, and increasingly controversial. Its influence—political and social, as well as economic—is powerfully pervasive, as evidenced in recent public conflicts over production controls, import quotas, industry tax shelters, and bitter behind-the-scenes feuding over a startling new project proposed for Machiasport, Maine.

(This is the first of several articles that explore first-hand and in depth the industry's singular position and prerogatives. The material was prepared by staff writers August Gribbin, Michael Malloy, Patrick Young, and senior editor Edwin A. Roberts, Jr. The reporting and research was done in Washington, D.C.; New York City; Machiasport and Augusta, Maine; New Orleans and Baton Rouge, La.; and Dallas, Longview, Houston, and Austin, Texas.)

The American oil industry, which registered more than $60 billion in sales in 1968, is the giant of giants in the business community. But it is an anxious giant, clanking about in several suits of armor and thus conspicuously protected from many of the rigors that are the spice and spark of enterprise.

But it soon may be stripped of its mail and a gauntlet or two. There is mounting evidence that Congress, reacting to customer and taxpayer indignation, will divest the industry of some of its distinctive assortment of protections. These protections can be listed under three headings: the oil-import quota system, state regulation of domestic production, and an unequaled variety of tax advantages.

The challenge to the industry is advancing on two fronts. One is a congressional review of the import-quota system, a review given important impetus by the proposal of Occidental Petroleum Corp., Los Angeles, to erect a huge refinery, using foreign oil, at Machiasport near the northeast tip of Maine. The other is the Government effort to reduce the multiple tax loopholes that, in size and sum, have been the particular privilege of the oil industry.

THE MOST POWERFUL BUSINESS LOBBY

The industry, for its part, is fighting any trimming of its advantages. The oil and natural gas lobby is the most powerful business lobby in Washington, and the industry counts scores of congressmen and Federal officials as its surrogates in the halls of Government. The oil companies have traditionally based their case for preferential treatment on the proposition that the nation's security requires a prosperous domestic oil industry, and a prosperous oil industry—so it is argued—is dependent upon tax incentives for exploration and import controls to save the United States from becoming dependent upon oil from politically unstable countries.

Those are the issues in their most elemental form. But underlying the general arguments on both sides is the frenetic history of the oil business. And out of this history has grown a huge, contorted industrial mechanism, prodigiously complex in the working of its parts and complicated still further by its tight meshing with the gears of government. It is a Chinese puzzle whose pieces are strewn throughout a labyrinth of law.

And behind the forests of oil derricks, the pipelines and giant tankers, the vast refineries and tank farms, the corporate edifices and millions of gasoline pumps—behind all the familiar hardware of this basic industry—lies the biggest gambling game ever devised by man, a game in which $1,000,000 is a token wager, a game that can determine the health and wealth of many nations.

Very high stakes make very anxious players, so it's not surprising that the companies that take the risks look about for all the protection possible. One way of protecting the price of domestic oil is to keep all but a trickle of foreign oil out of the country. This the industry has successfully done since 1959 when mandatory oil import quotas went into effect. Today this protectionist program is endangered. President Nixon has promised to decide by autumn of this year whether the Administration will support the revolutionary proposal called "Machiasport."

FAVORED BY A FEW WEALTHY FAMILIES

Machiasport, the town, is typically Maine. With a population of 1,370, it consists of a couple of stores, a rayon mill, a lumber mill, some piers for lobster boats, a cluster of neat-but-weathered houses, and rocky fields that roll down to the sea. Although it is far to the northeast of Maine's principal seashore communities, Machiasport has long been known to and favored by a few wealthy families who maintain summer estates in the vicinity.

It is the kind of rural community that had been most notable for its remoteness and obscurity. But the politics of oil have suddenly thrust the village into the national spotlight, and the technology of oil may turn Machiasport into a hub of industry. Machiasport is blessed with a remarkable harbor; it is 140 feet deep at mean low tide, meaning it could accommodate the largest ships in the world, including the new 300,000-ton super tankers.

But why build an oil refinery in a piney little village so far from the buyers of oil products? Because the plan involves an ingenious way of blowing a hole in the import-quota dike.

Aided by Kenneth Curtis, the 39-year-old governor of Maine, and enthusiastically abetted by the entire New England congressional delegation, Occidental Petroleum is hoping to build at Machiasport the largest crude oil refinery of its kind. The plant capacity would be 300,000 barrels a day. Its daily production would include some 90,000 barrels of home-heating fuel; 10,000 barrels of gasoline; 75,000 barrels of residual fuel used by heavy industry, especially for the generation of electricity; 30,000 barrels of jet fuel for the military; and 10,000 barrels of special Navy fuel.

Occidental would bring in crude oil from its wells in Libya. Therein lies the heart of the Machiasport controversy, and it is a controversy in which not only Occidental, but Maine and the entire nation have an important stake.

Under present law, no U.S. company is permitted to ship into the United States any oil produced in a foreign country, even if the company pumped the oil out of the ground and owns every drop of it, unless the company has been granted a special quota by the U.S. Interior Department. This restriction is contained in what is commonly known as the U.S. oil import-quota system.

The system is now under wide attack, not only because it forces Americans to pay artificially high prices for oil products, but because it is wrenched by so many exceptions, special provisions, and amendments that it no longer can be viewed as a coherent program.

The Secretary of the Interior, using figures developed by the Oil Import Administration in his department, decides every six months how much foreign crude, refined, and partially refined oils can come into the United States. The total generally hovers around 761,000 barrels a day, and it represents 12.2 per cent of the projected U.S. domestic production—excluding oil from Mexico, which is considered a special exception, and oil from Canada, which is also considered a special exception, and that oil from Venezuela entering the United States via Hawaiian refineries, which represents still another special exception.

DIVVYING UP THE QUOTA

The Secretary divides the 761,000 barrels a day among the 150 companies that now qualify for quotas. Some companies get bigger quotas than others. The amount of oil a company is permitted to import depends on a so-called historic quota, and also on the company's refinery production capacity as well as on a complicated "sliding scale" formula.

When a company that had not been on the import list is given a quota, every other company on the list must contribute a fraction of its share to help make up the newcomer's allotment. Since every barrel of foreign oil in a company's quota is worth $1.25 cash—the difference between the foreign and domestic price—companies already on the list are not anxious to share the largess with newcomers.

The "historic quota" criterion, like almost everything else about the oil business, merits explanation.

At the end of World War II, American industry returned to peacetime production of automobiles, and many new homes were equipped with oil instead of coal furnaces. The market for oil in the United States quickly expanded and the price of oil zoomed. With demand outrunning supply, the oil industry began vast exploration and development programs. By the early 1950s, the situation was reversed; the companies were producing more oil than they could sell.

While U.S. oilmen were moving from a position of shortage to surplus, oilmen in other countries—in South America and the Middle East—were doing the same thing. The international companies, realizing the United States presented the best market for oil, cut prices and began exporting their less-expensive oil into the United States on a large scale.

Domestic producers were furious. Responding to pressure from the oil lobby, President Eisenhower acted. He acted not only to mollify American oil interests but also to assure the nation the oil it might need in a military emergency. If the United States used so much cheap foreign oil that discovery and exploitation of U.S. oil fields dwindled, the country might become largely dependent on foreign sources for its military fuel. Given the political instability of most of the foreign nations that produce oil, reliance on foreign crude could endanger American security.

In 1955, a Cabinet-level committee much like the one recently established by President Nixon recommended that the President limit oil imports to about their 1954 level. For two years the Eisenhower Administration urged the seven major international companies to limit their imports. They didn't, and they didn't because it is not in the nature of businessmen to intentionally eschew easy and obvious profit opportunities.

So, in 1957, Mr. Eisenhower set up the Voluntary Import Control Program. He assumed the power to take this action from the National Security Amendment of the Trade Agreement Extension Act of 1955. This is one of the reasons import quotas are so often discussed in the context of national security.

The voluntary program provided for limiting imports of oil and refined oil products to 12 per cent of domestic production. The 12 per cent limit applied to the East and Midwest, known as U.S. Districts I–IV. There are five such districts in the nation, with District V including Arizona, Nevada, California, Oregon, Washington, Alaska, and Hawaii.

CALCULATING DISTRICT V'S QUOTA

The District V states traditionally have been unable to get enough domestic oil for their needs, so in those states the quota restrictions were made more flexible than those

applying to Eastern and Midwestern states. They were based on estimates of District V's demand in relation to available domestic supply. That's essentially the way the District V quota is calculated today.

The total amount of quota oil allowed into the United States was to be allocated to "established" importers, meaning the seven major oil importing companies, which, in order of size, are: Standard Oil (New Jersey), Royal Dutch Shell, Mobil Oil, Texaco, Gulf Oil, Standard Oil (California), and British Petroleum.

The program also provided for the addition of newcomers to the ranks and specified, just as the present mandatory program does, that the seven established companies' quotas would be reduced to accommodate allotments to newcomers.

The voluntary program had a fatal flaw. It was voluntary. While the established importers complied with its provisions, smaller companies disregarded them. Imports continued to rise. In March 1959, the Mandatory Oil Import Quota Program was enacted.

In the past decade the quota program has worked. It has guaranteed domestic producers high prices for oil pumped from U.S. reserves; domestic crude oil prices, in fact, are the highest in the world—about 60 per cent higher than world prices. This arrangement has successfully protected domestic producers from foreign competition, but the cost to the American economy has been staggering. An economist with the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee estimates that cost at $7.2 billion annually. Oil industry spokesman say the cost is "only" $2.7 billion. Independent economists put the figure somewhere in between, but usually closer to the higher estimate.

The industry argument is that the extra billions American consumers and businesses pay for oil products represent part of the cost of national security. Where would the nation be, they ask, if domestic facilities were to lie idle because of a flood of cheap foreign oil? Where would the nation's oil come from in a crisis that cut off access to the fields of the Middle East?

Critics of the present system respond with their own rhetorical questions. Is it wise for the United States to use up its own reserves when it could save them while buying far cheaper oil from abroad? And if national security is indeed the issue the industry spokesmen say it is, is there not some more efficient way to guarantee the United States a ready supply of oil in an emergency?

Another element has recently been introduced into the debate. There is evidence that the discovery of major oil fields in northern Alaska will expand U.S. reserves to the point where it is unlikely this country will run out of oil in this century—or the next century. Then, too, there is the new technology that could make economic the processing of huge, domestic oil shale deposits. And what of the likelihood that atomic energy will eventually replace oil as an industrial power source? And what of the current experimentation with automobiles powered by other than internal combustion engines?

These questions are part of the general argument. The particular argument hinges upon Occidental's attempt to obtain an import quota of 100,000 barrels of oil daily to feed its projected facility at Machiasport.

Companies already on the import list are naturally hostile to the idea. They note that 100,000 barrels is equal to almost 20 per cent of the quotas presently allocated to all other companies. They contend the Occidental plan would destroy the import quota system, ruin the domestic oil industry, and unfairly present Occidental with a windfall variously estimated at between $35,000,000 to $65,000,000.

When opponents speak of the "Occidental Deal" or the "Machiasport Deal," however, they are referring to much more than a big import-quota application. They are referring to a series of maneuvers that resemble a brilliant chess attack, the kind of master plan that has been associated with the oil industry since the halcyon days of John D. Rockefeller.

Here is the grand strategy:

Maine's Governor Curtis has energetically sought new industry for his state, which badly needs an economic boost. Maine's roads are poor; its school system is inferior; its services minimal.

Governor Curtis says Maine has the highest incidence of poverty in New England. Per-capita income figures calculated for 1966 show that Maine residents earn an average of $2,438 annually, compared with the New England average of $3,223. The low-income cycle is particularly pernicious because the state lacks cheap electrical power. Residual oil, rather than water power, turns its electricity-producing turbines. Industry does not usually seek out new plant sites in areas where power costs are high.

A MASTERFUL PROMOTER

Governor Curtis called in John K. Evans to help find a way to get Maine moving. Mr. Evans, who was formerly an executive with Royal Dutch Shell, is an expert in international oil operations. And he is a masterful promoter. It was Mr. Evans who devised the imaginative Machiasport project, although it soon became too big for him to handle, and in July 1968 he turned the plan over to Occidental, no doubt for a satisfactory consideration.

The main purpose of the Machiasport deal is to reduce power costs in the state and thereby attract new industry. Since the state depends on oil for electrical power, it must get cheap oil to reduce power rates. Since oil itself is a basic industry and raw material, it seemed reasonable that if Maine could tap a big supply of cheap oil, it might signal the beginning of a state-wide boom.

The oil for the Machiasport refinery could not come from the United States because U.S. oil is the most expensive in the world. Maine, furthermore, is almost as far from domestic sources of supply as it is from foreign wells that produce cheaper oil and transport it less expensively in foreign ships.

By law, U.S. oil must be carried in American-flag tankers. Thus, the oil for Maine had to originate outside the United States if the grand strategy were to work.

The planners knew they could eventually get a quota for foreign oil; any petroleum company with a refinery can manage that. But the quota system is so designed that the large refineries get proportionately less oil than the smaller ones. The quota system serves as a special protective device for the smaller operators.

Maine—and Occidental—had to find a way around the import-quota system, because that system wouldn't allow nearly enough foreign oil to enter Machiasport to make the facility practicable. Occidental not only wants to bring in huge quantities of foreign oil; it wants to bring it to Machiasport in the holds of huge foreign takers that are almost three times the size of the largest American tanker. Economies thus would be spread throughout the whole arrangement.

Even America's relatively small 100,000-ton tankers can't sail into most U.S. harbors because they draw nearly 90 feet of water. The bigger foreign tankers, in service and on the drawing boards, require still greater depths. The need for an extremely deep harbor was clear.

Files of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Coast Guard provided a likely answer: Machiasport. The water around the tiny spit of land on which the village stands, at more than 140 feet deep, is deep enough to handle anything afloat or on the drawing borads. What's more, Machiasport and a few other New England ports are the only ones in the nation offering at least two-mile turn-around room, which the super tankers need. Machiasport, in fact, has a four-mile turn-around area.

THE BIG PROBLEM

Machiasport's natural endowments solved one problem. But the greater problem was, and is, the import-quota system. How to get around that?

By setting up a free trade zone in the state of Maine.

A free trade zone is a technical term applied to a geographic area of the country that has been specifically exempted from certain import laws. Though physically a part of the United States, customs laws don't apply in these zones. Importers can bring in raw materials or other goods into a free trade zone, process them, store them, manipulate them, and export them without paying a nickel in import duty. Products shipped from the zone into the rest of the United States, however, are subject to regular customs charges.

Until 1965, oil could be shipped into a free trade zone in the manner of any other commodity. In that year, however, President Johnson issued a proclamation requiring petroleum importers to obtain a license from the Interior Secretary before importing foreign oil into a free trade zone.

It might be noted here that during the years the late Sam Rayburn was Speaker of the House, and when Lyndon B. Johnson, another Texan, was Majority Leader of the Senate and later President, the domestic oil industry had two of its most devoted friends in positions of surpassing power.

Maine's first move was to apply to have a section of the state declared a free trade zone. It then had to apply for a license to import foreign oil into the zone. This the state has done, requesting that the Portland area be designated a free trade zone with Machiasport declared a "subzone" having the same privileges.

The decision on the free-trade-zone application will be made officially by the Foreign-Trade Board, composed of the secretaries of Commerce, Treasury, and the Army. In fact, however, the final decision will be made by President Nixon.

Maine supports its case with several arguments.

The plan, it is argued, would enhance national security because the new refinery would add to the nation's oil-processing facilities; moreover, the refinery would be built in a part of the nation where no refineries now exist, thus dispersing the facilities of a vital industry.

The nation's balance-of-payments problems would not be aggravated because Occidental would build a refinery in the United States that it will build abroad if the trade-zone application is denied.

The Machiasport refinery would contribute to a lessening of air pollution in the Eastern United States. Libyan oil is lower in sulphur content than domestic crudes, and the emission of sulphur from burning residual oil is a major cause of air pollution.

Area consumers would save money on gasoline and heating fuel. Occidental has agreed to sell its gasoline in the "unbranded market" at approximately 2.5 cents per gallon below major company prices. Company officials say this will save gasoline customers $4,000,000 a year and heating-fuel customers $22,000,000 a year. This is an important aspect of the plan to New Englanders who pay high heating-fuel rates throughout their long, cold winters.

Occidental would also provide the military with lower-cost petroleum products.

The plan would provide the nation with a new deep-water port, which it may need for military and commercial purposes.

U.S. tanker trade would be stimulated because, though Occidental would haul its raw material in foreign ships, the company would export some of its products in American vessels.

If the plan is approved, Occidental has agreed to finance in New England a new, nonprofit oceanographic research and development foundation.

The project would provide 350 jobs immediately and would attract industry to a depressed area.

While the Machiasport deal would be good for New England, better for Maine, and entirely superb for Occidental, the rest of the oil industry is dead set against it. Leading the way in a propaganda campaign to counter the Maine-Occidental propaganda campaign are three giant oil companies—Humble, the marketing subsidiary of Jersey Standard, Gulf, and Shell. Too, if all the Democratic and Republican congressmen from New England are for Machiasport, the Texas and Louisiana delegations are strongly opposed to it.

One of Machiasport's most avid supporters is Massachusetts Sen. Edward M. Kennedy, perhaps the second most influential politician in the nation. Aligned with him and the rest of the New England delegation are the governors of the six New England states. Machiasport represents one of the few times since 1620 that practically everybody in New England is in agreement on an issue.

Squabbling between the New England and Texas-Louisiana factions began as soon as the proposal was announced and it's still raging. Last February, President Nixon declared he was personnally assuming responsibility for all decisions relating to oil. On March 26 he named a Cabinet-level committee to review the nation's oil-import policy. The committee, headed by Labor Secretary George Shultz, expects to finish its survey by October. Some time after that the President plans to make a decision about Machiasport.

What little opposition exists in New England has been localized and minute.

Bernard Cheney, an insurance adjuster, was asked what he thought of the Machiasport plan as he stepped from a bank on Center Street in the nearby village of Machias.

"I don't like it. I don't think it can solve the economic problems of Washington County (in which Machiasport is located). It won't create enough jobs. Even if it did we've got people around here who wouldn't work if you gave them $500 a week.

"But the biggest objection is that they want to build the refinery on the most beautiful section of the coast. Don't you realize that this country around here is one of the last places you can go to get away from the pollution and gook of the cities. You look forward to your kids coming back to escape from the city and bringing the grandchildren to a place with some beauty. Why it's like getting $1,000,000 to get out in your car and drive around this county. Now they're going to bring pollution here."

Fear of pollution—of both air and water—is uppermost in the minds of all local opponents of the plan. Even many who favor it do so with mixed feelings. Says lawyer Wesley Vose: "I can see that the refinery and the other industries it will attract will be an excellent source of jobs and tax revenue. But it's bound to change the community and most of us like it the way it is. Still I'm for the proposal. We need it."

Charles Kilton, manager of the sardine cannery in Machiasport, remarks: "I've always thought it was a good idea. Sure the refinery will hurt our cannery. It will bring changes. But we've got to have help. We've got to have better roads. Where's the money going to come from? The people around here are afraid of strangers coming in. I say let 'em come."

The poverty, or near-poverty, of many Maine residents is not the apparent kind. It is not the poverty of filthy, crumbling city slums. Nor is it the wretched hopelessness of barefoot mountain folk. It is rather an absence of amenities in old, rickety—but clean—houses that have known too many Maine winters. Most important of all, most poor people in rural Maine do not consider themselves poor. And they possess the Yankee knack of making do. Poverty is not always a matter of money; sometimes it is a matter of attitude.

One opinion widely held throughout New England is that New Englanders are forced to pay too high a price for home heating fuel. Seventy per cent of the residents of the six states heat their homes with oil. They use more than 900,000 barrels of oil a day, 21 per cent of the heating oil used by the entire nation. Since 1964, the price of that fuel has risen an average of a half-cent a gallon a year—at a cost to New Englanders of an additional $20,000,000.

Heating oil costs more in Boston, some 50 to 80 cents more a barrel, than it does in Chicago, Milwaukee, or Detroit, which also have long, frigid winters.

The cost of heating their homes is a particular irritant to New Englanders, and it is a major reason why most people in the area favor the Machiasport plan. There are smaller irritants, too, that contribute to a general feeling of dissatisfaction with the curious workings of the oil industry.

Governor Curtis says that people living in Portland resent the fact that though a major oil pipe line runs through Portland carrying oil from that city to Montreal, the price of heating oil in Montreal is 3.59 cents a gallon less than it is in Portland. The harbor at Montreal is too shallow to accommodate ocean-going tankers, so oil bound for the Canadian city is brought into Portland, the second biggest (after Philadedphia) oil port on the East Coast, and immediately transshipped to Montreal. But it's foreign oil that pours through those pipes and Portlanders aren't allowed to tap any of it.

The Machiasport proposal raised so many questions about the import-quota system that the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee began hearings on March 11 with a view to recommending changes in the present policy. The subcommittee, an offshoot of the Senate Judiciary Committee, is headed by Sen. Philip Hart, Michigan Democrat. Eighteen economists and educators appeared before the senators, and almost all of them were extremely critical of the quota system. In fact, Senator Hart observed during the hearings that his subcommittee had been unable to find any economist not connected with the oil industry who was willing to argue in favor of the present system.

The most telling points made by the expert witnesses were these:

The import-quota system is the "capstone" of a network of regulations that greatly benefit the oil industry and keep the price of U.S. petroleum products artificially high.

The cost of U.S. oil is so high that domestic prices could be reduced by more than 30 per cent and still permit 95 per cent of the oil produced in this country to be sold at a profit.

The import-quota system no longer makes a significant contribution to national security. It may, in fact, jeopardize national security because it forces the United States to drain its own reserves—reserves that might be more valuable as a wartime asset.

CREATING A CARTEL

The quota system preserves what Walter Adams, acting president of Michigan State University, calls a "Government-created, supported, and subsidized cartel." He said the Federal Government "does for the oil companies what they could not legally do for themselves." He means that Government policies have the effect of fixing prices, something the companies could not do on their own with impunity.

The present system keeps the most efficient wells from operating at capacity while encouraging the development and operation of the least efficient wells. If the restrictions on imports were moved, the per-barrel price of oil would drop from $3 to $2 and 5.4 per cent of domestic production would be lost. The most efficient companies would expand their production facilities and the marginal operators would be forced out of the market. The marginal operators contribute a small fraction to total production.

The witnesses before Senator Hart's subcommittee rarely equivocated; although their language was properly polite, the force of their arguments bespoke a barely muted anger.

At one point, Senator Hart asked Prof. Henry Steele of the University of Houston if he meant that the Government was subsidizing 95 per cent of domestic production just to safeguard 5 per cent of the oil operators. "Yes," said Professor Steele, "and it doesn't make sense."

Prof. Paul T. Homan, an economist with Resources for the Future, Inc., a nonprofit research organization, declared:

"We are under the impression that those responsible for adopting the allocation system never regarded it as having any importance for meeting the national security objects of the import program. . . . We are not aware that those responsible for framing the allocation system engaged in a serious economic analysis of the effects of the alternatives open to them. . . . It might be thought rather remarkable that a program affecting such a wide range of economic interests should be developed in a sort of intellectual economic void."

Professor Adams of Michigan State University explained some of the effects of the quota system that keep domestic oil prices high. He noted that Japanese manufacturers can buy Iranian heavy crude (residual fuel) at $1.35 a barrel. The same oil could be shipped to the U.S. East Coast at a delivered price of $2.10 before tariffs. U.S. industrialists, however, must pay $3.42 per barrel. That's a difference of $1.32 before tariffs and $1.22 including tariffs.

PASSED ALONG TO CONSUMER

Professor Adams concludes: "Such a differential obviously could not exist except for the penalties imposed on U.S. manufacturers by the import quota program. Major American chemical companies—du Pont, Union Carbide, Dow, etc.—have estimated that domestic oil prices on the East Coast average $1.25 per barrel more than elsewhere in the world; this amounts to 3 cents a gallon, or 60 per cent above the world price."

The higher price U.S. chemical companies must pay for raw materials, of course, is passed along to the American consumer. And the American consumer buys all manner of products that are derived from petroleum.

Major petroleum derivatives include carbon black, synthesis gas, methane, propane, toluene, and benzene. And from those chemicals come tires, plastics, fertilizers, explosives, shower curtains, pharmaceuticals, rayon, nylon, fumigants, synthetic rubber, lacquer solvents, windows, paint resins, polyesters, and dyes, among other products.

There is general agreement by many in the economic community that prices on these consumer goods would be lower if the price of domestic crude oil were not pegged by the Federal Government at a relatively high level. The manufacturers' costs, in any case, would be importantly reduced.

One witness before the Senate subcommittee told a reporter after testifying: "I would

prefer not to sound unscholarly in public, but it does not take much economic sophistication to come to the conclusion that the oil import-quota system is an exercise in insanity."

None of the witnesses urged that the system be scrapped at once; that would throw the domestic market into chaos. Critics urge instead that the quota program be eliminated gradually.

The oil industry is aware it has on its hands its toughest fight in years. Its old prerogatives are being called into question all at the same time, and there is some doubt that even the powerful oil lobby and its well-situated friends in Government can sweep back the tide of change.

The major oil companies have declined to be drawn out on their position in the import-quota controversy. This reluctance is due partly to the traditional secrecy that the companies attach to their operations and policies for fear of providing information that might be of use to competitors. Too, industry spokesmen in coming months will themselves be testifying before the Senate Antitrust and Monopoly subcommittee and they prefer not to tip their hand.

But the industry position can be summarized this way: The present quota system is imperfect, but a devil known is better than a devil unknown. Import quotas enhance national security by assuring the viability of the domestic industry in the event an international crisis should close off America's access to foreign sources. Elimination of the quota system would work an extreme hardship on the economies of oil-producing regions in the United States. And such elimination would adversely affect the nation's balance of payments.

Nowhere does the oil industry have more friends than in those agencies of the Interior Department that are charged with overseeing various aspects of industry operations. This is so whether the issue is oil spills off U.S. shores or the import-quota system.

Ralph W. Snyder, a key official of the Oil Import Administration, has reacted to the controversy over quotas with two suggestions. Mr. Snyder is unconcerned that the high cost of oil forces consumers to pay much more than necessary for oil products. He is concerned about national security, and he believes that even with the present quota system the nation is still too dependent upon foreign oil. And, even though the recent oil strike in Alaska promises to change the whole chart of world oil reserves, he is distressed at what he says is the low level of exploration in the United States.

Mr. Snyder would not only retain the import controls, he would supplement them. He would, for instance, offer U.S. offshore oil producers in the Gulf of Mexico the option of withholding up to 30 per cent of their permitted production for a period of two years in exchange for a crude-oil import allocation exactly equaling the amount of oil they agree not to produce. At the end of two years, the offshore wells would be put back in production for one year to test and verify their production rates. After a year of normal operation, the producer would be free to reduce production and qualify for an increased import quota again.

Mr. Snyder's second suggestion is similar. To encourage domestic oil exploration and well development, he would give operators who find and develop new fields the alternative of withholding up to 50 per cent of their domestic production for a period of one or two years in exchange for an import quota equal to the amount of domestic oil withheld.

Almost all independent economists, however, believe that national security would be better served by gradually abandoning the quota system. How likely is it, they ask, that all foreign oil would be denied the United States by a localized war in some part of the world. Western Europe would indeed suffer if war in the Middle East halted oil shipments from there. But the United States has at least a 12-year supply, and when the new Alaska fields are developed and when it becomes economic to extract oil from shale rock, the United States will have enough oil of its own to last for many generations.

And if the worst comes to the very worst, how much of an oil reserve will the United States require in a global, thermonuclear war? Such a war is not likely to last 12 days, much less 12 years.

A top executive, moreover, of one of the biggest international oil companies, who refuses to have the statement attributed to him or his company, says that the major oil companies are ambivalent in their attitude toward the import-quota system.

NATIONAL SECURITY

"Obviously we want to optimize the return to the shareholders," he says, implying that retention of the quota system would help assure that end. But he thinks the ostensible rationale for the system has eroded: "Since quotas were put on, changes in the program have made it bear less and less relation to national security. The world is different today than it was 10 years ago [when the quotas were made mandatory]."

The international companies are reluctant to discuss the controversy with the press. British Petroleum, for instance, which recently bought Sinclair's East Coast marketing operation, declined comment on the grounds that it might appear to be trying to influence the Senate hearings. Royal Dutch Shell also decided to withhold comment.

The international companies have good reason to straddle the fence about import quotas. The "foreign" oil barred from the United States is oil produced by U.S. companies on foreign soil. It's their oil that's being kept out of the nation, but, because they are domestic producers too, it's their oil that is being overpriced in the U.S. market. All the major international companies have recorded record profits in recent years. Standard Oil (New Jersey), the world's largest oil company, boosted earnings in 1968 to $1.3 billion, or $122,000,000 more than in 1967.

From an industry point of view, the present quota system is just fine, even for the international companies that have a big stake in foreign oil.

But the industry is well aware that in its current form the quota system is, in the opinion of many, an unfair and unnecessary burden on American consumers and businessmen. And nothing could revamp the system so simply and suddenly as approval of the Machiasport plan.

Maine's Governor Curtis is optimistic. "They've been delaying us to death down in Washington," he says. "But we're going to win something for sure, for the thing that gives our request and our argument credibility is merit."

Oil import quotas, however, are only one of the protections that have enveloped the industry in a cocoon of extraordinary privilege. The others are state-enforced controls on domestic production, which have the effect of further supporting high prices, and the many tax advantages, of which the 27.5 per cent depletion allowance is only the best known.

Machiasport and the quota system represent but an introduction to the biggest and most complicated of all business stories.

TESTING OF BIOLOGICALS BY THE ARMY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, it was reported in the Washington Post of Saturday, May 10, 1969, that the Army has acknowledged that antibodies to Venezuelan equine encephalitis have been discovered in the vicinity of Dugway Proving Grounds, Utah.

The Army spokesman did not reveal why antibodies to a virus normally found in swampy, tropical forests have been found in the deserts around Dugway, the Army's foremost testing site for chemical and biological warfare agents.

However, the spokesman did not rule out the possibility that the VEE virus had been tested in the laboratories at Dugway "where the strictest safety precautions are observed."

Similar conditions were thought to be in effect at Dugway in 1967, when 6,400 sheep were killed by drifting nerve gas.

Regardless of whether VEE virus has leaked from a Dugway laboratory or whether it seeped into the environment as a result of an errant field test, there is a clear need for a thorough study to determine the environmental effects of the research program at Dugway. This study should be conducted by an impartial committee of experts in the life sciences. It is critically important that the Congress and the American people be fully informed about this subject.

I ask unanimous consent that the Washington Post article, entitled "Test Area Virus Clues Confirmed," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1969]

TEST AREA VIRUS CLUES CONFIRMED

The Army acknowledged yesterday that the antibodies of a severely incapacitating virus rarely found in the United States were discovered in the vicinity of the Dugway, Utah, Proving Grounds.

But Army spokesmen also asserted that the virus of Venezuelan Equine Encephalitis (VEE) has never been field-tested at Dugway or anywhere else and there are no plans for field-testing in the future.

VEE is common to South and Central America but its presence in the United States has been detected only in coastal Florida and Louisiana.

The Army statement did not speculate on why the antibodies from a mosquito-borne virus normally found in tropical swamplands should exist in the arid regions of south western Utah.

An Army spokesman said the statement did not rule out the possibility that VEE might have been tested within Dugway's laboratories where, he said, "the strictest safety precautions are followed."

WORLD LEPROSY DAY

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Hawaii's tortuous journey toward the enlightened treatment of the victims of leprosy was eased by the humanitarian work of Father Damien De Veuster, a Belgian priest, who dedicated his life to ministering to the lepers at Kalawao, an isolated settlement for all those afflicted with this malady in Hawaii. For 16 years—from 1873 to 1889—Father Damien ministered to the lepers, bringing comfort where there was pain, joy where there was sadness, hope where there was despair, and love where there was hate.

Hawaii and the world have profited from the light Father Damien shed on the darkness of despair so long associated with leprosy. The State of Hawaii

recently expressed its gratitude to Father Damien with the presentation of his statue to the National Statuary Hall collection.

It was with special interest, therefore, that the people of Hawaii commemorated World Leprosy Day on February 16 and witnessed many spiritual and governmental leaders filling Washington Cathedral to commemorate this day. Dramatizing the problems leprosy has inflicted on its victims throughout the ages, the assemblage of distinguished leaders urged people to recognize and disavow the fears which have stifled community efforts to control this ancient disease and to help the unfortunate victims of this disease lead normal lives.

The messages for World Leprosy Day which were received from President Richard M. Nixon, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert Finch, Governor of the State of Hawaii John A. Burns and Mrs. Burns, and Dr. Detlev Bronk, and the sermon delivered by the Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre, express the deep concern which should move each of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have the messages and the sermon printed in the RECORD, together with an article describing the observance of World Leprosy Day, which was published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

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

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Feb. 17, 1969]

LEPROSY DAY IS OBSERVED

(By Frank Hewlett)

WASHINGTON.—Washington Cathedral was filled to capacity yesterday for a colorful and dramatic observance of World Leprosy Day.

Spiritual leaders of the Buddhist, Catholic, Hindu, Jewish, Moslem and Protestant faiths marched in procession from the north portal to the great choir area of the Episcopal cathedral. Following them were representatives of a score of embassies. Most of them were in colorful national dress and represented countries with a leprosy problem.

Another highlight was the carrying to the altar by staff members of the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Carville, La., of an apothecary jar containing capsules of diaminodiphynlsulfone (DDS), the sulfone drug used to arrest leprosy's spread.

The dean of the cathedral, the Very Rev. Francis B. Sayre Jr., described DDS as "the greatest break-through" in the treatment of leprosy and held it was fitting that this jar of medicine should be "offered to God."

Dean Sayre praised those who have cared about the plight of the world's estimated 15 to 20 million leprosy victims, including about 2,000 in the United States, and have done something about it.

"What sufferers fear most is to be cast out and isolated," said Dr. Sayre.

He explained the purpose of World Leprosy Day was to "dramatize the problem of this ancient scourge." That's why it was appropriate for the Washington Cathedral to be the setting for "great services like this," he said.

Theme of the sermon was the need to care about the plight of the victims and Dr. Sayre held that if the public cared enough "the whole ancient curse of leprosy may be eliminated in our times."

Dr. Sayre was high in his praise of research work being done, particularly at Carville, New Caledonia and the central Philippines. He is a trustee of the Leonard Wood Memorial for the Eradication of Leprosy which built a sanitarium and laboratory facilities in the Philippines.

From President Richard M. Nixon there came a statement which said in part: "World Leprosy Day offers each of us the opportunity to rededicate ourselves of the task of dispelling the false fears that have perpetuated our neglect of this ancient enemy and devising new programs to eliminate the obstacles to its eradication and control.

"I salute the generous concern and willing cooperation of those who sponsor this observance and I urge all my fellow Americans to contribute to the success of your rewarding work."

Organizations sponsoring the 16th annual World Leprosy Day were the Leonard Wood Memorial, the American Leprosy Missions, the Damien-Dutton Society, the Pan American Health Organization and the International Society for Rehabilitation of the Disabled.

Dr. William H. Stewart, surgeon general of the U.S. Public Health Service, was chairman of the Washington committee for World Leprosy Day. A member of his committee and attending the cathedral services was Sen. Daniel K. Inouye.

This year's national chairman of World Leprosy Day was Dr. Detlev M. Bronk, president emeritus of the Rockefeller University and a former president of Johns Hopkins University. The honorary co-chairmen were Gov. and Mrs. John A. Burns of Hawaii.

The Governor was the first president of the Hawaii Chapter of the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults. Mrs. Burns has been active in the work of the Crippled Children's Society and other organizations.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, February 12, 1969.

Leprosy is one of mankind's most ancient and most stubborn afflictions. But today the outlook is brighter than it has been throughout all of recorded history. Leprosy can be conquered if we replace fear with enlightened understanding and negligence with modern methods of care and rehabilitation. All of the world's people will benefit when this dread disease is brought under control. Only by working together constructively can the nations of the world make this dream come true.

ROBERT FINCH,
Secretary.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington.

Cruel and unjust myths have far too long deprived the victims of leprosy of the miracles of modern medicine. Far too often, stigma and superstition have prevailed over compassion and constructive treatment and research.

World Leprosy Day offers each of us the opportunity to rededicate ourselves to the task of dispelling the false fears that have perpetuated our neglect of this ancient enemy, and devising new programs to eliminate the obstacles to its eradication and control.

I salute the generous concern and willing cooperation of those who sponsor this observance, and I urge all my fellow Americans to contribute to the success of your rewarding work.

RICHARD NIXON.

EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS,
Honolulu.

Hansen's Disease, also known as leprosy, presents one of the world's most serious health problems. There are an estimated 10 to 15 million victims, most of whom labor under severe economic and social burdens. Not only is their working capacity reduced, but, because of the stigma attached to those who have the disease, they are sometimes denied a normal place in society even when they have jobs.

Many of the world's leprosy sufferers are in need of surgery. Less than 20 per cent receive any kind of modern medical treatment at all, despite the great increase in recent years in programs to provide it.

To hope to solve this problem, the understanding and support of every individual is needed. Effective action cannot be taken until there is more general knowledge of the problem's extent and what can be done to solve it from the points of view of treatment, rehabilitation, research for a preventive, education, etc.

For this reason we are doing all we can to promote observance of World Leprosy Day, Sunday, February 16, 1969. As honorary co-chairmen of the Day, we urge every American citizen to give careful consideration to the words of Mrs. Arthur J. Goldberg, retiring World Leprosy Day honorary chairman. She said, "The need for enlightenment and for support of constructive programs is urgent. Leprosy can be controlled and, finally, eradicated. This is one of the great contributions that America can make to the people of the developing lands, and to a happier, more healthful world."

JOHN A. BURNS.
BEATRICE M. BURNS.

THE ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION,
New York, N.Y.

For centuries leprosy has been a dreaded disease and those with leprosy have been social outcasts. Now scientific research has yielded knowledge that makes it possible to cure the disease and to destroy the myth that its sufferers are unclean people to be shunned. But there are still wide gaps between knowledge of the cause of the illness, its cure and removal of the false social stigma.

Fifteen million people still suffer from leprosy and the number will probably increase by more than a million during the next five years. Many of its victims are social outcasts because of ignorance and unreasoned prejudice.

To eradicate this affliction that has been dreaded since Biblical days, the needs are three:

Spread knowledge of the true nature of leprosy that need not be feared.

Provide medical care and drugs for treatment of its victims who are mostly in the poorer countries of the world.

Support research to discover means for preventing the disease.

To achieve these goals requires money, medical care and scientific research.

DETLEV BRONK., Ph. D.,
Chairman, World Leprosy Day.

SERMON: WORLD LEPROSY DAY

(By the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr.)

We all know how much it helps our understanding of something if we can just succeed in dramatizing it. Pageantry and scale conjure up for us the images by which we appropriate something and respond to it! So this Cathedral to which I welcome you all this morning is built because it dramatizes the whole Christian faith from beginning to end. People often wonder why it is built in this time of trouble and change and doubt. The answer, of course is because it says in exquisite form—and massively enough to compete with mass media—that God cares and that man can care too!

Thus a cathedral is built for great services like this one which can dramatize a concern that is as wide as the world, as old as man; and yet which, just because it is so wide and dispersed . . . often remains invisible to people: the 15 or 20 million leprosy victims living today, a couple of thousand of them right here in the United States. Such a service dramatizes the fact that they exist and the problem of mobilizing far more resources

than we now have, if we ever hope to treat more than the mere one-fifth of all victims of leprosy that are presently cared for in the world. This morning we want to dramatize the problem of this ancient scourge and what it will take to conquer it. That's what World Leprosy Day is for! Yet I suspect, as do all of you who have lived close to this disease, of whom there are many here this morning, that we will never really come to grips with leprosy or any other affliction until we see it not only dramatically but also on the undramatic, day-to-day plane of a human being's life. After we've finished dramatizing the world problem, then we have still to live with what it's like to try and work with a hand that no longer has any feeling in it, or live with people who don't understand because they are forever over-dramatizing the disease, which after all is not highly infectious (as most people believe) nor grossly destructive nor even always incurable.

The point that I am trying to make just now is marvelously made in the Second Book of Kings in the Old Testament, where you may remember we are told of Naaman, Commanding General of the Syrian Army, who, nevertheless, was a victim of leprosy. His wife's little Jewish maid advised that in neighborhing Israel there was a Prophet who in God's Name could heal him. Well, the General couldn't do anything if he didn't do it dramatically. So he got the King of Syria to write a letter of introduction to the King of Israel. Then he proceeded with splendid pageantry, with camel trains and gifts and all the panoply of an oriental despot to make his way to the King of Israel. But that poor monarch was dumbfounded. "Am I God" he said when Naaman arrived "to give life or to take it away? Perchance there is some trick here!" said he. But Elisha the Prophet heard about it. He sent to the King of Israel and said "Just send him down to me and he will know that there is a God in Israel." So Naaman with all his servants, his camels and his panoply arrived at the humble abode of the Prophet. He thought that God would tell him some great thing to do. "Just go wash in Jordan seven times" said the Prophet. As simple as that! Naaman was offended. "Are not Aband and Pharpar, rivers of Damascus, greater than all the muddy waters of Israel? Why should I do this simple thing?" But his servants said to him, "Ah, but if you want to be healed, why not do the humble thing that the Prophet recommends?" And the last we hear of the General, he is pushing two wheelborrowloads of earth back to Damascus in Syria. Believing that the wonderous God who had made him well was rooted in the soil of Israel, he undertook to carry a bit of it back with him so that he might never be far from that wondrous God, who could work so great a miracle in so humble an act. Is it not always so: that healing comes, in the end, in humble ways, one by one, by the agency of water mixed with faith? And neither one costs a cent in this world!

There is much that we seek to dramatize today at this service. I would that all of you might visit the laboratories around the world, in Carville in Louisiana, or Noumea in New Caledonia, or Ethiopia or Culion in the Philippines, where men and women have worked day after day in research on that persistent bacillus which was first described by Dr. Hansen in 1874. Many, many doctors supported by the U.S. Public Health Service, or private groups like the Leonard Wood Memorial—and agents of other governments too: have harnessed their lives to the hope that one disease at least might someday be all but eradicated from this planet. A symbol of that hope and of its partial realization is the presence with us this morning of Mrs. Faget, widow of the great doctor who in 1943 first made use of the sulfone drugs in treating leprosy. It was the greatest breakthrough ever in the arrest of the disease. And this is the precious medicine which she will carry forward and offer to God at this service, in our symbolic act of dedication and thanksgiving. "DDS" it is called, and it represents a dramatic battle won. But as Dr. Faget knew so well, it was made—that battle, of simple ingredients the chief of which is faith, even as it was in Elisha's day.

Talk of faith! The most vivid example of it I have ever seen took place in the colony for leprosy patients on that remote island of Culion in the Philippines which, before World War II was, I think, the largest colony in the world—more than 5,000 patients there. During the war it was isolated by the Japanese. No supplies of medicine or food were allowed to be carried in. Distress was acute. Houses had to be pulled down and burned for fuel. There was no light, there was no help. Many died; many more fled. But among those that remained the only medium of exchange for their little society was trust. The old Philippine currency was worthless then and the Japanese occupation money was unacceptable to them. All that remained in the Culion colony were the checks that had been issued, but never cashed because of the outbreak of the war, by the Leonard Wood Memorial, for research on leprosy done there. These checks had passed from hand to hand through all those dread years because the colony steadfastly believed that the people who once had cared would one day come back to redeem them. It happened that to me fell the moving joy, in 1946, of seeing Perry Burgess, head of the Leonard Wood Memorial, sitting at a little table in that colony, cashing all those notes, making good on human trust and hope. Later that same day as we climbed the high steps to the chapel, we were met by the children of the colony, victims of leprosy themselves, drawn up in a line before the Church, waiting for us so that they might sing "God Bless America".

What's it like to have leprosy? We, who have never had the disease can only guess. But I think we ought to try the exercise of imagination to make that guess. Way back at the beginning of the Bible, the regulations for leprosy victims were recorded in the Book of Leviticus: they give a little indication of what it is like to have leprosy. Here is an excerpt:

"And the leper in whom the plague is, his clothes shall be rent, and his head bare, and he shall put on a covering over his upper lip and shall cry unclean, unclean.

"And the days wherein the plague shall be in him he shall be defiled; He is unclean, and shall dwell alone; without the camp shall his habitation be."[1]

Unclean and cast out! That's the sting of leprosy. All through history until now the treatment was worse than the infection. The agony was in being cast out. The loneliness of the human spirit! To this day that is what the sufferers fear most. Many feel that the reason why no care reaches three-fourths or more of all leprosy victims in the world today is because they will not indentify themselves. They are afraid. They will not come in. They dread the "habitation without the camp", to which both myth and misconception would seem to condemn them. It rather makes one think of those ten lepers in a village of Samaria who stood off at a great distance and cried to Christ as he passed on the road: "Jesus, Master, Have mercy on us."[2]

His response, characteristically, was a simple thing. "Go, show yourselves to the priests," was all he said. And as they went, they were healed.

Healing whether of body or of spirit is always made of the everyday, the undramatic. As for example the gloves and socks that have been recently invented for patients with leprosy. The main reason why leprosy victims are deformed so often is simply because they cannot feel anything in their extremities. So when they grasp something or stamp their foot or use a tool, they squeeze too hard, break down the tissue, literally bash their limbs to pieces. But now these fabrics have been invented that contain little ampules of dye, which under pressure break and stain the glove or the sock or the trouser that the leprosy patient is wearing. And so warned by the external signal, since his internal nerve is impaired or destroyed, the individual is preserved from untold damage.

What a simple idea! But it would not have come had not someone cared and done something about it. Of the ten lepers cleansed, you remember only one turned back to thank the Lord. To him Jesus said, "Arise, go thy way, thy faith hath made thee whole." That's what I think he is saying to all the world through us, through this service here his morning: that if we care enough, and will give and live and love enough, the whole ancient curse of leprosy may indeed "Arise and be made whole"; in our time.

There was a time, in the Middle Ages, when in the Cathedrals that were built then, there were oblique holes pierced through the great thick outer walls of the Nave. These holes were so that the victims of leprosy who had to remain outside, could peek in when the Mass was celebrated. The angle of the aperture was such that the poor outcast could manage at least to see the Host, when it was elevated at the High Altar. But that was all. They might see Christ's body, but they might not enter in to receive it. Now has God bidden us to carry the body from this Cathedral, the body of His love to every end of the earth, that each last one who needs it may receive it. May God add his blessing to the speaking of His work this day and grant that His Grace may abide in all the world. Amen.

[1] Leviticus 13:45–46.

[2] Luke 17:13.

SENATE RESOLUTION 194—TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 152, Senate Resolution 194, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The assistant legislative clerk read the resolution as follows:

S. RES. 194

Whereas the administration has announced its intention and taken immediate steps to close fifty-nine Job Corps centers and camps and establish a new system of urban skill centers; and

Whereas the Congress has under active consideration bills regarding the Job Corps program, and has recently received several detailed studies of the program's record in the past: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that any action to shut down Job Corps centers and camps should be deferred until the Congress has had an opportunity to review the Job Corps program and decide upon the legislation which would extend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, and appropriations for that program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

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

The Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me without losing his right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be authorized to be in the Chamber during the consideration of this resolution.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I should like, quite briefly, to state some of the background concerning the resolution.

It does not represent a partisan attack in any way upon the President of the United States; nor does it represent an attack in any way upon the Secretary of Labor. It is not a partisan effort to embarass the administration.

I have talked personally about this resolution to every Republican Senator except two. I tried to talk with them, but they were unavailable.

My purpose in talking to my Republican colleagues was to express the objectives of the resolution and to assure them that my intentions and the intentions of other Senators supporting the resolution were neither partisan nor provocative—nor, of course, the intentions involved in those conversations which seek support for the resolution.

The resolution is not a defense of the Job Corps. The Job Corps is far from perfect, like most Government programs. It is undoubtedly more imperfect than some Government programs

Changes are in order in the Job Corps. Quite possibly, a total substitution, with another approach to manpower training for the particularly disadvantaged and underprivileged in our society, may well be in order. But the fact is that we have no alternative plan before us. The fact is also that a vote on this resolution binds no Senator in any way insofar as future votes are concerned. Later on, all Senators, no matter how they vote on this resolution, will be perfectly free to vote for or against keeping the Job Corps going, cutting it, modifying it, revising it, or substituting another program.

The resolution really represents an effort to preserve the rights of the U.S. Senate. It represents an effort to protect the young men and women who were in the Job Corps in camps suddenly ordered closed. It represents an effort to protect the young men and women who were 1 day away, or 1 week away, or 1 month away from assignment to a Job Corps camp; who were making their plans; who were told they had been accepted or were presumably about to be accepted; and who were then told the whole process is halted—"There may be no place for you in the Job Corps."

The problems that these young people face are truly immense. This is the first opportunity that many of them have had in their lives to rehabilitate themselves, to escape from an unhappy family environment, from a devastating community environment; the first opportunity they have had to seek to stand on their own two feet; to have a helping hand; to learn a skill or trade; and to become self-respecting members of our society.

When they heard that there was this sudden, impending ordered shutdown, it dashed their hopes. Dropouts increased something like 75 percent among enrollees in the camps. It was a very high ratio, not only in those that are about to be closed, but in those not to be closed, because of the fear that those would be subject to closing orders.

Some of these young people probably cannot be gotten back to the stream of opportunity that had been offered by the Job Corps camps. There is one rather striking example of a situation that confronted the young people in these camps which is portrayed in a communication from a newspaper in my State to its correspondent here in Washington, relating to one little example of the imposition of heartbreaks involved in the closing of Job Corps camps suddenly. I have slightly edited the communication, but it reads approximately as follows:

Reference this Parks Center thing—

Being a center in California—

We got a call from a woman here concerning a young man named Roberto Gonzalez. A Costa Rican, Gonzales was employed at the center learning to be an auto mechanic. Like 90 to 95 per cent of all trainees, Roberto's teeth were bad—(awful). Jobs Corps center dentists began pulling them, and are now halfway through the job.

But the center is closing and Roberto had no chance to get the rest of his teeth pulled or to get new teeth. They had been pulling good ones as well as bad ones, incidentally—to give him a full set of plates. Dentists—subcontractors—already are leaving Parks.

A call from us pretty well changed things for Roberto. He apparently is being transferred to another center where they teach auto mechanics and will continue his training and dental work.

The real problem is that dental work has apparently been started on a large number of these young men. Many are halfway through and are stuck with dental work which will not be completed—and in some respects, say the dentists at Parks, they are worse off than they were when they began.

Apparently some rehabilitative medical care is also being done and is being cancelled halfway through.

I assume they are going to go ahead and close Parks. But possibly the Federal Government could provide some way for them to finish medical and dental care.

The number of young people involved in all of this cannot be exactly ascertained. The Labor Department has provided figures which would seek to indicate that young men and women turned away from the closing camps will find spots elsewhere. I believe that the evidence—and the evidence is considerable—indicates that that cannot be done. The statistics from the Labor Department are based in part upon a very heavy dropout percentage of enrollees, and so they are partly based, and their hopes for placement of the remaining people are based, on the very large number dropping out. Many are dropping out because of the cutbacks.

There are no statistics available as to how many young men and women were on the way to the processing stage and were cut off by the order to freeze recruitments.

I sent the Secretary of Labor a telegram, asking several questions, including how many were stopped in the processing. I have received no response to it. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the RECORD, without taking time to read it.

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

MAY 7, 1969.

HON. GEORGE P. SCHULTZ,
Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

Would greatly appreciate your providing answers to the following questions by the end of this week:

1. How many youngsters were processed and scheduled to be enrolled as Corpsmen when the recruiting freeze was imposed?

2. How many youngsters had unprocessed applications pending at this time?

3. What steps have been taken to communicate with youngsters in each of these categories, and could I please have samples of any such standard communications?

4. When is it expected that youngsters in each of the categories will start being entered into women's centers, men's centers, and conservation camps left open?

5. When will active recruiting and processing be resumed?

I am asking these questions at this point because my review of the hearing transcript does not indicate that any data has been presented to provide these answers.

ALAN CRANSTON.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes; I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I was somewhat impressed by a television program shown yesterday, not because it dealt with this particular issue, but because it was discussing problems regarding inmates in penitentiaries. The program was on channel 4 locally. Those who discussed the matter were knowledgeable people, professional penologists, people who work with young criminals. Included was a very knowledgeable young woman with experience in rehabilitating persons. I think, perhaps, she held a responsible position with the Federal Government. She was asked about the matter of closing the private schools. She said she hoped very much that money could be found to continue the schools, because she said so many people in those schools, who admittedly are being provided skills at relatively high costs, will at least pay their own way in the future as taxpayers; whereas if we do not do this and do not offer this opportunity, these people are going to find their way into crime, drugs, prostitution, and a thousand other things which result in their being a burden on society. When people have no hope or no opportunity to better themselves, they often fall into that kind of life.

While it is true that one can severely criticize some of the poor conduct, some

of the poor manners, and some of the social habits that those people have brought to those schools, it seems to me that argument must be answered with the question, "Well, assuming all these things are wrong with these people, does that not prove they need help?" If we have nothing better to offer, do we just take 17,000 people who are looking for a chance in life and turn them out? That would seem to this Senator to be unwise, until we studied the problem and saw that we had an opportunity to use the money better somewhere else.

The Finance Committee is studying the medicare program. I have no doubt we will find ways to save money on medicare. We have before; we will again.

We will find ways where we can suggest savings in the medicaid program; there is no doubt in my mind about that. I have difficulty getting any votes on the Republican side of the aisle for my drugs proposal but if that proposal, which by the way has HEW support, were to be adopted we could save a minimum of $50 million a year right there. We will probably find the votes on the Senate to vote an economy there, whether or not we get a single Republican vote—which we failed to do last time we tried to save money on drugs.

But in this situation, why must we rush so headlong into a victory over the poor, without trying to see whether there might be some better way we could help these people?

Mr. CRANSTON. I have no idea why there is this rush. It seems to me that it is extremely wasteful. It certainly is heartless; and I think it really is going to cause the taxpayers, in many of the areas where we seek to protect the taxpayers, as we should in all the things we do here, to have a higher bill in the long run, because of what these young people will fail to learn, and how they will feel when they go back to the streets.

Mr. LONG. Is there any evidence that the young people in these Job Corps camps are not being turned out better qualified to make a living, improved and upgraded human beings, as a result of the training and opportunity provided them in the camps?

Mr. CRANSTON. One aspect of the undue haste of the administration is that they acted on a report by the General Accounting Office completed in June of last year, and they failed to wait for a more up-to-date report that would cover new accomplishments based upon past bad experience by the Job Corps.

The administration ordered, in January, a $250,000 report by Lou Harris, and the report was based upon 10,000 interviews with trainees, employers of trainees, families, and friends, and other people who knew trainees, as to what the accomplishments were.

The administration acted 1 week before that report came in, without waiting to see what it had to say. The report, when it was provided, indicated very substantial accomplishment, including an increase in real wages and a decrease in unemployment among graduates of Job Corps centers. Had they waited, it is quite possible they would not have acted in this rash and, I think, reckless way.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I for one wish the President every success in his administration. Be he a member of a different party than I, or not, he is our President; he is the only President we have. He is our President during a very critical time, and I certainly wish him every success.

But it would seem to me that he is going to need the cooperation of the majority party in both Houses of Congress. Now when a majority of those of us who voted to create this poverty program would like to take a look to see on what basis a lot of the undertakings to improve the lot of the poor are being cast aside, would it not seem that just mutual respect and cooperation, consideration of one branch of government for the other, would indicate that we should at least have the opportunity to let the people who are most closely involved in this program have their say. Should not these people who have with enthusiasm, volunteered to get into this program to try to provide opportunities for young people who otherwise would have no chance, report what they have done, and show us what they have been able to achieve and what they have not been able to achieve, so that we could judge for ourselves, whether this program should be terminated?

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator has put his finger on the fundamental point involved in this matter, and that is the issue of whether or not the opportunity and prerogative of Congress to consider what an administration does with ongoing, approved programs, through the authorization and appropriation process, shall be observed or not be observed.

Oddly enough, the President, in his message to Congress about the OEO on February 19, indicated a total intention to observe these rights. He said:

> How the work begun by OEO can best be carried forward is a subject on which many views deserve to be heard—both from within Congress, and among those many others who are interested and affected, including especially the poor themselves. By sending my proposals well before the Act's 1970 expiration, I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion.

In other words, he indicated that he intended to wait until 1970, and give Congress a full opportunity to consider whatever recommendations he had to offer. This resolution really enables him to fulfill that pledge to Congress.

It seems to me that what probably happened was that some overzealous administrator rushed in before Congress had the opportunity to follow that through, and thus defeated the intention of the President.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I would urge that we not slash with the meatax before we know what we are doing. I am willing to cooperate with the President and help him find money to finance his program. It might not make me any friends to say it, but when I was invited to express my opinion about the Revenue Act, I spoke up and urged, if something needed to be done about inflation, that we should repeal, or at least not extend, the investment tax credit.

That was not in the President's program when I suggested it. It is there now. I was a member of a group of Senators the President asked about fiscal and monetary programs. I am pleased to see that it is in the program now. It represents $3 billion, in my opinion, that the President gained right there, by some of us on the Hill having an opportunity to suggest how problems might be met.

This will have much more of an anti-inflation effect than simply raising $3 billion in taxes, because it will help induce the postponement of such practices as tearing down perfectly good plants, and building superplants to meet a highly speculative future need, at a time when it would be inflationary to do so.

I submit that here is a case where the administration could very well cooperate with Congress, and let us have the opportunity to see what they are proposing to do. I suspect if they do it, they will find that, to say the least, some of their plans are behind the times.

For instance, I have had information made available to me which indicated that some of these decisions were made just because the information was outdated. If they had had the latest information, they might have closed centers which they now planned to keep open, and keep others open which they plan to close.

I believe that where you really lose money in programs is to start something and not finish it. That is where the great loss is, and that is what seems to be happening here, if we simply abruptly terminate a lot of these undertakings, which may very well in the long run prove to be good investments.

Mr. CRANSTON. I should like to point out to the distinguished Senator something of which he is already well aware, but I should like to touch upon it: The fact that there will presumably be before the committee proposals for tax incentives to business, to enable them to be more assured of a profit while engaging in job training for underprivileged, untrained Americans, and providing them jobs in factories close to where they live.

I am inclined to go along with such plans, even as a Democrat, because I like to see things done by private enterprise whenever possible. But we do not know whether such plans will meet this problem or not; so, again, there is a part of our incentive to keep this program going until we have a chance to study the alternatives.

Mr. LONG. I hope the Senator will not be so zealous as to adopt some other alternative before it is started. It sounds to some of us as if this is a "rich get richer" poverty program. It seems to me that more direct help might be more advantageous than to help induce the businessman, by making him richer, to expand his own plant and train someone to work for him.

What the program seeks to do is ferret out the least qualified of the workers—all those that industry is least likely to hire under any conditions. If we continue the incentive program, it seems likely that the people industry would hire, and let us say just as a good business decision it makes good sense, would be those among the poverty cases who looked like they had the best possibilities.

Those in the program that the Senator is trying to help are those who have the least possibility of success, as I understand it.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. So that in one case we would reach those at the bottom of the pile, and in the other case we would reach those at the top. And, as long as it is possible to consider the other approach, there is no reason that we cannot do it both ways and help those at the bottom as well as those at the top, those who have the least talent, as well as those who have the most.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. Talking about profits for business, what is the view of the Senator about the aspects of the waste and potential profit related to that waste? $65 million is invested in private building by private contractors. That is now going to be abandoned. And the Government is shopping around elsewhere. The Department of Labor has written to other agencies saying, "We do not want the programs. Can you think of one which could use them?" Meanwhile, they are going to build 21 new camps, so-called minicenters, at a potential profit to those who build them and at a potential waste to the taxpayers, because we are substituting some brand new facilities for some that we already have.

Mr. LONG. It would certainly seem that one would do well to let those who apparently have an enthusiasm for the program proceed with their good work. I doubt that any contractor would have come into the program if he had not had some enthusiasm for it. After they have had some experience and have had a chance to see how it is working and have thought how it could be improved, it would seem that one should permit the people to come in and say how they think they might be affected.

I am not too much impressed by the fact that the cost of training new people might be more expensive than the cost of teaching students at Harvard. I am not too much impressed by the job they are doing at Harvard. We are giving them more than $60 million in Federal grants a year. One would gain the impression that they take young people from upper income families, who presumably have had the "proper" upbringing, and proceed to make bearded anarchists of them.

One cannot say that about these camps. Have there been any riots in these camps in which people have been burning the American flag?

Mr. CRANSTON. Despite the heartbreaks experienced by these people, there has not been one riot in any of the Job Corps centers since the order for closing. I do not know how many riots there have been on campuses for different reasons since that time.

Mr. LONG. Some people would make it appear that some of those who receive training in these camps are not the best of people. If that is correct, I would gain the impression that if they were the so-called "best" people, the money would be wasted, since we are proceeding on the basis that these are the people at the bottom, people who have had no choice, no proper inspiration. In some cases, they have not had an opportunity to know the difference between right and wrong. We are trying to make good citizens out of them before those people who might fall into trouble or who have already fallen into trouble get into further trouble.

Am I correct in the assumption that really we are not looking for the best citizens to send to these training centers? We are looking for those who have had the least opportunities and those whose families are able to provide them with the least with which to move forward and become a part of the mainsteam of American citizenship, rather than trying to find someone who has all of the potential skill of someone who does not need the training and is available to go to work and take a good job tomorrow.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. Most of these people come from broken families and from very bad community environments. Many of them are illiterate or are only able to read up to the third- or fourth-grade level, even though they are of high school or college age.

The people have no skills. And if they are not given an opportunity, they will go back on the streets and fall into crime, and the welfare cost for them will be far more throughout the remainder of our lives and their lives than the cost of any training program. Some of them will be in prison. Some of them had criminal records before being accepted in the Job Corps centers. They do not want to remain in a life of crime. They want to go to these camps. If we send them back to the streets, it will lead to very predictable results.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I for one am, I suppose, at variance with the views of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) concerning the ABM missile. I am in favor of that measure.

One argument that could be made is that one cannot guarantee it will work. Maybe it will not. It appears to me that we should at least try to help people whether we succeed or not. We should try to help people who have never had a chance in this richest country on the earth. They should have an opportunity to show if they can become full, 100-percent, first-class American citizens.

Mr. CRANSTON. I certainly think the Senator is correct. If there is a better program that the administration or Congress can develop through the normal processes to do this job better, I will vote for the program. And I am sure that the Senator from Louisiana and other Senators will vote for it.

I want, and I am sure that other Members of Congress want, an opportunity to examine the alternatives before the measure is acted on.

I mentioned tax incentives. I want a chance to consider that. I offered my proposal in a very pleasant, nonpartisan spirit. Perhaps it will not be a good plan. However, we should reserve the right to consider very carefully the alternatives before going along with the cutback.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, has the Senator analyzed the extent to which the abrupt closing of these schools will fail to achieve the purpose of economy in terms of loss to the contractors? When these schools are closed, all of the contractors will lose their investments. Some will sell out for whatever they can get.

Has the Senator undertaken to determine how much we will lose in taxes? That is something that no one seems to think about. We propose to close something down, but we find then that someone will lose a lot of money and can take deductions against his 52 percent corporate income tax.

We find sometimes that the revenue loss equals two-thirds or three-fourths of what one thought he was going to be able to save. Sometimes the saving is very meager.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, we have been unable to get any figures to cover that very important aspect of the matter. I do not think that the Department of Labor took those matters into account in any way in making the decision, as it did not take many other factors into account.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I hope this will be one case in which we can achieve bipartisan cooperation. What was the vote in the Senator's committee with respect to the resolution?

Mr. CRANSTON. In the subcommittee the vote was 7 to 4. In the full committee, the vote was 10 to 7.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, there was a substantial majority in the subcommittee, and there was a majority of three in the full committee. That majority felt that we would do well to take a good look at the matter.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. And it is solely on that basis that we have acted. The committee has not had an opportunity to look into the matter. We should consider other ways to deal with the problem.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I take it the Senator would hope if the resolution carries that, in addition to considering whether existing programs should be continued, we should consider the possible use of those facilities which have been built and would be simply sitting there unused or would be sold at a sacrifice. We should consider whether those facilities should be put to better or more effective use.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. GRAVEL. This thing that does not quite square with my own thinking is the fact that the President's message on February 19, in which he said, "I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion," has not been adhered to as a result of the action of the Secretary of Labor on April 11.

Has the Senator's committee addressed itself to the Secretary or heard testimony from the Labor Department as to why the wishes of the President have not been adhered to?

Mr. CRANSTON. We sought that information, and we could get no responsive reply.

Mr. GRAVEL. Was the information in the Harris poll brought out before or after the action by the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. CRANSTON. The action was taken by the Secretary of Labor 1 week before this quarter of a million dollar report was rendered to OEO.

Mr. GRAVEL. Is it the Senator's conclusion that the Secretary of Labor did not have knowledge that this report was in existence?

Mr. CRANSTON. They must have had knowledge that it was coming, but they simply decided not to wait for it. Perhaps they did not know it was coming. They did not know too much about the Job Corps, when they made these decisions, as is evidenced by a number of blunders committed in closing various camps and in selecting those that were to be closed.

Mr. GRAVEL. The Senator from California mentioned earlier that the Harris poll involved some 10,000 interviews. How does that square with the poll of the General Accounting Office or the numbers they used to arrive at their conclusion?

Mr. CRANSTON. The Harris poll was based upon approximately 10,000 interviews, whereas the GAO survey was based upon approximately 1,000. In some of their samples, they had as few as 5, 6, or 7 interviews, from which they extrapolated a decision that simply could not relate to an adequate sample by traditional scientific sampling methods.

Mr. GRAVEL. I cannot help feel distressed about the haste that apparently seems to have entered this act. If I were to draw a parallel, I would say that what the resolution is asking is exactly what the President suggested—time to study the program, time to evaluate it properly, rather than closing it.

I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana, that probably the best way to get to the hardcore unemployed, the cheapest way for society, is to put these people in a position in which they can be gainfully employed, can pay taxes, can pay the cost of the education of their children, can pay the cost of their health services, and not have to get these things from Federal programs or from the dole, but to enable them productively to do these things and to get a personal reward of some note.

I cannot help bring to the attention of the Senate a dichotomy that is apparently demonstrated by these acts—the simple fact that the Secretary of Labor goes off on one tangent while the President advocates another.

I am reminded of something that occurred yesterday.

The Secretary of the Interior now takes a different position, apparently, with respect to depletion allowance from the position the administration seems to have taken, or, for that matter, the position taken by the Platform Committee of the Republican Party at the Republican convention, where the same Secretary of the Interior was the chairman of the Resources Committee.

I believe this is worthy of note, and I think the Senate should be placed on guard. If there are fissures of policy within this administration, it should be noted and taken into consideration, because this may affect our decisions in the future.

I hope the Senate will realize the benefit of the program of the Job Corps centers and how they go to the heart of the matter—the individual, and how to make him productive in society. I hope the Senate will go along with this very modest resolution.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator for his contribution.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. I do not wish to transgress on the Senator's time, but reference has been made to the Harris poll. I will cover that in some detail later, as well as the studies made by the General Accounting Office, but I should like to point out one thing at the present time.

In response to a question I asked Mr. Harris, he said that there is evidence, based on his poll, to suggest that after training, former Job Corps trainees show useful gains the first 6 months but within a year these young men and women are losing these gains and reverting back to their pre-Job Corps training status. In other words, permanent training has not been received. That is a major problem that many of us on this side of the aisle have with this program. Approximately 40 percent of the trainees drop out within the first 30 days. I shall discuss this in some depth later, but I think that should be brought out at this point.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. BAYH. I arrived in the Chamber in the midst of the colloquy between the Senator from California and the Senator from Louisiana, and I was impressed by the points raised at that time.

I wonder if any effort has been made to total the consequences so far as to the cost involved in curtailing the program. The Senator from Louisiana correctly pointed out the contractual loss with respect to what this would mean by the time it was related back to the average taxpayer through the tax structure.

All of us want to find ways to lessen cost and to save tax dollars; but it is my considered judgment that, with respect to young men and women who have in all probability dropped out of high school and are about to drop out of society, we really are not talking about not spending money. The question is how we are going to spend it. Are we going to spend it, as the Senator from Alaska very dramatically pointed out, to rehabilitate these lost lives and get them back into producing society, or are we going to spend it for incarceration, for treatment in mental institutions, for welfare payments, for unemployment payments, and for the cost of crime?

Has any effort been made to compile the cost that this might bring to society, compared with the so-called savings attributed to cutting back the Job Corps centers?

Mr. CRANSTON. We have not had statistics available to us that would really clarify that point, but I think that is the most important tax aspect of the situation—that the costs of welfare and of crime, involving the lives of young people who will be deprived of the opportunity they presently have, can be astronomical.

Mr. BAYH. I compliment the Senator from California for taking the lead in this matter.

As a Senator who comes from a State that has a Job Corps center which has not been closed—as of this particular moment, anyhow—I am well aware of the tremendous political repercussions that surround such a center. With respect to the central part of my State, it may not be good politics for the Senator from Indiana to suggest that Job Corps training is meritorious, because that has been a political hot potato. But I suggest to my colleagues who may not already recognize this—and I think most of them do—that in dealing with the young men and women of today who need this type of treatment, there is no easy solution to the problem. This is a very difficult, knotty, controversial issue. While the problem is not new, our efforts to deal with it are relatively recent. I think it stands to reason that when we become involved in a new program to deal with an unmet need, there is bound to be some uncertainty and controversy.

I would like to think—and I believe there is ample evidence to indicate—that many of the knots have been taken out of this very complicated problem. We have made mistakes; but we have also learned by those mistakes.

I should like to associate myself with the Senator from California in his belief that, before a program in which there have been mistakes but from which we have learned is completely decimated, we propose to find out what mistakes are likely to be made in the other programs that have been suggested. Certainly there is no easy way to deal with the problem of the unemployed and the undereducated—the young men and women who today are in many cases almost beyond recall. It seems to me that this is the last chance we have to help them become producing members of society; and I, for one, support the Senator from California in his efforts to keep us from taking this step backward. I compliment him for it.

It is essential that Congress be given the opportunity to review President Nixon's decision to shut down the 59 Job Corps installations.

Such a matter cannot be lightly dismissed. We are dealing with a matter which is affecting people's lives. Time is needed to evaluate the potential damage and impact that the closing of these Job Corps centers may have upon those young men and women who have been counting on the program.

Decisions affecting such important matters must be given adequate debate. If irrevocable decisions are carried out before Congress even has time to review the program, then the legislative process is severely compromised.

It appears that President Nixon's order to shut down 59 Job Corps centers—half in all—might yield an immediate $100 million saving for the administra-

tion in 1970, but I question the expense it will cost the Government in the long run. The closing would represent a reduction of more than 17,000 opportunities for hard-core disadvantaged young persons in a comprehensive live-in job training center.

It is a tragedy that such a worthwhile program may be going down the drain simply in order to redeem a campaign pledge. Campaign rhetoric at the expense of citizens is inexcusable.

The closing of the centers seems to be in contradiction with today's goal of providing more employment for more people. By cutting back such a worthwhile program of job training, we are not helping the underprivileged help themselves; we are merely putting them back on the streets.

I am deeply concerned over the need to find ways to eliminate unnecessary Federal spending and, thus, save tax dollars. However, those who are mistakenly of the opinion that cutting back on job training opportunities for young men and women is actually saving money are either naive or totally unaware of the problem involved. By denying training and job opportunities for the unskilled who have dropped out of school and who are about to drop out of society, we do not save money. What we are doing, in reality, is adding to the costs which society will have to pay in other areas as a result of our negligence—increased costs of welfare, increased unemployment payments, increased costs of maintenance of our penal and medical institutions, and increased costs because of criminal activity.

President Nixon's substituting "mini" skill centers for the Job Corps center is simply substituting "mini" solutions for maximum problems.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CRANSTON. I shall be happy to yield but first I would like to respond to a point the Senator raised. I did not have an opportunity to attend the House hearings. They were going on simultaneously. However, I have the testimony given by a witness on March 19 before the House committee. The witness was Mr. Cliff, Chief of the Forest Service, which handled the training in the conservation camps bearing the brunt of the closings. This is another question we might explore. We might explore why they chose the conservation camps which gave the young men their first opportunity to get away from city slums.

On one question it was stated that the cost average per man-year or per trainee is $6,800. Mr. Cliff was asked at the close of the hearings what it costs per inmate in a prison at the present time. These are statistics of the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Prisons. In 1967 the annual cost was $3,000 per average man. Therefore, if we have a man there just over 2 years the cost would exceed the cost for training a man.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. There is also the cost of putting that man in the prison and the cost involved in getting rid of perhaps a dozen writs of habeas corpus in the State courts.

Mr. BAYH. I would suggest, as well, keeping the man's family and providing some way to sustain them while he is in prison.

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct. I have one other figure from the testimony of Mr. Cliff. This is from a research report entitled "Cost of Correcting Youthful Offenders." The District of Columbia Department of Corrections provides the following data. These are records of youth studies made over 9 years. The medium cost per youth was $31,000. The average age of subjects was 26 years. Therefore, it costs $31,000 to deal with a youthful offender as against $6,800 to train him.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, someone has referred me to the fact that it was stated recently in the press that up until now the cost of trying Sirhan Sirhan has been $927,000. The point is that we are not through with that trial yet. It will be appealed and there will be more said about it.

If one looked at what it cost to put a man in the penitentiary, as well as to keep him there, and having his family on welfare while he is there, the overall expense is much greater, and we fail to make that person a productive member of society.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank the Senator. I yield to my esteemed senior colleague from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished colleague for yielding.

Is it not part of the administration plan, as the Secretary of Labor stated, that every trainee at a center designated to be closed will be placed in another center or in another manpower program?

Mr. CRANSTON. That is the avowed objective of the Secretary of Labor.

Mr. MURPHY. Do I understand that my distinguished colleague does not place trust in the objective stated by the Secretary of Labor?

Mr. CRANSTON. I have great respect for him and his motives. I do believe that we have ample evidence, and I will be glad to provide that evidence in the course of this discussion, that that promise cannot be kept.

Mr. MURPHY. Can the Senator prove it cannot be kept?

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe we can; and it has not been kept.

Mr. MURPHY. Was this matter raised during the hearings?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I was not present at the time and I did not find it in the RECORD.

I would like to ask the Senator the source of the figure $6,800.

Mr. CRANSTON. It is in the committee hearings, page 237.

Mr. MURPHY. I merely want to point out that the problems facing the Job Corps are not new. It is certainly no surprise to the senior Senator from California, who has served on this committee for 4 years now, that in light of the past failure to resolve these problems this matter is being brought up and hopefully rearranged.

The General Accounting Office estimates the cost per man-year was in the neighborhood of $8,300. I understand that this does not include the cost of the capital investment.

There has never been a question as to the objectives of the program? I know of no one on the committee over the past 4 years who has raised an objection to the stated purpose or the objectives, but there have been continuous problems and it is to these that objections have been raised. I would say that in the entire war on proverty, no single program has had as much bad publicity as this particular one.

Is it not true that each year we have been asked to consider the program's continuation for another year and to give those in charge a chance to see if it can be operated efficiently and effectively?

Is it also not true that the Secretary of Labor, in taking a new approach, feels quite certain that the effectiveness of the program can be increased and many more of those who need help can receive it within a very short period of time?

Mr. CRANSTON. The basis of the testimony of the Secretary was that they would endeavor to find equivalent training positions for all those in camps ordered closed. He never said anything about those who might be 1 week away or 1 day away from going to camp. He never indicated anything in that respect.

Mr. MURPHY. He also indicated, has he not, that once the new program has been instituted that they will be able to train many more individuals at a lesser cost?

Mr. CRANSTON. He has talked in generalities about a program for many centers, or inner-city skill training centers that would be part of a substantive program. He never talked in specific terms in discussing what they claim, nor have others done so.

The only prototype skill center that exists presently is one in Baltimore. That has been a fiasco and a failure with a high dropout rate and with a lower rating in terms of finding employment than almost any other center in the country.

Mr. MURPHY. Does my colleague know of the skill centers now operating in Los Angeles?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes, I have visited many of them, as has the Senator.

Mr. MURPHY. They are doing quite well. I think they are.

Mr. CRANSTON. Some are. They are not Job Corps skill centers.

Mr. MURPHY. They are training, counseling, teaching, and motivating young men, and placing them in jobs in anywhere from 4 to 7 months at a great deal less cost than the Job Corps program.

Mr. CRANSTON. I believe that many boys and girls now in Job Corps centers were rejected for those programs because they were felt to be so disadvantaged they needed a different type of environment and a different approach to training than the effort involved in the Job Corps. So they are not necessarily comparable.

Mr. MURPHY. I beg my colleague to permit me to disagree. The hope has been to find a way to take unemployed youths and train them for a job, whether they need educational finishing improvement, vocational training, or both. I believe this

has been the stated objective of the program. I believe that experience has led the Secretary of Labor to the same conclusion that I share; namely, that the new approach will operate much more effectively, actually, within a short period of time to train more of the disadvantaged at a lesser cost to the American taxpayer who, in my opinion, is already so heavily burdened.

I have pointed out previously that every year we have asked how many boys were being placed in jobs, how long they stayed in the jobs, how much they advanced in terms of skills and wages as a result of their training. Yet, we were never given accurate data. Now we are, but the figure used is that of those supposed to go to a job, those who went into the Army or back to school, and those corpswomen who married. Still the result is not very good. One of the most frightening figures is that which shows that 26 percent of those recruited never show up at camp after they have gone through the whole process of examination, an explanation of the situation, and acceptance of the conditions of the contract.

We found in the first 30 days that another 17 percent would drop out, and during the next 60 days another 13 percent would drop out. My figures on percentages may be one or two points off.

But the point is that in the years the program has been operating a very small percentage stay in the program long enough to gain the benefits for which the program was designed. Is that not the case?

Mr. CRANSTON. There are many who drop out, but both the GAO report and the Harris report indicate that there are many who do finish. The Harris report has statistics indicating success in placing them in hourly wages far higher after Job Corps training.

Mr. MURPHY. I have read the GAO report quite carefully. I would point out that this report probably cost—I do not know—roughly, $1 million, maybe $1.2 million. However, on top of that, we had to obtain another $275,000 for the Harris report to get information which should have been made available to the committee on a yearly basis by those in charge of the program. This is a disturbing situation to me.

I say all this merely because I am afraid that in his enthusiasm for his resolution, my distinguished colleague might have missed some of the background that has caused many of us who are fully committed to the objectives of the Job Corps to be disturbed over the slogan, "Let us give it another chance."

I must say that I think we have wasted quite a bit of time and some money. That is why I rose and I thank my distinguished colleague for his comments. I will have statements to make further as debate proceeds.

Mr. CRANSTON. I thank my colleague very much. Now let me say to my colleague from California that the Harris report is based upon far later information than the GAO report made more than a year ago. The Harris report is based upon 10 times as much evidence as the GAO report.

Mr. MURPHY. May I ask my colleague, is that the same Harris who made the now famous political prognostication at the last presidential election?

Mr. CRANSTON. It is the same Mr. Harris, yes.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. Harris has made a pretty good record. I thank the Senator very much. I appreciate his helpful guidance.

Mr. President, now I should like to yield to the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), who has been exceedingly effective in this matter in the hearings and has a broad range of experience in this matter, for his comments at this point.

Mr. NELSON. As to the comment made by the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) as to cost, I thought it might be an appropriate place to raise the question with the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) about the testimony of the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Weber, on the cost of the proposed administration residential city centers—sometimes called the mini-centers which were planned by the Labor Department.

Does the Senator recall that Mr. Weber testified before the committee, as follows:

> The new inner city residential support centers we have currently priced at $5,600. They are the small ones which will have 25 or 40 people, much as we have them in New Haven.

A number of comments should be made on the $5,600 figure. First, it is considerably higher than the many Job Corps camps which are being closed, even if we add the camps' operating cost enough to allow for other costs such as overhead and enrollee allowances. Second, the New Haven center, to which Mr. Weber refers, provides for no vocational training at all. It has been primarily a center for intensive treatment, an enrollee and family center that apparently would have to be added at a substantial additional cost to the program. Third, on the $5,600 figure—and I think this is important—the subcommittee has been unable effectively to get really meaningful talks on the New Haven center. Fourth, Mr. Weber concedes that the figures are only estimates. Fifth, they are all "ball park" costs. They are a reasonable basis for planning.

Thus, I raise this question with the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). Is it not true that really meaningful costs of running a residential mini-center were not, in fact, presented to the committee of a kind which the Senator compares with the cost presented for the conservation of other Job Corps centers?

Mr. CRANSTON. That is correct. We do not have in the RECORD a reliable basis or comparison covering those costs.

Mr. MURPHY. Will my colleague yield at that point for clarification?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I thought the $5,600 figure included all the costs, while the GAO estimate of $8,300 did not include capital investment. It was $5,600 all inclusive in the new, planned centers, as against $8,300 noninclusive for the ongoing program. I believe those figures are correct.

Mr. CRANSTON. These are the exact figures that were presented, as set out on page 387 of the committee hearings by Mr. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States. The total center and enrollee direct cost averaged $6,601. That is a lesser figure than the one I cited. If we add the costs that are overall for the Nation, including amortization of capital, $360; work project costs, $362; agency direction, $159; other costs, $772, we get a total cost per enrollee in terms of man-years of $8,254.

Now I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator. If I am not mistaken—if I am, please correct me—California has had a program similar to this for quite a few years. Is that correct?

Mr. CRANSTON. Yes; California has had a somewhat comparable program.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I correct in remembering something in the newspapers to the effect that these camps are being closed in California?

Mr. CRANSTON. I beg the Senator's pardon?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Am I correct in remembering that they are closing these camps in California?

Mr. CRANSTON. There has been a general economy wave in California, as the Senator is aware, and I think it has led to a closing of these camps, although there was a considerable feeling, where they were and elsewhere in California, that they were serving a useful purpose and that the consequences of closing them would be a rise in welfare costs and the cost of combating crime.

Mr. GOLDWATER. When I was last in this body, I recall that when this matter first came up for discussion I asked the chairman of the committee, of which I was the ranking Republican member, if we could not have some testimony from California brought in at that time to see what a difficult time they were having in California in making this program work. In fact, as I remember, the dropout rate was higher than the dropout rate the program was supposed to correct.

The cost in California at that time—and again, I am depending upon memory—was getting up to around $7,000 per man. At that time—and it was 4 or 5 years ago—California was talking about dropping its whole program because it was not felt it was being effective.

Has that program been dropped in California? Is it still operating? If the answer to the second question is "Yes," does the Senator from California have any knowledge that the program will be dropped in the future because of its cost?

Mr. CRANSTON. No; I do not have specific knowledge on that point. If that is a relevant fact which should be brought into the RECORD, as apparently there are other facts which have not been given us, that is another reason for the resolution, because it will give us further time to consider the matter, rather than to have the hasty action which

would take place if the resolution were not adopted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might observe that the State of California has now offered the best evidence in this case. I was very sorry that, when we discussed this matter 4 or 5 years ago, the chairman would not allow witnesses from California to come before the committee and testify. I am a firm believer in going on the proven values of the past, and if the great State of California, which has its problems, was not able to operate a service like this and do it effectively, certainly California could have given us the benefit of her experience. Evidently, the program is not working in California, and it has not worked in California, I imagine, for the same reasons that this administration finds it is not working generally across the Nation.

If the Senator from California obtains any information on this point, I think it would be most helpful to this debate.

I am trying to go back, not to what is ancient history, but to a few years ago, and put that evidence into the debate. I am trying to see if we can get some evidence on it. I think it would be of interest if California is evidently dropping the program entirely, while the Nation as a whole is diminishing the program, which has had its troubles, partly for the same reasons that it had in California.

I thank the Senator for permitting me to make these comments.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to make some remarks in behalf of the resolution.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. NELSON. But if Senators want to ask questions——

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I would like to make a comment with respect to the dropouts which were referred to by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from California. Will the Senator from Wisconsin yield? He has the floor.

Mr. NELSON. If there is no objection to the Senator's making remarks, I yield.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I wish to suggest that the wisdom of the decision of the State of California in decreasing or eliminating this effort may not be the wisdom of the Nation, but both my personal friend the senior Senator from California and the Senator from Arizona addressed themselves to the dropout rates. I think the dropout rate is actual proof of the need for the program. Were there a 50-percent dropout rate, I would suggest that there was a 50-percent retention. The simple fact that these deprived people have not adjusted to the course of action required in this regard I would think shows the program has merit. If there has been a shift because there is a dropout or diminution in the number, I submit it is proof of the need for the program.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I do not want to yield for dialog.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor. To whom does he yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield if a Senator has a question.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I have one.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator has referred to the use of the term "dropout." I hope that the Senator understands that I am not referring to dropouts from the camps per se, but one reason for the California program was to do something about stopping the dropouts in the high schools and to give these people another chance. Then the dropouts from the camps were higher than the dropouts from the schools, which the program was trying to correct. I believe it should be made abundantly clear that it is relevant to point out that when we try to cure something by a program and the medicine is not working, we had better try another medicine.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a chart which will show some comparison of the figures which were being discussed by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). This chart was submitted by the Secretary of Labor when he testified.

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

The costs of an inner-city center are compared with those of the Job Corps in the following table:

COMPARISON OF MAN-YEAR COSTS—JOB CORPS AND INNER CITY CENTER

	Job Corps urban center	Labor E. & D. (New Haven)[1]
Center operating expenses	2,429	1,864
Enrollee expenses	1,176	[2] 124
Operations and maintenance		740
Other operative expenses (including rent)	1,253	1,000
Center staff expenses	3,114	3,320
Staff salaries and benefits		2,880
Travel		240
Contracted services		200
Enrollee direct cost	1,447	40
Allowances		[3] 0
Travel		0
Insurance		40
Total center and enrollee direct cost	6,990	5,224
Capital investment	251	560
Rehabilitation		240
Equipment		320
Grant total center cost	7,241	5,784

[1] Includes staff cost of services to families of the center residents and followup of graduates.

[2] Residents are required to contribute ¼ of earnings as rent for room and board. Amounts vary according to hours worked (out-of-school youngsters earn more than in school). Rent receipts are used to pay food costs ,which explains why this figure is so low.

[3] Residents are not paid allowances because they are expected to hold jobs which can be either public or private sector jobs.

Mr. NELSON. The chart shows that the average cost of the Job Corps urban center was $7,241 per man-year.

Then it was compared with the New Haven center, which is a very small one, comprising about 25 youths, whereas the urban center has 1,000. The cost of the New Haven center was $5,784. So the cost of the so-called minicenter of $5,784 was compared with the Job Corps urban center cost of $7,241, but one very significant cost was left out. Absolutely no vocational training cost at all was included in the New Haven center figure. All the vocational and educational training cost was included in the urban center figure of $7,241. There is a difference only of $1,400 in any event, but the New Haven center does not do any training. If that cost were added, the cost of operating the minicenter would come very close to the cost of operating the average Job Corps camp.

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. PROUTY. It seems to me we are placing too much emphasis on the cost, whether it is of urban centers or conservation centers, or wherever they may be. I for one am not too concerned with the cost. I am not concerned with whether it costs $10,000 or more if we accomplish our objectives with this training. The point is, we have not been getting results. That is the only issue.

The Secretary of Labor and the administration have guaranteed to take care of all the trainees presently in the camps being closed.

Also, the Secretary of Labor states that 5,700 additional training slots will be available in fiscal 1970 for out-of-school youth. We are not cutting down on these programs. We find, however, that many of the young men who go into these camps stay a few days and then they leave, for reasons of their own. The dropout rate the first 30 days is higher—that for 30 to 90 days is not much better. They feel that they are not getting any training, or are homesick, or are dissatisfied with the experiences they undergo in camp, or there is some other reason.

The only issue here is to find the best way to take care of these needs. Whether it costs $10,000 or $12,000 is immaterial, so far as I am concerned, if we are getting the job done. But the facts reveal we are not. We are wasting an awful lot of money, which might be better spent helping young people in other methods of training. I shall go into that in considerable detail when I have the floor, but I think that it is sufficiently important to mention now.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I might say to the Senator from Vermont that I think it would be helpful if he discussed the matter further at this point. The Senator has always been a strong supporter of the poverty program, and has made a fine contribution to the committee.

However, the administration has taken the position that the objective is jobs, and I think that is the ultimate objective, although many of the young people have other problems on which they need help, and that is the reason for the residential centers.

I was never able to get a satisfactory answer from the Assistant Secretary of Labor on this question. They emphasize that the objective is jobs at the least cost. Yet they closed the Tillamook Conservation Center, which had a higher job placement record than any one of all the urban centers they kept open; 75.8 per-

cent of all the boys who went into the conservation center at Tillamook were placed in jobs. There is no urban center that matched it; and I do not know of any other program we have in which they did so well.

Next, on the question of costs: The Tillamook Conservation Center had a lower cost than any of the urban centers save one. So it had one of the highest placements and next to the lowest cost at that center, and yet they closed the camp. We never got an answer as to why.

There are several other situations, not quite so dramatic. For example, Tamarack camp in Minnesota, had a 75 percent placement record, of all the young fellows who went through that camp. That is extremely good, in my opinion. Incidentally, I might mention that, as I know the distinguished Senator from Vermont is very much aware, among the objectives are to teach these kids how to get along socially, how to dress, personal hygiene, mathematics, and how to read and write. In an average of 8 months, in that Tillamook center, they raised their reading level by 2.12 years. The school system did not do that well; why is it we expect these conservation camps, just starting, to do a whole lot better than the school systems, where they did not accomplish anything and became dropouts, but did pretty well in the conservation camps?

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it is true, as the Senator from Vermont has stated, that money is not important when you are talking about people. The Senator has made a record in the regard which has even jolted me from time to time on some of these social security bills, wanting to do more for people than the Senator from Louisiana, who regards himself as a big spender in the welfare field and thought he could find money to finance.

So if the statement is correct, as far as the Senator from Vermont is concerned, that he is concerned about people and not money—and his record will prove it; there is no doubt in the world about that—I say to him, let us not kid ourselves: At the administration level, from the top on down, the argument against the program, and for closing these camps, has been that it is costing too much money, and other cheaper ways can be found to achieve the same result. That is the argument that was made by the distinguished Senator from California; and basically, that is the administration's argument, that you can spend money more wisely, spend less and get more results, but in some other way.

It does seem to me that the big point is being missed here. I would like to see the administration be successful in all its programs for the good of America, and I wish President Nixon all the success in the world with his administration. I would hope, if he is beaten by a Democrat, it would be because the Democrats have more to offer, not because President Nixon failed to make a great President. I helped present his tax bill to the Senate, and voted for it, which is something I did not even do for a Democratic President; so that is going the extra mile, it would seem to me.

But when we look at something like this, the American people should keep in mind that there are two programs involved.

One is a program to encourage industry to train people for jobs, which is fine. That is great. But under that program the people that the present centers are trying to help will be the last to be reached because when industry goes out to seek someone to train for a job, they try to get the fellow who has the greatest potential. The people the Senator is trying to help, as I understand, are those people who, just on the face on it, would appear to have the least chance, as of the moment, and who would be the last selected by industry for training, unless someone reaches out and offers them a helping hand.

Therefore, these costs are very important, when you ask how is the best way to do it, and when one proposes a program leaving out the vocational part of the effort as an means of cutting costs, that to me is a very important item because, let us not kid ourselves, it is cost items that caused the closing of these centers.

Mr. NELSON. I thank the Senator.

I should like to say, before I proceed with my prepared remarks, that the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Schultz, and the Assistant Secretary, in my opinion, made very able presentations to the subcommittee. I think that they answered questions honestly. They were strong and able advocates of the position they took.

There is no doubt in my mind that the Secretary of Labor is as strongly committed to the idea of training young people for jobs, providing job opportunities, as the previous Secretary of Labor under the Democrats, or as any Member on the Republican side or the Democratic side of this body. I want that understood, because I was very much impressed with his testimony and my feeling of his commitment to do something about affording opportunities for training for young people.

I say this because I do not want this to be in any way a partisan matter. I was much stronger in my criticism of the closing of some camps when President Johnson was President than I have been at this time, because, as chairman of the subcommittee, I wanted to avoid being partisan.

My difference here has not been with the philosophy of the residential camp. The President of the United States, the Secretary of Labor, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, and I think most Members of Congress endorse the Job Corps residential center concept. The difference is, should we have 16,000 slots, 35,000 or 50,000? That is all; I am not debating or differing in any way with the philosophy.

The President, the Secretary of Labor, and the proponents of the Job Corps residential theory are in agreement. The disagreement is over how much money we should allocate for how many training spots in residential centers.

Mr. President, many thousands of words have been written and spoken about the Job Corps since the Assistant Secretary of Labor announced the cutbacks in this program on April 11.

For my part, I should like to bring the discussion back, for the moment, to the Job Corps itself, and to center a little attention on this small experiment in rehabilitating disadvantaged young people.

Much of the time in this debate we have been talking about procedural issues. And that is as it should be. A very important principle is at stake in this debate. A program established by the Congress has been drastically altered without any consultation with Congress.

Regardless how one might feel about the Job Corps, and certainly there is a genuine difference of opinion within Congress on this program, it seems to me that full hearings would be had prior to any major alterations in the program.

After the hearings have been had, it may very well be that a large majority of the Members of Congress would agree with the administration's position. I do not know.

There are two main issues involved in the administration's move to close 59 Job Corps centers:

First. Should they be closed without affording Congress a full opportunity to consider and evaluate the administration's proposal?

Second. How many training positions should be maintained in these residential-type programs?

It is clear from the President's February 19 message that it was his intent to afford a full opportunity for Congress and the public to debate and consider the poverty program before basic changes were made. There are, of course, valid criticisms of the Job Corps program and improvements and changes to be made. None of the problems is insurmountable. Each could be satisfactorily resolved by the joint effort of Congress and the executive branch.

On the question of residential-type centers, there is no dispute between Congress and the executive branch over the need or rationale for them. There is general agreement that a certain number of youth are benefited most by the opportunity to leave their present environment to live, learn, work and play in a residential-type center. Administration spokesman strongly endorses the concept at hearings before the Labor Committee.

The issue, apparently, is solely over the question of how many youth should we train in this type of center. The administration believes it should be half the current number while others believe these centers ought to be maintained at current levels or above.

It is my own view the program at the present level of 35,000 is much too small to accommodate more than a fraction of those who need and would benefit from this type program. So, at least, if the program is not to be expanded it certainly should not be cut back.

The Job Corps was established in title I, part A, of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. We have now had 4 years of experience with it.

According to the General Accounting Office—GAO—audits, obligations for the Job Corps have been as follows:

Fiscal year 1965, $196 million.

Fiscal year 1966, $309 million.

Fiscal year 1967, $210 million.

Fiscal year 1968, $282 million.

During that 4-year period, 223,000 youths have been served by the Job Corps, for varying periods of time.

During fiscal year 1968, the GAO reports, total direct operating costs for the centers in operation as of June 30, 1968, amounted to $221 million.

During that same year a total of 100,000 youths were served by the Job Corps centers. Thus the average direct operating cost for each youth served was about $2,200.

A great deal has been said about Job Corps costs, much of it misleading. I will discuss the cost matter in more detail later in my remarks.

Job Corps enrollment is limited to a total of 45,000 by law. Enrollment reached a high of 42,000 on June 30, 1967. In December 1967, budget reductions forced a cutback in the Job Corps, and 16 of the 122 centers were ordered closed.

Prior to the April 11 announcement by the Secretary of Labor, the Job Corps had 34,860 youths enrolled and a capacity of 37,469.

That current enrollment figure is of major importance.

The Job Corps right now is serving about 35,000 young people at any one time.

This is what the Job Corps dispute is all about.

The Secretary of Labor has ordered camps closed so as to reduce the number of enrollees by 16,404.

Thus, in round numbers, he wants to cut 16,500 positions out of a program with 35,000 positions.

At the same time, the Secretary of Labor proposes to establish, over a period of about 1 year, a new network of 30 "urban skill centers," often referred to as "minicenters," which will provide a total of 4,600 training positions once they are fully established. Not all will be directly comparable to the Job Corps. Some will be residential centers only, and their enrollees will be trained elsewhere. Some will be training centers only.

The Secretary of Labor intends to invest $24 million in these new minicenters in fiscal year 1970.

He intends to cut the budget of the Job Corps program as we now know it from $280 million to $156 million. This, plus the $24 million for minicenters, would total $180 million, for a claimed budget saving of $100 million.

These few facts draw the issue clearly. They spell out a series of major policy changes in the training of hardcore disadvantaged youth, all of which the Secretary of Labor proposes to carry out, or at least set in motion, prior to any action by Congress.

The major policy questions are these:

First. Should 16,500 training positions be eliminated from the Job Corps program?

Second. Should a new network of 30 urban minicenters be established?

Third. Should there be an overall cost reduction of $100 million in the budget for training the hard-core disadvantaged?

Fourth. In the course of these changes, should the concept of "conservation camps" be virtually abandoned? This is a separate issue which I will discuss later.

Even before taking up those questions on the merits, I think any Senator would have to concede that they are clearly policy questions on which Congress should express itself.

An attempt has been made to develop the argument that the Cranston resolution invades the area of "Executive prerogative." How can anyone argue that the answers to these policy questions are merely within the area of Executive prerogative and not the business of the U.S. Congress.

Now as to the merits of those questions.

First, as to the elimination of 16,500 training positions from the Job Corps program.

To me, it is highly questionable at this stage in our Nation's history that we would make a reduction of about 50 percent in this tiny Job Corps training program, which offers a unique package of services to our really hard-core disadvantaged young men and women.

As I analyze this question, there are only two reasons which could possibly justify the elimination of these 16,500 training positions:

First. If it could be shown that there simply is no need for this kind of training.

Second. If it could be demonstrated that the training as offered by the Job Corps has not been successful.

From the information made available to our committee so far, neither of these propositions can be sustained.

The uniqueness of the Job Corps is that it provides manpower training in worthwhile skills in a residential setting, where a comprehensive array of remedial services can be provided to the enrollees, carefully integrated with their job training program.

They receive complete physical examinations, their teeth are fixed, they receive counseling on personal matters such as hygiene, they are taught to live together with other young people.

They are tested to determine their level of education attainment. Then a program of basic education is laid out for them.

Incidentally, wherever possible this basic education program is closely tied in with the vocational training program which the trainee selects. For example, reading instruction is planned in terms of the job on which the trainee will be working. A young man learning to operate construction equipment will often be given reading lessons which use the language of his trade. Specially developed printed texts also tie the reading into the job, as do tape recorded lessons. Through this kind of intensive education—personalized attention from a specially trained teacher, specially developed reading materials, and tape recorders—young men who have wasted many years in the schoolroom are suddenly brought into the world of reading and working.

The variety of vocational training varies with the camps.

One of the finest training programs is at the Gary Job Corps Center at San Marcos, Tex. Here a Job Corpsman has a choice of 34 different vocations, including welding, masonry, carpentry, bricklaying, printing, heavy equipment operation, electrical work, business skills, food services, and many others.

The training program at the Gary Job Corps Center was developed with the assistance of a voluntary council which includes representatives of 100 industries. These industrial representatives help to plan the training programs, they donate much of the material and tools used in the camp, and they help to design the placement programs through which the young men flow into the labor market.

Incidentally, the program at the Gary Job Corps Center is so successful that many of the boys are hired away before they can complete their training. Many who are enrolled in a training program which is supposed to take a year or 18 months are hired at good paying jobs after about only 10 months. This success story, of course, helps to reduce the "length of stay" figures for the Job Corps as a whole, another example of how misplaced statistical criticism can be.

Not every camp is able to offer the comprehensive programs of the Gary center, of course.

But even the small conservation camps, with 100 to 200 enrollees, offer for the most part a fairly broad variety of training opportunities in the building trades—heavy equipment operation, carpentry, masonry, electrical work, painting, and in some cases, automobile repair.

Is there a need for this kind of training?

During our subcommittee hearings, Senator JAVITS asked the Secretary of Labor:

> How many job slots do you really need and how many is the United States furnishing, public and private, at the optimum?

The Secretary agreed to provide that information, but to the best of my knowledge, we do not yet have it from the Labor Department.

Others have attempted to assess the need in various ways.

The Kerner Commission reported as follows:

> In 1967 approximately 3 million persons were unemployed during an average week, of whom about 638,000 or 21 percent were nonwhites. When corrected for undercounting, total nonwhite employment was approximately 712,000 or 8 percent of the nonwhite labor force. . . . Unemployment rates are, of course, much higher among teenagers, both Negro and white, than among adults; in fact, about one-third of all unemployed Negroes in 1967 were between 16 and 19 years old. During the first 9 months of 1967, the unemployment rate among nonwhite teenagers was 26.5 percent; for whites, it was 10.6 percent. About 219,300 nonwhite teenagers were unemployed (after adjusting for Census Bureau undercounting.) About 58,300 were still in school but were actively looking for jobs.)

After careful consideration of all available data, the Kerner Commission came up with this table:

NONWHITE SUBEMPLOYMENT IN DISADVANTAGED AREAS OF ALL CENTRAL CITIES, 1967

	Unemployed	Under-employed	Total
Adult men	102,000	230,000	332,000
Adult women	118,000	266,000	384,000
Teenagers	98,000	220,000	318,000
Total	318,000	716,000	1,034,000

Thus the Kerner Commission tells us of 219,000 unemployed nonwhite teenagers in the Nation as a whole; a total of 277,000 nonwhite teenagers either unemployed or "actively looking for jobs"; and a total of 318,000 unemployed or underemployed nonwhite teenagers just in the disadvantaged areas of our large central cities.

On March 1, 1969, the Kerner Commission report was updated by the Urban Coalition and Urban America in a report entitled "1 Year Later." This report indicated that the Kerner Commission actually had underestimated unemployment among nonwhite teenagers. In the year between the Kerner Commission report, things had improved somewhat. However, the improvement merely seems to have corrected the under estimating. "1 Year Later" said:

> Black teenagers in poverty neighborhoods in the final quarter of 1967 had an unemployment rate of a staggering 34 percent, worse than even the (Kerner) commission had estimated. By 1968 it had been reduced to 27.3 percent. The gain was highly significant, but did not remove the problem of idle youth from the streets of the slums and ghettos.

In other words, according to "1 Year Later," the Negro teenage unemployment rate in ghettos was not 26.5 percent as the Kerner Commission had estimated but actually was 34 percent, at least in the end of 1967. By 1968 it had been brought down to 27 percent, about what the Kerner Commission had originally estimated.

To sum up, the "need" which Senator JAVITS asked the Secretary of Labor about can be conservatively estimated at from 200,000 to 300,000 just for nonwhite teenagers, and largely in the inner cores of our large cities.

But of course we know that the problem of poverty, substandard education, and unemployment is not limited to our large urban areas nor to nonwhites. Forty-one percent of poor Americans live in rural areas—according to a 1969 study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, "Rural Poverty and Regional Progress in an Urban Society." An estimated 14 million rural Americans live in poverty.

The Job Corps enrollment shows this; 25 percent come from rural communities of less than 2,500 population; 47 percent from medium-sized communities of 2,500 to 250,000, and only 28 percent from metropolitan areas of 250,000 or more.

Manpower authorities state that the total of unemployed and underemployed youth in this country, who are not in school, is in the neighborhood of 800,000.

We have gone into these figures in some detail to show that the need for services such as the Job Corps provides is staggering when compared with the tiny experimental program we have been operating.

We have a program for 35,000 young people out of a total unemployed group of youths which may be as great as 800,000, without any real knowledge of how many of those 800,000 require a residential training facility.

We are cutting Job Corps positions by 16,500 under the guise of strengthening the overall manpower program by adding 4,600 new training positions in urban areas—4,600 new positions to serve 200,000 to 300,000 unemployed teenagers in our central cities.

Faced with those figures as to the overall need, who can seriously argue that we should cut our Job Corps program by 16,500 positions?

Would all the weight of the evidence not indicate instead that we should expand this program?

Not if the Job Corps is an ineffective program, it might be argued.

So let us take a look at the effectiveness of the program.

And let us look beyond the headlines. I doubt if any public program in my memory has received the shallow, superficial and unfair judgments which the Job Corps has received.

Certainly no one would deny that the Job Corps has had its troubles.

Difficulties are encountered, of course, when any new program is set up.

But the Job Corps had more than just the "normal" difficulties. It had the difficulties which are inescapably encountered when you try to deal with the kinds of young people who the Job Corps was meant to serve.

The average Job Corps boy is 17½ years old. He has spent 9 years in school. Yet he reads at only a fourth- or fifth-grade level.

About 60 percent of the Job Corpsmen are black.

About 60 percent come from broken homes; 63 percent come from a household where the head of the household is unemployed. Also 60 percent of them live in substandard housing.

Half of them have parents with less than an eight-grade education.

One of the most astonishing figures of all is that, of those eligible for the draft, 63 percent—almost two-thirds—failed to qualify.

I wonder if Congress and the Nation realizes what it is like to operate a program that does not skim the cream from the top, but takes from the very bottom of whatever kind of rating system you want to devise.

These are the young people who have been failed by every other institution in American society—the family, the schools, the churches, the vocational schools, the employment service—you name it.

There are hundreds of thousands of them. We have taken a tiny slice of that vast group, that explosive mixture of the dissatisfied and disadvantaged, and tried to make them into full-fledged American citizens within a few months.

How have we done?

It seems that it all depends on whom you ask. The Job Corpsmen themselves, a number of whom have testified before our committee, praise the program highly. They say it has saved their lives.

All across the country there are thousands of community leaders who work with the Job Corps camps. They have been saying the same thing in the last 3 weeks, in letters which have poured into congressional offices.

The program also has been highly praised by religious and civic organizations, by organized labor, by conservation organizations, by the League of Women Voters, the National Association for Community Development, and many, many others.

But others will tell you "the statistics do not look good." It costs too much; the dropout rate is too high; too much money is being spent on too few people.

Well who is to say how the statistics should look like on a program such as this?

William P. Kelly, Job Corps Director, submitted the following table of costs to our subcommittee. This is the direct operating cost per man-year for the Job Corps for fiscal year 1969 through January 31, 1969:

Clothing	$231
Food	388
Medical care	315
Basic education	436
Vocational training	637
Safety, morale, and recreation	230
Guidance and counseling	650
Center operations and maintenance	2,265
Enrollee allowances	1,027
Enrollee travel	209
Total direct operating cost	6,388

In addition to these direct operating costs, the Job Corps spends money for such items as recruitment and placement of enrollees, program development and evaluation, equipment and rehabilitation of facilities. It is charged for certain amounts of overhead.

The Comptroller General computed the total direct and indirect costs for fiscal year 1968 at $8,300 per man year. Since Job Corps operating costs have been coming steadily down, that figure is probably a little high, but it is the one most commonly used in evaluating the program.

Whether you use Mr. Kelly's direct operating cost figure of $6,388 per man year, or the Comptroller General's total cost of $8,300 per man year, there are certain important facts to keep in mind.

In the first place, this cost varies greatly from camp to camp.

According to the "selection criteria" developed by the Labor Department for use in deciding which camps to close, the costs of the men's urban Job Corps centers are as follows, in order of cost:

Gary	$4,035
Atterbury	5,547
Clearfield	5,824
Breckinridge	5,966
Kilmer	6,170
Parks	7,245

Here is a range of $3,200 per man. Obviously, if you are going to make an indictment of the Job Corps concept on the basis of cost, it makes a big difference whether you are talking about a cost of $4,035 or a cost of $7,245.

This tremendous disparity in costs raises the question of whether we should be talking about the high cost which is inevitable in the Job Corps program, or whether, through better management, we should simply strive to bring the high-cost camps down to the same range

as the lower cost camps, and preserve the program.

One would think, in view of all the criticism of Job Corps costs, that one of the goals of the drastic revision of the program being carried out by the Labor Department would be the closing of high-cost camps and the retention of low-cost camps.

But the selection criteria used by the Labor Department do not indicate such a result.

Cost was simply one item out of six considered in the Labor Department rating system.

As a result, we have strange results such as this:

The camp at New Waverly, Tex., with the astonishingly low unit cost of only $3,436 per man, has been ordered closed.

Other low-cost camps ordered closed were Grants, $4,058; Winslow, $3,932; Cumberland Gap, $3,733.

I seriously question the judgment which results in the closing of a Job Corps camp operating for $4,000 per man or less. Those figures sound like a real bargain to me.

Another important fact to keep in mind is that all these costs are per man per year costs. That is, they assume that the man is enrolled for 12 months.

But the real cost per man must consider the length of time he is in the Job Corps program.

If the length of stay is 6 months, the actual cost is only one half the figures which are usually quoted. If it is 9 months, the cost is three-fourths or 75 percent.

Comptroller General Staats stated in his testimony:

> During fiscal year 1968, total direct operating costs for the centers in operation as of June 30 amounted to about $221 million and about 400,000 man-months of training were provided to about 100,000 youths who were in attendance at the centers for varying periods of time during the fiscal year.

You will note that he talks of $221 million for 100,000 youths—a direct cost of only $2,210 per youth served.

It certainly is correct that we are not pleased with the comparatively short average length of stay at Job Corps camps. But all the experience indicates that this is a fact which must be expected in dealing with hard-core disadvantaged youth. The turnover rate is high in all programs which seek to serve these young men.

But since that is a fact, it is only fair in assessing the Job Corps program to remember that these costs are averages, and they do not necessarily reflect specific conditions.

Both the GAO audit and the Lou Harris Job Corps study indicate that youths who attend the Job Corps even for a short period of time receive some benefit from the program.

So if you really want to talk about "average costs," the average direct operating cost of the Job Corps in fiscal year 1968 was really only about $2,210 for each youth served.

Another point to be kept in perspective, when we talk about costs, is this:

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES?

If Job Corpsmen, most of whom are dropouts from broken homes who can barely read and write, are simply left in their home environment, what will be the cost to society?

These young people come to us because they are unemployable. The Labor Department's employment service certifies that they are not employable and not suited for any other training program.

So what is to happen to them? There certainly is a likelihood that many will be drawing relief, that many of them will merely repeat the cycle of broken homes and joblessness which is causing our welfare costs to soar every year. A high percentage also will almost certainly be involved in misdemeanors and felonies, raising the cost of law enforcement, the courts, and our very costly correctional institutions.

If we try to serve them in some other program, what will the cost be?

Well, let us look at some comparisons.

First, the new minicenters planned by the Labor Department.

Arnold Weber, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower, testified:

> The new inner city residential support center we have currently priced out at $5,600. These are the small ones which will have 25 or 40 people and serve kids much as we have done in New Haven.

A number of comments must be made on that $5,600 figure.

First, it is considerably higher than many of the Job Corps camps which are being closed, even if you add to those camps' direct operating cost figure enough to allow for other costs, such as overhead and enrollee allowances.

Secondly, the New Haven center to which Mr. Weber referred provided no vocational training. It has been primarily a center for intensive treatment of the enrollee and his family. So we apparently would have to add substantial additional costs for training.

Third, our subcommittee has been unable so far to get really meaningful cost figures on the New Haven center.

Fourth, Mr. Weber concedes that these figures are only estimates.

He testified:

> They are ball park costs, they are a reasonable basis for planning.

Job Corps costs not only compare very favorably with the estimated costs of the new minicenters, but they also compare favorably with the program known as JOBS—Jobs in the Business Sector—operated by the Labor Department and the National Alliance for Business—NAB.

It is important to remember that the programs are not directly comparable.

The JOBS program serves an older age group, a group which generally is less disadvantaged in terms of education and family background.

But most important of all, the JOBS program does not provide many of the services which the Job Corps provides. It is not a residential center. The other remedial services provided to trainees are minimal when compared with the Job Corps.

Yet the Labor Department reports an average cost of about $3,000 for the JOBS program.

The director of the Wisconsin State Employment Service informed my staff that the average JOBS cost in Wisconsin is $3,500.

And remember, this does not cover any of the substantial costs of a residential center—such as the $2,265 per man for center operations and $1,027 for enrollee allowances.

The Labor Department signed a contract July 1, 1968, with the Hotel Corp. of America, in Boston, to train men and women as waiters, waitresses, cooks, stewards, housekeepers, cashiers, storeroom workers, and so forth.

The cost was for $719,690 to train 250 people.

This averages out at $2,878 per person.

However, this is only a 22-week program. Would it be fair to compute a "cost per man year" figure? If so, it would be extremely high.

Also, in order to compute the true cost of this program, you have to consider the substantial dropout rate in this program.

Here are the figures of the Hotel Corp. of America contract:

In New York, 130 trainees have enrolled—and 82 have dropped out.

In Washington, 53 have enrolled—35 have dropped out.

In Boston, 66 have enrolled—39 have dropped out.

These are dropouts rates of 60 percent to 66 percent. A Labor Department report supplied to our committee (page 237 of hearing record), states that 48 percent of JOBS trainees leave within 90 days compared with 55 precent of Job Corpsmen.

That not only has a great effect on the cost figure, but it also demonstrates dramatically that the JOBS program has the same problems as the Job Corps.

As you know, the JOBS program is very highly regarded. Almost all the publicity in regard to it has been favorable. Full-page ads have been run in newspapers hailing its success. The administration is planning to expand the program in the coming year—while cutting the Job Corps almost in half.

The great advantage of the JOBS program, we are told, is that the trainee already has a job before he begins his period of training.

As Assistant Secretary Weber testified:

> It (the JOBS program) gets people right on the job, and is based on the assumption that one of the best motivational factors is the provision of direct employment as it relates to training.
>
> Under the JOBS program, you have provision for job coaching, for counselling, for continued education on the job involving services which do not come within the compass of the Job Corps program which says, once you leave the camp . . . you are on your own.

Yet how do you square that characterization of the JOBS program with dropout rates of over 60 percent?

I regret that neither the Labor Department nor the Comptroller General was able to supply us with really detailed figures on the JOBS program. But I am convinced, from the figures we have seen, that if we made a review of the JOBS program, comparable to that which has been made on the Job Corps, that we would find the exact same situation—surprisingly high costs, discourag-

ingly high dropout rates, rapid turnover in jobs after training, and so forth.

No factual evidence has been presented to show that the JOBS program is a satisfactory alternative for the Job Corps, or to show that it is free of the high costs and high dropout rates which have caused the Job Corps to be so highly criticized.

There are many objective, factual measurements of Jobs Corps success.

Even the GAO audit, which was critical of Job Corps on the cost and dropout problems, found that "increased employability and earning power also appeared to be associated with the length of stay of Corps members at the centers, those who graduated being the most successful."

The GAO audit found—before Job Corps—that 43 percent of the enrollees were unemployed. After Job Corps it was 31 percent—a drop of 12 percent.

Before Job Corps, the average wage was $1.42 an hour. After Job Corps, it was $1.85, an increase of 43 cents an hour.

Lou Harris, who conducted the broadest and most extensive study ever made of Job Corpsmen, found these figures:

Before Job Corps, unemployment was 50%; after Job Corps it was 23%, a difference of 27%.

Before Job Corps, the average wage was $1.39 an hour; after Job Corps it was $1.84, an increase of 45¢.

The GAO audit contends that the obvious increase in wages and the decrease in unemployment is largely attributable to the fact that the persons have simply grown older.

The Harris survey specifically refutes that conclusion.

Through much more extensive sampling, Harris was able to compare people of similar ages, and in his opinion the findings completely refute the GAO conclusion that most of the benefits result from aging.

As Harris testified:

We were able to take a look at 1,291 Job Corpsmen who entered the Job Corps at the age of 17. We also have 1,094 Job Corpsmen who are now 17 years of age. Therefore, what we are looking at are those who entered the Job Corps at 17 and those who finished . . . who are 17 today. So we are comparing 17 year olds with 17 year olds.

When we do this, you can see, in terms of unemployment . . . if those 17 year olds had not gone through Job Corps, 45% of them would have been unemployed. But if we looked over to the current group, 34% of the 17 year olds are unemployed. If we look at the wage data, if they hadn't been to the Job Corps, they would be earning $1.41. But they are earning $1.58.

In other words, it helps the 16 year olds, it helps the 17 year olds, it helps the 18 year olds, in that the changes which have previously been seen are not a matter of the Job Corpsman simply growing older . . .

But overall statistics fail to tell the really dramatic story of what the Job Corps has meant in the lives of specific young men.

In testimony before your subcommittee, a spokesman for the International Union of Operating Engineers quoted a young man from Selma, Ala., who wrote:

I am making $4.35 an hour, 10 hours a day, with two hours overtime and working six days a week. Last week I made $209. Before I came to the Job Corps I was making $24.50 a week. Now I get more than that a day. The Job Corps did more for me in a year than I did for myself in 20. Another youth wrote from Cleveland, Ohio:

Tell all the boys to stick with it at the Job corps, because in the long run it pays off. We all (mentioning three other graduates) work nice and hard. I make $5.50 an hour. That is why I say it pays off.

Our committee has received individual testimony from a number of boys and girls which corroborates these results. They are not isolated cases.

The spokesman for the Painters Union testified before our committee:

Of the 38 centers that we were involved in, 21 of these were dropped (in the Labor Department closing order.) . . . We had hoped to place between 500 and 600 corpsmen per year into apprenticeship programs in our industry at an average starting rate of $2.80 per hour.

The spokesman for the Operating Engineers Union testified:

(At Jacobs Creek camp) we have completed classes in 1967 and 1968; 110 youngsters completed their training and 102 were placed—89 in the construction industry and 13 in the armed services, and some of the latter at advanced rates (ratings) because of their skills learned at Jacobs Creek. . . . They have averaged well over $3.55 per hour, and many are in the $4 to $5 bracket.

Mr. President, who can review figures such as those and not be impressed?

Who can look objectively at the results and call the Job Corps a failure?

What was this program supposed to achieve that it has not achieved?

A young Job Corpsman from Camp Kilmer, David Walker, put it very eloquently to our committee. He said:

I don't know what you people want . . . The corpsmen can't do no more. I know for a fact that every corpsman almost goes to class every day—every day. I don't know, you are asking for the impossible . . .

What more are we asking of the Job Corps?

Look at the "selection criteria" developed by the Labor Department.

This purports to rate all the Job Corps centers and camps. We have a right to assume that those which are being closed are considered "failures."

Let us look at one of those "failures"—Camp Tillamook in Oregon.

It has a unit cost of $4,900 per man year—lower than all but one of the urban Job Corps centers which are to remain open.

It has a placement rate of 75.8 percent.

This means that of every man who walks through the gate, including all the dropouts we have heard so much about, almost 76 percent of the men who leave that camp are satisfactorily placed in a job, have returned to school, or are in Armed Forces.

Can anyone cite another program, anywhere, with a better rate of success?

But we are pronouncing this one a failure.

What do we expect?

I think Congress deserves an answer. What are the goals of our manpower training programs which the Job Corps, as represented by camps like Camp Tillamook, have failed to achieve?

Camp Tillamook also raised the reading level of the average Job Corpsman 2.12 grade levels—with an average stay of less than 8 months.

Think of that. The average Job Corps conservation camp enrollee in fiscal year 1968 had spent 8.4 years in school but could read only on a 3.7 grade level and cope with math only at a 4.1 grade school level.

In 8½ years, that typical youth had progressed 3.7 grade levels in reading. In 8 months, Camp Tillamook lifted him another 2.12 grade levels, out of the functional illiterate classification, able to read instructions and hold a job.

For that, Camp Tillamook was rated as a failure.

Look at some of the other "failures."

Camp Winslow raised the reading level an average of 3.24 grades with an average stay of less than 6 months. It placed 59.2 percent of its men. It had an average cost of $3,932 per man per year—and it is rated as a failure.

Camp Hodgens raised the reading level of its men 2.98 grades in an average stay of just over 5 months. It placed 66.9 percent of its men. It had a cost of $4,301 per man per year—and has been rated a failure by the Labor Department.

If these camps are failures, then we are simply admitting that our whole effort to salvage hard core disadvantaged youths is a failure, because we have no directly comparable programs to offer them, and we have no programs even remotely comparable with a better record of success.

The fact is, these camps are not failures, and the Labor Department has admitted the fact.

When we pointed out a long series of fantastic discrepancies in the Labor Department's closing list, the Assistant Secretary for Manpower replied that it really did not make any difference if there were errors in the rating system because "we made a policy decision that 50 conservation camps should be designated for closure."

That is really how this all came about.

Somebody decided that the conservation camp concept was no good, and that 50 out of 82 of the camps should be closed—without any careful review whatever as to how good they were or how much they were accomplishing.

And remember, all of this was done without consulting the Congress or the director of the Job Corps program.

This is a special tragedy which deserves special mention.

The whole idea of conservation camps is being lost in the current argument over placement statistics, manpower slots, and so on.

There seems to be some idea that the conservation camp concept is a kind of fuzzy minded idea which corrupts pragmatic thinking in regard to manpower training.

Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Lou Harris study shows that the conservation camps have had the greatest impact of all in changing the lives of Job Corpsmen. After Job Corps, young men who went to conservation camps experienced an 83-percent increase in earnings; those in urban men's centers, 79 percent, and women's centers 64 percent.

Dr. David Paynter, superintendent of the Garden Grove, Calif., School District and former director of Job Corps conservation camps, testified:

> The conservation camps have the greatest impact in terms of changing the individual from his attitude of opposition to society. . . The conservation centers make the greatest contribution in producing a more positive attitude. This can be done better in a conservation center where they are working, where they are improving the land, where they are learning skills, and many are freed from the proximity of a large city and the opportunity of returning.

Similar testimony has come out repeatedly in our brief inquiry into the Job Corps program.

Yet there is no question but that the Labor Department is rejecting the conservation camp concept without even giving it a chance for a fair hearing.

Until late in 1968, there was a conscious policy of sending the young men with the poorest attainment scores to the conservation camps. All the statistics showed this. That was one reason why conservation camp training emphasized training on the job. These young men, over half of them illiterate, could not be simply put back into a classroom. First they were taught basic work attitudes and work skills. Then this was integrated into a classroom program of basic education and vocational training.

At last report, some 42 of the 82 Job Corps conservation camps had worked out arrangements with labor unions for high quality vocational training, leading to a union apprenticeship program and a career as a skilled union craftsman.

The work which conservation corpsmen have done in their on the job training is truly impressive. Under capable direction of career employees of the National Park Service, the United States Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, they have performed conservation work which the Job Corps values at over $66 million.

They have built camping and picnic facilities to serve an estimated 27,000 families; they have built picnic shelters, toilets, boat ramps, and water systems in public parks and forests.

They spent 333,000 hours fighting fires, 34,000 hours on search and rescue missions, 11,000 hours cleaning up after tornados, 10,000 hours cleaning up after floods, 10,000 hours cleaning up lakeshores soiled by dead fish.

This is valuable public service work—valuable both to the public and to the young men who learn to perform it.

Yet none of these benefits are taken into account in assessing the costs of the conservation camp program.

To show the closed mind which the Labor Department has toward the conservation camp program, the Assistant Secretary for Manpower not only rejected the idea of crediting the program for worthwhile work done in our parks and forests, but he went on to argue that the camps should be charged for the value of the land they were located on, which would raise the apparent cost of the program still further.

Mr. Weber testified:

> Even though it is free to the Job Corps (the park or forest land on which the camp is located) you should establish a price to it, and that is the price that that land could gain if it were put on the open market and subject to bids. If you really want to get an economic cost, that should be included in it.

Mr. Weber also suggested that perhaps the cost of materials used in conservation camp construction projects should be charged against the program.

Imagine, a corps of young men is brought into a national park or forest, working directly under supervision of National Park Service and U.S. Forest Service officials. They build park buildings, picnic tables, and so forth. Their program receives no "credit" whatsoever on the balance sheet for the work they perform. And now it is suggested that they be "charged" for use of the land they are working on, and "charged" for the lumber, the bricks, and cement they use in building park buildings.

What more dramatic proof can there be of the Labor Department's rejection of the conservation camp concept, a concept developed and written into law by the Congress strongly supported by the conservation movement in this country, and solidly proved by the results experienced in these camps over the past few years.

(The following colloquy, which occurred during the delivery of Mr. NELSON's address, is printed at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent.)

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. The point has been made that it is difficult to explain to some father who is making $12,000 a year and sending his boy to college why we should spend so much money to help some disadvantaged child and keep him from spending the rest of his life in misery and poverty, on skid row or in the penitentiary, a boy or girl who has no opportunity or perhaps had no father to give him or her any guidance at all.

The point occurs to me that in the year in which I entered college, my father was making $12,000 a year as a U.S. Senator. He was assassinated.

About two-thirds of the money spent to pay for college education is not paid by their parents, but by the State or Federal Government. It was certainly that way at Louisiana State University. We had a program which tried to make it possible for young people to go to the university with nothing more than the shirts on their backs and work their way through college.

Many of these individuals today are financially well-off and outstanding citizens of our country. Generally speaking, most of those who go to college are the children of advantaged families that might have to dig a little deeper into their pockets and do without some of the luxuries they would like to have. However, those families can find a way to provide an education for the young children.

If we look at the amount of money we are spending—$60 million a year for Harvard University—and then analyze where it is going, I think we will find that in most instances it is going to young people whose families are middle and upper income families, and that those who graduate from the university will be even better off.

When we look at the amount of money concentrated at the Federal, State, and city levels, particularly if we include all of the tax deductions we are giving to these foundations that are making donations and the favorable tax treatment to those who make contributions to college institutions and others, directly and indirectly untold billions of dollars are being poured into helping the advantaged young people achieve even greater advantage and be able to serve themselves and, hopefully, their Nation.

When we look at what little is being done, however, to help the most disadvantaged children of the country, one would certainly make the case that even if it does cost more money to help one of those disadvantaged children have a chance in life, it is something that should be done, even if we fail to get the money back later.

Some things ought to be done simply because they are right, because they are good for people, or because they are in line with one's morality or conscience, quite apart from the cost.

The cutback, so far as I can see, is a case of putting the dollar figure ahead of the needs of people. I would certainly hope that the administration, even at this late date, would offer to be as conciliatory about the matter as the President and the administration have been about the war in Vietnam and the ABM. I would hope that they would consider the very able arguments being made, such as those being made by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and the junior Senator from California, and seek a meeting of the minds whereby we would try to resolve the matter in terms of what is right and best for the people.

I hope this will not be regarded as a partisan victory for one side or the other. I hope that it will be a case where men of good will try to do the best they can for people.

As I understand it, they are saying, "We would not close the Job Corps camps until you have had a chance to study the matter and Congress has had an opportunity to pass upon the program with all of the facts before it." Am I correct?

Mr. NELSON. The Senator is correct. We had a little debate on the matter earlier. The junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) said that the administration is offering an opportunity for all of the young men and women in the camps to get into an alternative program.

I am satisfied that the administration will accept any offer that is taken up by any young man or woman in the camps and will perform on their promise. I think the Secretary of Labor and, I am sure, the President intend to do what they have said.

The problem is that we have been talking with some of the young people in Camp Catoctin, Md., and a couple of them have said, "You take a young man, pull him away from home. He is in camp a month or 2 months. He is having a difficult time becoming adjusted. He has never been away from home before. Now you are going to send him somewhere else."

They are there now. Why not let them complete their program?

I have doubt about the sincerity of the administration to perform on their offer to the young man who undertakes to accept it. However, what about the young man who says, "I give up. I am going to go back home." The administration will have no ability to do anything about that.

The Senator from Louisiana mentioned that the Job Corps kids are disadvantaged.

On a comparative basis, at least, a large percentage of the kids in vocational training programs in this country, in colleges, and apprentices in unions, for example, are advantaged young people, compared with these kids with whom we are dealing. They have parents who had steady work, and who were able to give them the best of loving care. They were not in broken homes.

By comparison, what is the profile in the Job Corps? The average Job Corpsman is seventeen and a half years of age. They did not fail society. Society failed them. The average Job Corpsman has spent 9 years in school, but he reads at only the fourth- or fifth-grade level. Not because he is unintelligent. The school system he went to was no good. The Senator knows that and I know that. Many of these kids are of a very high degree of intelligence, but they just did not learn to read and write because they did not get the chance. So they are reading at a fourth- or fifth-grade level.

Sixty percent of these kids are black. Sixty percent—six out of 10—come from broken homes. Think of it. Six out of 10 are from broken homes. Sixty-three percent are from households in which the head of the household is unemployed, and in a good percentage of the instances in which the head of the household is employed, he is underemployed.

Sixty percent live in substandard housing. Half of them have parents with less than an eighth-grade education.

One of the most astonishing figures of all is that despite the fact that they are 17½ years of age, and should be in their prime in health and vigor, 63 percent of those eligible for the draft—almost two-thirds—cannot qualify for military service, either for physical reasons or because they cannot read and write.

This is the profile of the young man or young woman with whom we are dealing. The school systems already have failed them. Society already has failed them. Yet, we are supposed to take this bunch of kids—who, incidentally, were not drafted—who said, "I want to learn something. I want to learn so I can make a contribution to society." They have volunteered to come to camp. They come into that camp, and we are supposed to have in 6, 8, 10, or 12 months a several times better success record with them than all of society and the whole school system has had with them during the previous 17 years of their lives. It cannot be done by any mechanism at all.

I have looked at all these statistics. I have been in Job Corps camps. I have talked with these kids. I think the program is a success—unless you have some standard that is so high that you could never meet it; then all programs are a failure. Half of all the kids who enter college from middle-class families drop out before they finish. What about that statistic? Is that supposed to prove that the college system is no good? We have a high dropout rate here, but I think we are accomplishing a great deal. It is an experimental program.

For the first time in the history of America, we undertook to get to these young people and train them and give them an opportunity, and they undertook on their own to come and participate in the program.

I would hope that we would decide that out of the hundreds of thousands of kids around this country who ought to be in a program like this, we at least can maintain position—slots, if you will—in residential centers for 35,000, and see if we can work out a program and continue to improve it and arrive at a solution and a formula from which we will learn, as we are learning, how to get to these young people more effectively than we are. That is the objective. It is small; it is a pilot program. It should be 35,000 in my judgment, not 18,000.

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

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. When the President got ready to send to Congress a tax message indicating what should be done with regard to the fiscal problems of the country, he showed some of us on the tax-writing committees and the Appropriations Committees the courtesy of inviting us to the White House and discussing his budgetary and fiscal problems, and inviting our suggestions. May I say that there is no doubt in the opinion of this Senator that the President was 100 percent sincere. He was not just asking us there to talk at us. He wanted to have our suggestions, because some of the things that some of us suggested found their way into the President's message, and we know they were not there prior to the time he invited us to the White House. He did, it seems to me, try to move in a spirit of bipartisanship and thinking in terms of what was best for the country.

I do not mean to be critical, but those of us on these committees really are not the experts in the war on poverty. The experts in that area should be found in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in the Senate, for example.

I ask the Senator whether the senior members of his committee were invited to discuss this problem with the President prior to the time the announcement was made that these Job Corps centers were being closed.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator please repeat his question?

Mr. LONG. Was the Senator or the senior members of his committee, and their counterparts in the House of Representatives, accorded the opportunity to discuss this proposal with the President prior to the time the announcement was made that these Job Corps centers were being closed?

Mr. NELSON. No; we were not consulted on the changes in the Job Corps. We had a discussion with Mr. Moynihan on the poverty program in general on February 18. Then the President made a speech on February 19, in which there was a paragraph that I thought was clearly addressed to the whole poverty program, in which the President stated that he wanted to see full congressional debate and public discussion, including hearing from those who are involved and who would benefit from the program. In that message, he asked for a 1-year extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. I assumed, as I think everybody else did, that this meant there would just be an across-the-board, 1-year extension of the entire program, and he would come in with his recommendations, as the President said, prior to June 30; that we would consider those, and then have hearings and make a change for next year.

As to this part of the program, which is small overall, the administration decided that they would cut the Job Corps in half and start some "mini" centers, which could not be opened, surely, before next fall. I did not discuss any of that prior to April 11, the day the Secretary of Labor announced that 59 Job Corps camps were to be closed.

Mr. LONG. The thought that occurred to me is that the President of the United States has gone the extra mile so repeatedly in trying to reach agreement with those on the Hill who had an honest difference of opinion, that I find it somewhat surprising that this type of impasse would occur; because the Senator makes such fine argument that I should think it would have been considered and we would not be debating this matter on the floor today.

Mr. NELSON. I think we ought to consider the merits, at least on continuing the program until the kids in it complete their classes, and until the new residential centers they are talking about do open up, and until Congress has had an opportunity for full discussion. This is something on which perfectly honest people can disagree. One person can look at the statistics and say that the program is a failure, and another person can look at the statistics and say that the program is a success, depending on what one anticipates should be accomplished.

If one anticipates the program should accomplish twice as much as it has, then it is termed a failure, or if it has fulfilled as much as one anticipates, then it is a success. As far as I am concerned the Job Corps camps have accomplished at least as much and more than I would have anticipated from my acquaintanceship with this kind of a program. That is why I think it is a good program. We do have Senators who think it should accomplish twice as much as it has and, therefore, that it is a failure.

I think we should have time for full debate before they move to close the camps.

Mr. LONG. I thank the Senator. It seems to me that there is such a crying need to help people in this category, these youngsters who have no hope unless someone does something to help them, that the fact that some of them drop out and some of them are unable or unqualified to take full advantage of the opportunity accorded them, should not cause one to dismiss the program. One should

think in terms of how many persons it has managed to help and how many were able to improve their condition. I believe the study on that point is somewhat impressive in that many of these young people could find employment, were able to work at better wages, and begin to move up the ladder.

I believe the figures indicate that to be true, do they not?

Mr. NELSON. I have been very impressed with the results. I might say that I went to one of the conservation camps a couple of years ago. On an individual basis I asked 27 young men the same question—"Why did you come here?" All but one gave the same answer in different words. What they all said was, "I came here to learn something so I can make a living." In effect, that is what they all said except one. He said, "Senator, I came here to learn to read and write so I can get into Uncle Sam's Army. They won't let me in now."

I talked to one of those kids for a good half hour. He was 5 feet 3 inches and weighed 115 pounds; he had gained 10 pounds since he had been there. He was 18 years old. He had left home when he was 15 years of age. He was from Harlem. He had ridden the freight cars across the country, he went to Chicago, and then he left Chicago and went to Texas.

I said, "Why did you leave home?"

He said, "I did not have any money."

Remember, he was 13 years old at the time he left home.

I said, "Why did you leave home?"

He said, "Because I do not have a father, and my mother can't feed me."

I asked, "Why did you leave Chicago?"

He said, "It gets cold sleeping in warehouses in the fall."

He made it to Los Angeles and he did all this between the ages of 13 and 18, or for a period of 5 years.

I said, "What did you do?"

He said, "Sometimes when people took a vacation I would sleep in their houses. I bummed food, I stole food, and I lived on the streets of Los Angeles for 5 years."

Then, he came to the Job Corps because he heard about it. He could not read and write the word "cat." Yet he was a very, very intelligent boy. He had gone to school for 6 months in the first grade; that is all. He was very intelligent.

I asked, "Why did you come here?"

He said, "To learn something so I can make a living. You don't want me on relief all my life, do you?"

I said, "I sure don't."

What better motivation could one ask for? If only one case out of five were a success it would be a successful program.

Mr. LONG. The alternative is that the same young man, for failure to earn an honest living, might have found himself a pistol somewhere and found he could exist by robbing grocery stores or holding up filling stations, and perhaps eventually killing some honest businessman who wanted nothing more than to do business legitimately. All that could happen because nobody provided that youngster a chance in life.

Nobody is putting on the dollar scale the worth of that businessman's life. Then, the boy goes into a life of crime, or perhaps peddles narcotics, or anything that comes along because he has had no opportunity.

Mr. NELSON. Or he goes on relief.

Mr. LONG. Or fathers droves and droves of children without claiming paternity so that the mother then claims welfare.

(This marks the end of the colloquy which occurred during the delivery of Mr. NELSON'S address and which was printed at this point in the RECORD by unanimous consent.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I am happy to be a cosponsor of the pending resolution submitted by the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), calling on the President to delay the closing of Job Corps centers until Congress has had the opportunity to revew this problem thoroughly.

The closing of 59 of the 106 Job Corps centers and conservation camps would eliminate more than 17,000 openings for hard-core disadvantaged young people. Approximately 13,000 young men and women would, so to speak, be thrown to the wolves. The administration assures us that those trainees unable to be placed in jobs or proposed mini-centers will be absorbed into existing manpower programs. This is unrealistic and oblivious of the fact that one reason the Job Corps was created is that it is a last attempt at reclaiming broken and hopeless youth when other programs cannot or will not.

The average Job Corps trainee reads at a fifth-grade level. Sixty-four percent are dropouts or have been expelled from school. Sixty percent are from broken homes.

It is a fact that there was some maladministration at the outset in the operation of the Job Corps. It is a fact that in the beginning there were too many high-paying jobs and too many frills. However, in the 4 years since its inception most of these problems have been corrected.

Furthermore, we have learned that much of the overhead cost of Job Corps centers is fixed and that small centers such as proposed by the administration tend to be proportionately more expensive. It is very questionable whether the proposed mini-centers that are now to be opened in urban areas will actually result in a saving of taxpayers' money.

The President claims that his proposal will save $100 million in fiscal year 1970. The point of the Job Corps is to save lives, not dollars. We must not overlook the human factors involved—that many of the young people now enrolled in the Job Corps will lose the will to keep trying even though they were making progress in their present centers. We will in effect be telling the underprivileged, poverty-stricken youth of America that we have given up on trying to make a real effort to help them join the mainstream of society.

If hundreds of thousands of untrained, ill-educated youth drift into the stagnant pool of unemployables, they will cost the Nation much more in the long run in crime, drug addiction, and higher welfare costs. More small training centers in the cities are envisaged, but the overall effect still will be to scale down the job training program.

We are spending more than $30 billion of taxpayers' money a year in our involvement in the ugly civil war in Vietnam—all blown up in smoke. In that undeclared and immoral war we are spending more than $100 million every day of the year. How can we justify dismantling the Job Corps program, designed to provide youth now without hope with training and jobs, in order to save $100 million, when we willingly spend that amount every day in a little country 10,000 miles distant from our shores, a country which is of no economic or strategic importance to our Nation? Compared with our expenditures on defense and space, this proposed saving is ridiculously small. Some saving may result, but the social injury will be far more expensive in the long run.

The administration and Congress should take a second look at this proposal. I commend the Senator from California for his leadership in the fight to save the Job Corps and strongly urge that his resolution be agreed to by the Senate.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the 59 Job Corps centers chosen for closure by the Nixon administration is the Kicking Horse Center, near Ronan, Mont. As in the case of the other 58, there are some very good reasons to object to the decision.

I believe those objections were ably expressed in the committee's report on Senator CRANSTON'S resolution which asks that any action to close any Job Corps center be delayed until Congress has had an opportunity to review the program. It is a resolution I gladly cosponsored.

There is no need for me to review here the findings of the committee majority as set forth in the report. It is enough for me to say that I agree with the report, particularly where it describes the Department of Labor's criteria for closure as "arbitrary and unreliable."

If these criteria—length of stay, 30-day dropout rate, and so forth—were the only considerations, and I have no reason to believe they were not, then important individual characteristics of each Job Corps center, which might have had a determining role in whether the center was to close or continue, were either unknown or neglected.

Mr. President, the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center serves as a perfect example of what I mean.

The Kicking Horse Center is one of three Job Corps centers in Montana. The other two are called Trapper Creek and Anaconda. A quick comparison of the Department of Labor's rating of the three centers shows that they are not far apart in performance.

The per enrollee training cost was $4,461 at Kicking Horse and $5,368 and $5,491 at Trapper Creek and Anaconda, respectively. Length of stay was virtually the same at all three camps. The placement record, on which the Department of Labor placed so much emphasis, was 66.3 percent at Kicking Horse, 67 percent at Anaconda and 68.6 percent at Trapper Creek. The one area that caused Kicking Horse to fall below the level at which the centers were to be kept open was progress in reading.

When the news went out that the Kicking Horse Jobs Corps Center was

among those to be closed, many Montanans reacted with justifiable rage. They knew what the administration did not know, or, if it knew, what it did not choose to consider:

That the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center is the only Job Corps center in the Nation that is truly oriented to the training of Indian youth.

As I told a Job Corps official after I learned of the decision:

Because of their isolation on reservations, it has been difficult to interest Indian youth who have dropped out of schools in such programs as the Job Corps.

Some of the early trainees were prone to go AWOL to a greater extent than boys from the eastern centers. These particular problems with the Indian trainees have just begun to be worked out. The Kicking Horse Camp is on the threshold of its greatest significance to the Indian boys who are being trained there.

Despite the early history of the camp, the Kicking Horse Center has compiled a solid record. John Belindo, executive director of the National Congress of American Indians, testified before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

The Kicking Horse Center has a lower cost per man-year than 25 centers that will remain open, its percentage of Category I graduates (those who finish the full program) exceeds that of 22 Centers that will remain open, the average length of stay exceeds that of 17 Centers that will remain open . . . "

Mr. Belindo added that the Kicking Horse Center had helped 298 Indian boys and had contributed nearly $1.5 million worth of recreational, conservation, and community development programs to the area. He said:

When the closing order was announced, the Kicking Horse Center, which has a capacity of 200 young men, had 197 in attendance with four additional Indian corpsmen on the way. There were already 121 Indians in attendance, in addition to 74 non-Indians.

An amazing part of this story is how the community feels about the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center, for, as we all know, community relations were a sore point in the early history of Job Corps centers. In this case, the community is the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, for the Kicking Horse Center is located on the Flathead Reservation of western Montana.

In the contract with the Federal Government under which the Job Corps was granted land on which to build the facility, there was a clause that provided that the land and facilities were to revert to the use of the Consolidated Tribes as a community center at no cost, should the Job Corps center be discontinued for any reason.

In spite of this feature which guaranteed to the tribes a new community center in which $1,200,000 of Federal funds has been invested, the community let it be known that it wanted the Job Corps center to remain open. This is what Harold W. Mitchell, Jr., tribal chairman, said:

This is the only predominantly Indian center in the United States. Its loss would be another example of the disregard by the Federal Government of the needs of the first Americans. We strongly urge reconsideration of this decision and request you to keep Kicking Horse open. It has an outstanding record and the impact of its training of Indian youth is just beginning to be felt.

Furthermore, on May 2, the tribal council unanimously passed a resolution asking the Department of Labor to reconsider its decision and retain Kicking Horse Job Corps Center as a predominantly Indian center.

When the facts were brought to the attention of the Department of Labor, it sent an inspection team to make an on-site appraisal of the Kicking Horse Center. I understand that this was one of the few camps so favored.

As a result, the Department of Labor announced last week that, while Kicking Horse would in the Department's words "be phased out as of the end of June 1969," there would spring up in its place a new Northwest Indian Manpower Skills Center.

The new center, we were told, would have a capacity of 150 Indians, drawn from Montana and the Northwest. It would serve adults as well as youth who would be offered a broadened range of training based on a survey of the occupational needs of the area.

The Department of Labor went to great pains to explain that there would be significant differences between the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center and the Northwest Indian Manpower Skills Center. That may be. I do not know, for the details of the new skills center have not been worked out.

But I would like to point out what Mr. Belindo so aptly pointed out in his testimony—that the administration declared during the 1968 campaign that it would be its policy to carefully study the administration of Federal programs affecting Indians "to provide maximum efficiency consistent with program continuity."

If the Kicking Horse operation is disrupted, then, I ask, "How is that consistent with the administration's pledge for program continuity?"

Furthermore, the administration also pledged:

The right of self-determination of the Indian people will be respected and their participation in planning their own destiny will be encouraged.

If the resolution of the Consolidated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation is ignored, then, I ask, "How is that consistent with the administration's pledge to respect Indian self-determination and planning?"

I repeat that we do not yet know how the new manpower skills center will differ from the Kicking Horse Job Corps Center.

If the new center becomes basically what the old one was, that is, an operation dedicated to the vocational training and education of young, disadvantaged Indians in an environment in which they feel familiar and comfortable, then that is just fine with me, no matter what the bureaucrats choose to call it.

Personally, I prefer the color and romance of the West that was implicit in the name Kicking Horse. To forestall any confusion that might arise in the transition, I am toying with this name, to be used in letters to concerned constituents: "The Northwest Kicking Horse Job Corps Indian Manpower Skills Center."

But the name is not important. The function is. In that spirit, Mr. President, I submit that an on-site appraisal conducted at each Job Corps center scheduled for closure might turn up, as it did in the case of the Kicking Horse Center, good and substantial reasons for the administration to reconsider its decision.

Should that happen, I think this body would risk any confusion caused by a wave of new names.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I wish to lend my voice in support of Senate Resolution 194, which urges the administration to defer its action to shut down the Job Corps centers until Congress has had the opportunity to complete its normal authorization and appropriations processes on this program.

In discussing the shutdown of these centers, it appears easy to become embroiled in complicated sets of figures of cost analysis, and the like. These considerations are not unimportant; however, I believe the most important consideration is the human cost of these closings. For example, it appears that many of the enrollees in the affected centers have already left their Job Corps camps or have become so disillusioned as to indicate no interest in continuing in other manpower programs. These enrollees are severely disappointed by the administration's precipitate action. It is not clear to us, and certainly not to them, that adequate plans exist to provide for an orderly transition to other manpower programs. More important, it is unclear that the needs of the present Job Corps enrollee would be adequately met by the types of manpower programs the Department of Labor hopes to induce the enrollees to join. Enrollees in the Job Corps are among the most disadvantaged youth in our Nation, and a large percentage enter functionally illiterate. Other manpower programs such as MDTA and the JOBS program are not specifically aimed at developing basic skills, attitudinal and work habits for these enrollees, but rather concentrate merely on occupational skills.

Hawaii's Job Corps center has received an order that it would be shut down. However, the Department of Labor has recently indicated that this decision is being reevaluated. Yet, it is not clear to me what purpose or whose welfare is served if the Koko Head Center is shut down, with a mini-center to be established later in the same place. To illustrate what I believe to be the poor planing involved in the decision to shut down these Job Corps centers, let me cite the case of the Koko Head Center. Approximately 80 percent of the enrollees in our Koko Head Center are those from Guam and the Trust Territory of the Pacific. If the Koko Head Center should be closed these enrollees would be forced to travel an additional 3,000 miles to another Job Corps center to complete their training. Parenthetically, I should note that a number of Job Corps centers in Cali-

fornia have also been ordered closed, which would force these enrollees to travel farther away to a stranger environment. While Hawaii is located a great distance from many of these enrollees' homes, there are some similarities with their previous life to mitigate against the homesickness and feeling of foreignness.

In announcing the closing of the Koko Head Job Corps Center, it was also announced by the Department of Labor that an entirely new center was to be established and designated as an urban skills center. The implication underlying the Department of Labor's decision was that the present Job Corp center was inaccessible and quite removed from the urban area of Honolulu. However, as it later came out, the new center which was to be established was merely 5 or at the most 10 minutes closer to the heart of Honolulu. This clearly demonstrates to me the total lack of planning in the decision to close these Job Corps centers. I am certain that this example could probably be duplicated by others with Job Corps centers in their own States.

As I mentioned earlier, the Department of Labor has indicated that the Job Corps center at Koko Head would be reevaluated, probably retained, and later turned into an urban skills center. This is welcome news; however, other Job Corps centers around our country deserve the same consideration as the Koko Head Center may receive. Yet it is still unclear to me whether the present Koko Head Center will be closed down now only to be later reopened as an urban skills center.

My basic concern is for the Job Corps enrollees themselves. What will become of them? I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the end of my statement several letters which other members of Hawaii's congressional delegation and I have received from enrollees themselves describing the effects of the Job Corps centers on their lives.

As has been adequately covered in this debate on this resolution, some of us in Congress believe that little planning went into the decision to shut down these centers. Upon examination it would appear the decision to close out a major portion of the centers was made first and efforts to find justification for the 50 to be closed followed. The Congress has the responsibility and the duty to look into this matter and should be permitted the opportunity for a more complete review of the entire action and the future direction of the Job Corps.

Rhetoric often creates dreams and expectations that cannot be fulfilled and those of us in Congress are often guilty in this regard. However, many hopes and dreams have been dashed by the closing of Job Corps centers. It was to build just such hopes and dreams, in those with little cause for hope, that Job Corps was established in the first place.

I urge this administration to keep that hope alive—I urge Senators not to provide additional justification for those who would condemn our Government as being heartless and unconcerned with the future of those who are not a part of the "establishment." I urge the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Hawaii?

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

KOKO HEAD JOB CORPS CENTER,
Honolulu, Hawaii.

To my CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: I think Job Corps is important because I feel there's a lot of good future in the corpsmens who are in the Job Corps. And I personal feel that the fellow people who brought out the idea about Job Corps had a good thing going. I feel very sorry that some of the Corps center have to be close down, because I myself know how it feels. I feel that Jobs Corps should continue not only because people have troubles at home or any other places, but people like the Job Corps because what they do for the corpsmens who are already in the project of the Koko Head Job Corps or any of the Conservation Centers, it means a lot of great honor to the fellow corpsmens. Job Corps has done a lot for me in education and though our work is different from the outside schools but we still learn the same thing.

Sincerely yours,
Corpsman ZACHARIAS M. LORENZO.

KOKO HEAD JOB CORPS CENTER,
Hawaii, April 10, 1969.

To my CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I think Job Corp is important because it provides training for boys who find it hard trying to go to school outside. It also keep them from getting in trouble with the law etc.

I think Job Corp should continue or the crime wave is going to get larger and get out of control.

Job Corp in the few months that I've been here has given me an opportunity to do some things that I have most often thought of doing. It has stopped me from doing some of the things that I used to do before I came here. So please take me into consideration thank you.

Sincerely,
WILKIE K. HAYASHIDA.

KOKO HEAD JOB CORPS CENTER,
Hawaii, April 14, 1969.

To my CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I love Job Corps.

J. MIURA.

KOKO HEAD, HAWAII.

To my CONGRESSIONAL REPRESENTATIVE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIRS: According to the newspapers this morning, it's makes me lot of crying, because I know how Job Corps helped me. As far as Job Corps is concern, it will helps me to have a very good life future. Or I learned many things that I never knew before. And also job corps stop me from making trouble in my Country. So I think it is good to be continue because it's gives me from thinking some thing that is not fair.

Sincerely yours,
E. HADLEY.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the administration's decision to shut down 59 Job Corps centers—including the Catoctin Job Corps Center in Maryland—is indefensible. It is wrong. It is arbitrary. It cannot be justified.

On the basis of an arbitrary rating system using out-of-date statistics, the administration has chosen to turn 17,000 of the Nation's most disadvantaged and potentially hostile youngsters out on the streets at the peak of the summer. It decided to do this without even consulting the Director of the Job Corps or visiting the centers it victimized with its meat ax.

The administration's decision to emasculate this effective antipoverty program comes just a month after its decision to spend upward of $7½ billion to deploy a dubious missile defense system. The destruction of the Job Corps to help pay for useless military hardware demonstrates a cynical disregard for the real needs of the American people. It indicates, once again, that the administration has seen fit to make the poor people foot the bill for its courtship with the military-industrial complex.

The administration's ABM and Job Corps decisions turn logic upside down and national priorities inside out. The ABM will be deployed even if it is worthless. The Job Corps will be destroyed, whatever its value.

The principal victims of the administration's meat ax are the conservation centers—the Job Corps camps that have served the most destitute poor. Fifty of the 82 conservative centers—including Catoctin—have been ordered to shut down.

In all, nearly one-half of the 36,000 Job Corps enrollees will be sent back to the streets by July 1.

For the past 4½ years, the Job Corps, particularly through its conservation centers, has provided a ray of hope for the most hopeless and disadvantaged young people in the Nation;

Ninety percent of the corpsmen have been school dropouts.

Two-thirds, including more than 90 percent at the conservation centers, have entered the Job Corps as functional illiterates.

Sixty percent entered unskilled.

Fifty-six percent were unemployed.

Sixty percent came from broken homes; 27 percent from families on relief.

Sixty-eight percent of the corpsmen entered Job Corps from families where the head of the household was unemployed.

The Job Corps was their only hope. It is a cruel blow to extinguish that hope. It may, however, be an even crueler blow to our cities this summer. Turning 17,000 disillusioned corpsmen loose to roam the streets this summer is an open invitation to violence. According to the Kerner Commission report, the corpsmen are, by and large, the same kind of youths who did the burning and looting in more than 50 American cities during the 1967 riots.

It would also be interesting to know why in its eagerness to condemn the Job Corps for its high operating costs, the administration neglected to consider the constructive contributions corpsmen have made to this country.

Since the inception of the Job Corps in 1965, corpsmen have completed conservation work projects valued at more than $70 million. In the last 8 months alone, they have completed more than $14 million worth of work in our national parks and forests. In addition, during fiscal year 1968 more than 4,000 corpsmen voluntarily contributed more than 400,000 hours in emergency services to

this Nation, including more than 330,000 hours fighting fires. That is no small contribution from a group of youths who without the Job Corps likely would have contributed nothing at all.

Unfortunately, the administration chose not to use such rational criteria in its rush to close Job Corps centers. It never even considered them. Administration officials did not even go out to the centers to see what the corpsmen were doing. Rather it chose to arbitrarily assign point values to out-of-date statistics and close productive job training centers on the basis of those points totals.

There is little doubt that the administration arbitrarily rated the centers. It gave the Angell Job Corps Center, for example, a rating of 8 for its 63.0 placement record, while it gave Catoctin a rating of only 5 for its 64.0 record. Because the administration then doubled the value of the placement record, the Angell Job Corps Center earned 16 points for the placement category to only 10 for Catoctin, even though Catoctin actually had a better record.

Nor did the administration use the most current Job Corps statistics. Had it done so, Catoctin would have ranked favorably with the centers the administration intends to let remain open.

The administration, for example, listed the operating cost at Catoctin at $4,482 per corpsman per year, though the current actual cost, according to most recent Job Corps statistics, is only $4,051 per year. Similarly, the administration used 5.76 months as the figure for the average length of stay of Catoctin corpsmen. The most recent Job Corps figure is 6.3 months. Had the current figures been used, Catoctin would have come out with 46 points on its tally sheet—or two points more than it needed to be kept open.

Clearly, closing productive Job Corps centers on such criteria cannot be justified. What is most alarming is that with their inability to rationally justify their decision, administration officials are pointing to confidential OEO reports alleging incidences of gang rapes, homosexuality, and drug abuse at Job Corps centers. Not only is this a cheap and disgusting tactic, but it is a malicious distortion of the facts.

One report, for example, alleged 22 cases of narcotics during the first 6 months of 1968 at the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey. As the Senate District Committee's recent narcotics hearings revealed, if the staff of the 1,700 man Kilmer Job Corps Center could keep the narcotics incidences down to 22 cases in 6 months, they should be commended for their efforts. What the administration's hatchet men did not report was that within the past month 10 Kilmer graduates were sworn in as police cadets of the Baltimore Police Department and nine more became Washington, D.C., police cadets.

Certainly, the Senate of the United States cannot stand idly by as the administration takes the low road to arbitrarily destroy a working job-training program. The Job Corps should be expanded, not destroyed. The Senate must have the opportunity to consider pending antipoverty legislation before the administration wields its meat ax.

In accepting President Nixon's appointment as Director of OEO, Congressman Donald Rumsfeld alluded to "the voices we have lost amid the shouting—the voices of quiet anguish; the voices that speak without words, the voices of the heart.

"We are all poor, regardless of where we live," he said, "when we fail to heed these voices."

In its decision to close 59 Job Corps centers, it is quite obvious this administration has failed to heed these voices.

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I am pleased to support Senate Resolution 194, in which I have joined our distinguished colleague, Senator CRANSTON, and 30 other Senators in sponsoring the resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that administration action to close 59 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation should be deferred until Congress has an opportunity to review the matter in depth during the course of its normal authorization and appropriations process.

Mr. President, the intent of Congress in approving the Job Corps program, as stated in the Economic Opportunity Act, is as follows:

> To assist young persons who need and can benefit from an unusually intensive program, operated in a group setting to become more responsible, employable and productive citizens, and to do so in a way that contributes, where feasible, to the development of national, state and community resources.

The act further goes on to state that—

> Enrollees will participate in intensive programs of education, vocational training, work experience, counseling and other activities.

In short, Congress recognized in approving the Job Corps program that problems of the hardest core unemployed could never be completely resolved by placement, training, and development programs, and that programs of a remedial nature will always be with us. Such factors as broken homes, failure in school, inability to read and write, lack of self-confidence and motivation, neglected physical defects, and other developmental deficiencies have roots that go deep. Too often they produce an individual whose habits, attitudes, motivation and skills are wholly inappropriate to a working environment, unless special and intensive remedial attention is applied. Moreover, the ills of the ghetto youth cannot be cured unless he is enabled to get away from the neighborhood environment and often the family environment itself.

Mr. President, I believe it is generally agreed that whatever the underlying reason for the administration's decision to close this series of Job Corps centers, it was based upon insufficient factfinding. Indeed, it is difficult for me to find any rationale or purpose which warrants calling the action by the administration a program for meeting the needs of inexperienced, unskilled, deprived youth possessing an innate sense of unworthiness and destined for a bleak future.

If the administration was convinced that expansion of the inner cities program was a wise course of action, it needed but $100 million to go after the problem. Instead of bolstering the program, however, it proceeded to cut the present Job Corps program by $130 million to secure funds for this purpose. I cannot see where any economies have been realized through this action, particularly in light of the cost of phasing out the programs and the resultant loss of capital investment.

In a detailed and urgent letter to the President, dated April 14, 1969, I explained my position on the Job Corps programs. I ask unanimous consent that that letter appear in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of my remarks. Additionally, I believe several points I raised in my letter to the President are reinforced in an editorial which appeared in the May 7 issue of the Washington Post, and I therefore request that this excellent editorial also be included as part of the RECORD.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I should like to say that when one measures the resultant savings to society as a whole—in terms of those enabled to find a secure and productive place in our society, the increased tax dollars, the reduction in cost of welfare and crime in the community, State, and Nation—the Job Corps is an economical venture. Without it, we must reconcile ourselves to increasing community instability and delinquency and crime. Until more creative and dynamic means of dealing with our seriously deprived youth are evolved, I cannot envision a humane society and people permitting these programs to be reduced.

I fully support Senate Resolution 194, and oppose the administration's decision to go ahead with its intended closure of the 59 Job Corps centers without first consulting with Congress. I look forward to adoption of the resolution and the administration's cooperation in postponing the closures so that we can all avail ourselves of the opportunity of determining whether Job Corps and other proverty programs have been worthwhile, and how they may be enabled to become more efficient.

There being no objection, the letter, enclosures, and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As a cosignatory of the recent telegram sent to you by Members of the Senate expressing concern over the decision to close certain Job Corps camps throughout the Nation, I should like to request additionally that most serious reconsideration be given to reinstatement of the four Job Corps Conservation facilities planned for closure in my own State of New Mexico. These facilities are: The Eight Canyon Civilian Conservation Center in Otero County administered by the Interior Department; and the following Civilian Conservation Center programs of the Agriculture Department's Forestry Service: Grants (Valencia County), Luna (San Miguel County), and Mountainair (Torrance County).

Enclosed are statistics and data I have gathered which appear to have been overlooked in reaching decision with respect to closure of these camp sites. In this connection, I should like to add the following observations which I hope might be of assist-

ance in re-evaluating the importance of these Conservation Centers.

As you know, the elements of our population being served by the Job Corps programs come from backgrounds of severe deprivation and poverty, have not had the benefit of any community-based remedial programs that might exist, and are almost wholly less than functionally illiterate. Hence, we are dealing here with young people who come from an inadequate home and/or community, possess an innate sense of unworthiness, and as a result have neither the the aptitudes nor attitudes necessary to make them employable under the most liberal of hiring criteria. Thus, despite the availability of meaningful work-training programs for these Job Corps enrollees at these camp sites (see Table 1) and the added advantage of on-the-job experience, it is the inculcation of remedial social adjustment, work habits and attitudes, and self-confidence gained under the Job Corps programs which are just as essential to their success as any training and skills they acquire.

The dramatic success of the Job Corps Conservation programs in my own State in instilling proper values, motivation, and a sense of participation and community responsibility in these seriously deprived youth has been well documented. It is reflected in the total placement rates contained in the attached Table 2, resulting from placement in jobs, return to school, or entry in the military. Considering the fact that these young people have for most of their lives been 100% dropouts, these placement rates are a significant achievement and a criterion for the success of these four specific programs. Moreover, they compare favorably, and in some cases exceed the over-all national placement average for Conservation Center enrollees (60 to 65%), and hence I am at a loss to understand why these four centers were chosen for closure over and above others in the Nation.

Among other noteworthy, ancillary benefits which speak well for these Conservation Centers is their success in maintaining enthusiasm and discipline among the Corpsmen, and hence in stemming the tide of alienation and juvenile and adult crime in the decades ahead.

With the proposed phasing out of these Job Corps Conservation Centers, not only could a substantial segment of these young people (794 in my State of New Mexico) be adversely affected, but additional hundreds of New Mexico youth (a total of 2,355 since inception of the program in January, 1965) participating in other Job Corps programs throughout the Nation may suffer a devastating setback if forced to return home. And special problems will be created in accommodating those youth who cannot or should not return to their home environment and families. Indeed, because of further serious effects on the morale of these young people, it would not be surprising if they matured into failures, at great cost to themselves and the community.

Moreover, Mr. President, in speaking of these four specific Conservation Centers in New Mexico, we are also talking about jobs and money going into counties and communities that cannot build the economic base necessary for self-sufficiency. Experience gained through the closing of 16 Job Corps Centers throughout the country last year indicates that the economic impact of similar closures in these severely depressed counties of New Mexico will be equally and in all likelihood even more devastating.

As Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Economic Development, I am deeply involved in finding ways and means for improving the economic, industrial and environmental bases of economically depressed areas of the Nation. It is no exaggeration to state that a County such as, say, San Miguel County, New Mexico—which has an unemployment rate of 9.7% and a below-poverty-level median family income of $2,409 annually—could literally "dry out" as a result of the Luna Conservation Center leaving and the concomitant withdrawal of $1.1 million in Job Corps expenditures within San Miguel County. And of course 59 counselors and other employees at the camp would become jobless.

Nor can the Job Corps programs be viewed as "make-work" projects. In a society confronted with a huge backlog of public service needs in its parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools, colleges and universities, libraries, hospitals, rest homes, public buildings—indeed, throughout the public and non-profit sector of the economy—the appraised value of conservation work accomplished by the Corpsmen at these four camps alone represents a step forward in attacking these immense needs. As you are well aware, it is only by fully mobilizing *all* of our available human resources through such programs as these that the task of renewing our environment can be undertaken and the cycle of poverty broken.

In short, Mr. President, the conditions described above in and of themselves justify, and indeed demand, not a process of retrogression in our *remedial* (as distinguished from *preventive*) programs for severely deprived youth, but, rather, efforts to improve and expand economic and social opportunities for them. When one measures the resulting savings to society, the Job Corps program is an economical venture. Without it, little is likely to be accomplished in helping these young people.

There must, in fact, be no let-up in providing the specialized, intensive, remedial orientation which these youngsters are in dire need of and which the Job Corps programs are structured to make available to them in order that they might become acceptable for further training. Until these young people take on another status, they must be entitled to the highest presumption of remedial potential.

I would hope, therefore, that the Labor Department will rethink and consider separating its *remedial* programs from, rather than linking them inexorably with, other manpower programs of a preventive or other nature. The remedial problem is rapidly multiplying itself, and that is why I sincerely believe the Job Corps programs must be seriously re-examined in terms of their effectiveness for those seriously deprived youth in need of social, emotional and other adjustment before they can become responsible, employable, and productive citizens.

It has also come to my attention that the legality of the proposed closures is in question on two counts. First, Section 106(e) of the law requires that 50% of male enrollees be in conservation centers. However, the proposed closures would leave open but 32 conservation centers, with a total bed space of 5,300. Approximately 8,000 enrollees will be left at the remaining four urban men's centers and at least 3,000 male enrollees at the new Residential Manpower Centers to be opened by the Labor Department. These estimates would indicate that the proposed closures will result in the number of male enrollees in conservation centers at a figure well below 40% of the legal requirements.

Secondly, there appears to be some question as to whether the Secretary of Labor has the authority to proceed with these closures prior to the effective July 1, 1969 date of transfer of Job Corps activities from OEO to the Labor Department.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I am hopeful that in light of the climate of concern over reducing the Job Corps program, that—simultaneously with Congressional hearings on the subject—a thorough re-examination will be conducted by the Labor Department of the Job Corps program, including on-site inspections. I would fervently hope, too, that as a result of inquiries into the influence of the program on the seriously deprived, the rate of their progression, and the over-all economic benefits the program has generated—and unless more creative and dynamic approaches can be substituted—that action will be forthcoming to reinstate and expand these constructive programs in view of the important and extremely fundamental contributions they are providing.

Respectfully submitted,

JOSEPH M. MONTOYA,
U.S. Senator.

TABLE 1.—TRAINING DATA ON 4 NEW MEXICO JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE

1. GRANTS CENTER

[Since inception of the program at the Grants Center, there have been approximately 131 similar projects carried on for a total appraised value of $1,308,538]

Vocational skills [1]	Typical 1969 work projects and appraised value [2]	Typical community projects
Auto mechanics, carpentry, culinary arts, cement masons, heavy equipment operator, welding.	Tobo Canyon road project ($200,000); coal mine campground ($74,000); parking lot, McGaffey ($3,000); forest road improvement ($15,000); cattle guard construction ($10,000); Guadalupe cabin (Grants ranger district) ($6,000).	Community cleanup (San Rafael, Milan, Grants); putting up Xmas decorations (city of Grants).

2. MOUNTAINAIR CENTER

[Since inception of the program at the Mountainair Center, there have been approximately 121 similar projects carried on for a total appraised value of $1,086,402]

Auto mechanics, carpentry, culinary arts, bricklayer, cement mason, heavy equipment operator.	Sandia ranger station construction ($60,000); Foothills road construction ($80,000); Priest Mill Road ($50,000); Colorado water line ($30,000); Cole Spring Conservation Center rehabilitation ($14,000).	Recreation development (Manzano Range).

3. EIGHT-CANYON CENTER

[Since inception of the program at the Eight-Canyon Center, there have been approximately 88 similar projects carried on for a total appraised value of $887,874]

Auto mechanics, carpentry, culinary arts, bricklayer, cement mason, heavy equipment operator.	White Sands picnic area ($30,000); Otero boys camp ($18,000); Eagle Creek Road ($58,000); juniper eradication ($66,000); Harley well and pipeline ($13,000); Sienega recreation area development ($22,000).	Clean up city dump; Boy Scout camp (Otero); assist Indian tribes as needed.

Footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—TRAINING DATA ON 4 NEW MEXICO JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE—Continued

4. LUNA CENTER

Vocational skills [1]	Typical 1969 work projects and appraised value [2]	Typical community projects
[Since inception of the program at the Luna Center, there have been approximately 87 similar projects carried on for a total appraised value of $760,375]		
Auto mechanics, carpentry, culinary arts, bulldozer operator, motor grade operator, welding.	El Pueblo water system ($16,000); Gallinas cabin ($14,000); ski basin campground ($10,000); Santa Fe spike camp ($15,000); Colonias road construction ($75,000); Penasco warehouse ($35,000).	Clean up local cemetery. Numerous responses to requests from Luna townspeople.

[1] These training courses are structured training standards developed by industry and the unions (carpentry, engineering, etc.) which entitle corpsmen, upon completion, to an apprenticeship status in the trade, from which they progress on the job to the journeyman status. Further promotion is, or course, dependent upon individual capabilities.

[2] Appraised value is defined as the cost of the project if done by formal contracting methods

Note: All centers contribute to development of economic, industrial, and recreational assets for the entire State.

TABLE 2.—DATA ON 4 NEW MEXICO JOB CORPS CONSERVATION CENTERS SCHEDULED FOR CLOSURE

Name of center	County	Capacity	Annual median family income	Percent unemployment rate	Annual Job Corps expenditures in the county	Fiscal year 1968 cost per Job Corps enrollee	Value of facilities	Value of equipment	Consumable supplies [1]
Eight-Canyon (Interior)	Otero	200			$1,023,804	$5,484	$934,297	$405,878	$175,000
Grants (Forest Service)	Valencia	160	$5,615	5.3	1,057,925	5,048	912,420	278,463	175,000
Luna (Forest Service)	San Miguel	224	2,409	9.7	1,140,246	4,148	[2] 816,779	319,577	175,000
Mountainair (Forest Service)	Torrance	210	3,568	8.5	1,080,608	4,088	862,813	333,283	175,000

			Overall placement of enrollees					
Name of center	County	Appraised value of conservation work	Number of employees	Percent placed in jobs	Percent returned to school	Percent entering military	Total placement	Average wage of all placements	Agerage wage of graduates
Eight-Canyon (Interior)	Otero	$887,874	52	59.0	6.4	1.1	66.5	$1.52	$1.58
Grants (Forest Service)	Valencia	1,308,538	52	54.4	3.4	4.8	62.6	1.51	1.64
Luna (Forest Service)	San Miguel	760,375	59	57.3	10.2	3.9	71.4	1.53	1.59
Mountainair (Forest Service)	Torrance	1,086,402	52	54.5	2.7	1.3	58.5	1.56	2.12

[1] Food, clothes, nails, lumber, etc.

[2] Old military base.

Note: Enrollees at conservation centers are almost totally "functional illiterates," i.e., defined as the 6.8 grade level by Dr. Douglas Porter, of Harvard. At these 4 centers, the average enrollee reads at the 3.7 grade level and has a 4.2 grade-level proficiency in mathematics. Only about 6 percent read at the 6th grade level, and many are nonreaders and non-English-speaking.

[From the Washington Post, May 7, 1969]

TREAD SOFTLY ON THE JOB CORPS

The basic mistake the Nixon Administration may be making about the Job Corps as it seeks to close 59 of the 109 centers and to shift the rest from OEO to the Labor Department, is in assuming that it is only a job-training program. Anyone who has ever been at a Job Corps center the day a batch of recruits piled off the bus will know it isn't. Unkempt, unsociable, unwell, unlearned, their condition adds up to a frozen unfitness for anything, not to mention job-training.

Officials dealing with the poor are fond of the term *the disadvantaged* in describing Job Corps youth. Disadvantaged? They read and add at fifth grade level. Fifty per cent have never seen a doctor or dentist. Sixty-four per cent have been either thrown out or pushed out of school. Sixty per cent lived in substandard housing. Sixty per cent are from broken homes. Add to all this the fears, neuroses and suffering that statistics can't get to, and the term *disadvantaged* becomes a puton. At best, the average Job Corps youth is seriously sub-disadvantaged, so far at the bottom of society's barrel that until Job Corps, no scraping was thought possible.

The Administration, sensitive to charges that some 13,000 trainees will be thrown to the wolves when the 59 centers are closed, has busily given assurances to everyone that those trainees unable to be placed in jobs or other centers will be absorbed into existing manpower programs. But this is unrealistic. One reason Job Corps was created in the first place is that it is a human renewal program, a last-stand try at reclaiming the broke and broken youths when other programs can't or won't. Programs in the Manpower Development and Training Act and Concentrated Employment Program are meant for the pleasantly "disadvantaged," not the unpleasant kind in Job Corps.

Sides have been forming in recent weeks on the fate of Job Corps. Last week the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee cleared a resolution calling on the President to hold up the shutdown. It is scheduled for the Senate floor Monday. Meanwhile, Nixon aides are now holding confidential files alleging a high incidence of gang rapes, homosexuality and drug use at the Job Corps centers. Presumably, the Administration may use this information, if things get tight, as a trump card to persuade Congress that it's better to let Job Corps die.

Aside from the cheapness, the tactic would be based on a distortion. The headlines describing the files may say, for example, that the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey had 22 cases of narcotics in the first six months of 1968. Yet Kilmer's 22 narcotics users represent a relatively small proportion of the 1700 total in the center, whose officials should be congratulated if that's actually the full dimension of their drug problem.

The genesis of all this is President Nixon's trimming of the $280 million budget currently set for Job Corps by the House and Senate to $180 million. This cut allows him to tell taxpayers of another $100 million saved. But next to defense and space money, the saving is ridiculously small. Job Corps never had the funds it needed in the first place. Economy driving now only adds fiscal insult to social injury.

As for the injured, a few showed up here last week. A busload of students, faculty and Job Corps trainees on a 25-hour ride from northern Michigan testified before the House Education and Labor Committee. They said simply that the Job Centers are worth preserving.

Reports from individual centers around the country reveal that trainees at the axed centers are shocked and depressed at he Administration's action. Others, too beaten by the odds to react, have slipped off quietly. They may have misinterpreted the signal from on high as an invitation to get lost. But that is how they read it, nevertheless. And the message the Job Corps centers are sending back to the Administration in return is in the words of Yeats: "Tread softly, because you tread on my dreams."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, with reference to the administration's plan to cut out more than half of the Job Corps centers in the United States, I would ask your indulgence to express for the RECORD my personal feelings about the tragedy that will result if one of these facilities—a women's center in my own State—is closed.

I would like to relate the Clinton, Iowa, story.

Let me make it clear at this point that the good intentions of the administration and Secretary Shultz are not in question.

But their rationale for making this precipitate move is in severe question.

Their logic is not convincing for the simple reason that it fails to take into adequate consideration the most important factor involved—the human quotient.

This is a factor that should unite all Americans who are concerned about conserving our American society in its intended image.

The administration set up certain criteria for judging the efficiency of the Jobs Corps program which might be valid if we were dealing with a normal cross-section of American youth. We are not. This is the hardest of the hard-core. They come from the dirtiest, ugliest, and unhappiest environments you will find in America. They already have virtually reached a point of no return, at the average age of 18 in the case of the girls at the Clinton Center.

It is a classic understatement to call them simply "disadvantaged" youth. They are the miserable ones, hopelessly mired in poverty, malnutrition, ignorance, and hopelessness. Half of them have never seen a doctor or a dentist. About one-fifth of them are unwed mothers. Many have already been touched by the insidious influence of crime, dope, and prostitution. They are the legion of the condemned. It is toward these, the most hapless victims of our society, that the Job Corps program is precisely directed.

Therefore, the Job Corps program, as I understand it, is not simply another program of training to be judged by the same standards as any other program of training. It is, in its third and most important dimension, a program of human redemption.

Its trainees are not just dropouts from school; they are dropouts from life. Its purpose is not only to train these young people in the elementary arts of life and to give them skills which will enable them to support themselves. Its higher purpose is to restore these young people to the sunlit mainstream of human life, to give them hope for the future that they never had before, and a faith in the benign purpose of this great society that proudly calls itself the land of the free.

Judged by this standard of human values rather than statistics, I can tell you from personal experience that one Job Corps center has not been a failure. But a magnificent, moving success. I have no reason to believe that the same appraisal does not apply to other Job Corps installations, as well.

Every good American is concerned about the polarization of races and of the haves and have-nots that presently threatens to pull our Nation apart at the seams.

Every thoughtful American knows that what we need to meet our unprecedented crises is a unified America, from Manhattan to the Golden Gate, from the blue lakes of Maine and Minnesota to the Deep South.

We must think and act as a Nation if we are to endure as a Nation.

The Secretary of Labor has adduced—as one of his main points for junking the present going Job Corps centers in favor of mini-centers, more widely distributed throughout America—the assumption that the centers will be more economical to operate and less subject to dropout if located near the home environments of the trainees.

In making this point, the Secretary completely misses one of the great values the Job Corps has given us—that of pulling the United States together, obliterating the ugly stain of discrimination, and reducing the narrowing influence of regional parochialism.

Also missed in the assessment is the basic point that many of these young people benefit from being far removed from the environment in which they would be certain losers to a completely different set of circumstances in which they have a chance to find themselves and start a new life.

Mr. President, let me now tell you the Clinton story.

About 3 years ago, at a time when I was serving as Governor of Iowa, the Job Corps announced plans to move a women's Job Corps center into the excellent building facilities in Clinton that had formerly been the location of a veteran's hospital.

Clinton is a small city of about 35,000 that represents the best Iowa has to offer in community living. Beautifully located on the Mississippi River, Clinton, like other Iowa communities, has a rural flavor. But it is a progressive city that can compare with any other community of its size in the United States in its initiative for attracting industry. Its citizens are self-reliant, stable, and predominantly conservative. There are probably no more than a couple of hundred black citizens in Clinton, with only a small sprinkling of other racial minorities.

When the Job Corps installation was announced, a wave of apprehension swept over the city. The girls who would be coming in would be drawn largely from the rural poverty areas of the South. Seventy-five percent would be black, with the rest divided between whites, Mexican-Americans, and Indians. They would be hard-core cases—young people who had been deprived of the most rudimentary advantages, semiliterate, unruly, without working skills, and even ignorant of how to conduct themselves at a restaurant or how to buy something at a store. Some were unwed mothers; many had been in trouble with the law.

What would their impact be on a stable, law-abiding, quiet city like Clinton? How would the local police be able to keep order? Would the sons and daughters of Clinton citizens be contaminated by the example of these restless trainees who had known nothing but misery and trouble in their lives? Would the peaceful community life be disrupted when male intruders came in on weekends to visit the Job Corps trainees? What would be the impact on the business community when an effort was made to place these girls in on-the-job training situations?

How did it all turn out? I do not want to give the Senate an account that glosses over the true facts. I do not need to. There were some incidents involving the Job Corps girls, yes. But no more than involved any other segment of the youth population.

And the way that the people of Clinton took these young, unimaginably handicapped girls to their hearts and helped them find their way back to a life worth living is one of the great stories of America. So is the story of how these youngsters responded and learned to believe in people again—or perhaps for the first time. So is the story of the job that the crack professional staff of the Clinton women's center did, with the help of volunteer workers, to restore the self-confidence of the trainees and teach them vocational skills and—even more important—such elementary matters as personal hygiene, how to keep house, how to cook, and how to take care of children.

Some of the letters I have received about the closing of the Clinton women's center tell the story better than I possibly could.

A citizen of Clinton writes to express his utter bewilderment at the closing of the Job Corps center:

If they are concerned with economizing, there are many other areas which might be brought into focus.

He points out:

The cost of 2 hours of the Vietnam War will more than pay the cost of operating the Clinton center for 1 year.

The chief of police, who retired in 1967 after 35 years of service, and who had first-hand experience with the discipline situation relating to the Job Corps girls, writes:

I urge you to assist in any way possible in keeping the Clinton Job Corps center open. I believe that the Clinton center has helped girls learn skills and basic education necessary to make a living.

The mayor of the city has, from the beginning, been one of the center's most enthusiastic supporters and I have conferred with him often about the program.

The municipal judge is convinced that these girls from 40 different States, 60 percent of whom are from Southeastern States and three-quarters of whom are black, did not cause any more problems in the community than any other group of 900 girls would have caused.

A man and his wife who live in the nearby community of Dewitt write:

We have had opportunity to observe the training program and its results. We have entertained trainees in our home and have become acquainted with their problems and hopes for the future. We are also personally acquainted with some of the volunteer workers in the enrichment programs at the center and know of their enthusiasm for the changes that take place in the future of the girls. We also firmly believe that the only solution to the ills of this Nation lies in the training of underprivileged persons that they and their children may have equal opportunities to achieve the "American way of life."

An Episcopal rector writes:

Can we, as Americans, afford to cut $100 million from the war on poverty and racism?

Another pastor, a Lutheran, writes of the contacts he and members of his congregation had with the Job Corps girls. Through these contacts, he relates:

My people have changed their attitude and feel positively toward the work being carried on at the center.

The superintendent of schools praises the work of the Clinton Center in helping "certain young people make a turnaround from a potential welfare client to a productive citizen."

Each person so re-directed—

He continues—

becomes a national asset rather than an economic liability to our society.

The superintendent goes on to make a final point that I think is especially worth noting.

The Job Corps—

He says—

has been in operation long enough so that we have some notion concerning the weaknesses of the program, and can, therefore, concentrate our efforts on improving it in terms of those known weaknesses. To establish a new program would mean that we

would have to go through this effort all over again.

Another Clinton citizen expresses the fear that if there is a time lag between the closing of the Job Corps and the establishment of adequate replacement programs, the disappointed trainees might "return to their homes and spread the word that the Government talks out of both sides of the mouth."

An angry Clinton housewife writes:

What is wrong with you people in Washington? Why are you letting our young people down? Are you going to throw 900 young women back into the streets and the ghettos?

Finally, I would quote you a few sentences from the letter a young Indian-American girl, Fay White Calf, wrote to President Nixon:

I shudder to think where I would have been if it hadn't been for Job Corps.

She says:

I have discovered talents in myself I didn't know I had. I've learned to understand and get along with people of other races, something I had never done before.

I've learned to appreciate the modern conveniences of life and I now have the desire to work for them instead of waiting for them.

I have learned that there are people in this world that can be trusted.

I really dread the day when the Job Corps will close. Because if it closes before I have the chance to get what I came here for, I know I will be a disgrace to my family when I go back to the way I was living before.

It seems appropriate to conclude the reading of these letters with this eloquent plea from this Indian-American girl who represents that group in affluent America that is the most wronged and most deprived of all of the minorities in our land.

I do not know what the new administration expects of a facility such as the women's center at Clinton. I do know that this center recruited a top professional staff from 112 colleges and universities, with 26 percent minority representation on the staff. I do know that during the last 2½ years, 225 girls succeeded in getting high school equivalency diplomas. I do know that the collaboration between community and center was something great and special on the contemporary American scene.

I appreciate the thoughtful and carefully prepared testimony given by Secretary Shultz before both House and Senate committees. I take in good faith his statement that economy is not the main reason for the administration's decision to shut down more than half of the Job Corps centers. I would not deny that he has made a case on the basis of the criteria he has used for judging the effectiveness of the Job Corps.

I simply say that in setting up his criteria, he has left out the most important criterion of all—the human value quotient.

In terms of redeeming for useful living young Americans who, through no fault of their own, had hit the bottom and seemed beyond reclamation, the Clinton Women's Job Corps Center has been an inspiring success.

The Clinton Center has enabled the people of one midwestern community—people I consider highly representative of the vast majority of decent, compassionate citizens of America—to learn at firsthand to know, understand, and accept as equal citizens the poor, the deprived and the nonwhite from faraway parts of the country. If this be a worthy objective for the Job Corps, then here again the Clinton operation was very successful, indeed.

Mr. President, we must never lose sight of the fact that these Job Corps trainees were enrolled from the dregs of humanity. They were "the least of these" in our society. If we bear this realistically in mind, we will realize that the dropout figures that have been cited were not alarmingly high, but amazingly low, dropouts, by the way, were about 17 percent at the Clinton Center.

No Federal program in the poverty sector has worked against greater odds than the Job Corps. No program has been directed at a more desperate need in our society.

The provisions the Labor Department has made for taking the place of the Job Corps program may look convincing, on paper, to some observers.

I can only say that, in my view, they are diffused, inadequate and off-target.

I am sure that the closing of the Job Corps centers looks to the poor people of this country and to the racial minorities like a breach of faith on the part of the white, undeprived majority in our society.

I am aware that Secretary Shultz has indicated that all of the present Job Corps trainees are being interviewed by Government counselors and encouraged to fit into some other niche in Federal training and employment programs for which they might qualify. But the Job Corps program was unique in its application to the cases of last resort. I have seen nothing else on the horizon that is beamed directly at the needs of these hard-core young people. The danger in dispersing these people over the landscape of the Federal bureaucracy is that many will think they are being politely told to "get lost."

All I can tell you is that if we let these pitiful kids "get lost" at this point, it will be our civilized society itself that will be lost in the long view.

In justice to these disadvantaged people and to our own consciences, I would ask your support for the resolution to defer the closings.

No one claims that the Job Corps program has functioned perfectly or that it has fully met the needs of the hard-core, impoverished, unemployable youth of America. But it has been something where nothing existed before. Aimed precisely at an area of most desperate need in our society, it has stood as a symbol of our best and most compassionate national effort.

Mr. President, we cannot, we must not give up in our effort to reclaim these potential dropouts from life. We need to increase our work in this area, not reduce it. We need a maximum effort, not a mini-effort.

As I think of the Clinton story I have related to you and how it proved that people will rise to compassion and understanding if given the opportunity, I am reminded of the familiar words:

Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethern, ye have done it unto me.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I rise to speak in support of the decision of the administration and the Department of Labor—a decision made after careful and thoughtful deliberation—to cut back on the Job Corps program in the interests of establishing a much more meaningful and effective overall national training program for the unskilled and disadvantaged youth of our Nation. Therefore, I am unable to support Senate Resolution 194.

The President's judgment that much better results will be obtainable through the delegation of responsibility for the operation and administration of the Job Corps program from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Department of Labor is sound.

The Secretary of Labor's determination that more efficient training and a significantly higher placement rate in productive jobs for trainees will flow from reducing the scope of the Job Corps program and integrating it into an overall pattern with the other training programs operated by the Department of Labor is also sound.

Both of these decisions, Mr. President, represent a new and creative approach in our attempts to solve one of the major problems which has faced our country in recent years, and both deserve the strong support of the Senate.

The first point I intend to make—and one which cannot be overemphasized—is that not a single trainee in any Job Corps camp scheduled for closing is going to be turned loose on the street or abandoned.

This fact has not been given the publicity that it should have received, despite numerous and repeated statements on this point by administration spokesmen and the Secretary of Labor.

This fact has not been accepted by my colleagues on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee who hold honest convictions that no reduction in the size of the Job Corps program should be made.

More importantly, however, it has been ignored and twisted by certain groups, including, I have reason to believe, employees of Job Corps and OEO, which have been desperately searching for an issue to use as a strawman for the purpose of precipitating a "confrontation" with the administration in the hope of discrediting it in the eyes of the American people as an administration concerned about the problems of the uneducated, the unskilled, and the disadvantaged.

Misrepresentation, phony slogans, and false emotionalism are the hallmarks of these groups in their attempt to make it appear that we are acting with a callous disregard for the welfare of our young people and that, by permitting the Secretary of Labor to close certain Job Corps camps, we are dooming many of them to lives of despair, poverty, and crime.

Our job then, Mr. President, is to destroy these snide insinuations and sly implications. To accomplish this, we must make the record clear for the general public as to what we are doing and why we are doing it.

What are the facts with respect to what has been done and is being done for every single trainee in a Job Corps camp scheduled for closing?

Professional counselors from the appropriate State employment service agencies have been placed in each camp which will be closed. The skills, needs, and potential of each trainee in these camps is being carefully reviewed and evaluated, and each is being given professional advice by these counselors.

Three options are being given to all these trainees. If they are qualified for and desire jobs, they will be placed in employment. If they are unqualified for jobs or employment is not available for them, they will be given the opportunity to transfer either to another Job Corps camp to be continued in operation or into another training program operated by the Department of Labor. This latter decision would be based entirely on the needs, capabilities, and desires of each individual.

Let me again repeat, Mr. President, that not a single trainee will be abandoned or turned loose in the street. Those who return home unemployed will do so only because they have elected to reject a job or further participation in the Job Corps or some other training program. In fact, the counselors presently working in these camps are not accepting "no" for an answer, and are actively trying to change such decisions to the acceptance of one of the alternatives which are available.

The Washington Post recently carried an article, Mr. President, containing reports of young people dropping out from Job Corps camps whose closing have been announced, allegedly because their spirits were broken and their morale shattered due to having been abandoned, and questioning what would become of them this summer.

Let us look at the facts. The record shows that in calendar year 1968, 40 percent of all Job Corps enrollees dropped out of the Job Corps program before they received 30 days' training. This dropout rate is broken down as follows: 38 percent at men's urban centers; 41 percent at conservation camps; and 34 percent at women's urban centers.

The record further shows a continued high dropout rate for trainees who stay in Job Corps camps more than 90 days in 1968, resulting in only 36 percent of all Job Corps trainees actually completing the programs for which they enrolled. The training completion rate breaks down to 43 percent in men's centers; 24 percent in conservation camps; and 38 percent in women's centers.

These figures, I submit, place this situation in its proper context. I believe that they establish beyond doubt that those trainees now dropping out from Job Corps camps scheduled to be closed would have dropped out in any event, and are not doing so because of a feeling that our society has broken faith with them.

In fact, I would predict that, as a result of the intensive counselling being given trainees in camps that are closing, the dropout rate will probably be lower—and in no event higher—than it has been in the past under normal operations. I share the Washington Post's concern for the future of these dropouts, but they are dropouts in spite of the camp closings and not because of them, and I suggest that the Post should have shown an equal concern for the same large or larger number of trainees who have dropped out of Job Corps camps each summer and every year since the Job Corps program initiated.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I want to compliment the distinguished Senator for his very able presentation. I would observe that it should be apparent that there is no argument—and I would ask this question of the Senator—insofar as our concern and the concern of every Member of this body goes, that we are trying to reach the so-called disadvantaged people or people in the poverty class—call them as one may. Are we not all trying to give them programs that will advance their educational level, that will give them the motivation so they will be able and will inspire them to go out and seek jobs and, having gotten those jobs, give them the talents that will assure them that they will be able to discharge those jobs successfully and become self-supporting? Is that not correct?

Mr. PROUTY. The Senator is absolutely correct. That is the objective we have always had in mind, both as members of the committee and as Members of the Senate. The point is, we are not achieving that objective. That is the reason for reevaluating the whole program.

As a result of an amendment to EOA which I offered in this body in 1967, the General Accounting Office has made an intensive study into the whole war on poverty program for the first time. It has made recommendations. It will have 51 volumes, discussing not only the Job Corps, but other programs within the poverty field in OEO's jurisdiction. I think it is a magnificent report, and for the first time since the Job Corps has been in existence, we have been able to obtain factual information by a completely objective and unbiased agency.

They have given us the facts and recommendations, which certainly indicate that we must make some changes if we are going to achieve the overall objectives which we have in mind.

Mr. HANSEN. I asked the distinguished Senator the question because, as I have listened to the debate this afternoon, I have noticed that various Senators speaking on the matter have gone into considerable detail to describe the problem, to point out this particular class of young people that the Job Corps seeks to deal with and, by implication, I think that it would not be difficult for one to assume that there may be some questions on the part of some of us whether we subscribe to the notion that there is indeed such a problem.

I have no feeling of doubt about there being a problem, and I know very well the distinguished Senator from Vermont had no such feeling. I am conscious of the great efforts he has made in bringing the Manpower Development Training Act legislation into being, in order to come to grips with the problem.

I simply wish to point out that it seems to me that there is little to be gained, now, in trying to discuss what the problem is, because we all agree that there is a problem, and we want equally, I am sure, to do something about that problem.

The distinguished Senator from Wisconsin painted a very accurate picture of the profile of poverty and starvation in this country, which I think was helpful. But it is not helpful, in my opinion, in trying to decide what should be done about the resolution proposed by the very distinguished and able junior Senator from California. Rather, it seems to me that what we need to look at is the relative effectiveness or ineffectiveness of this present program, to examine it closely, as my distinguished colleague has done, and then to see if there may not be better ways of involving some of these people.

I was impressed with the Senator's statement that 40 percent of all of the enrollees in the Jobs Corps program have dropped out, if I understand the Senator correctly, before they had completed 1 month of service. Did I understand the Senator correctly?

Mr. PROUTY. That is correct. For calendar year 1968.

Mr. HANSEN. Did I further understand the distinguished Senator to say that only 36 percent of all the enrollees have completed those programs in which they signified an original interest?

Mr. PROUTY. In 1968—that is correct. That figure is probably high, because there is a difference of opinion as to what is meant by "completing" a program. Simply on the basis of the time spent in the camp, it might be said that some have completed a program. On the other hand, looking at it from the standpoint of whether they have acquired a skill which will enable them to go out and become employed as productive citizens, the answer is "no" in too many instances.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. I wonder if the Senator, in commenting on dropout rates for the Job Corps, had noted that on page 237 of the committee report, there is a chart showing dropout rates. In the on-the-job sector, which is, I think, a program that has considerable support in this administration—and I have been greatly interested in it myself—there is a 40-percent dropout rate in the first 90 days of enrollees in those programs. Those are Labor Department figures.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I ask the Senator from California, did I understand him to say that the chart to which he referred showed that the dropout rate in the MDTA program was 40 percent within the first 90 days?

Mr. CRANSTON. In the job opportunities program sponsored by the private business sector.

Mr. HANSEN. For comparison, I understood the distinguished Senator from Vermont to say that the dropout in the Job Corps was 40 percent for the first month. Is that correct?

Mr. CRANSTON. The comparable figure for the Job Corps—and this is the chart presented to the committee by Secretary Shultz—is 55 percent, as against 48 percent. It shows no vast difference between the private program and the Job Corps public program.

Mr. PROUTY. I have some figures given by the Secretary of Labor when he testified before the House committee, which I shall read:

Dropout rates.—In calendar 1968 approximately 40% of enrollees dropped out in the first ninety days—38% at men's centers, 41% at conservation centers, and 34% at women's centers.

Training completion rates.—In calendar 1968 36% of Job Corps enrollees completed the program for which they enrolled—24% at conservation centers, 43% in men's centers and 38% in women's centers.

These figures compare with the following training completion rates in some of the other manpower training programs:

68%—M.D.T.A. Institutional Training.
60%—M.D.T.A. On-The-Job Training.
67%—The Job Opportunities in the Business Sector Program, (JOBS).

So it indicates very definitely, I think, that the results in these other programs have been far more effective and productive than is true in the case of the Job Corps.

Having set the record straight and cleared the air, so to speak, as to what is available for and what will become of trainees in the Job Corps camps being closed, let us turn to a consideration of some of the facts which are persuasive in concluding that the Job Corps program should not be continued at its present level.

A principal—if not the primary—consideration in evaluating the merits of a reduction in the scope of the Job Corps program is whether—and to what extent—it is producing results and accomplishing objectives which Congress set for it in 1964. Before discussing that subject, however, I wish to bring out some data contained in the Comptroller General's report to Congress on Office of Economic Opportunity programs recently submitted pursuant to an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act which I was successful in having Congress enact in 1967.

I am sure we have all heard many times the allegations that agencies which recruit young men and women for the Job Corps camps are often more interested in meeting their quotas of referrals than they are in insuring that those referred are the ones who need and will benefit from Job Corps training. In this regard, the GAO study contains the following information for fiscal year 1968.

Ninety thousand youths were recruited for Job Corps camps, of which 73,000 entered the program and 17,000 never showed up. Quotas for the women's camps were met, but only about 68 percent of the quotas for men's camps—both urban and conservation—were met.

Of the 73,000 enrollees who actually showed up at Job Corps camps, data as to whether or not they met Job Corps eligibility criteria was unavailable for 27,000.

This leaves 46,000 for whom data as to eligibility criteria was available. Of this number, approximately 10,000 did not meet Job Corps eligibility requirements.

The Comptroller General further reports that the three most important eligibility requirements not met were:

First. The minimum period that an applicant had to be out of school, a requirement designed to discourage youth from dropping out of school to join the program.

Second. The requirement that an applicant meet certain behavior standards.

Third. The requirement that an applicant not be a high school graduate.

The GAO study further concludes, and I quote:

We noted in many cases there was not adequate verification by the screening agencies of data supplied by applicants and their parents, a factor which raises additional questions as to the extent to which youths may not have met the eligibility criteria for acceptance in the program.

Another important finding based on this study is that screening organizations often accepted young people without first determining whether the Job Corps program was the most appropriate available training program to meet the individual applicant's needs, and that this condition existed primarily because:

First. Emphasis was on meeting of quotas; second, screeners were not familiar with other available training programs; and, third, screening personnel did not question the wisdom of the applicants' choice to participate in the Job Corps program.

Before interpreting these statistics and findings, let me make plain once more that what we are faced with and what we are considering is not—and I repeat, is not—the abolition of the Job Corps program. Rather, it is a judgment that it can function more effectively and in concert with other training programs at a reduced level.

The administration and the Secretary of Labor have made clear that they see a need for continuing Job Corps for those disadvantaged and unskilled youngsters who need a change in environment and who cannot qualify for other programs. The Comptroller General, in reaching the same conclusion, put it this way:

It is probable that a valid need can be documented for residential training of the type envisioned in Job Corps for a certain number of youths whose needs, because of environmental characteristics or because of geographic location, cannot be well served through other programs operating in or near their home communities. We have doubt, however, that, in light of our findings and the cost of this type of training, the resources now being applied to Job Corps can be fully justified.

Now, what do the findings of the GAO study mean in terms of justifying a cutback in—rather than the abolition of—the Job Corps program?

First, they show that of 46,000 trainees for whom data was available in fiscal 1968, 10,000—or 22 percent—should never have been referred to Job Corps camps originally.

Thus, if we apply this 22 percent figure to the 73,000 trainees who entered the program, we find it could be reduced by more than 14,000 slots without denying Job Corps training to a single applicant who was, in fact, eligible to receive it. Of course, if we use the 90,000 youths who were recruited and agreed to attend, the program could be reduced by 18,000 trainees without impairing its ability to accept every qualified applicant.

There is only one inescapable and logical conclusion that can be drawn from all of this, even if we accept as valid the statement in the committee report that there will be a net reduction of 14,413 residential training positions available in fiscal 1970.

The one real fact which emerges is that, with proper screening procedures and strict adherence to Job Corps eligibility standards, the cutback in Job Corps camps announced by the Secretary of Labor will still provide space in fiscal 1970 for every qualified applicant who desires to attend, with those being screened out being placed in less costly training programs but programs better tailored to meet their individual needs.

Again, the committee report states:

It is conceivable that by concentrating on less-disadvantaged youngsters we can get more people on the employment rolls for less money.

This statement to me misses the point completely. Rather, I submit that by getting the less-disadvantaged youngsters out of the Job Corps program and into less costly training programs capable of qualifying them for post-training employment, we can get the most disadvantaged youngsters into the more costly Job Corps program while still decreasing it significantly below present levels.

Thus far, I have not discussed the merits or the substance of the training programs offered in the Job Corps camps. This is of critical importance not only on the present issue, but also in considering the future of the camps to remain open. Based on the results achieved by this program since 1964, can we justify continuing the Job Corps in its present form and at present levels? Is the Job Corps showing the results and doing the job that was envisioned for it by Congress in 1964?

Based on the hearings recently concluded by our committee, and the recent report of the Comptroller General, there is no question in my mind but that the answer to these questions is "No."

Let us first look at the conservation camps. As we do so, we must bear in mind that there is a vast distinction between what was sought to be accomplished by the CCC camps during the depression of the 1930's and the objectives we seek to obtain through the operation of Job Corps conservation camps.

The old CCC camps were not primarily designed to train people in skills which would permit them to obtain jobs in the private sector of our economy after their tours at the camps were completed. Rather, the CCC program was a massive effort by the Federal Government to provide "make work" employment as the employer of last resort to help offset the most disastrous and widespread unemployment in our Nation's history.

It was a plus benefit that the CCC program, in addition to providing jobs for young men for whom there were no jobs, also benefited the Nation and improved its natural resources. Any training these young men received, however, was incidental to the main thrust of creating paying jobs and getting some of our unemployed off the streets and into an earning capacity.

The thrust behind the establishment of the Job Corps program was entirely different. There are plenty of attractive jobs today for young men who are trained for them or who have learned a trade or a skill. The motivation behind Job Corps was to provide this training to our unskilled and disadvantaged so that they could obtain and hold available jobs after they completed training.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I have been reviewing some of the information made available to the Senate. I refer to the Harris survey of ex-Job Corps men.

On page 5 of that report, there is a schedule and a chart which depicts what a typical group of 100 men had been doing before Job Corps. It points out that insofar as men's conservation centers are concerned, 35 men were working, 18 men were in school, 3 were engaged in other activities, 44 were unemployed, and the hourly wage was $1.44.

The current status, after 6 months with the Job Corps, discloses that there has been an increase in the number of men working. There are now 40 men working, 5 working and going to school, engaged in school only, 10, plus the fact that five are in the military. And other positive placement includes six.

In the minority views and the further individual views, the distinguished Senator from Vermont points out:

As pointed out by Mr. Staats, however, the GAO study and the Harris eight-center study counted former trainees as placed who were in the armed services, ill, married or imprisoned, as well as those who were working, while the Harris OEO study, in addition to these, counted as placed those young people who 12 months after leaving Job Corps training had been accepted and were still waiting to enter the Armed Forces or school and also females who were not working because they were fulfilling full-time family responsibilities.

I ask my distinguished colleague if, in his judgment, a person who is imprisoned—and while I will grant that he is placed—is in satisfactory placement as a proper recognition of the contribution the Job Corps has made.

Mr. PROUTY. I agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that he is not, or should not be, regarded as a good Job Corps placement. I will discuss the approach taken by the GAO and Harris studies in a moment, and will show that by changing the ground rules a little, the Harris-OEO survey was able to show a better record than actually existed.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. PROUTY. The most important factor in Job Corps training has to be that of training these young people for productive jobs and worthwhile lives—not in providing work for them at the taxpayers' expense which will leave them unsuited and unqualified for other employment once Federal financial assistance is withdrawn and they are again on their own.

The value in conservation camp training under the Job Corps program is not—or should not be—the value of the conservation work which they perform. This is the benefit to the Nation that is merely incidental. The real value or lack of it flowing from Job Corps conservation camps is the acid test as to whether the training being received by enrollees is qualifying them to go out and get and hold jobs after their training program is finished.

In justification of the Job Corps conservation camps, the Director of the Job Corps points with pride to the following accomplishments achieved by over 4,000 trainees during fiscal years 1967 and 1968: 333,000 hours suppressing fires; 34,124 hours on search and rescue missions; 11,300 hours on tornado cleanup; 10,816 hours on flood cleanup; 4,800 hours on pine beetle eradication; 10,000 hours gathering dead fish from our shores; 768 hours on lake cleanup; 800 hours on duck rescue from oil washed to our shores; and 800 hours on duck burial.

Now, I want to make this perfectly clear so that I am not misunderstood. I believe that all of this work provides useful and needed services to our country in the field of conservation and matters related thereto. However, this is obviously not the type of training which prepares a trainee to leave the camp and obtain a job in the private sector of our economy now going unfilled because of a lack of qualified personnel.

There may even be a present need for the Federal Government to hire unskilled labor to perform these worthwhile services in the capacity of an employer of last resort. I have thought so in the past, and on two occasions I have introduced legislation cosponsored by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania which would result in this kind of Federal Government program. To effectively conserve our national manpower assets, however, this approach must be confined to our "unemployables" and "untrainables."

I submit, therefore, that this type of training at Job Corps conservation camps fails completely in meeting the congressional mandate to Job Corps to train and equip these trainees with job skills to make them employable after they leave camp.

The study of OEO programs undertaken by the Comptroller General reaches the same conclusion, and the following quote is from his report to Congress:

We have considerable doubt as to whether conservation centers can be expected to provide the intensive training contemplated in the act, at least without substantially upgrading the vocational training program which would appear to be quite costly. Conservation centers generally provide vocational training through the performance of conservation work projects, with little or no related vocational classroom instruction.

We recognize the value of conservation work in itself. We also recognize that most of the centers have some work projects which permit exposure to some occupational skills and that, generally, work projects are a good vehicle for instilling proper work habits in corps members. However, the size and complexity of the work projects coming to our attention at the centers we reviewed generally were not of a nature to serve as a basis for intensive vocational training. It does not appear to us that the use of work projects as the primary vehicle for providing vocational training would permit the centers to establish and operate an effective training program directed toward skill development in occupational areas above the helper or laborer categories.

Let me stop here for a moment. The Comptroller General is saying that a conservative work project has some value in instilling proper work habits to our disadvantaged young people. In other words teaching them to get up and go to bed at reasonable times, and to report for work on the job at the proper time. This is the type of function performed by caseworkers under the old work-training program.

Aside from this value, however, the report concludes that little is being taught in the way of job skills through vocational education techniques, and that employability of trainees is not being improved beyond the classifications of helper or laborer. It is obvious, however, that if these trainees had had a counselor to bird-dog them into daily reporting for work at the right time, they were qualified to work as a helper or laborer without ever having set foot in a conservation camp. And what else would an ex-Job Corps trainee be qualified to do if he told a prospective employer that he had been trained in a conservation camp as a fire suppressor, or a pine beetle eradicator, or a dead fish gatherer, or a duck rescuer and burier?

I again quote from the Comptroller General's report:

Our perusal of the requirements prescribed in May 1968 by Job Corps, in conjunction with the departments, "(that is, Departments of Interior and Agriculture)," for improvements in the training program indicated that, in order for corps members to accomplish the minimum requirements for program completion in the various occupational areas, corps members would need an opportunity to take part in intensive classroom and work-experience programs directed specifically toward development of knowledge and technical skills needed beyond the helper and laborer categories.

To establish intensive vocational training programs at each of the 82 centers in a number of vocational areas for the 100 to 250 corpsmen enrolled at each of the centers would appear to be quite costly. Moreover, it is questionable whether a sufficient number of qualified instructors could be obtained to provide such training at the generally remote and isolated conservation center locations.

The GAO report regarding the Job Corps conservation camps includes a finding that very few corpsmen achieve the program goals established by Job Corps even though such goals are equivalent to about a seventh grade education. The reasons precluding corpsmen from advancing to the desired grade level were found to be first, their generally low academic achievement level when they entered the camp; second, their short

length of stay; and third, the general practice at conservation camps of dividing their time equally between academic and vocational training.

I quote from the Comptroller General's report on this subject:

In one instance there were indications that academic training was not emphasized because of the importance attached by the center to completing work projects. The need for intensive academic training is apparent from Job Corps data showing that enrollees who entered conservation centers during fiscal year 1968 had average grade levels of 3.7 in reading and 4.1 in mathematics . . .

We found instances where terminees were classified as graduates, without regard to their length of stay, on such basis as their having obtained employment or having entered the armed services after termination. Some terminees were classified as graduates although they had apparently made no measurable progress in vocational or academic training areas.

Finally, in concluding that the results of his study raised doubt as to first, whether the resources now being applied to the Job Corps program can be fully justified, and second, whether the Job Corps program is sufficiently achieving the purposes for which it was created to warrant its continuation at present levels, the GAO report states:

Our doubt in this regard is especially applicable to the conservation center component of the program, particularly in consideration of the significant changes which appear necessary in this component to upgrade its effectiveness in achieving training program objectives.

I hope my colleagues have all read the GAO report, particularly that section dealing with the Job Corps, and that they have also taken the time to read the testimony of the Comptroller General before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 2.

This report and testimony is a damning indictment of the manner in which the Job Corps program was set up and has been administered by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

It can also be viewed as being a damning indictment of congressional action—or perhaps congressional inaction would be a better term. Far too often during the last 8 years, the prior administrations and the majority party in Congress have concluded that once legislation was enacted establishing a particular program, and that program did not work properly in obtaining the objectives Congress had intended, the automatic cure-all for all program defects was simply to keep authorizing and appropriating ever increasing funds for it. The folly of this philosophy is now coming home to roost as it pertains to the Job Corps program.

In addition to providing an objective and independent source of support for the decision of the administration and the Secretary of Labor to cut back on the Job Corps program and attempt to integrate it with other manpower training programs, however, the Comptroller General's report should make both Congress and the Secretary of Labor think—and think hard—concerning the future of even a limited Job Corps program in terms of what can be done in order that conservation camps may make a really positive contribution in solving our national manpower problems.

Congress must think about the requirement in the law that 40 percent of all Job Corps enrollees have to be assigned to conservation camps. In view of the GAO report, Congress must think about this even though the Secretary of Labor has taken the position that he can live with this statutory requirement in his plan to continue a limited Job Corps program.

The Secretary of Labor must think about what can be done to improve the training records of conservation camps to be continued in light of his own and the Comptroller General's findings. He must think about this, and he must implement the necessary changes, because, if he does not and the record of the conservation camps in training results is as bleak the next time the Job Corps program is reviewed as it is today, I predict that grassroots opinion in this country will demand the complete termination of this type of training program.

To digress for a moment, I would like to comment here on the testimony of the Secretary of Labor and his Assistant Secretary for Manpower, and that of the Comptroller General and his aides, before our committee.

The Secretary and Assistant Secretary of Labor did a remarkable job in furnishing data justifying both the cutback in the Job Corps program and the reasons why certain camps were selected for closing and others chosen to continue in operation.

Our committee heard more facts pertaining to the Jobs Corps camps and their operation and administration during the 1 day these gentlemen testified than we were ever able to ascertain from representatives of the prior administration who testified before our committee on innumerable occasions during the past 4 years.

In addition, the facts presented by the Comptroller General and the other representatives of GAO who testified substantiated the recommendations contained in their report and fully supported the Secretary of Labor's decision to cut back the Job Corps program. Again, their testimony was refreshingly different from what our committee had become accustomed to hearing from witnesses of the prior administration.

I would be remiss not to note here that our Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty voted to report the resolution now before the Senate to the full committee on Tuesday, April 29, and that our full committee on Labor and Public Welfare voted to report it to the Senate on Wednesday, April 30. This is so even though the Comptroller General and his office, who has done the only thoroughly objective and independent study and evaluation of the Job Corps program, did not testify before our committee until Friday, May 2.

In discussing studies of the Job Corps program, the record would not be complete without reference to the testimony of—and the studies conducted by—pollster Lou Harris and his associates.

To start with, I will bring one matter to my colleagues' attention by quoting from the individual views to the committee report filed by the distinguished senior Senator from California and myself:

Much publicity has been attached to a recent study which pollster Lou Harris made for the Office of Economic Opportunity concerning the overall effectiveness of the Job Corps program upon participants. This contract with O.E.O., incidentally, was entered into a few days prior to the Nixon Administration's taking office and was concluded 3 months later at a cost of approximately $275,000.

The Comptroller General put the results of this survey in their proper perspective by submitting a chart which compared the data from the G.A.O.'s study of nine Job Corps centers with the results of the Harris Survey for O.E.O. released in April and with another Lou Harris study of eight Job Corps centers which was released in January 1969. The results of the G.A.O. nine-center study and the Harris eight-center study are remarkably similar with the G.A.O. study in some respects being more favorable to this program. The latest Harris study, however, done for O.E.O., differs remarkably from these other two studies in two categories, one being the placement of former Job Corps trainees and the other being the reduction of unemployment following Job Corps training.

As pointed out by Mr. Staats, however, the G.A.O. study and the Harris eight-center study counted former trainees as placed who were in the armed services, ill, married or imprisoned, as well as those who were working, while the Harris O.E.O. study, in addition to these, counted as placed those young people who 12 months after leaving Job Corps training had been accepted and were still waiting to enter the Armed Forces or school and also females who were not working because they were fulfilling full-time family responsibilities.

The carryover effect of this, of course, was to drastically increase the reduction in unemployment after Job Corps training reflected by the Harris O.E.O. study.

Mr. President, that is the point that the Senator from Wyoming and I discussed awhile ago.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Is it not fair to assume that with or without the Job Corps, and with or without any program, as people mature, one might expect females to have families and to direct their efforts toward discharge of the full-time family responsibilities that go with having children?

Mr. PROUTY. Certainly.

Mr. HANSEN. In that context, then, is it not self-serving to try to take credit, insofar as the Job Corps is concerned, for people who find themselves thus involved?

Mr. PROUTY. I agree. To be completely fair, I wanted both the Harris eight-center study and the GAO nine-center study counted "marriage," and that the Harris overall study for OEO added to this "women otherwise fulfilling full-time family responsibilities."

Mr. HANSEN. I am well aware of that, and I used the word "self-serving."

I wish to ask this question. I think both of these surveys are charitable in that regard. I do not see how we can assume anything different would be the situation. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. PROUTY. I do agree thoroughly.

In addition, in the third Harris poll these young people were counted as placed who, 12 months after leaving the Job Corps training, were accepted but still waiting to go into the Armed Forces or to school. Also, women who were married and those having families, regardless of marriage. I wanted to point out the difference between the two surveys.

Mr. HANSEN. I appreciate that, and I do thank the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the comparative chart of these three surveys submitted by the Comptroller General be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

The chart, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

COMPARISON OF DATA FROM THE GAO 9-CENTER SURVEY, LOUIS HARRIS 8-CENTER STUDY OF JANUARY 1969, AND THE LOUIS HARRIS OVERALL STUDY OF APRIL 1969

	Pre-Job Corps							About 12 months after Job Corps[2]							Change in—		
	Working (percent)	School (percent)	Working and school (percent)	Other[1] (percent)	Unemployed (percent)	Total other and unemployed (percent)	Hourly wage (percent)	Working (percent)	School (percent)	Working and school (percent)	Other[1] (percent)	Unemployed (percent)	Total other and unemployed (percent)	Hourly wage	Unemployment (percent)	Unemployment and other (percent)	Hourly wage (percent)
Total:																	
GAO	37	16	1	3	43	46	$1.42	47	8	4	10	31	41	$1.85	−12	−5	+0.43
L/H 1	34	13	----------	3	50	53	1.44	50	11	----------	6	36	42	1.82	−14	−11	+.38
L/H 2	32	15	----------	3	50	53	1.39	41	8	4	24	23	47	1.84	−27	−6	+.45
Men's urban:																	
GAO	40	16	1	2	41	43	1.48	55	6	4	9	26	35	1.90	−15	−8	+.42
L/H 1	33	11	----------	1	55	56	1.54	58	11	----------	2	32	34	1.97	−23	−22	+.43
L/H 2	32	15	----------	3	50	53	1.50	42	7	5	24	22	46	1.95	−38	−7	+.45
Conservation:																	
GAO	42	19	----------	3	36	39	1.37	46	7	5	6	36	42	1.80	0	+3	+.43
L/H 1	37	15	----------	3	45	48	1.44	52	13	----------	4	34	38	1.76	−11	−10	+.32
L/H 2	34	15	----------	3	48	51	1.41	46	8	4	14	28	42	1.85	−20	−9	+.44
Women's urban:																	
GAO	26	13	2	3	56	59	1.16	27	12	4	16	41	57	1.60	−15	−2	+.44
L/H 1	34	10	----------	5	51	56	1.32	36	8	----------	15	45	60	1.57	−6	+4	+.25
L/H 2	28	16	----------	5	51	56	1.21	31	9	4	40	16	56	1.57	−35	0	+.36

[1] For GAO 9-center study and Louis Harris 8-center study (L/H 1) this column includes those in the armed services, those ill, married, or imprisoned. For the overall Louis Harris (L/H 2) study this column also includes those accepted and waiting to enter the Armed Forces or school, and females not working or otherwise placed due to fulfilling full-time family responsibility.

[2] For L/H 1, the terminees were interviewed after being out of Job Corps for 6 to 18 months.

Source of data:

GAO: Survey of 9 centers—5 conservation, 2 urban, 2 women's (TransCentury, August 1968).

L/H 1: Louis Harris survey of 8 centers—4 conservation, 2 urban, 2 women's (all centers in this survey were included in the GAO survey), dated January 1969, No. 1869.

L/H 2: Louis Harris survey—Overall, dated April 1969.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in this same context, I draw my colleagues' attention to the chart which appears on page 6 of Mr. Harris' prepared testimony before our committee. This is confined to data obtained in the most recent Harris study for the Office of Economic Opportunity, and illustrates once more how statistics can be used to create various kinds of impression.

This chart shows that prior to entering the Job Corps program, 50 percent of the enrollees were either working or were in school, and that after receiving Job Corps training, 52 percent of the trainees were working or were in school.

This would seem to clearly indicate that there was a 2-percent increase in the number of young people working or in school after they attended Job Corps camps. The Harris chart reflects, however, that there was a 21-percent decline in unemployment among former trainees.

Some of this decrease is explained by the fact that young men who enter military service after training are no longer carried as unemployed. I do not quarrel with this. However, the major decrease in unemployment results from Mr. Harris having placed 14 percent of former trainees in a category entitled "Other Positive Placement."

A note at the bottom of the chart defines the category "Other Positive Placement" as including trainees who, 6 months after leaving a Job Corps camp, are not working but who have been accepted and are waiting to enter either the Armed Forces or school, and females who are not working because of marriage or because they are otherwise fulfilling full-time family responsibilities.

I bring this point out because I believe that the average person glancing at this chart and noting a 21-percent decrease in unemployment following Job Corps training would normally assume that this meant a 21-percent increase in employment and that the Job Corps program was greatly increasing the employability of our disadvantaged youth. If this were true, of course, it would be a fine record. However, a close analysis of the statistics shows how they are being manipulated to suggest a result which just simply is not so.

Next, I quote a colloquy which took place between the chairman of our subcommittee and Mr. Harris during Mr. Harris' testimony on April 18. I quote, with my friend, the junior Senator from Wisconsin, directing his first remark to me:

Senator NELSON. Isn't it correct, Senator, that some percentage of the men who are in the military are men who were not qualified either physically or in terms of reading and writing and arithmetic accomplishment level to get into the military prior to the training in Job Corps. Did you understand my question?

Mr. HARRIS. Some couldn't get into the military, I am sure that is right, yes.

Senator NELSON. Some couldn't get into the military and after their training they could qualify to get into the military?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, many of them as a matter of fact were rejected by the military before entering the Job Corps who later on after the Job Corps were admitted.

While Mr. Harris was still testifying, I was informed by a representative of the Department of Labor that they had checked with the Job Corps and had been informed that there was no data available to substantiate a statement or an inference that Job Corps trainees who had failed an examination for military service prior to enrolling in the Job Corps later were successful in entering the armed services as a result of Job Corps training. The colloquy between Mr. Harris and myself at that point was as follows:

Senator PROUTY. I just had a check made with the Job Corps people and they say there is no data which would indicate whether or not a Job Corps enrollee who had failed a military examination later succeeds in getting in as a result of Job Corps training. That is their testimony. I mean they say there isn't any such data.

Mr. HARRIS. What we can say, definitely, Senator is that after Job Corps a certain number of them, which we have documented here, have entered the military.

Senator PROUTY. They might have anyway.

Mr. HARRIS. Right. We know those under 17 could not have gotten into the military.

Senator PROUTY. But in reality, there is no data available at this time to suggest that they were able to enter the military services simply because of Job Corps training.

Mr. HARRIS. No, sir. I hope I didn't imply that.

Senator PROUTY. Perhaps you didn't say that, but I understood you to.

Mr. HARRIS. I think the only points I tried to make were, it seems to me that it would be a serious mistake to imply that entering the military service wasn't every bit as good as obtaining a job.

Senator PROUTY. I am not suggesting that. Some of them might have entered the military service, in any event, and perhaps some of them were helped as a result of Job Corps training, but there is no data to support that according to the Job Corps people.

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, sir.

Senator PROUTY. Thank you.

The record speaks for itself, and I leave my colleagues to draw their own conclusions.

I also questioned Mr. Harris concerning his testimony before the House committee as reported in the April 17 edition of the Evening Star, to the effect that trainees showed substantial gains 6 months after leaving Job Corps but that these gains tended to fade out as more time passed.

Mr. Harris analyzed statistical data on page 28 of his prepared statement, and then continued as follows:

Now Senator, what I said yesterday, I think there are two ways in which one can read this. As Job Corps fades back in time in terms of more time elapsing from a young person leaving the Job Corps, one might conclude from this that the benefits of the Job Corps are more ephemeral, more temporary, they are a passing phenomenon which might fade quickly.

They may prove one might claim that the Job Corps therefore, its training and experience, has no depth, no real staying power. It might also indicate that if one waited long enough, that those who dropped out of the Job Corps might ultimately catch up in terms of wage rates with those who had completed the Job Corps.

One might also say therefore in view of all this, why have a Job Corps or any training program, because sooner or later if you wait long enough, perhaps all of them will end up the same.

There is another possible conclusion one might reach from this. That is that what is happening here is during the first six months I would say incontrovertibly the impact of the Job Corps is great, positive challenges are being registered. You get the 12 months' mark, taking that, if that were the only point in time we had, you would say the gains were still great but the rate of change of guage is slowing down and the gaps are beginning to close.

After an exchange with Senator NELSON, Mr. Harris continued on this subject:

I might suggest the possibility here is that, indeed, the effects of the Job Corps are not long and lasting, because these young people for the most part we know have gone back precisely to the same environment from which they have come.

It could well be that the old existence of disadvantages and discrimination and a kind of bottom existence has begun to take over and these elements are, indeed, snuffing out that experience that they had in the Job Corps.

That is why I suggested yesterday that the strong implication, to me at any rate, from these results are that these young people simply cannot be exposed to a four or six months' Job Corps or call it what you will, training, and then try to be out-placed and then left on their own.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield at that point?

Mr. PROUTY. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Before the Senator gets too far beyond his discussion of the drop-out rate experienced in this operation, I should like to ask whether the Senator has any specific figures he can recall which would indicate the number of enrollees who were summarily dismissed or expelled—whatever term we wish to use—because of obvious violation of the rules under which they became members of the Corps and participated in the program?

It is my understanding that a rather sizable percentage of Job Corps enrollees were removed from the program because, among other things, they were found to be in the possession of firearms.

Does the Senator have any figures indicating the number of people who have been removed from the program because of that kind of violation?

Mr. PROUTY. I have no figures on that subject. I think that those figures are available and are in the possession of the Secretary of Labor. They have not been brought out for perhaps one good reason; namely, that the Department of Labor does not wish to paint such a bleak picture that there might be a great tendency on the part of Congress to close down all the Job Corps camps.

I know that there have been serious disciplinary problems, and other problems, and in some cases, a substantial number of trainees have been removed. Most, of course, should never have been there in the first place because they did not meet the criteria set out for such admissions. These conditions have also caused many of the drop outs.

I am sure that the Secretary of Labor could give that information to the Senator. I am sure it is available. Unfortunately, I do not have it at this time.

Mr. HANSEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, turning to the next page of Mr. Harris' testimony, he concludes his remarks on this subject as follows:

With these kinds of young people, and that is why I develop at the beginning how they are different, they are right down at the bottom of society here, with these young people it seems to me patently apparent that you have to have programs that go beyond just the training programs that they are exposed to.

We have to continue them out in time. I don't know, I dare say there isn't a man alive who knows how long they should go. Maybe they go two, five, even ten years where these young people are traced through and they have someplace to go to, to see that the spectacular gains scored in the first six months continue after that.

Mr. President, it should be pointed out that a great deal of weight has been given to the Harris OEO survey, which cost about $275,000, by the proponents of the pending resolution. It seems to me that Mr. Harris has stated frankly and definitely that, in his opinion, the camps are not achieving their overall objectives.

Although Mr. Harris would not say whether he felt the Job Corps program should be continued, or continued at present levels, it appears to me, Mr. President, that his testimony which I have just quoted strongly indicates that this program is failing to reach its objectives and failing to achieve the results desired.

Whether training is given on a residential basis or a nonresidential basis, it seems to me his testimony tells us that supportive services and effective followup of trainees is needed long after the disadvantaged have been given vocational and academic training courses.

The Job Corps program has not been productive as structured in the past. The type of additional services needed as seen by Mr. Harris can be provided as an adjunct to any other appropriate training program just as easily if not more easily than for Job Corps. I am convinced that these are areas in which the Secretary of Labor intends to move with respect to all training programs operated through or under the Department of Labor, including that portion of the Job Corps program which will be continued, and I submit that we give him a reasonable period of time to see what he can accomplish instead of trying to lock him into established programs which the record shows have produced miserable results in the past.

There is one other statement of Mr. Harris which I should like to bring out here. When Mr. Harris commenced his overall Job Corps survey for OEO, he started with an original list of 36,000 names furnished him by Job Corps. Of these, his organization attempted to contact 19,613, and succeeded in contacting 11,278.

I asked Mr. Harris whether it would not be a more effective method for determining the value of the Job Corps program to go into particular camps and get all the facts concerning young people enrolled in that camp, such as background, education when they arrived, education received while in camp, skill or job training received, length of stay, and then follow up to determine the jobs obtained after training and whether the jobs obtained bore any relationship to the type of training received at the Job Corps camp.

Mr. Harris agreed that this would be the most effective way to determine whether these programs were working, and I quote him:

Let me say if you did a one-to-one program, which if you ask me, I would say I favor, I think this should be done; as a matter of fact, if I might suggest, I think one of the areas that I think all of Government has been remiss on as well as many areas of the private sector is that somehow we assume that monies can be proven to be spent efficiently by some cost accounting methods and therefore the program works.

Very rarely in our society have we ever gone out to the objects of the program and said what really happened to them. I will give you one good illustration.

I think Medicare, we have all kinds of cost accounting systems on Medicare, and, to my knowledge, no one has gone to the individuals who got the Medicare treatment and found out what happened to them.

I should like to point out that this is the general procedure the General Accounting Office followed in its study, and that it will shortly come out with voluminous reports on the individual camps, which it studied in great depth.

I told Mr. Harris I was glad to have him agree with me, because I had felt that way for a long time and it had been a prime consideration of mine in sponsoring the amendment to OEO legislation which directed the Comptroller General to conduct such a study.

That is one reason I feel the GAO study is entitled to such great weight. In numbers of trainees interviewed, this study did not approach the scope of the Harris OEO overall survey. On the other hand, the GAO study did not reach for trainees in a manner similar to buckshot scattered at random. Rather, the Comptroller General's people went into nine Job Corps camps selected as being representative, and did an indepth study of each. It is the only study of its kind of which I am aware. This is one reason, Mr. President, that I consider our committee's actions in ordering this resolution reported prior to the appearance of the Comptroller General and his asso-

ciates to testify before our committee as having been hasty and ill advised.

Mr. President, I was one of the original sponsors and strong supporters of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. I have diligently and consistently supported manpower training programs over the years which would enable our young men and women to become self-supporting and productive citizens. No one wants our attempts to achieve these objectives to succeed more than I do.

I want the Job Corps program to succeed, as well as all the other training programs. I want to give all our disadvantaged and unskilled young people every chance in life. The record will support me when I say that during my entire stay in Congress I have always tried to judge every training program on the basis of what it was accomplishing in this regard.

The Secretary of Labor's proposal to put youngsters who do not require the kind of residential training provided by the Job Corps program into other training programs which will more appropriately meet their needs is put forward as part of a new approach designed to provide a more efficient, effective, and integrated overall manpower program for the training of all our citizens who need or desire it.

I believe this is a sound approach and I endorse it. Last year over $318 million was spent on operation of the Job Corps program. This money was paid by the taxpayers of this country, both large and small, and averages out to somewhere in excess of $8,000 per trainee. I do not believe the American people would object to these expenditures of their tax moneys if the job was being done. It is senseless, however, to continue the waste of tax money where results are small when it appears that for many, much more lasting benefits may be obtained in different types of programs.

If this new approach does not produce better results, then we will have to again reassess the situation in the hope of finding new methods that will succeed. For the present, however, the Department of Labor should be given every opportunity to implement its concepts of appropriate training programs, and I intend to support their efforts to do so.

In bringing my remarks to a close, Mr. President, I quote from the Secretary of Labor's testimony before our committee to underscore the fact I made at the beginning of my speech that no trainee in any Job Corps camp to be closed will be denied an opportunity to continue in an appropriate training program. On this point, Secretary Shultz said:

I would like to emphasize that in these closings we have made an absolute flat guarantee that every presently enrolled Job Corps member will have an opportunity to transfer to another Center if he or she chooses to do so.

So no one will be deprived of an opportunity to continue the program if that person wishes to do so. That we make as an absolutely flat statement.

In addition, as my statement will bring out, we will take measures for those who don't choose to move to another center to see that they have every opportunity and a priority opportunity in other Manpower programs that are available, if that seems to be their wish, and we have set aside a special fund from our Department of Labor funds of $1 million to just be sure that we can do that over and above funds that are flowing into a community for regular Manpower programs. So I want to emphasize that insofar as the individual people in the Centers are concerned, we have taken steps to look after as best we possibly can their interests.

When the Comptroller General and his assistants testified before our committee, the supporters of the resolution now before the Senate made many allegations in attempting to discredit and invalidate the results he reported and the recommendations that he made. These allegations included: biased reporting, inadequacy of sample used, inappropriate and incomplete measures of the program's success, inadequate interpretation of economic benefits data, overgeneralizations which were not supported, incorrect or questionable assumptions, and misunderstandings of the program.

Mr. President, the Comptroller General has now prepared an eight-page reply, which specifically rebuts each of these allegations. In my opinion, this is a complete vindication of all charges that the GAO did not conduct an objective and honest study and evaluation of the Job Corps program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this document, prepared by the General Accounting Office, be printed at this point in my remarks.

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

COMMENTS ON CERTAIN ALLEGATIONS CONCERNING THE ADEQUACY OF THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE EVALUATION OF THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

ALLEGED BIASED REPORTING

It has been alleged that the General Accounting Office (GAO) report is biased and unobjective and contains distortions. These charges are untrue. During the course of the work GAO had the benefit of advice from acknowledged authorities in the field on the courses of inquiry to follow. In order to ensure objectivity of reporting, the findings and conclusions were made available for review by recognized researchers of manpower training programs and their views were considered before finalization of the report. Additionally, the results of the GAO work at a number of locations and the tentative overall findings and conclusions were made available to the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and its comments were carefully considered by GAO in preparing its report.

Throughout the course of the work and the development of the report, it was GAO's objective to present to the Congress useful and objective information on the operations of the Job Corps program. GAO made a concerted effort to include in its report not only the conclusions reached on various aspects of the program, but also the basis for these conclusions and any qualifying information considered necessary to enable the users of the report to consider the results of the review in their proper perspective.

ALLEGED INADEQUACY OF SAMPLE

It has been alleged that GAO's selection of centers was inadequate to draw general conclusions and that, deliberately or by accident, it reviewed the least efficient or effective centers rather than representative centers.

GAO carried out its assignment on the basis of two closely related approaches. In-depth field examinations were made of programs of Job Corps centers at selected locations, and statistical and economic analyses relating to the achievement of program objectives were undertaken because of the difficulty of generalizing from conclusions based on detailed audit work performed at relatively few locations. GAO made in-depth examinations at nine Job Corps centers and obtained for analysis through interviews by a contractor selected information relating to five of these centers and 12 additional centers. In addition, one of GAO's contractors performed analyses of data collected on a national basis by an opinion research organization.

GAO's review provided a valid basis for the conclusions contained in its report concerning the effectiveness of the Job Corps and the efficiency of its operations. The principal basis for this belief is that the in-depth studies included an analysis of program operations, the policies under which these operations were carried out, and the manner in which the responsible Federal agencies monitored or supervised actual program operations.

Accordingly, GAO's conclusions concerning program accomplishment are based not only on indicators of post-program experience of participants but also upon the apparent underlying reasons in terms of program content and effectiveness of administration. Also, the results of the studies in national data served to generally support the results of the in-depth studies.

GAO selected the centers primarily on the basis of getting a cross section of the three basic types of centers, and in the case of conservation centers, getting a representation of the principal Federal agencies which operate the centers for OEO.

On the basis of evidence available to it, GAO is satisfied that circumstances and conditions coming to its attention at the centers reviewed would exist in varying degrees at other locations.

The Job Corps did develop a formula for measuring centers which has more recently been adopted with some modification by the Department of Labor. GAO has not attempted to evaluate this formula but it believes all concerned would agree that the application of such formulas while useful, will not result in precise measurements of center effectiveness.

As a matter of information, however, in January 1968 when GAO began its review, the Job Corps ranked the men's urban and conservation centers then in operation. By use of the formula, a minimum score of 14 for the least efficient centers and a maximum score of 31 was assigned to each of the various centers with the median score being 23. Two of the men's centers GAO reviewed received scores of 21 and 22, respectively, and the five remaining centers received score equal to or greater than the median. These data would indicate that these centers were neither extremely good nor extremely bad under the formula, but, on the whole, were about average.

ALLEGED INAPPROPRIATE AND INCOMPLETE MEASURES OF PROGRAM SUCCESS

It has been alleged that the GAO report did not give adequate consideration to (1) medical, dental, nutritional, and other health program benefits, (2) changes in Corps members attitudes, reliability, honesty, aspirations, and ability to get along with fellow men, and (3) basic education including reading, mathematics, language and study skills.

GAO did give consideration to these factors both explicitly and in considering the meaning of the information developed. It believes that this should be clear from its report.

The GAO review did not consider the relative effectiveness of the health program because in order to protect the confidentiality of the doctor-patient relationship, Corps members health records were not made available. However, GAO did not question that to the extent that medical problems have

been corrected or alleviated and nutritional deficiences were met, benefits to individual Corps members have been achieved.

With respect to behavioral and attitudinal changes, GAO considered that the ability or inability of the centers to retain enrollees for a sufficient period of time to benefit from training is critical to the development of such changes. Achievements of the Job Corps, overall, and centers individually have not been highly successful in this regard. Most Corps members terminated before the 6-month time period considered by the Job Corps as the minimum time required to meet its objectives; among these early terminees a high percentage left within 3 months.

GAO also considered those aspects of center life most closely aligned with changes in the behavior and attitudes of the Corps members including such matters as the counseling provided, discipline achieved and the effectiveness of the vocational and educational programs provided.

At each center GAO examined into the basic education program provided to the Corps members. As pointed out in the GAO report, it found that for a number of reasons, including the unfavorable retention rate, the need for improvements in program content, and the need for better enforcement of requirements, many Corps members had not met the objectives of the program at the time of termination.

Overall GAO considers that the adequacy of training provided should be reflected generally in the post-Job Corps experience of Corps members. In its examination of the post-Job Corps experience of a sampling of Corps members, GAO found indications that training objectives had not been met. A relatively small percentage of the youths were employed in vocational fields related to their Job Corps training. GAO's contacts with employers showed that in a high percentage of cases the youths had been dismissed because they did not meet performance requirements or the youths had walked off the job and had given no reason for leaving. GAO recognizes that a number of factors other than the Job Corps training affect the ability of the youths to obtain and retain gainful employment. It considered the experience of the terminated Corps members in relation to a control group—youths also eligible for Job Corps who decided not to attend—in an attempt to isolate the effect of such other factors.

ALLEGED INADEQUATE INTERPRETATIONS OF THE ECONOMIC BENEFITS DATA

It has been alleged that the comparison group used by GAO is not appropriate and that alternative interpretations of the data concerning wage gains would be more favorable to the Job Corps. It also has been alleged that GAO did not make a number of comparisons which would be useful.

GAO believes that the control group included in its sample does serve as a basis for comparison with the post-Job Corps experience of terminated Corps members. It recognized in its report the difficulties in obtaining a fully comparable control group. GAO also recognized that at the time of sign-up for Job Corps, the control group was in greater need, particularly in terms of employment, than was the group of terminated Corps members.

However, it does not consider that because this greater need existed comparisons of the experience of the two groups should be avoided. Those in the control group were eligible for and have been accepted by the Job Corps and were therefore part of the population meant to be served. Also, the data concerning the control group at the time of sign-up in the program is applicable to a period varying by an average of about 6 months from similar data concerning the terminated Corps members. The data developed in GAO's analysis follows.

DATA ON EXPERIENCE OF TERMINATED JOB CORPS ENROLLEES AND NONPARTICIPANTS (NO-SHOWS)

	Terminees at signup in program [1]			No-shows at signup in program [1]			Immediately after termination from program			At interview approximately 1 year later [2]		
	Number	Percent	Average hourly rate	Number	Percent	Average hourly rate	Number	Percent	Average hourly rate	Number	Percent	Average hourly rate
Conservation centers:												
Working	44	42	$1.37				72	69	$1.50	48	46	[3] $1.80
School	20	19					8	8		7	7	
Work and school					[4]		4	4		5	5	
Unemployed	37	36					16	15		37	36	
Other [5]	3	3					4	4		7	6	
Terminees interviewed	104	100					104	100		104	100	
Urban centers, men:												
Working	154	40	1.48				245	62	1.72	218	55	[3] 1.90
School	64	16					28	7		24	6	
Work and school	5	1			[4]		6	2		15	4	
Unemployed	160	41					93	24		101	26	
Other [5]	9	2					20	5		34	9	
Terminees interviewed	392	100					392	100		392	100	
Total men terminees:												
Working	198	40	1.45				317	64	1.67	266	54	[3] 1.87
School	84	17					36	7		31	6	
Work and school	5	1			[4]		10	2		20	4	
Unemployed	197	40					109	22		138	28	
Other [5]	12	2					24	5		41	8	
Terminees interviewed	496	100					496	100		496	100	
No-shows, men:												
Working				25	24	$1.67				39	38	[3] 1.90
School				15	15					4	4	
Work and school	[4]						[4]			11	10	
Unemployed				61	59					37	36	
Other [5]				2	2					12	12	
No-shows interviewed				103	100					103	100	
Urban centers, women:												
Working	37	26	1.16				55	39	1.40	38	27	[3] 1.60
School	19	13					12	8		17	12	
Work and school	3	2			[4]		1	1		5	4	
Unemployed	79	56					58	41		58	41	
Other [5]	4	3					16	11		24	16	
Terminees interviewed	142	100					142	100		142	100	
No-shows, women:												
Working				5	12	0.92	[4]			14	34	[3] 1.41
School				10	24					2	5	
Work and school	[4]									3	7	
Unemployed				25	60					16	38	
Other [5]				2	4					7	16	
No-shows interviewed				42	100					42	100	

[1] 2 columns are provided for the at signup information because of chronological differences between the time that the terminees signed and the time that no-shows signed. This time difference is approximately 6 months, the average length of stay in the Job Corps for terminees.

[2] At the time of interview the average age of those included in our sample was as follows:
Conservation center terminees, 18 yrs. 10 mos.
Urban center terminees, men, 19 yrs. 0 mos.
No-shows, men, 18 yrs. 8 mos.
Urban center terminees, women, 19 yrs. 4 mos.
No-shows, women, 18 yrs. 11 mos.

At the time terminees entered Job Corps they would have been an average of 18 months younger, compared with no-shows who would have been approximately 1 year younger at the time they were scheduled to enter Job Corps.

[3] Represents the average hourly wage rate for those terminees and no-shows working and reporting a wage rate.

[4] Not available.

[5] Represents imprisoned youths, married females, those in the armed services, or those that did not provide the necessary information.

With respect to alternative interpretations of the data concerning wage gains, comparisons cannot be made between (1) gains by the control group from time of sign-up to approximately one year after the Corps members had terminated and (2) gains by Corps members from time of sign-up to approximately one year after termination because, as previously indicated these periods do not represent a similar span of time. An adjustment of the data for the time span difference between the control group and the terminated Corps members would show somewhat lower gains for the control group.

The above table shows that employed male terminees of urban and conservation centers had average wages about 42 cents per hour higher than at enrollment. This increase corresponds to a period of approximately 18 months. Hence, it is not directly comparable with the 23 cents per hour increase indicated for "no-shows," which corresponds to a 12-month period. In order to make the comparison with "no-shows" more clearly understood, their 12-month wage increment can be multiplied by 1.5, i.e., to an 18-month basis—or to 34.5 cents per hour increase. This procedure would result in an estimated program wage effect of 8 cents per hour for the Job Corps terminees.

External evidence supports the reasonableness of an estimated control wage increment on the order of 23 cents per 12 months and 35 cents per 18 months over the period under consideration. This increment has two components: (a) the effect of the rising trend of wage rates over calendar time; and (b) the effect of higher wage rates associated with additional years of age for individuals in the 16–21 age group. Based on data pertaining to lower paying industries and other industry wage data in the Department of Labor publication *Employment and Earnings*, GAO's contractor, Resource Management Corporation, believes that 15–16 cents per hour is a reasonable estimate of the average wage increment for men in relatively low-wage industries and occupations over one year. This would amount to 7–8 cents per six months.

The "worth" of a year of age for disadvantaged individuals in the 16–21 range is estimated by our contractor at 6–8 cents. The Louis Harris Survey of August 1966 Job Corps terminees in February 1967 indicated a 15-cent average wage differential between 16–17 year olds and 18–19 year olds, and an 8-cent differential between the latter and the 20–21 year olds. Taking into account the age distribution of wage earners within each 2-year group, the average wage increment for a year of age appeared to be 6–7 cents per hour. Similar data for Neighborhood Youth Corps terminees from a Dunlap Associates survey in February-April 1967 indicated increments of 18 cents per hour from 16–17 to 18–19, and 7 cents per hour from 18–19 to 20–21. In this case the average increment per year of age was estimated at 8 cents.

Summing the separate calculations of wage effects of calendar time—related to general wage increases resulting from economic conditions—and aging, yields a combined estimate of 21–24 cents per hour per year which is entirely consistent with the 23-cent increment for no-shows in the GAO table. These findings are additionally supported by data in the Louis Harris Survey of no-shows in early 1967 which indicate a 29-cent per hour wage gain for an average period of slightly less than a year.

With respect to the potential for making additional comparisons, GAO did make a number of comparisons which indicated that increased employment and earning power among the terminated Corps members included in the sample could be attributable to the greater employability of youths due to the process of growing up, higher employment and wage levels, and the length of stay of Corps members at the centers. GAO recognizes that a great number of additional comparisons could be made of statistical data; however, the comparisons made were selected on the basis of considerations of the content of past similar studies by others and the desire to be most informative as to the results of the work.

ALLEGED UNSUPPORTED OVERGENERALIZATIONS AND ALLEGED INCORRECT OR QUESTIONABLE ASSUMPTIONS AND MISUNDERSTANDINGS OF THE PROGRAM

It has been alleged that the report represents unsupported overgeneralizations which do not include any evidence or data other than hourly wages and job experience. It also has been alleged that the report does not indicate a correct understanding of the Job Corps program particularly with respect to such matters as the goals and objectives of the vocational and educational programs. It has been stated also that vocational classroom training is not practical considering the academic achievement levels of the entering youths. It has been suggested that (1) vocational classroom training may not be meaningful, (2) many areas of industry are primarily interested in obtaining youths with proper attitudes who it can provide vocational training by its own standards, and (3) GAO placed too much emphasis on graduation criteria.

The GAO report contains comments on the adequacy of the Job Corps program with respect to recruiting and screening, retention of Corps members, vocational and academic training, counseling, and placement and follow-up as well as the post-Job Corps experience. GAO's views are based on consideration of all of these facets of the program.

GAO found and reported that the vocational training program at the conservation centers generally lacked precise, detailed curriculums and lesson plans. In this connection the Job Corps recognized the weakness and has taken action to improve the situation.

GAO recognizes that vocational training, whether in the classroom or in practical on-the-job training, requires a minimum level of literacy and that in many cases incoming Corps members had not reached this level. Job Corps calls for intensive academic training partly to meet this need, and, with respect to individual centers, GAO has made suggestions to Job Corps for improving academic training.

While there may be views among some educators that vocational classroom work may not be of value, such views do not appear to have been the basis for the methods followed at the Job Corps centers. In this respect, GAO noted that the program at conservation centers where vocational training was provided primarily within the context of work projects contrasted with the programs at the urban centers which usually included both classroom and on-the-job training.

It may be that in many areas of American industry there is a growing desire to provide skill training by the industry's own standards. However, GAO's examination was made against the objectives of the Job Corps program which are in part to provide intensive vocational training to participants. GAO recognizes the need to develop in Corps members good work habits and attitudes, but if it is demonstrable that such qualities are all that are desired by industry in those it employs, the objectives of the various manpower programs to provide intensive vocational training would have to be reconsidered.

The stress on graduation has been established, not by GAO, but by the Job Corps which has developed its program to give the greatest assistance to those classified as graduates. GAO would not agree that anyone should be classified as a graduate at termination merely because he took part in the program and showed some progress. Considering the objectives of the Job Corps program, measurements of improvements in the participants is an essential tool for evaluating the extent to which the program is successful.

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

Mr. PROUTY. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have been on the same committee with the Senator from Vermont for some years. The Senator from Vermont has constantly taken the position he has now taken with respect to the Job Corps situation, which has very largely developed along the lines he predicted.

What the Senator has developed in great detail and depth is characteristic of the fairness and preparation that have gone into his whole approach to the situation.

Because I know he would not say it himself, I should like to say that his solicitude for those who need training, and who should have training with the help of the Federal Government, is second to no one's here, neither the sponsor of the resolution nor any other Senator.

I know that his statement comes only after real study and with a design for doing a fine and better job. He is the primary author of the Human Investment Act, which so many of us supported here, which is designed to attain the very purposes that I certainly think our committee is united on and which represents a different point of view from that of the sponsor of the resolution and those Senators who have supported him.

It is only fair to say that that proposal has as its objective the same effort to provide every young American, no matter how he may have been situated before, the opportunity to acquire the skill and training which would enable him to share fairly and equitably in the tremendous productivity and power of the American economy.

I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. PROUTY. I am very grateful to my distinguished friend, the senior Senator from New York. Certainly, my statement today has not been intended as anything other than constructive criticism. I am sure all of us on the committee and in the Senate want to do everything we can to make these training programs successful and enable thousands of young men who have not had a fair chance up to this time to receive the training and skills necessary to become productive citizens. That is all I am interested in. That is what we are all interested in. If there is a better way to do it, then let us try it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator and I have served together now for a very long time. In my judgment, the Senator from Vermont shows that he is not going to be deterred from attaining the objective by narrow financial considerations, but that he will lend himself to every constructive measure, on a high priority, to attain the result which he has indicated by his previous statement that he wishes to attain.

Mr. PROUTY. I have said on many occasions that, if more money is needed to do the job, I would be in favor of it if it did the job. My assertion today is that we are not now doing the job with the money spent on the Job Corps program. If we can find a better way, even

though it may cost more in the end, I am in favor of taking that action.

Mr. JAVITS. Again I congratulate my colleague.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Frank Q. Nebeker, of Virginia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS (S. Doc. No. 91–18)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year 1969 in the amounts of $172,600,000 for mandatory payments to veterans; $30,353,000 for Federal agency expenses of recent storms and floods; $17,305,407 in budget authority and $24,651,000 in other proposals for essential needs of the Executive Branch; and $1,700,000 for fiscal year 1968 and 1969 needs for the Judiciary, which, with accompanying papers was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF AGREEMENTS SIGNED UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480

A letter from the Administrator, Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, report of agreements for foreign currencies signed by the Department in March and April 1969 (with an accompanying report and papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT—NATIONAL ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCES PROGRAM

A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the national atmospheric sciences program, for the fiscal year 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION ON CERTAIN CONCESSIONS AT WASHINGTON NATIONAL AIRPORT

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of October 9, 1940 (54 Stat. 1030), in order to increase the periods for which agreements for the operation of certain concessions may be granted at the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE FOR ALTERATION, MAINTENANCE, AND REPAIR OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS AND PROPERTY UNDER LEASE OR CONCESSION CONTRACTS

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the alternation, maintenance, and repair of Government buildings and property under lease or concession contracts entered into pursuant to the operation and maintenance of Government owned airports under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Transportation and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION AUTHORIZING ARRESTS FOR OFFENSES COMMITTED ON FEDERAL LANDS ACQUIRED TO PROVIDE ACCESS TO DULLES AIRPORT

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of September 7, 1950 (relating to the construction of a public airport in or near the District of Columbia), to authorize arrests for offenses committed on Federal lands acquired to provide access to the airport, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting pursuant to law, a report on observations on development and status of the audit function at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated May 9, 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION BY CAMERON COUNTY WATER IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 2, SAN BENITO, TEX., FOR LOAN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a request that the loan application by the Cameron County Water Improvement District No. 2 of San Benito, Tex., be dropped from consideration (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF TITLE 5 UNITED STATES CODE

A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 5, United States Code, to repeal the reporting requirement contained in subsection (b) of section 1308 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

An act (H.F. No. 881) adopted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

H.F. No. 881

"An act relating to the cession by the state of Minnesota to the state of North Dakota of certain parcels of real property located in Kittson county, Minnesota

"Be it enacted by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota:

"Section 1. [Finding.] Because of the construction of the Drayton Dam on the Red River of the North for industrial and municipal water supply purposes, an avulsion has occurred leaving the following parcel of land physically detached from the state of Minnesota and attached to the state of North Dakota:

"That portion of government lot 1, section 18, township 159 north, range 50 west of the 5th principal meridian, county of Kittson, state of Minnesota, bounded by the thread of the Red River of the North as it existed prior to April 1964, and the thread of the new channel and spillway constructed to the east of the old channel, containing 2.83 acres, more or less.

"Sec. 2. [Cession of lands.] The state of Minnesota upon passage by the legislature of the state of North Dakota of the necessary enabling legislation accepting jurisdiction over the property described in section 1, so that said property shall be a part of the state of North Dakota, hereby agrees to the cession of said lands so that the same will no longer be a part of Minnesota.

"Sec. 3. [Lands, Titles, Records.] Nothing contained in the provisions of this act shall be construed in such manner as to prejudice the title, right or claim of any person to any of the lands herein involved. The register of deeds of Kittson county, Minnesota shall cooperate with the register of deeds of Pembina county, North Dakota in furnishing him such records of title, or copies thereof, to the land described in section 1, recorded in Kittson county, Minnesota, as may be necessary. The register of deeds may make the usual charge for certified copies of records and documents if the same are required by the register of deeds of Pembina county.

"Sec. 4. [Agreement, Consent of Congress.] The act of the legislature of the state of North Dakota referred to in section 2 of this act, together with this act, shall constitute the agreement between the states of Minnesota and North Dakota. The congress of the United States, upon passage of such acts by the respective legislatures of the states of Minnesota and North Dakota, is petitioned, pursuant to Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution, to give its consent to this agreement and to amend the enabling acts of such states accordingly. The secretary of state of Minnesota shall transmit copies of this act to the presiding officers of the senate and house of representatives of the United States and to the several senators and representatives of the states of Minnesota and North Dakota in the congress of the United States who are petitioned to take such action as they deem proper to procure the consent of the congress of the United States to this agreement between the states of Minnesota and North Dakota.

"L. L. DUXBURY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"JAMES B. GOETZ,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed the House of Representatives this seventh day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

"EDWARD A. BURDICK,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Passed the Senate this 11th day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

"H. Y. TORREY,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Approved April 22, 1969.

"HAROLD LEVANDER,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed April 22, 1969.

"JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
"Secretary of State."

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Philadelphia, memorializing the President of the United States to reconsider the anti-ballistic-missile plan; to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 1287. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1970, 1971, and 1972 to carry out the metric system study (Rept. No. 91–168); and

H.R. 8794. An act to amend the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 to continue the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–169).

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. DOLE):

S. 2115. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Wichita, Kans.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for Mr. AIKEN):

S. 2116. A bill to provide for the inspection of certain egg products by the U.S. Department of Agriculture; restriction on the disposition of certain qualities of eggs; uniformity of standards for eggs in interstate and foreign commerce; and cooperation with State agencies in administration of this Act; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S. 2117. A bill for the relief of Lai Wai (Wai-ming); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

S. 2118. A bill to improve the health and safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. GOLDWATER:

S. 2119. A bill to provide for the restoration of the Antelope Creek lands to the Navajo Tribe of Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. GURNEY, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. PROUTY and Mr. MILLER):

S. 2120. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to extend its duration, to authorize assistance for projects for foster grandparents and senior companions, to provide assistance to strengthen State agencies on aging, and to otherwise strengthen and improve that act; to the Committeee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 2121. A bill to amend the act of August 28, 1950, enabling the Secretary of Agriculture to furnish, upon a reimbursable basis, certain inspection services involving overtime work; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McCLELLAN (for himself Mr. ERVIN, and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 2122. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prescribe the manner in which a witness in a Federal proceeding may be ordered to provide information after asserting his privilege against self-incrimination and to define the scope of the immunity to be provided such witness with respect to information provided under an order; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. McCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under an earlier heading.)

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 2123. A bill for the relief of Mr. Mir Shamsuddin Ali Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 2124. A bill to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to administer a program to provide for the construction of parking facilities in the District of Columbia for Government employees and visitors to the District of Columbia without displacing families or businesses or reducing the tax base of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 2125. A bill to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to accord to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the same tariff treatment as is provided for insular possessions of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

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

By Mr. DODD:

S. 2126. A bill for the relief of Hon Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McINTYRE:

S. 2127. A bill for the relief of Jose Dias Costeira Afonso;

S. 2128. A bill for the relief of Domitilia da Silva Sousa;

S. 2129. A bill for the relief of Jose Maria Pimentel Jeronimo;

S. 2130. A bill for the relief of Jose Luis Tavares Arruda;

S. 2131. A bill for the relief of Manuel Espilola de Veiga and his wife, Rosa Augusta de Melo de Veiga;

S. 2132. A bill for the relief of Dimas Carvalho Pimentel;

S. 2133. A bill for the relief of Clarimundo S. De Quadros;

S. 2134. A bill for the relief of Daniel Dias Machado; and

S. 2135. A bill for the relief of Fernando da Silva Matos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 2136. A bill for the relief of Hsia Cheung Fat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 2137. A bill for the relief of Dr. Chung Hong Khan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD:

S. 2138. A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 2139. A bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include certain amounts paid for special foods as amounts paid for medical care; 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. JACKSON:

S. 2140. A bill to provide for the conveyance of a portion of pier 91, Seattle, Wash., for National Guard purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 2141. A bill to provide that Federal income tax returns may be mailed free of postage; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 2142. A bill to provide for the renewal and extension of certain sections of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. McGEE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey):

S. 2143. A bill to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. GRAVEL (for himself, Mr. COOK, and Mr. Moss):

S. 2144. A bill to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. MONDALE:

S.J. Res. 109. A joint resolution to provide for a study of student unrest on campuses in the United States; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

S. 2115—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE STRIKING OF MEDALS IN COMMEMORATION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE CITY OF WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, today I introduce, for myself and Senator DOLE, for appropriate reference, a bill which will provide for the striking of medals to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the founding of the city of Wichita. This centennial celebration is to begin June 28, 1969. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish the Wichita Centennial, Inc. with not more than 100,000 national medals for the celebration. The designs, sizes, and composition of the medals are to be determined by the Wichita Centennial, Inc., the sponsoring organization, subject to the approval by the Secretary. The medals may not be made until security satisfactory to the Secretary is furnished to indemnify the United States for full payment of all costs. The medals may be made in quantities of not less than 2,000 and no medals may be made under the authority of this legislation after December 31, 1970.

Wichita, the largest city in Kansas with a population of 282,381, serves as county seat of Sedgwick County with a total population of 352,553. Named for the tribe of Wichita Indians which came to Kansas from Oklahoma Territory in 1863, Wichita had its beginning for the purpose of trade with the Indians. Wichita has grown from an Indian village to a metropolis in its first century.

Wichita is termed the "Air Capital of the World." Fifty-six percent of all general aviation aircraft manufactured in the United States are produced by Wichita's Beech, Cessna, and Lear Jet. Moreover, the Wichita Division of the Boeing Co. is the largest industrial employer in the State of Kansas, and contributes a high percentage of this country's airline and military jets. McConnel Air Force Base, also located at Wichita, adds to the city's air travel fame. As a result of the capabilities of its aerospace industries. Wichita is proud of the many contributions made through the years to the defense and security of America.

As Sedgwick County and Wichita are situated in the center of an extensive fertile agricultural area, agriculture is important and diversified. Wichita is a principal agricultural market in Kansas. It is the third largest grain storage city in the Nation. Wichita for many years has been the largest broom corn market in the world. The city also serves as a major livestock terminal market and meatpacking center. Wichita is headquarters

for oil production in Kansas and for parts of Oklahoma, New Mexico, Colorado, and Wyoming.

The people of Wichita have long realized the importance of culture in everyday life, and they are supporting city-wide improvement programs, including core-area beautification, tree-lined boulevards, a $2.5 million library, a $3.6 million natural habitat zoo, and a $12.6 million civic and cultural center known as Century II.

The House has completed action on this legislation. Because of the nearness of the centennial, I hope the Senate may act expeditiously.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2115) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the founding of the City of Wichita, Kans., introduced by Mr. PEARSON (for himself and Mr. DOLE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2124—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR PARKING FACILITIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize the mayor of the District of Columbia to administer a program for the construction of parking facilities in the District of Columbia for Government employees and visitors to the District of Columbia without displacing families or businesses or reducing the tax base of the District of Columbia.

This bill is basically the same, with a few minor changes, as that passed by the House of Representative on September 25, 1968. The purpose of the bill is to provide adequate parking on federally owned or District-owned property. The general idea is to have these facilities constructed, maintained, and operated by experienced operators.

Besides minimizing cost of site acquisition and avoiding erosion of the property tax base, another important aspect of the bill is that the cost of these facilities would be self-liquidating. In other words, fees would be charged to amortize the cost of the facilities. Therefore, it would not cost the Federal taxpayers any money. This is most important at a time when we are trying to hold down Federal expenditures and stop the runaway inflation we have been experiencing for so long. The need for this legislation is urgent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2124) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to administer a program to provide for the construction of parking facilities in the District of Columbia for Government employees and visitors to the District of Columbia without displacing families or businesses or reducing the tax base of the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2125—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL EXEMPTING THE TRUST TERRITORY FROM CERTAIN TARIFFS AND DUTIES

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am today introducing a measure to exempt most goods of the Trust Territory from the tariffs and duties now imposed on such goods entering the United States from this area. At the present time, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands enjoy tariff preferences for the entry of their goods into the United States. My bill would grant the Trust Territory the same privileges afforded these territories. While the Trust Territory is not itself a possession of the United States, it is administered by the United States under a United Nations trusteeship. I believe this places a special obligation upon us relative to this area. Assumption of our proper responsibility for the economic development of the Trust Territory is long overdue. As a first step we should assist in developing as viable an economic base as possible despite the Trust Territory's lack of natural resources and its great distance from large markets. The proposed legislation would be a step in that direction.

The Trust Territory has few duties and these only apply to specific commodities such as tobacco, liquors, and petroleum. Of the $13,572,052 imported into the Trust Territory in fiscal year 1968, the U.S. share of this market was approximately 50 percent. Trade is not a one-way street.

Undoubtedly concern will be expressed by some that the Trust Territory will merely become an assembly point for foreign produced goods thereby giving them preferred treatment in U.S. markets. To prevent this, the bill I am introducing would provide for a 50-percent foreign materials limitation on the duty-free goods imported into the United States. There is a similar provision which applies to those goods imported from Guam and the Virgin Islands duty free.

Public attention has once again focused on the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands as a result of a recent visit by Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel.

Unfortunately such attention is rare for the Trust Territory. The U.S. Government has not given this area the attention it needs, nor have we expressed our concern through meaningful action. The bill I am today introducing would help to assist the Trust Territory to become more self-sufficient, raise their miserably low per capita income, and demonstrate our intent to fulfill our obligations to the people of these islands. The time for action is now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2125) to amend the Tariff Schedules of the United States to accord to the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands the same tariff treatment as is provided for insular possessions of the United States, introduced by Mr. INOUYE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2139—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO INCLUDE CERTAIN AMOUNTS EXPENDED FOR SPECIAL DIETARY FOODS AND BEVERAGES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference a bill to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. Specifically, this bill provides for an expansion of the definition of "medical care" as found in section 213(e) of the code to include certain amounts expanded for special dietary foods and beverages. Such foods and beverages which are needed to satisfy the nutritional requirements of an individual who, for reason of health, is unable to consume a regular diet would be made tax deductible to the extent that the cost of such items exceeds the cost of a normal diet. In addition, the cost of transportation which is undertaken for the primary purpose of obtaining such foods and beverages would also be made deductible.

There are millions of people in this country, Mr. President, who must adhere to strict diets for health reasons. Currently they are not allowed to deduct as "medical care" expenses those amounts expended for special foods which are above and beyond that which would be spent on normal diet. This is so even though those who must utilize such diets are, in the strictest sense of the world, ill. Although adherence to required dietary prescriptions will ordinarily prevent illness in the affected person, any departures from the regimen are capable of producing serious illness and even death. Section 213(e)(1)(A) of the code provides that amounts expended "for the mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease" should be treated as allowable expenses, yet the Internal Revenue Service has consistently refused to acknowledge that special diet foods have the effect of mitigating, treating, or preventing disease and thus has refused to bring them within the language of the section.

The following outline indicates those clinically identified diseases wherein the patient knows he has the disease and wherein dietary restrictions, regimens, or supplements are prescribed by a physician.

Disease	Diet	Number
High blood pressure	Sodium restricted	17,000,000
Coronary heart disease	Fat restricted	3,125,000
Diabetes	Carbohydrate restricted.	2,000,000
Gastric ulcers	"Sippy" food regimens.	10,000,000
Colitis	"Bland" food regimens.	(1)
Iron-deficiency anemia	Iron-enriched foods	(2)

[1] Unknown, but common in white women in their thirties outside the Southern United States.

[2] 10,000,000 to 60,000,000 among children and women (estimated prevalence).

In addition to the above-listed diseases there are many conditions which require anti-allergenic diets, fat gluten-free diets, therapeutic vitamin and/or mineral supplements, protein supplements; as well as restricted diets in connection with certain kidney and metabolic diseases.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be reprinted immediately after my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2139) to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include certain amounts paid for special foods as amounts paid for medical care introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2139

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 213(e)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of medical care) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of subparagraph (B);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(3) by inserting after subparagraph (C) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) for food and beverages necessary to satisfy the nutritional requirements of an individual who is unable, by reason of his health, to consume normal food and beverages (but only to the extent the amounts paid for such food and beverages exceed the amounts which would be paid for food and beverages for such individual if he was able to consume normal food and beverages), and transportation undertaken primarily to obtain such food and beverages."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 2143—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROMOTE TRAVEL IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the past 8 years, the United States has experienced major balance-of-payments difficulties, a significant element of which is the so-called "travel gap"—the difference between what U.S. tourists spend abroad and what foreign travelers spend in the United States. Yet, except for the establishment of the U.S. Travel Service in 1961, no effective national program or resources have been developed to meet this major problem.

The last administration's record was unhappily inadequate in this respect. It first launched the so-called "Discover America" program in 1965, financed entirely by travel industry contributions. It subsequently reduced the value of goods that returning American travelers could bring into the United States duty-free to discourage U.S. overseas travel. In early 1968, the President called for additional measures to restrict travel, including a travel tax. Fortunately, Congress had the good sense not to act on these restrictions. In November of 1967, President Johnson appointed an Industry-Government Special Task Force on Travel to develop recommendations for government and private action in the field of travel. The report of the task force was completed February 6, 1968, and some of its minor proposals were implemented by the travel industry. When it came to such major proposals as the establishment of a national tourist office with an annual budget of $30 million, differences within the administration prevented it from implementing them.

The point I am making here is that we are in the ninth year of the U.S. balance-of-payments crisis, and the Federal Government still has not been able to come up with an effective national travel effort. Despite the heroic efforts of the USTS through its meager financial resources, the travel deficit has widened. It was $1.6 billion in 1964, and $1.96 billion in 1968.

The outgoing administration's last proposals were to request the start of a matching fund program to encourage the travel promotion efforts of State and local governments and private or public nonprofit organizations, and a $6 million appropriation for the USTS for fiscal 1970. Senator MAGNUSON, Senator STEVENS, and I have introduced legislation, S. 1289, to establish a matching fund program.

I do not believe that either the matching fund proposal or a minor increase in USTS' budget will be adequate to do the job that needs to be done.

I believe that now is the time, at the outset of the new administration, to chart a new course, and to make this country into a first-class travel nation. It is for this reason that I am introducing the International and Domestic Travel Act of 1969. The bill would significantly broaden the authority and scope of the USTS, will provide it with $15 million in annual appropriations; and will establish a 15-member Commission to assess the long-term travel needs of this country, financed by a separate $2.5 million appropriation.

Specifically, the bill provides:

First, new authority for the USTS to develop a coherent national travel policy to coordinate the present travel activities of various Federal agencies; to encourage and improve domestic travel facilities; and to coordinate and act as the Federal Government's liaison with State and private tourist organizations.

Second, a budget of $15 million to finance the USTS' new activities and to strengthen its present activities abroad. Of this, $5 million could be devoted to start the domestic travel program proposed by the bill, and $10 million to promote foreign travel to the United States.

Third, a national inventory of our travel resources to lay the groundwork for a long-term national travel program. The bill calls for the establishment of a 15-member National Tourism Resources Commission, to be appointed by the Secretary of Commerce from among private citizens knowledgeable and experienced in the travel field.

The legislation I am proposing today will provide the Nation with the basis for an effective national travel effort. The USTS now has an able, new Director in the person of C. Langhorn Washburn, who already has made himself felt during the brief period that he has been in office. He has proposed a number of interim steps to stimulate the flow of travel to this country from abroad, proposals which received the endorsement of the 15-man Travel Advisory Board of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

I have also discussed the need for a new travel effort with the Secretary of Commerce, Maurice Stans, during his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee earlier this year and in subsequent correspondence, I am impressed with Secretary Stans' determination to strengthen the USTS and to establish an effective travel program for the United States based on new concepts. I very much hope that this bill will gain Secretary Stans' and Director Washburns' support, and urge that the Senate Commerce Committee undertake hearings on U.S. travel policy in the immediate future.

The U.S. travel industry, composed of thousands of hotels, motels, resorts, airlines, national parks and forests, gas stations, seashores, restaurants, is one of our most important national resources. It is a $30 billion industry, ranking as third largest behind manufacturing and agriculture. It is vitally important as an employer of 6 million individuals, 3 million directly and an additional 3 million indirectly, many of them unskilled and semiskilled; as a source of profits to investors and owners, as a source of tax revenue, both to the States and the Federal Government. A vigorous domestic travel industry is also—vital as the most effective means of dealing with the so-called tourism gap—the difference between money spent by U.S. tourists overseas and foreign tourists in the United States.

By promoting foreign and domestic travel effectively at the national, State, and local levels, we will be in a much better position to attract foreign tourists—confident, for example, that when they arrive they will be able to convert their currency easily at points of entry and in the larger cities, that they will be able to find officials and employees in the hotel and transportation field capable of speaking their language, that the natural and manmade wonders of our country will be made available to them with the least possible difficulty. In short, that they will find facilities awaiting them, similar to the facilities and services available to foreign visitors in Europe for the last half century.

The responsibility to own, invest in, and to promote and manage our travel industry belongs to the private sector. The responsibility to encourage, assist, and to act as a catalyst and spearhead for our travel industry rests with the national, State, and local governments in cooperation with private industry.

Since the end of World War II, European countries, Canada, and Japan, as well as developing countries, have embarked on large-scale efforts to increase foreign travel to their countries, as well as to increase travel within their borders. They realize early the enormous earnings potential to travel as a source of employment and tax revenues. With this realization in mind, their budgets for travel promotion have risen each year.

A few statistics will demonstrate what is at stake here: Nearly 141 million for-

eign visitor arrivals were recorded in the different countries of the world in 1968, generating an estimated $14.4 billion. The United States received approximately 11 million visitors: 8.7 million from Canada, 1.8 million from overseas countries, and 500,000 from Mexico. These visitors spent approximately $2.002 billion in the United States. On the other hand, some 16.7 million U.S. residents traveled to Canada, 3.9 million to overseas countries and 400,000 to Mexico. These travelers accounted for an outflow of $3.96 billion. Thus, the travel gap, the difference between expenditures by U.S. residents for travel and U.S. receipts from foreign visitors, in 1968 equaled $1.96 billion.

The United States is a late starter in the competition for the foreign traveler. It was not until the creation of USTS in June, 1961 that the U.S. Government seriously started to promote foreign travel to our shores. This effort has been extremely successful as is demonstrated by the steep rise in foreign travel to the United States since the USTS went to work. On the budget that has reached $4.5 million only in the current fiscal year, the USTS has succeed in stimulating an increase in foreign travel to the United States by over 20 percent in 1967. Through the help of USTS, from 1961 to 1968, the overall percentage increase has been 176.7 percent, an average of over 14 percent per year.

According to information supplied by the USTS, the estimated number of foreigners whose income level would permit a visit to the United States is 13.2 million as compared with the nearly 2 million who visited this country from overseas last year—excluding those from Canada and Mexico. It is therefore quite clear that the USTS budget should be sharply increased if an effective travel promotion campaign is to be mounted by the United States.

It is rather obvious that before an effective national effort can be mounted to fully exploit the potential of travel in the United States, there must be developed a focal point within the Federal Government to orchestrate the activities of the Government in travel and tourism.

If anyone today attempts to discuss the problem of improving our American travel resources with official Washington, he would find it impossible to find any one agency involved with the broad aspect of travel. There is an agency to promote foreign travel to this country, another to encourage outdoor recreation. The Agriculture Department is encouraging farmers to build campsites. Interior is helping Indian reservations to create tourist attractions. ARA is lending money for tourist development in distressed areas. Interior has National Parks, and Agriculture, National Forests. The Department of Transportation establishes transportation policy and so do some of the independent agencies.

More than a dozen Federal departments and agencies spend millions of dollars on travel and tourism functions. Departments or agencies not already named include the Forest Service, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Civil Aeronautics Board, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Armed Forces. The need is obviously great for a central coordinating body which can at least think about the overall state of the American travel industry.

Providing the specialized facilities and services needed by foreign and domestic visitors must also be considered. There is a great need for taking a national inventory of our national travel resources and assessing its adequacy over the next decade. A new initiative must be taken to establish a close relationship between our national efforts to promote domestic and foreign travel in the United States and the efforts of the States.

Such an inventory would be the responsibility of the National Tourism Resources Review Commission which is authorized by the bill I introduce today. The Commission, whose members would be experienced in the tourism and travel industries, would bring into focus our current resources and facilities and help draft long-range plans for the future.

Under my bill, the Commission would be provided with a budget of $2.5 million and would be ordered to report to the President and the Congress within 2 years. The staff of the U.S. Travel Service would be authorized to assist the Commission; but expert consultant hire would also be authorized.

Among the problems that should be considered by the Commission in the course of its study is: Whether a separate Federal agency should be created to consolidate and coordinate the tourism research, planning, and development now handled by many different departments, offices, and agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD various tables to which I have referred.

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

(See exhibits 1 to 4.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the International and Domestic Travel Act of 1969 for myself and Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and I request unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

The bill (S. 2143) to amend the International Travel Act of 1961 in order to promote travel in the United States, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2143

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the International Travel Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2121–2126) is amended—

(1) by striking out the first and second sections and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"That it is the purpose of this Act to strengthen the domestic and foreign commerce of the United States, and promote friendly understanding and appreciation of the United States by encouraging foreign residents to visit the United States and by facilitating international travel generally, and by otherwise encouraging and facilitating travel within the United States (including its possessions for the purposes of this Act).

"SEC. 2. In order to carry out the purpose of this Act the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Secretary') shall—

"(1) formulate for the United States a comprehensive policy with respect to domestic travel;

"(2) develop, plan, and carry out a comprehensive program designed to stimulate and encourage travel to and within the United States for the purpose of study, culture, recreation, business, and other activities and as a means of promoting friendly understanding and good will among peoples of foreign countries and the United States;

"(3) encourage the development of tourist facilities, low-cost unit tours, and other arrangements within the United States for meeting the requirements of all travelers;

"(4) foster and encourage the widest possible distribution of the benefits of travel at the cheapest rates between foreign countries and the United States and within the United States consistent with sound economic principles;

"(5) encourage the simplification, reduction, or elimination of barriers to travel, and facilitation of travel to and within the United States generally;

"(6) collect, publish, and provide for the exchange of statistics and technical information, including schedules of meetings, fairs, and other attractions, relating to travel and tourism; and

"(7) establish an office to be known as the Office of Travel Program Coordination, which shall assist the Secretary in carrying out his responsibilities under this Act for the purpose of (A) achieving maximum coordination of the programs of the various departments and agencies of the United States Government to promote the purposes of this Act, (B) consulting with appropriate officers and agencies of State and local governments, and with private organizations and agencies, with respect to programs undertaken pursuant to this Act, and (C) achieving the effective cooperation of Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, and of private organizations and agencies, concerned with such programs.";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end of section 3(b) the following: "and shall not otherwise compete with the activities of other public or private agencies";

(3) by inserting "(a)" after "SEC 4", and by inserting at the end of such section 4 a new subsection as follows:

"(b) The Secretary may appoint two assistant directors for the purpose of this Act, Such assistant directors shall be compensated at the rate provided for GS–18 in the Classification Act of 1949.";

(4) by redesignating sections 5, 6, and 7 as sections 6, 7, and 8, respectively, and by inserting after section 4 a new section as follows:

"SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary shall establish a National Tourism Resources Review Commission. Such Commission shall be composed of fifteen members appointed by the Secretary from among persons who are informed about and concerned with the improvement, development, and promotion of United States tourism resources and opportunities or who are otherwise experienced in tourism research, promotion, or planning. The Secretary shall appoint a chairman from among

such members. The Commission shall meet at the call of the Secretary.

"(b) The Commission shall make a full and complete study and investigation for the purpose of—

"(1) determining the domestic travel needs of the people of the United States and of visitors from other lands at the present time and to the year 1980;

"(2) determining the travel resources of the Nation available to satisfy such needs now and to the year 1980;

"(3) determining policies and programs which will insure that the domestic travel needs of the present and the future are adequately and efficiently met;

"(4) determining a recommended program of Federal assistance to the States in promoting domestic travel; and

"(5) determining whether a separate agency of the Government should be established to consolidate and coordinate tourism research, planning, and development activities presently performed by different existing agencies of the Government.

The Commission shall report the results of such investigation and study to the Secretary not later than two years after the effective date of this section. The Secretary shall submit such report, together with his recommendations with respect thereto, to the President and the Congress.

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be necessary to assist the Commission, the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Commission such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Commerce as the Commission may require to carry out its functions.

"(d) Members of the Commission, while serving on business of the Commission, shall receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(e) There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,500,000 for the purpose of this section."

(5) by striking out "$4,700,000" in the section redesignated as section 7 and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000"; and

(6) by striking out "International Travel Act of 1961" in the section redesignated as section 8 and inserting in lieu thereof "International and Domestic Travel Act of 1969."

EXHIBIT 1.—Travel promotion expenditures of countries as compared to their gross national products and travel receipts—1967

Country	National tourist office budget for advertising and promotion	GNP	Receipts from international tourism
Austria	$1,730,800	$10,600,000,000	$615,000,000
Belgium	1,100,000	19,200,000,000	(1)
Canada	8,931,000	57,400,000,000	1,209,000,000
Denmark	671,000	12,200,000,000	(1)
Finland	576,600	9,400,000,000	(1)
France	3,339,800	108,000,000,000	1,041,000,000
Germany	[2] 2,000,000	120,900,000,000	877,000,000
Greece	4,700,000	5,700,000	127,000,000
Ireland	[2] 5,000,000	3,100,000,000	(1)
Italy	3,023,000	67,000,000,000	1,424,000,000
Luxembourg	75,000	677,400,000	(1)
Mexico	1,361,900	24,000,000,000	(1)
Netherlands	1,292,000	24,300,000,000	299,000,000
Norway	630,000	8,500,000,000	102,000,000
Portugal	1,793,700	4,185,000	257,000,000
Spain	2,045,200	21,900,000,000	1,210,000,000
Sweden	[2] 600,000	26,000,000,000	109,000,000
Switzerland	2,695,000	15,700,000,000	575,000,000
United Kingdom	[2] 8,500,000	95,000,000,000	652,000,000
United States	1,400,000	789,663,000,000	1,641,000,000

[1] Not available.
[2] Estimated.

Source: Overseas business reports, IUOTO and OECD.

EXHIBIT 2

Budgets of Federal agencies dealing with some aspects of travel, fiscal year 1968 [1]

	*1968 estimate**
Fish and Wildlife Service	$288,197,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs	256,374,000
Bureau of Land Management	156,584,000
National Park Service	130,283,000
Bureau of Reclamation	301,799,000
Army Corps of Engineers: civil works program, fiscal year	1,306,428,000
Bureau of Outdoor Recreation	123,469,000
Forest Service	531,675,000

[1] Funds available for travel promotion or facilities used by traveler are contained within these budgets.

*New obligated authority including revenues.

EXHIBIT 3

Expenditures of State governments for travel promotion, fiscal year 1968—Advertising and promotion budget

Alabama	$374,370
Alaska	200,100
Arizona	75,000
Arkansas	300,000
California	(1)
Colorado	$395,000
Connecticut	70,000
Delaware	4,300
Florida	625,000
Georgia	400,000
Hawaii	400,000
Idaho	140,000
Illinois	100,000
Indiana	282,000
Iowa	20,000
Kansas	50,000
Kentucky	130,000
Louisiana	200,000
Maine	263,598
Maryland	100,000
Massachusetts	555,000
Michigan	367,000
Minnesota	230,000
Mississippi	240,000
Missouri	250,000
Montana	100,000
Nebraska	(1)
Nevada	7,000
New Hampshire	100,000
New Jersey	220,000
New Mexico	145,218
New York	$628,285
North Carolina	525,000
North Dakota	20,000
Ohio	75,000
Oklahoma	85,000
Oregon	353,000
Pennsylvania	340,000
Rhode Island	100,000
South Carolina	125,000
South Dakota	218,500
Tennessee	140,000
Texas:	
Texas Highway Department	(1)
Texas Tourist Development Agency	225,000
Utah	268,600
Vermont	140,000
Virginia	865,000
Washington	220,000
West Virginia	38,000
Wisconsin	228,435
Wyoming	207,600
Total	11,145,006

[1] None.

Source: "Survey of State Travel Offices, 1967–1968" prepared by National Association of Travel Organizations (NATO), October 1968.

EXHIBIT 4

U.S. TRAVEL SERVICE BUDGET AND STAFF

Fiscal year	Approved budget	Size of Staff, District of Columbia	Overseas	Number of offices
1962	$2,500,000	21	27	7
1963	3,350,000	26	38	9
1964	2,600,000	25	44	9
1965	3,000,000	29	47	9
1966	3,000,000	31	48	11
1967	3,000,000	32	44	11
1968	3,000,000	29	47	11
1969	4,500,000	[1] 39	[1] 38	7
1970 (requested)	6,000,000	43	41	8

[1] As of Apr. 30, 1969.

S. 2144—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO CLARIFY AND STRENGTHEN CARGO-PREFERENCE LAWS

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation which is designed to clarify and strengthen our cargo-preference laws, and to insure that we at last move toward the attainment of their original goal—the strengthening and improvement of the American-flag merchant marine.

The concept of providing some minimal safeguards for the American merchant marine is an historic one. Since its founding, this Nation has been dependent upon merchant shipping for the adequate development of our peacetime commerce and for the carriage of our national defense requirements. Repeatedly, our ability to develop merchant shipping under the American flag has been placed in jeopardy by the highly competitive nature of international shipping.

On the one hand, we have an American merchant marine which reflects the economic vitality of our country. Because we have a high standard of living, American sailors enjoy wages unmatched by any other maritime power. Because of our high standard of living,

the higher economic base of all American workers—in shipyards, in steel mills, in ore mines, in woodworking, in metal working, and the like—finds itself reflected in higher capital costs for the American shipowner who builds and registers his vessel in this country. Because of our humanitarian concern and sense of social responsibility, American sailors enjoy the best of working conditions and fringe benefits, and the vessel on which they work must measure up to the highest achievable safety standards.

All of these cost money, and they place the American-flag ship operator at a disadvantage when he is forced into face-to-face competition with the foreign-flag operator who benefits from lower wages, substandard working conditions, and smaller capital costs resulting from lower safety and operating standards.

Yet, competitive pricing aside, America's need for a merchant fleet of its own has never been challenged. And it is out of this need that the system of insulating American operators against predatory competition developed.

In the international trade, the cargo-preference program had its origin in laws enacted to reserve all of our military cargo for American-flag ships. The reason, again, was obvious: Our military strength would be placed in jeopardy if war and defense materials were carried on foreign ships of uncertain friendliness.

The 73d Congress enacted a cargo-preference law—Public Resolution No. 17 (U.S.C. 616a). This law provided that when the purchase and shipment of American goods is financed by Federal lending agencies, the cargo is to be carried by American-flag ships. This law remains in effect, but it has not beer subject to strict enforcement and the intent of the law has been negated.

In addition to the statutes that I have already cited, there is on the books what is commonly referred to as the cargo-preference law—section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1241(b)). In brief, this law provides that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of Government-generated cargo shall be carried in privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels, to the extent they are available at fair and reasonable rates. This is the law which was intended to insure a minimum of 50 percent participation by American-flag ships in the carriage of foreign aid, food for peace, and other Government-generated cargo which we have provided in such vast quantities for the less fortunate nations.

There can be no question about the intention of Congress in passing this law and all subsequent amendments. The purpose of the legislation was to make sure that there was a minimum of 50 percent of this cargo reserved for American-flag ships.

Notwithstanding this plain intention, repeated and emphasized in every enactment and amendment of the law, Government agencies have acted in such a way as to make the 50-percent participation a maximum and not a minimum mandate. Accordingly, it has been only rarely—and only for brief periods—that American ships have carried as much as 50 percent of such cargo, while foreign-flag lines have feasted on our bounty to the detriment of our commercial fleet.

Recently, the Transportation Institute of Washington, D.C., which concerns itself with all phases of transportation but whose primary concern is for maritime matters, made an analysis of the practices of the Federal agencies involved. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to include in my remarks at this point the statistics on fiscal year 1967 compiled by the Transportation Institute on this subject.

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

U.S.-FLAG SHARE OF GOVERNMENT SHIPMENTS, DECEMBER 1968

While the matter of the government's waterborne shipment of Food-for-Peace and foreign aid cargoes is one of primary concern to the maritime industry, it is of equal concern to all American taxpayers, since, of necessity, public funds underwrite the cost of these shipments.

The basis for allocating cargo to American-flag ships versus foreign-flag ships under these programs is embodied in Section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and P.L. 480—both of which make clear:

(a) That American-flag shipping should receive a *minimum* of 50 percent of the cargo generated by the government, and

(b) That the minimum 50 percent requirement be computed *separately* for each segment of the industry, i.e., liners, tankers and tramps.

In recent weeks, this issue has been the subject of increasing public discussion generated by the contention by some segments of the maritime industry that the laws have been administered unevenly in terms of cargo allocation. In the course of these discussions, some confusion has arisen based on the fact that different federal agencies involved in various aspects of the program use different methods for measuring their activities. This has led to the erroneous conclusion, in at least some quarters, that the program has been completely effective in assuring each segment of the maritime industry its "fair share" of the available government-generated cargoes.

The research staff of the Transportation Institute has analyzed the data supplied by all federal agencies involved in order to clarify the status of the program and to make possible objective conclusions as to the effective implementation of the law.

The Maritime Administration, the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development all publish statistics on the U.S.-flag percentage of government agency shipments. MarAd's data are on a calendar-year basis and cover all agencies except the Department of Defense. AID and Agriculture, on the other hand, use a fiscal-year base and only concern themselves with their own liftings.

The information supplied by MarAd for calendar 1967 breaks down as follows:

MARAD SUMMARY OF GOVERNMENT EXPORTS [1]

	Total long tons	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT			
Tramps	6,174,000	1,497,000	24.2
Tankers	3,366,000	1,718,000	51.0
Liners	1,082,000	707,000	65.3
Total	10,622,000	3,922,000	36.9

MARAD SUMMARY OF GOVERNMENT EXPORTS [1]—Con.

	Total long tons	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
AID			
Tramps	2,036,000	366,000	18.0
Tankers	287,000	86,000	30.0
Liners	2,786,000	1,867,000	67.0
Total	5,109,000	2,319,000	45.4

[1] "All Agencies (Except Department of Defense) Summary of Public Law 664 Exports and Imports, Calendar Year 1967," Maritime Administration, Division of Cargo Promotion.

The Interamerican Development Bank also exported 12,000 tons; all carried on U.S.-flag liners. Excluding this, the totals for AID and Agriculture combined are:

	Total tonnage	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
Tramps	8,210,000	1,863,000	22.7
Tankers	3,653,000	1,804,000	49.4
Liners	3,868,000	2,574,000	66.5
Grand total	15,731,000	6,241,000	39.7

The law states that the 50–50 cargo preference provision shall be "computed separately for dry-bulk carriers, dry cargo liners, and tankers." As can be seen, the liner segment was the only one which exceeded the minimum legal requirement for total AID and Agriculture shipments.

If the tonnage carried by liners—approximately 75 percent of which are subsidized—is excluded, the figure drops to *31 percent* as the U.S.-flag share carried by the largely unsubsidized portion of the fleet—3,667,000 tons out of a total of 11,863,000.

AID's export figures for fiscal 1967 were somewhat more complicated than those of MarAd:

AID EXPORTS [1] (FISCAL 1967)

	Total tons	Tonnage subject to 901(b)	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
Tramps	1,983,377	879,928	468,154	53.0
Tankers	366,014	279,250	141,098	51.0
Liners	2,923,039	2,923,039	1,934,603	66.0
Total	5,242,430	4,082,217	2,543,855	62.3

[1] "Cargo Preference Report, Fiscal Year 1967," AID Office of Procurement, Resources Transportation Division.

Normally, the only discrepancy between this and the AID tonnage figures compiled by MarAd would result from comparing the "apples and oranges" of calendar and fiscal years. In most years the difference would be minor. However, there is substantial percentage difference: 45.4 percent reported by MarAd as opposed to 62.3 percent reported by AID.

The reason for the difference lies in the means whereby the two agencies arrived at their results. The reasoning used by AID was as follows:

The column headed "Tonnage Subject to 901(b)" represents that U.S. tonnage which was *available* at time of cargo movement. The percentage of U.S.-flag tonnage actually carried is figured as a share of this subtotal, rather than of the true total.

AID's position is that Section 901(b) of the Merchant Marine Act—the 50–50 cargo preference requirement—applies only where American ships are available. The agency thus "writes off" the remaining portion of its liftings to foreign-flag vessels before com-

puting the U.S.-flag percentage. As can be seen in the above table on AID exports, even where U.S. tonnage *was* available, AID saw fit to use it for only 62.3 percent of its total shipments.

To be valid, the U.S.-flag tonnage carried should be considered as a percentage of the grand total, not of the subtotal. When this is done, the following results are obtained:

	Total tonnage	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
Tramps	1,983,377	468,154	23.6
Tankers	336,014	141,098	42.0
Liners	2,923,039	1,934,603	66.0
Total	5,242,430	2,543,855	48.5

The 48.5 percent figure is a more reasonable one and, furthermore, is one which is comparable to the 45.4 percent total given by MarAd for calendar 1967.

Again, the U.S.-flag percentage drops considerably if the liner segment is not included. Subtracting those receiving a "double subsidy" leaves a total tonnage of 2,319,391, out of which U.S.-flag tramps and tankers carried 609,252 tons. The percentage then becomes *26.3*, rather than 48.5.

Department of Agriculture liftings are covered by P.L. 480, which governs the disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. The law is divided into two Titles. Title I concerns long-term credit sales and Title II, the "Voluntary Agency Program" portion of the law, concerns free donations of agricultural surpluses to friendly nations on a government-to-government basis. Although an Agriculture Department program, Title II is administered by AID.

The U.S. Attorney and Comptroller-Generals have ruled that the 50–50 cargo preference provision is applicable to Title I of P.L. 480. AID and Agriculture have agreed, in their words, to "maximize" the use of U.S.-flag vessels in carrying out Title II, but there is no formal cargo preference requirement.

For fiscal 1967, the following shipments were made:

	Total long tons	U.S.-flag tonnage	U.S.-flag percentage
Under title I:			
Tramps	5,167,000	1,606,000	31.1
Tankers	4,958,000	2,711,000	54.7
Liners	1,052,000	674,000	64.1
Total	11,177,000	4,991,000	44.7
Under title II:			
Tramps	450,000	156,000	34.7
Tankers			
Liners	636,000	421,000	62.0
Total	1,086,000	577,000	53.2

Title II Agriculture Department shipments constitute the only area where there is no explicit cargo preference and yet this is the only area where more than 50 percent of the total tonnage was lifted in U.S.-flag ships. It also represents the smallest total—only a little over a million tons for fiscal 1967, or about one-fifteenth of the 15,743,000 tons exported by all agencies for calendar 1967.

The Agriculture Department statistics follow the same pattern as do those of MarAd and AID—U.S.-flag tramps and tankers carried 42.6 percent of Title I tonnage and tramps (no tankers were involved) carried 34.7 percent of Title II tonnage. It was the 62.0 percent carried by liners which pushed the Title II percentage over the 50–50 mark.

Most liners receive a daily operating subsidy to enable them to compete with *foreign ships* for *commercial cargo*. The subsidy *is not* intended to enable liners to compete with other U.S. ships for U.S. government cargo. In light of this it is strange that the only segment of the industry which consistently receives more than 50 percent of government generated cargo is the liner segment.

It is equally strange that in spite of the clear language and the intent of the legislation, the other industry segments have not received a *minimum* of 50 percent of government cargo. While tankers have not fared as well as liners, it is the tramps which have really suffered from unfair distribution of government cargo. Regardless of whose figures are used and regardless of whether annual or fiscal periods are used, U.S. tramps do not come close to being allocated at least 50 percent of total tramp cargo. No manipulation of "availability" claims can hide the fact that of this cargo only about 25 percent was carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, subsequently, the Transportation Institute issued some additional data showing that the pattern of using foreign-flag vessels did not change in fiscal year 1968—in fact, during that year, there was a further decline in American-flag carriage. I ask unanimous consent to include these statistics at this point in my remarks.

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

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT EXPORTS, TITLE I, PUBLIC LAW 480, FISCAL 1967 AND 1968

[Long tons]

	Total long tons		U.S.-flag tonnage		U.S.-flag share (percent)	
	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968	Fiscal year 1967	Fiscal year 1968
Tramps	5,167,000	7,765,000	1,606,000	2,081,000	31.1	26.8
Tankers	4,958,000	2,832,000	2,711,000	1,431,000	54.7	50.6
Liners	1,052,000	1,228,000	674,000	773,000	64.1	62.9
Total	11,177,000	11,823,000	4,991,000	4,285,000	44.7	36.2

Note: Fiscal year 1968 figures compiled on basis of quarterly reports published by U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I am introducing today legislation which will reaffirm and implement our cargo-preference laws.

This bill would strengthen these laws in such a way as to encourage greater use of American-flag vessels in the carriage of military, foreign aid, and surplus agricultural shipments generated by the U.S. Government as a means of revitalizing the privately owned merchant marine.

The clear intent of this bill is to assure that privately owned American-flag vessels receive priority over Government-owned ships; and that all American-flag vessels, privately owned and Government-owned, receive priority over the ships of recipient nations.

In accordance with the intent of the original law, the bill vests responsibility for the administration of cargo preference with respect to foreign aid and agricultural surplus shipments in the Federal Maritime Administration, and leaves within the Department of Defense responsibility for administration of cargo preference with respect to military shipments.

The enactment of this bill, Mr. President, would serve the positive goal of ending the present decline of American shipping capabilities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2144) to clarify and strengthen the cargo-preference laws of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRAVEL, for himself and other Senators was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2005—THE RESOURCE RECOVERY ACT OF 1969

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on April 29, 1969, I introduced the Resource Recovery Act of 1969 and asked unanimous consent to have the text of the bill printed in the RECORD. Through an inadvertence only a part of the bill was printed. I, therefore, ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of the bill printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

S. 2005

A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, to improve research programs pursuant to such Act, and for other purposes

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 "Resource Recovery Act of 1969".

SEC. 2. Section 203 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"(7) The term 'municipality' means a city, town, borough, county, parish, district, or other public body created by or pursuant to State law and having jurisdiction over the disposal of solid wastes."

SEC. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 204 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by striking out all beginning with "the development and application" through the end of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "the reduction of the amount of such waste and unsalvageable waste materials, and the development and application of new and improved methods of collecting and disposing of solid waste and processing and recovering usable materials from solid waste (including devices and facilities therefor)."

(b) Such section 204 is further amended by striking out subsection (d).

SEC. 4. The Solid Waste Disposal Act is amended by redesignating sections 205 and 206 as sections 206 and 207, respectively, and by inserting after section 204 a new section as follows:

"SPECIAL STUDY AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS ON RECOVERY OF USEFUL MATERIALS

"SEC. 205. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall as soon as practicable carry out an investigation and study to determine—

"(1) economical means of recovering useful materials from solid waste, recommended uses of such materials for national or international welfare, and the market impact of such recovery;

"(2) appropriate incentive programs (including tax incentives) to assist in solving the problems of solid waste disposal;

"(3) practicable changes in current production and packaging practices which would reduce the amount of solid waste; and

"(4) practicable methods of collection and containerization which will encourage efficient utilization of facilities and contribute to more effective programs of reduction, reuse, or disposal of wastes.

The Secretary shall report the results of such investigation and study to the President and the Congress.

"(b) The Secretary is also authorized to carry out demonstration projects to test and demonstrate recovery techniques developed pursuant to subsection (a).

"(c) The authority contained in section 204 for the purpose of carrying out research and demonstration projects shall be applicable to the provisions of this section."

SEC. 5. Section 207 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as redesignated by the previous section of this Act, is amended to read as follows:

"GRANTS FOR STATE, INTERSTATE, AND LOCAL PLANNING

"SEC. 207. (a) The Secretary may from time to time, upon such terms and conditions consistent with this section as he finds appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act, make grants to State, interstate, municipal, and intermunicipal agencies, and organizations composed of public officials which are eligible for assistance under section 701(g) of the Housing Act of 1954, of not to exceed 66⅔ per centum of the cost in the case of a single municipality, and not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost in the case of an area including more than one municipality, of (1) making surveys of solid waste disposal practices and problems within the jurisdictional areas of such agencies and (2) developing solid waste disposal plans as part of regional environmental protection systems for such areas, including planning for the reuse, as appropriate, of solid waste disposal areas and studies of the effect and relationhip of solid waste disposal practices on areas adjacent to waste disposal sites, and not to exceed 50 per centum of the cost of overseeing the implementation, including enforcement, and modification of such plans.

"(b) Grants pursuant to this section shall be made upon application therefor which—

"(1) designates or establishes a single agency as the sole agency for carrying out the purposes of this section for the area involved;

"(2) indicates the manner in which provision will be made to assure full consideration of all aspects of planning essential to areawide planning for proper and effective solid waste disposal consistent with the protection of the public health, including such factors as population growth, urban and metropolitan development, land use planning, water pollution control, air pollution control, and the feasibility of regional disposal programs;

"(3) sets forth plans for expenditure of such grant, which plans provide reasonable assurance of carrying out the purposes of this section;

"(4) provides for submission of a final report of the activities of the agency in carrying out the purposes of this section, and for the submission of such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time find necessary for carrying out the purposes of this section and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as he may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(5) provides 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 this section.

"(c) The Secretary shall make a grant under this section only if he finds that there is satisfactory assurance that the planning of solid waste disposal will be coordinated, so far as practicable, with, and not duplicative of, other related State, interstate, regional, and local planning activities, including those financed in part with funds pursuant to section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954."

SEC. 6. The Solid Waste Disposal Act is further amended by redesignating the last four sections in such Act as sections 211 through 214, respectively, and by inserting after section 207, as redesignated by this Act, the following new sections:

"GRANTS FOR CONSTRUCTION

"SEC. 208. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to make grants pursuant to this section to any State, municipality, or interstate or intermunicipal agency for the construction of solid waste disposal and resource recovery facilities, including completion and improvement of existing facilities.

"(b) Any such grant—

"(1) shall be made for a project only if it is consistent with any State or interstate plan for solid waste disposal, is included in a comprehensive plan for the area involved which is satisfactory to the Secretary for the purposes of this Act, and is consistent with any standards developed pursuant to section 209;

"(2) (A) shall be made in amounts not exceeding 25 per centum of the estimated reasonable cost of the project as determined by the Secretary in the case of a project serving a single municipality and not exceeding 50 per centum of such cost in the case of a project serving an area including more than one municipality, and only if the applicant is unable to obtain such amounts from other sources upon terms and conditions equally favorable;

"(B) Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under (A) by an additional 50 per centum of such grant for any project which utilizes new or improved techniques of demonstrated usefulness in reducing the environmental impact of solid waste disposal, recovery of resources, or recycling useful materials.

"(3) shall not be made until the applicant has made provision satisfactory to the Secretary for proper and efficient operation and maintenance of the project after completion;

"(4) shall not be made unless such project is consistent with the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act; and

"(5) may be made subject to such conditions and requirements, in addition to those provided in this section, as the Secretary may require to properly carry out his functions pursuant to this Act.

"(c) In determining the desirability of projects and of approving Federal financial aid in connection therewith, consideration shall be given by the Secretary to the public benefits to be derived by the construction and the propriety of Federal aid in such construction, the relation of the ultimate cost of the project to the public interest and to the public necessity for the project, and the use by the applicant of comprehensive regional or metropolitan area planning.

"(d) Not more than 15 per centum of the total of funds appropriated for the purposes of this section in any fiscal year shall be granted for projects in any one State. In the case of a grant for a program in an area crossing State boundaries, the Secretary shall determine the portion of such grant which is chargeable to the percentage limitation under this subsection for each State into which such area extends.

"RECOMMENDED STANDARDS

"SEC. 209. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, in cooperation with appropriate State, interstate, and regional and local agencies, within eighteen months following the date of enactment of this section, recommend to appropriate agencies standards for solid waste collection and disposal systems (including systems for private use) which are consistent with health, air, and water pollution standards and can be adapted to applicable land use plans.

"(b) Further, the Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, recommend model codes, ordinances, and statutes which are designed to implement this section and the purposes of this Act."

SEC. 6. (a) Subsection (a) of section 214 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, as redesignated by this Act, is amended by striking out "not to exceed $19,750,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed $46,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, not to exceed $83,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, not to exceed $152,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, not to exceed $216,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and not to exceed $236,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974. The sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended."

(b) Subsection (b) of such section 214 is amended by striking out "not to exceed $12,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970." and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "not to exceed $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, not to exceed $17,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, not to exceed $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, not to exceed $22,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and not to exceed $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974."

SEC. 7. The amendments made by this Act shall be effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1969.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 109—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION CREATING A SPECIAL COMMISSION ON STUDENT UNREST

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, today I introduce a joint resolution establishing a Commission on Student Unrest, authorizing the Commission to investigate student unrest and campus disorder, and to report and make recommendations for appropriate action to end campus disorders and eliminate from American educational institutions the causes of legitimate student unrest.

The Commission is intended to produce information for intelligent consideration of the problems in our universities, to prevent ill-advised governmental intervention in our traditionally independent system of higher education, and to provide a forum for discussion of the causes and effects of violence on campuses.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proposed joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

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. 109) to provide for a study of student unrest on

campuses in the United States, introduced by Mr. MONDALE, 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.J. RES. 109

A joint resolution to provide for a study of student unrest on campuses in the United States

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Commission on Student Unrest".

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. Student unrest and campus disorders throughout the nation require emergency attention in order to prevent serious damage to the stability of individual institutions, the process of higher education, and our social system.

SEC. 2. In a free society, adequate response to unrest and disorder requires an understanding of the causes of such unrest.

SEC. 3. Whether premeditated or spontaneous, violence and disruption or the threat of violence and disruption of the educational process cannot be tolerated; nor can protection from violence or the threat of violence be allowed to suppress just criticism of weaknesses and injustices in our educational and other social systems.

SEC. 4. Remedies must be found for unresponsiveness and injustice in American social institutions, wherever such unresponsiveness and injustice may be found.

SEC. 5. Investigation and due process are the hallmarks of the solution of problems in a free society.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION

SEC. 6. In accordance with the above-stated declaration of policy, there is hereby created a Special Commission on Student Unrest to be composed of fifteen members, appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In making such appointments, the Secretary shall give due consideration to the need for representation on such Commission of students, university faculty and administrators, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, municipal and State authorities and informed citizens, and he shall also give consideration to appropriate representation from racial groups and political parties.

SEC. 7. It shall be the duty of the Commission to report and make recommendations, as hereinafter provided, to the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States, for action to accomplish the following objectives: (a) to establish procedures within the Federal Government to determine what action, if any, is appropriate to end campus disorders; (b) to eliminate from American educational institutions the causes of legitimate student unrest; and (c) to probe the manifestations of student unrest and disorder and gain an understnding of the forces at work on college campuses.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall make its first preliminary report and recommendation as herein provided, within one month from the effective date of this Act and shall make its final report, as herein provided, not later than six months from the effective date of this Act.

ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

SEC. 9. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and Vice Chairman from among its members.

SEC. 10. (a) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

(b) The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810) but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

(c) The Commission is authorized to negotiate and enter into contracts with private business and nonprofit research organizations, including educational institutions, to conduct such studies and to prepare such reports as the Commission feels necessary in order to discharge its duties.

(d) Financial and administrative services (including those related to budgeting, accounting, financial reporting, personnel, and procurement) may be provided the Commission by the General Services Administration, for which payment shall be made in advance, or by reimbursement, from funds of the Commission in such amounts as may be agreed upon by the Chairman of the Commission and the Administrator of General Services: *Provided,* That the regulations of the General Services Administration for the collection of indebtedness of personnel resulting from erroneous payments (5 U.S.C. 46d) shall apply to the collection of erroneous payments made to or on behalf of a Commission employee, and regulations of said Administrator for the administrative control of funds (31 U.S.C. 665(g)) shall apply to appropriations of the Commission: *And provided further,* That the Commission shall not be required to prescribe such regulations.

SEC. 11. Eight members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 12. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members from the Executive Branch.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members from private life.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 13. (a) Hearings and sessions.—The Commission, or any member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable.

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

(c) The Commission, or any member of the Commission when so authorized by the Commission, shall have power to issue subpenas requiring the attendance and testimony of witnesses and the production of any evidence that relates to any matter under investigation by the Commission. The Commission, or any members of the Commission or any agent or agency designated by the Commission for such purpose, may administer oaths and affirmations, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. Such attendance of witnesses and the production of such evidence may be required from any place within the United States at any designated place of hearing.

(d) In case of contumacy or refusal to obey a subpena issued to any person under subsection (b), any court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which the inquiry is carried on or within the jurisdiction of which said person guilty of contumacy or refusal to obey is found or resides or transacts business, upon application by the Commission shall have jurisdiction to issue to such person an order requiring such person to appear before the Commission, its member, agent, or agency, there to produce evidence if so ordered, or there to give testimony touching the matter under investigation or in question; and any failure to obey such order of the court may be punished by said court as a contempt thereof.

(e) Process and papers of the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, may be served either upon the witness in person or by registered mail or by telegraph or by leaving a copy thereof at the residence or principal office or place of business of the person required to be served. The verified return by the individual so serving the same, setting forth the manner of such service, shall be proof of the same, and the return post office receipt or telegraph receipt therefore when registered and mailed or telegraphed as aforesaid shall be proof of service of the same. Witnesses summoned before the Commission, its members, agent, or agency, shall be paid the same fees and mileage that are paid witnesses in courts of the United States, and witnesses whose depositions are taken and the persons taking the same shall severally be entitled to the same fees as are paid for like services in the courts of the United States.

(f) No person shall be excused from attending and testifying or from producing books, records, correspondence, documents, or other evidence in obedience to a subpena, on the ground that the testimony or evidence required of him may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture; but no individual shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture (except demotion or removal from office) 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, except that such individual so testifying shall not be exempt from prosecution and punishment for perjury committed in so testifying.

(g) All process of any court to which application may be made under this Act may be served in the judicial district wherein the person required to be served resides or may be found.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

TERMINATION OF COMMISSION

SEC. 15. The Commission shall cease to exist thirty days after submitting its final report as required by this Act.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the proposed joint resolution declares the following policy:

First, the "student unrest and campus disorders throughout the Nation require

emergency attention in order to prevent serious damage to the stability of individual institutions, the process of higher education, and our social system";

Second, that "in a free society, adequate response to unrest and disorder requires an understanding of the causes of such unrest";

Third, that "whether premeditated or spontaneous, violence and disruption or the threat of violence and disruption of the educational process cannot be tolerated; nor can protection from violence or the threat of violence be allowed to supress just criticism of weaknesses and injustices in our educational and other social systems";

Fourth, that "remedies must be found for unresponsiveness and injustice in American social institutions, wherever such unresponsiveness and injustice may be found";

And fifth, that "investigation and due process are the hallmarks of the solution of problems in a free society."

The joint resolution provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare appoint the Commission, giving representation to students, faculty, university administrators, the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Federal Government, municipal and State authorities, and informed citizens. I hope that such appointments would give appropriate representation to racial groups, political parties, and campus factions.

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch expressed interest in the idea of such a commission to study the problems of change on campus in an article appearing yesterday in the Washington Post entitled "Finch Blames Universities in Disorders." I ask unanimous consent that portions of the Washington Post story be included at this point in my remarks.

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

FINCH BLAMES UNIVERSITIES IN DISORDERS: SAYS UNITED STATES MUSTN'T "PLAY COP"; MAY PROPOSE COMMISSION

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch has placed a great share of the blame for current campus unrest on the failures of American universities, which he describes as "more rigid than almost any other institution in our whole society."

In an interview with the Washington Post, Finch said he is considering recommending to the White House a Federally appointed commission to study the problem of change on campus. Among other things, he said, the commission should study possible "conflict of interest" on the part of university presidents who are members of corporate boards of directors.

As Finch sees it, the Federal Government can have only a very limited role in stemming the current disorders. The small group of hard-core militants is not the basic problem, he said, and in any case, HEW does not intend or desire to "play cop." If Federal aid to student protesters is to be cut off, it must be the colleges themselves that take the action, he declared.

The HEW Secreary, who carries heavy responsibility for a wide range of domestic policy in the Nixon Administration, gave his views in a recorded interview with staff writers Don Oberdorfer, Victor Cohn and Eric Wentworth.

The following is a partial transcript of the interview:

Q. Mr. Secretary, in view of the campus disorders going on this spring, and of the debate that is developing over them, what are your views about what the Federal Government's role should be. What should the Federal Government not be doing? What can you do to try to meet this problem?

A. (Mr. Finch) You have to begin with the existing state of the law, which evolves out of two sections that were passed late in the last Congress. One requires the cutoff of loan funds on grounds of the conviction by a court of general jurisdiction (for an offense) that disrupts the campus, or if (there is) a violation of a campus regulation that disrupts the academic community.

The prior Administration felt the language was ambiguous and chose not to advise the institutions of this law. We felt that we should put them on notice, and I did so.

We have made it clear that obviously the responsibility for enforcing this really just gives governing bodies and administrators an additional several strings to their bow if they choose to use them . . .

Some have insisted that we ought to be cutting off the funds under the existing law. That's clearly not administratively possible.

We don't pretend nor would we try to keep a master list of a million and one-half students who are getting loans or grants of one kind or another . . . It's clearly not administratively possible for us to terminate funds from Washington. This has to be left to the local campus autonomy.

There are several things I think we can do and that we are doing. In the course of my communications with the college presidents, advising them of this law, we have asked for suggestions of techniques that have proven helpful in dealing with disorder. We will make a composite of these, those that we think have national applicability, and circulate that to the campuses.

I think we need to have a long hard look at what is behind this student unrest. It is not simply the Vietnam war. In my opinion, it is a failure of the governance of education, the governing bodies, the institutional apparatus to respond. Probably they've been more rigid than almost any other institution in our whole society . . . in the face of very fast-changing conditions.

I think we need to take a hard look at the role of each of the components in the higher education academic community—the governing bodies, themselves the administration, faculty, students, the parents and the immediately surrounding community—and not with the idea that they should all have conformity, because what we should be searching for here is diversity.

Some of the bills that are before Congress would have you have a Federal Student Code of Conduct, in effect. This is part of the very legitimate complaint of a lot of students, well articulated, that this would be like learning factories with a lot of interchangeable parts. We don't want that in higher education. We want diversity which reflects this pluralistic society.

Q. You say we ought to take a hard look at the education process. Who should take that hard look?

A. We haven't made a determination of that. (Commissioner of Education) Jim Allen has just come aboard. We could appoint a commissioner. Whatever form this takes, I think its clear that it's time to look at how we govern our institutions of higher education.

Q. Is the possibility of a Federally appointed, Federally started commission under reconsideration now?

A. Well (it is), within the Department of HEW. We've made no formal recommendation to the White House as yet. I'm waiting until I get all of these responses back from all of these university and college presidents on implementing this other law. We want to collate and get that input before we come to any firm conclusion within our own shop.

I come back to the fact that, in all of this—implicit in this—is the idea that the Federal Government should somehow play cop. That's the antithesis of what I think this department is out to accomplish.

Q. You do have some aspects of campus protests which involve activities of the Federal Government itself. For instance, is ROTC a legitimate academic subject in your opinion?

A. I think that is something that each legislature in each state and each governing board has to decide for themselves.

Q. How about the legitimacy of secret or even nonsecret research for the Department of Defense or the Central Intelligence Agency on campus? Kids are protesting about this.

A. That's really not in my domain. I think there are some very severe problems in this that could be looked at in the scope of the inquiry that I suggest. For instance I think we should examine very carefully the number of (university) presidents or chancellors who at the same time are on boards of large corporate enterprises. I can name you a half a dozen. I'm not at all sure that is a wise policy. You get into a kind of conflict of interest situation.

Q. In your opinion is conspiracy a major element of the difficulties facing our colleges today, or the difficulties facing our high schools?

A. If you mean a national conspiracy, I gather from the rather imperfect data that we have that there are some hard-core militants in the SDS who think they can contest, challenge, overthrow these institutions as we know them.

Q. If they were to disappear tomorrow, would this problem be much different than it is today?

A. No. Some of these people have gotten to be very sophisticated and very articulate, that might alleviate the problem somewhat, but as I say the basic problem goes to the structure of the higher educational institution, its rigidity and its unwillingness to respond to the demands of the community around it, and the students, and just the changes in modern technology.

Q. From the information you get, what is happening in our high schools?

A. We know that the agitation is on the increase. This does not get as well-reported. We have no intelligence system per se to evaluate it. But from the imperfect data that we get . . . the syndrome is extending downward. The incidence of drug abuse appears to be mounting in certain localities.

. . . I do feel trying to take the long view, that there are certain encouraging signs in the problems of higher education—the so-called silent majority taking steps to contain the militants, some institutions, being more responsive to legitimate demands, the fragmentation within the SDS between the Negroes and the white militants—but our problem areas down the road in a great many areas lie in Elementary and Secondary education.

In elementary and secondary education, the problems cover the whole spectrum—in financing, you've got major school districts that are in desparate trouble, there's the whole field of civil rights compliance, the question of whether compensatory education really works at all, and the very uneven performance of high schools, within states, within districts. Some within ghetto areas, they just pass the kids along.

This is why we are trying to put such major emphasis on the community college in the states where they don't already have them, because we think that's a kind of a mechanism that will prepare a child for higher education who has not had as good a

high school education as perhaps his peers had. And also we can put greater stress on adult education in community colleges and also on vocational education for those students who want to go that way.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a nation rocked by the turbulence of her cities in past years seems equally shocked by the explosion of violence on campuses. Campus tactics are varied, ranging from sit-ins to the introduction of arms, from chaining campus gates to race riots. The responses may include injunctions, seizure by the police, counter-student violence, expulsion, faculty resignation, or no response at all.

As of the first of this month, the current academic year has seen demonstrations on more than 200 campuses, 2,300 arrests and property damage in excess of $2.2 million. And the violence is quickening as the school year draws to a close.

Two years ago, when Senator HARRIS and I introduced the resolution establishing a Special Commission on Civil Strife, which became the Kerner Commission, there had been 128 riots. At that time I believed we needed a commission to tap the resources of many areas to get at the sources of discontent and violence and to learn to deal with disorder. I believed then, as I do now, that one of the problems we have in responding to civil disorder is that we have not explored the fundamentals resulting in disturbances and have not come to a national understanding of what they involve.

One cannot read the major columnists in our papers or the statements of major public officials without finding a surprising disagreement and uncertainty over what is bringing about this widespread unrest. I hope that the Commission's study would help disclose to the American people—and create a consensus about—the outlines and character of the problem we face. Not until we understand the problem can we hope to cure it.

Just as campus disturbances have been increasing, so have proposals to solve the problem. Some want all Federal aid to student dissenters cut off. Others want all Federal aid to universities cut off. The President asked college administrators to show more "backbone." The Attorney General of the United States has stated that the time to get tough is at hand, with no mention of reform. The Deputy Attorney General has suggested that if people demonstrated in a manner to interfere with others, they should be rounded up and put in a detention camp.

I suppose that one of the first reactions to this proposal will be, "Here we have a grave national problem, and our answer is one more study." The reaction to the Kerner Commission before its report was that it substituted a study for action. But the outspoken study served as a valuable guide, particularly in legislation for fair housing and law enforcement techniques.

When we better understood the problems of the cities, we found that law enforcement was only one part of the problem and that fundamental reform was essential. I suspect that a study of our universities will show that without some reforms, they cannot expect to achieve order.

Violence and lawlessness must stop. It is not sufficient, however, to say that laws are being violated and violators must be arrested. Whenever a broad social issue becomes wrapped up with the activities of a few apostles of violence, the response of order must include reform as well. And the form of order must be acceptable to a majority of students and faculty if we want our academic institutions open and running.

I hope that a commission will include the following in its study: Student grievances against universities; meaningful response by universities to criticism; the effect of injustices in our society including racial and economic problems, the war in Vietnam, the power of the military and the draft; the inability of our society to respond to its problems such as pollution and traffic; the quality of life in a technological age and the romantic reaction to it by young people; and the loss of individualism resulting from the size of our institutions.

I hope also that the Commission will consider whether outside agitators have been involved in campus disturbances; whether there is interstate travel to incite riots as the Justice Department claims; the role of SDS radicals and black militants; the effect of general violence in our society; the effect upon young people of growing up with television; Prof. George Wald's assessment of a "generation uncertain that it has a future"; campus-community problems; and the reaction provoked on campuses by calling in the police to restore and maintain order.

In considering the problems of student unrest, I found a number of articles most useful. I ask unanimous consent that these articles be included in the RECORD:

New York Times Magazine, April 27, 1969, "You Have to Grow Up in Scarsdale to Know How Bad Things Really Are," by Kenneth Keniston.

Letter to President Nixon from Calvin H. Plimpton, president, Amherst College.

Editorial, the New York Times, May 4, 1969, "The Amherst Declaration."

"Pusey Voices Fear of Outside Efforts to Curb Students," the New York Times, May 5, 1969.

"Academic Body Deplores Mitchell's View on Unrest," the New York Times, May 5, 1969.

Editorial, the New York Times, May 10, 1969, "Avoiding the Backlash."

"Louisville, Ky.: From Anarchy to Repression?" by James Reston the New York Times, May 4, 1969.

"Topics: Who Is Really Uprooting This Country?" by Josephine W. Johnson, May 10, 1969.

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

[From the New York Time magazine, Apr. 27, 1969]

YOU HAVE TO GROW UP IN SCARSDALE TO KNOW HOW BAD THINGS REALLY ARE

(By Kenneth Keniston)

The recent events at Harvard are the culmination of a long year of unprecedented student unrest in the advanced nations of the world. We have learned to expect students in underdeveloped countries to lead unruly demonstrations against the status quo, but what is new, unexpected and upsetting to many is that an apparently similar mood is sweeping across America, France, Germany, Italy and even Eastern European nations like Czechoslovakia and Poland. Furthermore, the revolts occur, not at the most backward universities, but at the most distinguished, liberal and enlightened—Berkeley, the Sorbonne, Tokyo, Columbia, the Free University of Berlin, Rome and now Harvard.

This development has taken almost everyone by surprise. The American public is clearly puzzled, frightened and often outraged by the behavior of its most privileged youth. The scholarly world, including many who have devoted their lives to the study of student protest, has been caught off guard as well. For many years, American analysts of student movements have been busy demonstrating that "it can't happen here." Student political activity abroad has been seen as a reaction to modernization, industrialization and the demise of traditional or tribal societies. In an already modern, industrialized, detribalized and "stable" nation like America, it was argued, student protests are naturally absent.

Another explanation has tied student protests abroad to bad living conditions in some universities and to the unemployability of their graduates. Student revolts, it was argued, spring partly from the misery of student life in countries like India and Indonesia. Students who must live in penury and squalor naturally turn against their universities and societies. And if, as in many developing nations, hundreds of thousands of university graduates can find no work commensurate with their skills, the chances for student militancy are further increased.

These arguments helped explain the "silent generation" of the nineteen-fifties and the absence of protest, during that period, in American universities, where students are often "indulged" with good living conditions, close student-faculty contact and considerable freedom of speech. And they helped explain why "superemployable" American college graduates, especially the much-sought-after ones from colleges like Columbia and Harvard, seemed so contented with their lot.

But such arguments do not help us understand today's noisy, angry and militant students in the advanced countries. Nor do they explain why students who enjoy the greatest advantages—those at the leading universities—are often found in the revolts. As a result, several new interpretations of student protest are currently being put forward, interpretations that ultimately form part of what Richard Poirier has termed "the war against the young."

Many reactions to student unrest, of course, spring primarily from fear, anger, confusion or envy, rather than from theoretical analysis. Governor Wallace's attacks on student "anarchists" and other "pin-headed intellectuals," for example, were hardly coherent explanations of protest. Many of the bills aimed at punishing student protesters being proposed in Congress and state legislatures reflect similar feelings of anger and outrage. Similarly, the presumption that student unrest *must* be part of an international conspiracy is based on emotion rather than fact. Even George F. Kennan's recent discussion of the American student left is essentially a moral condemnation of "revolting students," rather than an effort to explain their behavior.

If we turn to more thoughtful analyses of the current student mood we find two general theories, gaining widespread acceptance. The first, articulately expressed by Lewis S. Feuer in his recent book on student movements, "The Conflict of Generations," might be

termed the "Oedipal Rebellion" interpretation. The second, cogently stated by Zbigniew Brzezinski and Daniel Bell, can be called the theory of "Historical Irrelevance."

The explanation of Oedipal Rebellion sees the underlying force in all student revolts as blind, unconscious Oedipal hatred of fathers and the older generation. Feuer, for example, finds in all student movements an inevitable tendency toward violence and a combination of "regicide, parricide and suicide." A decline in respect for the authority of the older generation is need to trigger a student movement, but the force behind it comes from "obscure" and "unconscious" forces in the child's early life, including both intense death wishes against his father and the enormous guilt and self-hatred that such wishes inspire in the child.

The idealism of student movements is thus, in many respects, only a "front" for the latent unconscious destructiveness and self-destructiveness of underlying motivations. Even the expressed desire of these movements to help the poor and exploited is explained psychoanalytically by Feuer: Empathy for the disadvantaged is traced to "traumatic" encounters with parental bigotry in the students' childhoods, when their parents forbade them to play with children of other races or lower social classes. The identification of today's new left with blacks is thus interpreted as an unconscious effort to "abreact and undo this original trauma."

There are two basic problems with the Oedipal Rebellion theory, however. First, although it uses psychoanalytic terms, it is bad psychoanalysis. The real psychoanalytic account insists that the Oedipus complex is universal in all normally developing children. To point to this complex in explaining student rebellion is, therefore, like pointing to the fact that all children learn to walk. Since both characteristics are said to be universal, neither helps us understand why, at some historical moments, students are restive and rebellious, while at others they are not. Second, the theory does not help us explain why some students (especially those from middle-class, affluent and idealistic families) are most inclined to rebel, while others (especially those from working class and deprived families) are less so.

In order really to explain anything, the Oedipal Rebellion hypothesis would have to be modified to point to an unusually *severe* Oedipus complex, involving especially *intense* and unresolved unconscious feelings of father-hatred in student rebels. But much is now known about the lives and backgrounds of these rebels—at least those in the United States—and this evidence does not support even the modified theory. On the contrary, it indicates that most student protesters are relatively *close* to their parents, that the values they profess are usually the ones they learned at the family dinner table, and that their parents tend to be highly educated, liberal or left-wing and politically active.

Furthermore, psychological studies of student radicals indicate that they are no more neurotic, suicidal, enraged or disturbed than are nonradicals. Indeed, most studies find them to be rather more integrated, self-accepting and "advanced," in a psychological sense, than their politically inactive contemporaries. In general, research on American student rebels supports a "Generational Solidarity" (or chip-off-the-old-block) theory, rather than one of Oedipal Rebellion.

The second theory of student revolts now being advanced asserts that they are a reaction against "historical irrelevance." Rebellion springs from the unconscious awareness of some students that society has left them and their values behind. According to this view, the ultimate causes of student dissent are sociological rather than psychological. They lie in fundamental changes in the nature of the advanced societies—especially, in the change from industrial to post-industrial society. The student revolution is seen not as a true revolution, but as a counter-revolution—what Daniel Bell has called "the guttering last gasp of a romanticism soured by rancor and impotence."

This theory assumes that we are moving rapidly into a new age in which technology will dominate, an age whose real rulers will be men like computer experts systems analysts and technobureaucrats. Students who are attached to outmoded and obsolescent values like humanism and romanticism unconsciously feel they have no place in this post-industrial world. When they rebel they are like the Luddites of the past—workers who smashed machines to protest the inevitable industrial revolution. Today's student revolt reflects what Brzezinski terms "an unconscious realization that they [the rebels] are themselves becoming historically obsolete"; it is nothing but the "death rattle of the historical irrelevants."

This theory is also inadequate. It assumes that the shape of the future is already technologically determined, and that protesting students unconsciously "know" that it will offer them no real reward, honor or power. But the idea that the future can be accurately predicted is open to fundamental objection. Every past attempt at prophecy has turned out to be grievously incorrect. Extrapolations from the past, while sometimes useful in the short run, are usually fundamentally wrong in the long run, especially when they attempt to predict the quality of human life, the nature of political and social organization, international relations or the shape of future culture.

The future is, of course, made by men. Technology is not an inevitable master of man and history, but merely provides the possibility of applying scientific knowledge to specific problems. Men may identify with it or refuse to, use it or be used by it for good or evil, apply it humanely or destructively. Thus, there is no real evidence that student protest will emerge as the "death rattle of the historical irrelevants." It could equally well be the "first spark of a new historical era." No one today can be sure of the outcome, and people who feel certain that the future will bring the obsolescence and death of those whom they dislike are often merely expressing their fond hope.

The fact that today's students invoke "old" humanistic and romantic ideas in no way proves that student protests are a "last gasp" of a dying order. Quite the contrary: All revolutions draw upon older values and visions. Many of the ideals of the French Revolution, for example, originated in Periclean Athens. Revolutions do not occur because new ideas suddenly develop, but because a new generation begins to take old ideas seriously—not merely as interesting theoretical views, but as the basis for political action and social change. Until recently, the humanistic vision of human fulfillment and the romantic vision of an expressive, imaginative and passionate life were taken seriously only by small aristocratic or Bohemian groups. The fact that they are today taken as real goals by millions of students in many nations does not mean that these students are "counterrevolutionaries," but merely that their ideas follow the pattern of every major revolution.

Indeed, today's student rebels are rarely opposed to technology per se. On the contrary, they take the high technology of their societies completely for granted, and concern themselves with it very little. What they are opposed to is, in essence, the worship of Technology, the tendency to treat people as "inputs" or "outputs" of a technological system, the subordination of human needs to technological programs. The essential conflict between the minority of students who make up the student revolt and the existing order is a conflict over the future direction of technological society, not a counterrevolutionary protest against technology.

In short, both the Oedipal Rebellion and the Historical Irrelevance theories are what students would call "putdowns." If we accept either, we are encouraged not to listen to protests, or to explain them away or reject them as either the "acting out" of destructive Oedipal feelings or the blind reaction of an obsolescent group to the awareness of its obsolescence. But if, as I have argued, neither of these theories is adequate to explain the current "wave" of student protest here and abroad, how can we understand it?

One factor often cited to explain student unrest is the large number of people in the world under 30—today the critical dividing line between generations. But this explanation alone, like the theories just discussed, is not adequate, for in all historical eras the vast portion of the population has always been under 30. Indeed, in primitive societies most people die before they reach that age. If chronological youth alone was enough to insure rebellion, the advanced societies—where a greater proportion of the population reaches old age than ever before in history—should be the least revolutionary, and primitive societies the most. This is not the case.

More relevant factors are the relationship of those under 30 to the established institutions of society (that is, whether they are engaged in them or not); and the opportunities that society provides for their continuing intellectual, ethical and emotional development. In both cases the present situation in the advanced nations is without precedent.

Philippe Aries, in his remarkable book, "Centuries of Childhood," points out that, until the end of the Middle Ages, no separate stage of childhood was recognized in Western societies. Infancy ended at approximately 6 or 7, whereupon most children were integrated into adult life, treated as small men and women and expected to work as junior partners of the adult world. Only later was childhood recognized as a separate stage of life, and our own century is the first to "guarantee" it by requiring universal primary education.

The recognition of adolescence as a stage of life is of even more recent origin, the product of the 19th and 20th centuries. Only as industrial societies became prosperous enough to defer adult work until after puberty could they create institutions—like widespread secondary-school education—that would extend adolescence to virtually all young people. Recognition of adolescence also arose from the vocational and psychological requirements of these societies, which needed much higher levels of training and psychological development than could be guaranteed through primary education alone. There is, in general, an intimate relationship between the way a society defines the stages of life and its economic, political and social characteristics.

Today, in more developed nations, we are beginning to witness the recognition of still another stage of life. Like childhood and adolescence, it was initially granted only to a small minority, but is now being rapidly extended to an ever-larger group. I will call this the stage of "youth," and by that I mean both a further phase of disengagement from society and the period of psychological development that intervenes between adolescence and adulthood. This stage, which continues into the 20's and sometimes into the 30's, provides opportunities for intellectual, emotional and moral development that were never afforded to any other large group in history. In the student revolts we are seeing one result of this advance.

I call the extension of youth an advance advisedly. Attendance at a college or university is a major part of this extension, and there is growing evidence that this is, other things being equal, a good thing for the student. Put in an oversimplified phrase, it

tends to free him—to free him from swallowing unexamined the assumptions of the past, to free him from the superstitions of his childhood, to free him to express his feelings more openly and to free him from irrational bondage to authority.

I do not mean to suggest, of course, that all college graduates are free and liberated spirits, unencumbered by irrationality, superstition, authoritarianism or blind adherence to tradition. But these findings do indicate that our colleges, far from cranking out only machinelike robots who will provide skilled manpower for the economy, are also producing an increasing number of highly critical citizens—young men and women who have the opportunity, the leisure, the affluence and the educational resources to continue their development beyond the point where most people in the past were required to stop it.

So, one part of what we are seeing on campuses throughout the world is not a reflection of how bad higher education is, but rather of its extraordinary accomplishments. Even the moral righteousness of the student rebels, a quality both endearing and infuriating to their elders, must be judged at least partially a consequence of the privilege of an extended youth; for a prolonged development, we know, encourages the individual to elaborate a more personal, less purely conventional sense of ethics.

What the advanced nations have done is to create their own critics on a mass basis—that is, to create an ever-larger group of young people who take the highest values of their societies as their own, who internalize these values and identify them with their own best selves, and who are willing to struggle to implement them. At the same time, the extension of youth has lessened the personal risks of dissent: These young people have been freed from the requirements of work, gainful employment and even marriage, which permits them to criticize their society from a protected position of disengagement.

But the mere prolongation of development need not automatically lead to unrest. To be sure, we have granted to millions the opportunity to examine their societies, to compare them with their values and to come to a reasoned judgment of the existing order. But why should their judgment today be so unenthusiastic?

What protesting students throughout the world share is a mood more than an ideology of a program, a mood that says the existing system—the power structure—is hypocritical, unworthy of respect, outmoded and in urgent need of reform. In addition, students everywhere speak of repression, manipulation and authoritarianism. (This is paradoxical, considering the apparently great freedoms given them in many nations. In America, for example, those who complain most loudly about being suffocated by the subtle tyranny of the Establishment usually attend the institutions where student freedom is greatest.) Around this general mood, specific complaints arrange themselves as symptoms of what students often call the "exhaustion of the existing society."

To understand this phenomenon we must recognize that, since the Second World War, some societies have indeed begun to move past the industrial era into a new world that is post-industrial, technological, post-modern, post-historic or, in Brzezinski's term, "technectronic." In Western Europe, the United States, Canada and Japan, the first contours of this new society are already apparent. And, in many other less-developed countries, middle-class professionals (whose children become activists) often live in post-industrial enclaves within pre-industrial societies. Whatever we call the post-industrial world, it has demonstrated that, for the first time, man can produce more than enough to meet his material needs.

This accomplishment is admittedly blemished by enormous problems of economic distribution in the advanced nations, and it is in terrifying contrast to the overwhelming poverty of the Third World. Nevertheless, it is clear that what might be called "the problem of production" can, in principle, be solved. If all members of American society, for example, do not have enough material goods, it is because the system of distribution is flawed. The same is true, or will soon be true, in many other nations that are approaching advanced states of industrialization. Characteristically, these nations, along with the most technological, are those where student unrest has recently been most prominent.

The transition from industrial to post-industrial society brings with it a major shift in social emphases and values. Industrializing and industrial societies tend to be oriented toward solving the problem of production. An industrial ethic—sometimes Protestant, sometimes Socialist, sometimes Communist—tends to emphasize psychological qualities like self-discipline, delay of gratification, achievement-orientation and a strong emphasis on economic success and productivity. The social, political and economic institutions of these societies tend to be organized in a way that is consistent with the goal of increasing production. And industrial societies tend to apply relatively uniform standards, to reward achievement rather than status acquired by birth, to emphasize emotional neutrality ("coolness") and rationality in work and public life.

The emergence of post-industrial societies, however, means that growing numbers of the young are brought up in family environments where abundance, relative economic security, political freedom and affluence are simply facts of life, not goals to be striven for. To such people the psychological imperatives, social institutions and cultural values of the industrial ethic seem largely outdated and irrelevant to their own lives.

Once it has been demonstrated that a society can produce enough for all of its members, at least some of the young turn to other goals: for example, trying to make sure that society does produce enough and distributes it fairly, or searching for ways to live meaningfully with the goods and the leisure they already have. The problem is that our society has, in some realms, exceeded its earlier targets. Lacking new ones, it has become exhausted by its success.

When the values of industrial society become devitalized, the élite sectors of youth—the most affluent, intelligent, privileged and so on—come to feel that they live in institutions whose demands lack moral authority or, in the current jargon, "credibility." Today, the moral imperative and urgency behind production, acquisition, materialism and abundance has been lost.

Furthermore, with the lack of moral legitimacy felt in "the System," the least request for loyalty, restraint or conformity, by its representatives—for example, by college presidents and deans—can easily be seen as a moral outrage, an authoritarian repression, a manipulative effort to "co-opt" students into joining the Establishment and an exercise in "illegitimate authority" that must be resisted. From this conception springs at least part of the students' vague sense of oppression. And, indeed, perhaps their peculiar feeling of suffocation arises ultimately from living in societies without vital ethical claims.

Given such a situation, it does not take a clear-cut issue to trigger a major protest. I doubt, for example, that college and university administrators are in fact more hypocritical and dishonest than they were in the past. American intervention in Vietnam, while many of us find it unjust and cruel, is not inherently more outrageous than other similar imperialistic interventions by America and other nations within the last century. And the position of blacks in this country, although disastrously and unjustifiably disadvantaged, is, in some economic and legal respects, better than ever before. Similarly, the conditions for students in America have never been as good, especially, as I have noted, at those élite colleges where student protests are most common.

But this is precisely the point: It is because so many of the other problems of American society seem to have been resolved, or to be resolvable in principle, that students now react with new indignation to old problems, turn to new goals and propose radical reforms.

So far I have emphasized the moral exhaustion of the old order and the fact that, for the children of post-industrial affluence, the once-revolutionary claims of the industrial society have lost much of their validity. I now want to argue that we are witnessing on the campuses of the world a fusion of two revolutions with distinct historical origins. One is a continuation of the old and familiar revolution of the industrial society, the liberal-democratic-egantarian revolution that started in America and France at the turn of the 18th century and spread to virtually every nation in the world. (Not completed in any of them, its contemporary American form is, above all, to be found in the increased militancy of blacks.) The other is the new revolution, the post-industrial one, which seeks to define new goals relevant to the 20th and 21st centuries.

In its social and political aspects, the first revolution has been one of universalization, to use the sociologist's awkward term. It has involved the progressive extension to more and more people of economic, political and social rights, privileges and opportunities originally available only to the aristocracy, then to the middle class, and now in America to the relatively affluent white working class. It is, in many respects, a quantitative revolution. That is, it concerns itself less with the quality of life than with the amount of political freedom, the quantity and distribution of goods or the amount and level of injustice.

As the United States approaches the targets of the first revolution, on which this society was built, to be poor shifts from being an unfortunate fact of life to being an outrage. And, for the many who have never experienced poverty, discrimination, exploitation or oppression, even to witness the existence of these evils in the lives of others suddenly becomes intolerable. In our own time the impatience to complete the first revolution has grown apace, and we find less willingness to compromise, wait and forgive among the young, especially among those who now take the values of the old revolution for granted—seeing them not as goals, but as rights.

A subtle change has thus occurred. What used to be utopian ideals—like equality, abundance and freedom from discrimination—have now become demands, inalienable rights upon which one can insist without brooking any compromise. It is noteworthy that, in today's student confrontations, no one requests anything. Students present their "demands."

So, on the one hand, we see a growing impatience to complete the first revolution. But, on the other, there is a newer revolution concerned with newer issues, a revolution that is less social, economic or political than psychological, historical and cultural. It is less concerned with the quantities of things than with their qualities, and it judges the virtually complete liberal revolution and finds it still wanting.

"You have to have grown up in Scarsdale to know how bad things really are," said one radical student. This comment would probably sound arrogant, heartless and insensitive to a poor black, much less to a citizen

of the Third World. But he meant something important by it. He meant that even in the Scarsdales of America, with their affluence, their upper-middle-class security and abundance, their well-fed, well-heeled children and their excellent schools, something is wrong. Economic affluence does not guarantee a feeling of personal fulfillment; political freedom does not always yield an inner sense of liberation and cultural freedom; social justice and equality may leave one with a feeling that something else is missing in life. "No to the consumer society!" shouted the bourgeois students of the Sorbonne during May and June of 1968—a cry that understandably alienated French workers, for whom affluence and the consumer society are still central goals.

What, then, are the targets of the new revolution? As is often noted, students themselves don't know. They speak vaguely of "a society that has never existed," of "new values," of a "more humane world," of "liberation" in some psychological, cultural and historical sense. Their rhetoric is largely negative; they are stronger in opposition than in proposals for reform; their diagnoses often seem accurate, but their prescriptions are vague; and they are far more articulate in urging the immediate completion of the first revolution than in defining the goals of the second. Thus, we can only indirectly discern trends that point to the still-undefined targets of the new revolution.

What are these trends and targets?

First, there is a revulsion against the notion of quantity, particularly economic quantity and materialism, and a turn toward concepts of quality. One of the most delightful slogans of the French student revolt was, "Long live the passionate revolution of creative intelligence!" In a sense, the achievement of abundance may allow millions of contemporary men and women to examine, as only a few artists and madmen have examined in the past, the quality, joyfulness and zestfulness of experience. The "expansion of consciousness"; the stress on the expressive, the aesthetic and the creative; the emphasis on imagination, direct preception and fantasy—all are part of the effort to enhance the quality of this experience.

Another goal of the new revolution involves a revolt against uniformity equalization, standardization and homogenization—not against technology itself, but against the "technologization of man." At times, this revolt approaches anarchic quaintness, but it has a positive core as well—the demand that individuals be appreciated not because of their similarities or despite their differences, but because they are different, diverse, unique and noninterchangeable. This attitude is evident in many areas: for example, the insistence upon a cultivation of personal idiosyncrasy, mannerism and unique aptitude. Intellectually, it is expressed in the rejection of the melting-pot and consensus-politics view of American life in favor of a post-homogeneous America in which cultural diversity and conflict are underlined rather than denied.

The new revolution also involves a continuing struggle against psychological or institutional closure or rigidity in any form, even the rigidity of a definite adult role. Positively, it extols the virtues of openness, motion and continuing human development. What Robert J. Lifton has termed the protean style is clearly in evidence. There is emerging a concept of a lifetime of personal change, of an adulthood of continuing self-transformation, of an adapatability and an openness to the revolutionary modern world that will enable the individual to remain "with it"—psychologically youthful and on top of the present.

Another characteristic is the revolt against centralized power and the complementary demand for participation. What is demanded is not merely the consent of the governed, but the involvement of the governed. "Participatory democracy" summarizes this aspiration, but it extends far beyond the phrase and the rudimentary social forms that have sprung up around it. It extends to the demand for relevance in education—that is, for a chance for the student to participate in his own educational experience in a way that involves all of his faculties, emotional and moral as well as intellectual. The demand for "student power" (or, in Europe, "co-determination") is an aspect of the same theme: At Nanterre, Columbia, Frankfurt and Harvard, students increasingly seek to participate in making the policies of their universities.

This demand for participation is also embodied in a new ethic of "meaningful human relationship," in which individuals confront each other without masks, pretenses and games. They "relate" to each other as unique and irreplacable human beings, and develop new forms of relationships from which all participants will grow.

In distinguishing between the old and the new revolutions, and in attempting to define the targets of the new, I am, of course, making distinctions that students themselves rarely make. In any one situation the two revolutions are joined and fused, if not confused. For example, the Harvard students' demand for "restructuring the university" is essentially the second revolution's demand for participation; but their demand for an end to university "exploitation" of the surrounding community is tied to the more traditional goals of the first revolution. In most radical groups there is a range of opinion that starts with the issues of the first (racism, imperialism, exploitation, war) and runs to the concerns of the second (experimental education, new life styles, meaningful participation, consciousness-expansion, relatedness, encounter and community). The first revolution is personified by Maoist-oriented Progressive Labor party factions within the student left, while the second is represented by hippies, the "acid left," and the Yippies. In any individual, and in all student movements, these revolutions coexist in uneasy and often abrasive tension.

Furthermore, one of the central problems for student movements today is the absence of any theory of society that does justice to the new world in which we of the most industrialized nations live. In their search for rational critiques of present societies, students turn to theories like Marxism that are intricately bound up with the old revolution.

Such theories make the ending of economic exploitation, the achievement of social justice, the abolition of racial discrimination and the development of political participation and freedom central, but they rarely deal adequately with the issues of the second revolution. Students inevitably try to adapt the rhetoric of the first to the problems of the second using concepts that are often blatantly inadequate to today's world.

Even the concept of "revolution" itself is so heavily laden with images of political, economic and social upheaval that it hardly seems to characterize the equally radical but more social-psychological and cultural transformations involved in the new revolution. One student, recognizing this, called the changes occurring in his California student group, "too radical to be called a revolution." Students are thus often misled by their borrowed vocabulary, but most adults are even more confused, and many are quickly led to the mistaken conclusion that today's student revolt is nothing more than a repetition of Communism's in the past.

Failure to distinguish between the old and new revolutions also makes it impossible to consider the critical question of how compatible they are with each other. Does it make sense—or is it morally right—for today's affluent American students to seek imagination, self-actualization, individuality, openness and relevance when most of the world and many in America live in deprivation, oppression and misery?

The fact that the first revolution is "completed" in Scarsdale does not mean that it is (or soon will be) in Harlem or Appalachia—to say nothing of Bogotá or Calcutta. For many children of the second revolution, the meaning of life may be found in completing the first—that is, in extending to others the "rights" they have always taken for granted.

For others the second revolution will not wait; the question, "What lies beyond affluence?" demands an answer now. Thus, although we may deem it self-indulgent to pursue the goals of the new revolution in a world where so much misery exists, the fact is that in the advanced nations it is upon us, and we must at least learn to recognize it.

Finally, beneath my analysis lies an assumption I had best make explicit. Many student critics argue that their societies have failed miserably. My argument, a more historical one perhaps, suggests that our problem is not only that industrial societies have failed to keep all their promises, but that they have succeeded in some ways beyond all expectations. Abundance was once a distant dream, to be postponed to a hereafter of milk and honey; today, most Americans are affluent. Universal mass education was once a Utopian goal; today in America almost the entire population completes high school, and almost half enters colleges and universities.

The notion that individuals might be free, en masse, to continue their psychological, intellectual, moral and cognitive development through their teens and into their 20's would have been laughed out of court in any century other than our own; today, that opportunity is open to millions of young Americans. Student unrest is a reflection not only of the failures, but of the extraordinary successes of the liberal-industrial revolution. It therefore occurs in the nations and in the colleges where, according to traditional standards, conditions are best.

But for many of today's students who have never experienced anything but affluence, political freedom and social equality, the old vision is dead or dying. It may inspire bitterness and outrage when it is not achieved, but it no longer animates or guides. In place of it, students (and many who are not students) are searching for a new vision, a new set of values, a new set of targets appropriate to a post-industrial era—a myth, an ideology or a set of goals that will concern itself with the quality of life and answer the question, "Beyond freedom and affluence, what?"

What characterizes student unrest in the developed nations is this peculiar mixture of the old and the new, the urgent need to fulfill the promises of the past and, at the same time, to define the possibilities of the future.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass., April 29, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Faculty and Students of Amherst College have just experienced an extraordinary two days. Our usual educational activities were replaced by debate, discussion and meditation which have given shape to our beliefs about the nature of higher education and the governance of educational institutions. It is clear that we have much to do to set our own house in order. We are convinced, and have shown during these days, that changes, even fundamental ones, can take place without physical duress. It will require all our care and energy in the months ahead to combine change with continuity, to provide students with a real and regular role in influencing their education and the College's govern-

ment, and to honor both intellectual discipline and creativity. We have as a College emerged from these two days with a renewed sense of the urgency and seriousness with which we must attend to our primary purpose.

We have also as a College embraced a new sense of urgency of another kind. We believe that we must speak out to make clear that much of the turmoil among young people and among those who are dedicated to humane and reasoned changes will continue. It will continue until you and the other political leaders of our country address more effectively, massively, and persistently the major social and foreign problems of our society. Part of this turmoil in universities derives from the distance separating the American dream from the American reality. Institutions dedicated to the nurture, husbanding, and growth of critical intelligence, and to inquiry into basic problems cannot but open people's eyes to the shoddiness of many aspects of our society.

In yesterday's New York Times it is reported that five officers in your Cabinet "seemed to agree that the disorder was caused by a small minority of students." Our conviction is that such a view is seriously in error if it is taken to mean that no legitimate and important reasons exist for the anger and sense of impotence felt by many students and faculty. The pervasive and insistent disquiet on many campuses throughout the nation indicates that unrest results, not from a conspiracy by a few, but from a shared sense that the nation has no adequate plans for meeting the crises of our society. To name only one issue of special concern to the students: since the Kerner Commission's report, there has been no decisive response to its recommendations.

We do not say that all the problems faced by colleges and universities are a reflection of the malaise of the larger society. That is not true. But we do say that until political leadership addresses itself to the major problems of our society—the huge expenditure of national resources for military purposes, the inequities practiced by the present draft system, the critical needs of America's twenty-three million poor, the unequal division of our life on racial issues—until this happens, the concern and energy of those who know the need for change will seek outlets for their frustration.

We realize that in writing this letter we have taken the unusual step of speaking publicly for our community on pressing issues of the moment. We do this out of an urgent concern to question the widely held view that university unrest is merely an internal problem or at most fomented by outside influences. More, we believe that if political leaders act on this mistaken assumption, their actions will serve only to widen the separations within the university and between the universities and society at large. If, however, this important element in student unrest is understood, it would be possible for you, Mr. President, to redirect youthful energy toward those more idealistic, creative and generous actions which reflect a concern for others. Your influence can provide that hope which encourages those visions to which young men so gladly dedicate themselves, and we will support those efforts.

I send this letter to you on behalf of an overwhelming majority of Amherst students, faculty and administration who attended the closing meeting of our days of inquiry tonight. Copies of this letter with the signatures of all those who wish to subscribe will follow as soon as possible.

Respectfully yours,

CALVIN H. PLIMPTON.

THE AMHERST DECLARATION

The search for solutions to the sick contagion of the student rebellion is a matter of high national priority. University presidents, forsaking virtually all other functions of leadership, are desperately trying to chart a course that will prevent both violence and surrender to the threat of violence. The appalling spectacle of guns on campus, of students attacked by students, and of professors being threatened and actually beaten by students, has added to a nightmare that should at last alert to the danger of escalating lawlessness even those who are most sympathetic to the student radicals.

The successful use of court orders by President Cordier at Columbia has illustrated what should never have been forgotten: The only way to prevent contempt for law is to rely on, and firmly enforce, lawful procedures against violators. There should never have been any doubt that the abuse of amnesty as an instrument of appeasement could only embolden the young totalitarians to step up their guerrilla tactics.

But it is also clear that great numbers of idealistic and normally moderate students fail to oppose the radical forays, not because they approve of lawlessness, but because they are sincerely troubled and severely frustrated by much of what they—as well as many of their elders—know to have gone wrong with their colleges and their country.

It is for them that President Calvin H. Plimpton of Amherst College appealed to President Nixon. He urged the President to understand that, although not all the campus unrest can be ended by specific reforms, there can be little hope for a moderate consensus as long as many students and their teachers sense "that the nation has no adequate plans for meeting the crises of our society."

Mr. Plimpton did not pretend that society's ills are alone to be held responsible for the college turmoil. But he warned that the frustrations will continue to divert the energies of young people "until political leadership addresses itself to the major problems of our society—the huge expenditures of our natural resources for military purposes, the inequities practiced by the present draft system, the critical needs of America's 23 million poor, the unequal division of our life on racial issues."

President Kennedy perceptively capitalized on the idealism of American youth by offering it a Peace Corps. But the wasteful and tragic demands of war have in the minds of American students long since overshadowed this opportunity to serve the nation and the world in the cause of peace. The overwhelming majority of American youth, on and off the campus, is neither revolutionary nor disruptive. But, as the Amherst declaration suggests, it is deeply concerned with the basic issues facing the country, nationally and internationally, a concern for which Americans of every age can be thankful.

The use of force and violence on or off campus is inadmissible. It cannot be condoned or appeased and must be met with the full application of academic discipline and external law, as is now beginning to be successfully done in many places.

But the great mass of America's youth is going to continue to be in a state of ferment—and has every right to be—until and unless a serious search is undertaken for ways to bridge the chasm that, in President Plimpton's words, separates the American dream from the American reality.

S.D.S. SCORES BIG GAINS BUT FACES MANY PROBLEMS

(By Barnard L. Collier)

CHICAGO, May 3.—Students for a Democratic Society, perhaps one of the most provocative radical organizations ever to spring up on America's campuses, is exultant over its "revolutionary victories" so far this year. But evidence is mounting that it may be facing some potentially grave crisis.

In its relatively brief history—the group was founded in 1962 when 59 students from 11 colleges met in Port Huron, Mich., to draft a manifesto calling for "a democracy of individual participation"—the S.D.S. has spread its direct influence to some 350 campuses and claims about 70,000 members.

As the S.D.S. has expanded, student strikes, sit-ins, guerrilla theater type disruptions, riots, mass rallies and other examples of what its members call "militant actions" have shattered the academic tranquility of almost every major American university.

By count of one of S.D.S.'s three national officers (the three who prefer not to be quoted by name, are Michael Klonsky, 25 years old, national secretary; Bernadine Rae Dohrn, 27, interorganization secretary, and Fred Gordon, 25, education secretary), there have been more than 200 separate "militant actions" on campuses across the country in the last six months.

"It's been one of our most successful years," the officer said. "The strike at San Francisco State that lasted for five months, which makes it the longest student strike in American history. Columbia again. And the fantastic strike at Harvard. And the spring isn't over yet."

Indeed, in the spring of 1969, it is difficult to see how much more could have been legitimately expected of S.D.S.'s ability to stir rebellion. Where its chapters have chosen the issues carefully—mostly in the key realms of "American racism" and the university's relation with the community and its role in aiding the so-called military-industrial complex—S.D.S. has received notable student and faculty support for the justice of its demands, even if many of those same supporters decry some of its tactics of confrontation.

Yet at the same time the S.D.S. appears on the surface to be most successful, the organization also finds itself in what Jeff Rice, a leading member of the S.D.S. chapter at Northwestern University, called "a crucial period of transition."

Basic S.D.S. doctrine has not changed much since the Port Huron call for "participatory democracy," a decentralized system in which the ideas of all men are somehow given equal weight or at least an equal hearing. There remains the conviction that something is essentially wrong with the corporate-based system of American capitalism and with the colleges and universities that serve it.

But problems of strategy and tactics, made more complex by increasingly sophisticated and sometimes harsh counteroffensives by the universities and the police, have been compounded by the problem of redefining and maintaining national interest in issues as circumstances change.

When the Spring Offensive of 1969 is finished, S.D.S. members at various campuses say, there must be a hard rethinking of the S.D.S. line if the organization is to remain effective.

The following—according to S.D.S. members, unaffiliated student radicals, faculty members and administrators, and members of Negro militant groups interviewed across the country—are some of S.D.S.'s major problems:

No national issue now seems to engage the same kind of broad popular support that the Vietnam war did before the Paris peace talks started.

The issue of racism in America, while still extremely powerful, is almost everywhere being pursued forcefully by Negro and Hispanic-American groups who often resent what they feel are S.D.S. attempts to "coopt our black struggle" for white radical ends.

S.D.S. members affiliated with the Maoist Progressive Labor party are a severe cause of ideological concern to the majority of S.D.S. members, in many campus chapters, who do like the Progressive Laborites' always aggressive, often "unrealistic" line—particularly in relation to ways of forming a student worker alliance.

Moderate students seem more quickly "turned off" than before by some of S.D.S.'s tortured political "rhetoric," and the tendency of some chapters to disrupt campus life for less and less important issues.

Heavy police surveillance and infiltration of S.D.S. has made many chapters, and certainly the national headquarters personnel, more conspiratorial in their methods—a fact that tends to alienate some of its less guileful "hippie" supporters who enjoyed the old wide-open debate days.

BICKERING AT COLUMBIA

Not all of those problems are vexing to all S.D.S. chapters. At Columbia University, for example the ideological bickering between Progressive Labor Party members (who found the labor committee they controlled disbanded by the chapter last fall because it opposed school decentralization, which most of S.D.S. backed) and the rest of S.D.S.'s membership is acute.

This is so, too, at the University of Chicago (where some regular S.D.S. members refer to the Progressive Laborites as "the stupids.") At Harvard, the Progressive Laborite faction is very strong and was the first to take over a building in the prelude to the strike.

At Stanford University and at Northwestern, on the other hand, there are few, if any, Progressive Laborities in the S.D.S. chapters to cause such problems.

Part of the reason that S.D.S. has the kind of problems it does, and yet does not necessarily have them all in all of its many chapters, can be traced to the extraordinarily diffuse—some would say anarchic—structure of the organization.

Each S.D.S. chapter is essentially independent of every other. Some have been well-organized, able to plan ahead and then carry out their plans; some have not. Every chapter deliberately opens its membership rolls to political activists of all stripes: Maoists, Socialists, anarchists, liberal Democrats, even conservative Republicans if they should wish to join.

The national headquarters here—which operates on meager funds derived from the sale of publications, posters, protest buttons, donations from sympathizers and $5-a-year dues paid by those chapter members who want to (but need not) become national members—exercises no direct control over any chapter. In fact, several campus chapters disdain the "N.O."—for national office—because its officers are somehow regarded as on the periphery of the "real" battles on the local levels.

"To talk about some sort of nationwide or international conspiracy of S.D.S. in ridiculous," said an investigative official in charge of keeping track of the group's activities. "In fact, what S.D.S. really suffers from, why they can't do a lot of the things they say they want to do, is that they are trying to run a revolution without discipline. That never works."

S.D.S. OFFICER DISAGREES

An S.D.S. officer here, when told of the investigator's comment, responded hotly:

"That's absolutely wrong. We are part of an international Communist conspiracy. We have solidarity with the 700 million Chinese, the 14 million North Vietnamese, and all the poor people of the world."

There are thousands of S.D.S. members who would agree more with the investigator than the national S.D.S. officer, which is both a measure of the organization's ideological diversity and an indication why some of S.D.S.'s major problems loom large and difficult in the months to come.

"There may be some dogmatic types who disagree," said David Pugh, a 21-year-old political science student who is a leading member of the S.D.S. at Stanford University in Palo Alto, Calif., "but I don't think the Vietnam war is a visible issue as such any more—and that has lost us a lot of our appeal to liberals.

"Even the trustees [of Stanford] want to get out of the war now. It's not good business any more. So we have to make an issue out of war itself, beyond the Harvard R.O.T.C. thing. Now that the war is petering out, and Nixon is not up for re-election, we are trying to get liberals to understand that Vietnam was no aborration, that there is a war macine built into our system.

"But I'll tell you, the liberals don't trust us and it's not going to be easy to go beyond the Vietnam issue for them."

Last week, after a violent S.D.S. sit-in protesting classified counterinsurgency studies by the Stanford Research Intsitute, the school suspended 39 students, including Mr. Pugh.

Distrust of S.D.S. by American liberals appears to be more than matched by militant Negro distrust of S.D.S. and white radicals in general.

The typical S.D.S. member is white, is a good student and comes from a politically liberal family that is rather well-off financially. As a Columbia administrator quipped, the S.D.S.'ers are "suburban Che Guevaras."

"DON'T KNOW THEIR ROLE"

Milton Gardner, a journalism student who is communications coordinator of a militant Negro group at Northwestern University called "For Members Only," said in a recent interview at The Black House, a Negro students' gathering place:

"Some white radicals just don't know their role. They want to take over. They don't have their own thing, and they don't have their own good issues.

"When blacks come up with an issue, it is a concrete issue and we can mobilize the people we count on in the middle and turn them on. But S.D.S. can turn something serious into something ridiculous and absurd."

One of S.D.S.'s national officers agreed that problems between white and black radicals did exist, but he contended that the problems would always exist "until American racism is dead and we are a socialist society."

"S.D.S.," he added, "is the only group that maintains real solidarity with the blacks—even if the blacks do not trust us now."

What really seems to create the most distrust between black activists and the white, middle-class radicals is the S.D.S.'s violently anti-establishment posture.

"Like at the university," said Milton Gardner. "I say in the university you either have to reform it or destroy it. We aren't to the stage yet of destroying it, but we can reform it. We have to get black people in the Establishment to change it—and when we're in it then we'll have the power to make it over our way."

Perhaps the single most pervasive S.D.S. problem, and one that appears likely to grow under the Nixon Administration, is police surveillance and infiltration.

RUDD ARREST RECALLED

How the police have burrowed into the S.D.S. structure was probably best illustrated when Mark Rudd, the key S.D.S. figure at Columbia last year, was arrested by his trusted bodyguard, who was an undercover agent.

But across the country, Federal, state and local investigators keep scrupulous track of S.D.S. activities. The Federal Bureau of Investigation maintains lengthy dossiers on all of its important members and has undercover agents and informers inside almost every chapter.

The national headquarters as well as S.D.S. chapters on many campuses, have had their files mysteriously rifled or stolen. There appears to be cause for the widespread S.D.S. belief that its telephones are tapped, and its meeting places bugged. One investigator explained the police tactics this way:

"The S.D.S. can't be a dangerous organization as long as we know what they are up to. So we keep watching it. Nothing the S.D.S. does surprises us. If they are going to have a rally, then we know what kind of tactics they are planning and we are ready for them if they want to cause trouble."

He added:

"Our inside information has caused S.D.S. to get more conspiratorial in a lot of places. They make their plans at the last minute now to fool us. But that doesn't leave them much time for getting the word around, and it causes them confusion and makes it harder for them to draw the kinds of crowds they used to get at their rallies.

"We also find that the more conspiratorial S.D.S. becomes the less they appeal to the hippies and people like that who think everything should be wide open and who are afraid of political secrets and secret political planning. I think the conspiratorial mood is hurting S.D.S. a lot."

WORK IN FACTORIES

This summer, according to some members, much of S.D.S.'s membership will be engaged in spreading S.D.S. ideas into the nation's factories as a way of forging the first links in a proposed student-worker alliance.

S.D.S. members seem to be encouraged by, and hope to duplicate, the success of radical black groups in Detroit, where the Dodge (Main) Revolutionary Union Movement is growing very powerful in several automobile plants, and in Mahwah, N.J., where the Mahwah Black Brotherhood has been using militant tactics with some success at the local Ford plant.

Most S.D.S. members believe that America's white blue-collar workers will not be an easy class to recruit. "They hate us," one S.D.S. girl said bluntly. But it is vague (and still hotly disputed) S.D.S. doctrine that the "workers class" and "students class" are destined to "struggle" together against the "capitalist imperialist" system. Many S.D.S. members are thus willing to give factory recruiting a try.

Meanwhile, S.D.S. will continue to concentrate on winning over high school students, a project that appears to be going very well. In Southern California alone, the S.D.S. national headquarters estimates there are 57 chapters on high school campuses. There are numerous chapters also in Boston-area high schools, in Chicago, Detroit and New York. "They are coming to us, we don't even have to work very hard," said one national officer.

The various S.D.S. draft resistance projects around the country show no real signs of deterioration either. Many of the S.D.S.-run coffee houses near Army bases are doing well by quietly spreading antiwar ideas to increasing numbers of receptive soldiers.

The disruptive magnitude of what S.D.S. considers its successes has thrust the organization high into the American consciousness. Success in its terms has made S.D.S. a prime target for both liberals and conservatives, who are coming to regard its tactics as more destructive to American society than the often important issues the group raises.

That sometime soon there could be a harsh and possibly fatal reaction to S.D.S. figures high in the thinking of many of its members.

There is little doubt that S.D.S. is moving ideologically further left each year—and that as it does its appeal to the "ones in the middle" will decrease and its problems will increase.

Jeff Rice, at Northwestern, along with S.D.S. members on other campuses, is concerned about the consequences of the organization's ideological drift.

"It could be," he said, "that we could bring on a fascist reaction that could wipe us out. It's something to think about. But we have to remember that S.D.S. ideology is still forming.

"I don't know what's going to happen 10 years from now. I don't know where I'll be or

what I'll be or what I'm going to think. All I know is that what we are doing today about the war and racism and American society is what radicals should be doing."

PUSEY VOICES FEAR OF OUTSIDE EFFORTS TO CURB STUDENTS

(By Robert M. Smith)

BOSTON, May 4.—Nathan M. Pusey, the president of Harvard University, said today that he was "terribly afraid" of any steps that might be taken outside universities to enact laws or tighten controls on colleges in an attempt to deal with student unrest.

Mr. Pusey declared, in a television interview, that "the answer has to come from within the university community itself."

"I think," he said, "that it has to come from the students and faculty primarily, and it will come only as [they] themselves come to see that this kind of disrupting activity is something that can't be tolerated. They'll have to withhold their sympathy [from] this small group of revolutionaries who don't care about the university."

In an interview after the television program, the 63-year-old college president also said:

He is sanguine about Harvard's future. "The evidence," he said, "is that a majority of our people do care about the institution." He cited "the way the students didn't go the whole way with S.D.S. [Students for a Democratic Society]" and "the way the faculty stayed together." But he said he is concerned lest Harvard's alumni "lose their confidence and interest in the institution." He said he has been "flooded with mail from deeply unhappy and upset" graduates. "It could very well affect their contributions in the long run," he added, depending on what happens "from here on in."

Granting students a voice in the selection of faculty for the black studies program "is going to create quite a few difficulties in trying to get the kind of black studies program we want." Giving students that power was an issue in the student strike that virtually paralyzed the Harvard campus for more than a week.

He would like to see the Reserve Officers Training Corps stay at Harvard "because I think all those young men—and there are several hundred of them—who want to fulfill their military obligations that way should be allowed to."

The Harvard faculty has decided that R.O.T.C. may stay on the campus only on an extracurricular basis. The president added that he was "afraid the services won't accept R.O.T.C. as an extracurricular activity."

He made "a deliberate decision that nothing was to be gained by talking to large groups" during the turmoil on campus. Mr. Pusey has been criticized by many people at Harvard, including the editors of the Harvard Alumni Bulletin, for staying away from a large segment of the community, particularly students, during the crises and being "virtually invisible."

In the television interview today, Mr. Pusey voiced sympathy for what he called "the valid concerns "motivated" a lot of the general unrest on campus."

"Insofar as people show those concerns," he continued, "we as a nation ought to think of them as a source of future strength. It's just the impatience that insists on correcting the situation right now that is a little hard to live with."

Today's session on the National Broadcasting Company's "Meet the Press" program and the interview afterward was the first time Mr. Pusey has made himself available to answer the questions of reporters since the start of the student disturbances, nearly a month ago.

At the very start of the questioning by the four panelists at WBZ–TV here, Mr. Pusey said that he still regarded having summoned the police to clear students from University Hall, the administration building they occupied April 9, as the best way to handle the situation.

There were alternatives, he said, but they "just seemed to clearly be more productive of long-range harm than calling the police at that time."

"The question," Mr. Pusey went on, "was whether or not we could survive such an action and still get the university back to its regular activity in a reasonable length of time that way or by letting the thing drag on and have it drag on and brought in very large numbers of people from all over the area and the region into the Yard. I think probably the results might have been worse."

Mr. Pusey said he realized at the time that "some, perhaps at least 2,000 or more of our students, would show an immediate sympathy" with Students for a Democratic Society because the police was summonded. "But," he explained, "we had to weigh that against what we thought would be a prolonged disruption if we didn't do it."

He said "there was no dissenting opinion" about the decision to call the police.

Asked why he did not consult with the faculty before summoning the police, he said he had consulted with the Council of Deans—the heads of the various faculties of the university—and "he had assumed that in talking with them and getting their views I was getting access to faculty opinion and also, to a degree, student opinion."

Mr. Pusey has been bitterly criticized by several faculty members at Harvard for not consulting them in the crisis.

He said today that the clearing of University Hall by the police was "done remarkably quickly and with a relatively small amount of injury." The university news office has reported that 44 persons were treated for injuries sustained during the police action and five persons were admitted to hospitals.

At another point in the program, a panelist asked Mr. Pusey whether he had any intention of resigning. He said no.

"I must say," he added, "that any one that has one of these jobs today would have to recognize that it's not just an activity filled with pleasure and happiness. But there still are things that are worth trying to do."

On the issue of tighter laws and recommendations from persons outside universities that colleges "get tough" with student dissidents, Mr. Pusey said:

"Many of us, I think, are terribly afraid about that kind of reaction from outside the campus communities. And it is something we ought rightly to be frightened by."

If colleges are going to come through this period, he declared, it will be because the majority of students and teachers come to see that chronic disruption cannot be tolerated.

He drew a sharp line between "a group within S.D.S. that have espoused violence and force" and "the largest number of them" who have not gone that far.

"I would think," he said, "that there are lots of people in the S.D.S. group at Harvard who have a genuine affection for the institution."

AVOIDING THE BACKLASH

In Minneapolis last week a police detective running as an independent on a "law and order" platform finished first by a wide margin in that city's mayoralty primary. At Queens College, in this city, white students offered physical resistance to rampaging blacks. In Congress and other legislatures over the country more and more demands are being made for "crackdowns" on student dissenters, and laws aimed at campus disorders have been passed or are under legislative consideration in almost half the states. The symptoms are evident that a massive backlash is building up against student disrupters.

Ironically, this build-up—with its threat of repression in the wings—is coming at a time when developments on many campuses suggest that university administrators are beginning to learn how to deal with the forces making for disruption, and thus to frustrate the miniscule minority whose only purpose is to destroy American higher education as a first step toward destroying American society. The fiasco suffered last week by the Students for a Democratic Society at Columbia was one important indication. Another was Harvard's ability to restore peace and normal conditions of study and class attendance so quickly after last month's "bust" and the passions it aroused. At Stanford, student demonstrators peacefully surrendered an administration building when informed police would be coming on campus.

By a combination of concessions to justfied demands, improved communications among students, administrators and faculty, and firmness where required, university administrators are showing that they can regain the initiative from the wildest dissenters and even mobilize student majorities to back campus order and peace.

A mindless, vindictive backlash movement now will surely play into the hands of the disrupters, win them more supporters, and reverse the encouraging trend on what were recently some of the most endangered campuses. This is because the backlash is likely to result in overkill, in the passage of new laws and the taking of other punitive measures that would enable the disrupters to pose as the victims of persecution by a soulless adult Establishment.

Last spring at Columbia and this spring at Harvard, the radicalization of both campuses was the product of such overkill by policemen who used far more violence in ending student sit-ins than was required by the objective situation. Repetition of such tactics at higher levels of government is likely to have similar boomerang effects and increase rather than diminish the prospects for campus turmoil.

American society can deal with the mini-revolution on the campuses by insisting on the rule of law but at the same time by retaining perspective and a sense of proportion. The serious disrupters constitute a small minority among the millions of the nation's college and university students, and they have succeeded in shutting down only a very tiny fraction of the nation's thousands of higher educational institutions. This disruptive minority becomes powerful when it is able to gain leverage through the mistakes and insensitivity of its opponents.

It can be and has been defeated by intelligent administrators who have moved rapidly against the causes of student discontent, thus separating the majority that wants to continue its studies from those who have become semiprofessional revolutionaries. A firm adherence to the rule of law is necessary, along with understanding and a willingness to discuss needed change. But in dealing with the young people on the campuses, the blacklash psychology points the way only to disaster for university and society alike.

LOUISVILLE, KY.: FROM ANARCHY TO REPRESSION?

(By James Reston)

LOUISVILLE, KY., May 3.—The political reaction to the campus disorders is now running very strong. The threat of anarchy is now producing the threat of repression, and politicians all over the country are trying to put the university wreckers up against the wall.

The wild wing of the Students for a Democratic Society has done a remarkable thing. It has awakened all its proclaimed enemies. It has mobilized the squares, stirred up the Federal and state legislators, weakened the anti-Vietnam war movement, divided the left, and pushed the country to the right.

ACTION AND REACTION

This is quite an achievement. No other combination of political and moral forces in this country, from J. Edgar Hoover to Billy Graham, could possibly have aroused such a powerful coalition against the extreme left, or made opposition to the demands of the white and black extremists so respectable.

In many ways it is a sad story, for in the end, it could easily mean more political interference and control of the universities, more opposition even to legitimate dissent, reduced state and Federal funds for higher education, more separation and hostility between the races, and more trouble for the idealistic students who want fundamental but nonviolent changes in our society.

A NEEDED CHALLENGE

The dangers of over-reaction now are plain. The challenge of the young was not a bad but a good thing. They were questioning our materialism and hyprocrisy, our policies and priorities in Vietnam and the cities, and the structure of many of our universities.

But the S.D.S. extremists who started by demanding "free speech" at Berkeley are now denying it to others. They want the right of dissent for the protestors but no right of dissent for their opponents. They have gone well beyond Gandhi's or Thoreau's concept of civil disobedience. Gandhi and Thoreau were prepared to take their punishment for breaking the law, but not the young extremists of today.

They seize and destroy private property, shut down classes, interfere with scholarly research, and then demand amnesty and submission to their "non-negotiable demands." They want "due process" for themselves but not for their opponents.

It is not easy to shake the indifference of the quiet majority in this country, but the militants have achieved it. They forgot that students are not the only people who are troubled by the complexities, contradictions and inequalities of American life. The middle-aged and the middle class—caught between their rebellious kids and their aging parents, and between inflation and taxation—are really the ones in the middle. And the sight of guns on campuses and kids sneaking out of occupied buildings with covered faces plus all these endless demands and headlines about the student rebellion, have finally produced great pressure on the politicians from the middle class to get this movement under control.

The politicians are delighted to respond. They have always enjoyed moralizing about the wickedness of the young and the permissiveness of the universities. President Nixon has had his say and J. Edgar Hoover will be reciting on the radicals within the next few days.

Also, various Congressional committees are planning investigations under such pillars of philosophical meditation as Senators John McClellan of Arkansas and James Eastland of Mississippi—not to mention that other old friend of the S.D.S.—the former House Un-American Activities Committee.

PREDICTABLE REACTION

None of this is surprising, however. It is following the usual political scenario of violent action and extreme reaction. The odd thing is that the young militants who claim to know so much about human psychology and political tactics provoked such a predictable reaction. It is said they welcome the repression, for this will bring the moderates over to their cause. That at least is the theory, but that is not what is happening now; the militants are not getting stronger but weaker, and the only thing that can really help them now is another angry lurch to the right.

TOPICS: WHO IS REALLY UPROOTING THIS COUNTRY?

(By Josephine W. Johnson)

The wild cherry leaves are waxy green and bronze in this spring morning. The rain is falling over the buckeye pyramids, over the limegreen flowers and the dark-green leaves. The woods are flooded with flowers. The fern-cut leaves of dutchman-breeches and squirrel corn, the white hearts of their flowers, shake in the rain.

When the sun comes out it is as though a veil of silver ice sheathed every living thing. A green-white ice where the slow rain stayed on every leaf and shoot it touched. And as far as the eye can see white glittering spiderwebs are flung on the hillside, and long strands, pearl-hung, wave from the beech twigs, invisibly anchored somewhere far out in space.

These are only a few hours out of a spring woods that will unfold, flower, change with every day. The buds of buckeye have that waxy rose of petalled sap, and then a burst of green leaves and the rose petals falling. The great oaks and maples and beeches will begin to leaf, begin their giant breathing, the soundless respiration and purifying to which our own lives are tied.

This is indeed a beautiful country, one thinks. A land to be loyal to. One's soul expands. But down beyond this valley, beyond the circle of hills that ring this wild greenness, plans are being made to destroy it. Anarchic, sweeping, enormous and expansive plans. Who is making these plans?

A half mile away in the early spring morning, the great orange school buses begin to roll, gathering up the children, weighted down with books, carrying them to their new and beautiful buildings on old pasture lands. Among the thousands of things these children will hear are words about a Man Without a Country: "Breathes there a man with soul so dead who never to himself has said, this is my own, my native land?"

POLLUTERS OF SPRING

From these words should flow love, patriotism, and law into the veins of the growing child. But busily behind the edifice, under cover of the mighty music of the organ sound, a vast throng of people are working night and day, destroying all they still call their native land.

Who are these people? Who are the destroyers? Breathes there a man. . . . Try and breathe. Who pollutes the air? Who fouls the rivers? Who cuts down the trees, builds houses on the stripped hillsides? Who poisons the sheep, shoots the deer, oils the beaches, dams and rivers, dries up the swamps, concretes the countryside? Who bulldozes homes, builds missile sites, pours poison wastes underground, poison gas overground, slabs over mountain tops, rocks the earth with explosions, scars the earth with strip mines?

LAW-ABIDING DESTROYERS

Who is doing this? Who is responsible for this anarchy and ruin? Is it the revolutionaries, the black militants, the draft refusers? Is it the college students, the pacifists, the hippies? Who is taking our country away from us before our eyes?

It is the well-dressed, law-abiding, patriotic and upright citizens who are taking our country away from us. In the name of saving us, protecting us, and civilizing us, statesmen and generals, scientists and engineers, businessmen and Congressmen, are making us into a people without a country, dead souls and exiles. And we are paying to do it.

In the name of saving and protecting us, the Pentagon has become the symbol of the greatest power on earth today. There it sits, a terrible mass of concrete. Its power penetrates into every single life. It is in the air we breathe, the water we drink. Because of its insatiable demands we are drained and polluted. Nothing in the world is like this concrete monster. It is like the great god Moloch into which the children were thrown as sacrifices. It is our greatest unnatural disaster.

We are dying of preconceptions, outworn rules, decaying flags, venomous religions, and sentimentalities. We need a new world. We've wrenched up all the old roots. The old men have no roots. They don't know it. They just go on talking and flailing away and falling down on the young with their tons of dead weight and their power. For the power is still there in their life-in-death. But the roots are dead, and the land is poisoned for miles around.

After the first silent spring will come a short and suffocating summer, then asphalt autumn, and in the end, winter. Cold, clean, orderly, concrete winter. Winter forever. And then we will have nothing to fear anymore, nothing to be protected from, nothing to be protected for, nothing at all, in fact, that we or anyone else will want to call our own.

ACADEMIC BODY DEPLORES MITCHELL'S VIEW ON UNREST

MINNEAPOLIS, May 3.—The American Association of University Professors found Saturday "a direct threat to academic freedom" in speeches on campus disrupters by Attorney General John N. Mitchell and other spokesmen for the Nixon Administration.

A resolution approved by a majority of the 800 delegates attending the association's annual convention here said that the Nixon Administration's position was "of grave concern."

The delegates, representing 90,000 professors around the country, were particularly alarmed about one statement attributed to Mr. Mitchell in his Detroit speech on Thursday. He had been quoted as saying that the Justice Department would begin prosecuting "violence-prone militants" to "the fullest extent" under the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

"The present tragic season in our intellectual life must not be made the occasion for premature or punitive intervention" by public officials, the resolution said.

Although the resolution did not mention Mr. Mitchell by name, its target seemed clear.

The professors rejected a last-minute appeal from the Justice Department, which urged by telephone and telegram that the convention delay the resolution until the Administration could provide the delegates with "an authoritative text" of Mr. Mitchell's speech.

The Administration suggested that the speech had been inaccurately reported.

The final text of the resolution was lightly altered in recognition of the Administration's appeal but still referred to Federal officials' speeches on campus disorders as "provocative."

It said that Federal officials had used "indiscriminate" and "dangerous" language in criticizing campus militants as "ideological criminals" and "new barbarians."

"Such statements assert a policy which is a direct threat to academic freedom and autonomy," the resolution said.

The original resolution referred to threats of prosecution against "students allegedly responsible for disruption." The words "professional militants" (in quotation marks) were substituted for "students allegedly."

Wording saying that these statements "assert" a policy threatening to academic freedom was changed to say that the statements "suggest" such a policy.

Mr. Mitchell was one of a number of Justice Department officials who made Law Day speeches of campus disorders. In his speech, he said: "If arrests must be made, then arrests there should be. If violators must be prosecuted, then prosecutions there should be."

In another resolution, the association expressed "grave concern" over the spread of campus violence and voted to "unreservedly condemn any forcible interference with teaching, learning and research."

It said, however, that any attempts to quell student disorders should be left to school administrators and faculty members and that "the current crisis can only be compounded by vengeful reprisals" by Federal and state governments.

The resolution voicing concern over Mr. Mitchell's statements had been prepared Friday night. The association's meeting ended Saturday.

TEXT OF RESOLUTION

The 55th annual meeting of the American Association of University Professors notes with grave concern reports of a recent series of provocative statements by high Federal officials which threaten "professional militants" responsible for disruption with prosecution for conspiracy, and which employ indiscriminate and dangerous phrases such as "ideological criminals" and "new barbarians." Such statements suggest a policy which is a direct threat to academic freedom and autonomy.

Academic life must be protected from both external and internal assaults. Having affirmed that the initiative in that protection must rest with properly constituted academic authorities, the annual meeting states its conviction that the present tragic season in our intellectual life must not be made the occasion for premature or punitive intervention by public officials. It calls upon administrative officers, faculty members and students to exercise their obligations affirmatively so as to insure maintenance of institutional autonomy, academic order, and academic freedom.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in recent months there has been a tremendous increase in the amount of unsolicited obscene and pornographic literature being sent through the U.S. mails. I have received a great many protests from my constituents in Montana and I think the situation has reached such a magnitude that it demands some action on the part of the Federal Government. While I recognize certain constitutional guarantees of freedom of speech and the first amendment, I think that there can be some controls established through legislation.

First of all, it is important to protect children against this kind of traffic in smut. Also, I see no reason why the average citizen should have to put up with this kind of unsolicited material through the mail. I am certain that no one has the absolute answer but it is my hope that the appropriate committees of Congress will now give every consideration to the necessary control measures. Whatever laws may be enacted, I hope that the responsibility for keeping this material out of the mail will be placed on the sender and not the unsuspecting box holder.

Last week several bills were introduced in the Senate which provide an excellent basis for further discussion. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my name added as a cosponsor of S. 2057 introduced by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and S. 2073 and S. 2074 introduced by the minority leader (Mr. DIRKSEN), and others. I ask further that my name be included as a sponsor on the next printing of these bills.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at their next printing, the names of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) be added as cosponsors of the bills S. 2073 to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transporting of certain materials to minors; and S. 2074 to prohibit the use of interstate facilities including the mails for the transportation of salacious advertising.

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

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1851), the Honey Promotion and Research Act of 1969, to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1937) to supplement and strengthen voluntary youth service and learning opportunities supported or offered by the Federal Government by establishing a National Youth Service Council and a National Youth Service Foundation, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2071) to amend the National Labor Relations Act to prohibit certain secondary boycotts in the construction industry which impede technological progress in such industry and unduly restrict the design professional's freedom in selecting the best and most efficient materials to accomplish construction projects.

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

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator of Illinois (Mr. PERCY), I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 2037) to amend title VI of the Public Health Service Act to include within the scope of part A thereof comprehensive ambulatory health services, and otherwise to extend and improve the program established by such part A, the name of the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 2098) to establish the Lindenwald Historic Site at Kinderhook, N.Y., and for other purposes, that my name be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1949) to amend section 620 of title 38 of the United States Code to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to share with public or private persons the cost of nursing home care for veterans in Alaska and Hawaii, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 59) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens of the United States shall be entitled to vote for President and Vice President without regard to excessive residence and physical presence requirements.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 195—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF SENATE DOCUMENTS 91–13

Mr. ELLENDER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 195), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 195

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations eight hundred additional copies of Senate Document 91–13, entitled, "Review of United States Foreign Policy and Operations, 1968", by Honorable Allen J. Ellender, United States Senator from the State of Louisiana.

SENATE RESOLUTION 196—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR THE REFERRAL OF THE BILL (S. 2138) TO THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF THE U.S. COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. HATFIELD submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 196), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 196

Resolved, That the bill (S. 2138) entitled "A bill for the relief of the estate of William E. Jones", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the United States Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28, United States Code, and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon

as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States or a gratuity and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

THE NEW JOHNSON DOLLAR

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on the UPI wire service today, an item appeared as follows:

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury Department announced today it will recommend production of nonsilver half dollars and dollars, thus taking silver out of the last U.S. coins in circulation.

Treasury Secretary Kennedy said he will seek legislation from Congress authorizing the minting of both nonsilver coins along with the sale of $2.9 million in rare Carson City dollars as collectors items.

Kennedy made his statement to a meeting of the U.S. Coinage Commission which advises the Government on coinage policy.

Treasury General Counsel Paul W. Eggars said the Commission also discussed a suggestion that the new nonsilver dollar bear a likeness of former President Eisenhower instead of the traditional head of Miss Liberty.

Mr. President, I object to the placing of President Eisenhower's picture on this new nonsilver dollar.

During his administration President Eisenhower was a strong supporter of a sound American dollar, and I have entirely too much respect for him to have his picture placed on this cheap coin.

Instead I recommend that a picture of former President Lyndon Johnson be placed on this new coin as a constant reminder to the American people that it was as the result of the deficit spending policies of his administration that the purchasing value of the American dollar was undermined.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete item as it appeared on the UPI wire service be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury Department announced today it will recommend production of non-silver half dollars and dollars, thus taking silver out of the last U.S. coins in circulation.

Treasury Secretary Kennedy said he will seek legislation from Congress authorizing the minting of both non-silver coins along with the sale of $2.9 million in rare Carson City dollars as collectors items.

Kennedy made his statement to a meeting of the U.S. coinage commission which advises the Government on coinage policy.

Treasury General Counsel Paul W. Eggars said the commission also discussed a suggestion that the new non-silver dollar bear a likeness of former President Eisenhower instead of the traditional head of Miss Liberty.

Eggars said the commission took no action on the suggestion and that no decision has been made on the design of the new dollar coin.

"The size would have to be the same as the old silver dollars because we intend to use them as substitutes for vending machine use," Eggars said.

He explained that the Treasury Department had been under increasing pressure to produce a dollar coin to head off the growing use of dollar tokens used by resort hotels in the West.

"We want coins that will be in circulation in commerce," Eggars said.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I think it would be doing our children a great service to keep reminding them of the disservice that was rendered in the field of our monetary policy during the last 8 years.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator.

TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 194) to express the sense of the Senate in regard to changes in the Job Corps program.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I support Senate Resolution 194 as it has been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. The resolution expresses the sense of the Senate that Job Corps closings should be deferred until Congress has had an opportunity to review and consider the Job Corps program.

In the past, Congress has vigorously asserted its commitment to combating poverty and helping the disadvantaged in our society. Passage of Senate Resolution 194 would confirm our determination to follow through closely on that commitment.

The Job Corps program is unique in several important respects. First, the target is not just the disadvantaged members of society. Rather, the Job Corps is aimed at what might be called the "subdisadvantaged"—the most seriously deficient of the disadvantaged youths. We are talking about 17- and 18-year-olds who have achieved an education level of less than the sixth grade. We are talking about a group in which 63 percent fail to meet eligibility standards for the Armed Forces. We are talking about youths with a 47-percent unemployment rate.

Eighty percent of starting trainees have not seen a doctor or dentist in 10 years. Sixty percent come from broken homes. Forty-nine percent have parents, both parents, who have had less than an eighth-grade education.

The Job Corps is aimed at helping dangerous, undisciplined, hard-core social dropouts who have been unable to make it anywhere else. Where other programs have failed, the Job Corps offers a final opportunity for them to become productive and responsible members of society.

Second, the Job Corps is not simply a skills training program. Job Corps enrollees have a wide range of deficiencies. They lack adequate education, emotional stability, good health, ability to cope with the demands of society, and so on.

Recognizing these needs, Job Corps centers offer comprehensive services. In addition to job training, there is medical care, dental care, hygiene training, and basic education.

Third, the Job Corps operates on the residential center principle. Experience indicates that most hard-core social dropouts need to break out from their captive environment—to get away from the negative and disruptive influences and old patterns which have handicapped them throughout their life. Job Corps residential centers provide a chance to get away and make a fresh start, without the temptation or the easy opportunity to return to bad habits and to regress in an unproductive environment.

Other Federal manpower programs differ markedly from the Job Corps. All Job Corps trainees are under 22. More than half of the trainees in such programs as "JOBS," "SEP," and "MDTA" are over 22.

Thirty-eight percent of the Job Corps trainees have no more than an eighth-grade education. The figure is less than half for other manpower programs.

Only 12 percent of Job Corps enrollees have completed the 12th grade. The figure is more than double for other manpower programs.

Only the Job Corps offers wide, comprehensive services. Only the Job Corps operates on the residential center principle.

I firmly endorse our Federal commitment to assist extremely disadvantaged, hard-core social dropouts. Therefore I feel that any curtailment of programs designed specifically to help them must be made with the greatest care. Job corps cuts should not be taken lightly. We must ask several tough questions and we must have satisfactory answers before we proceed with cutbacks.

Is the Job Corps program working successfully?

Do other Federal programs exist which can meet the objectives of the Job Corps?

Is there adequate evidence that proposed alternative programs will be effective?

Are only the least effective centers being closed?

Have full detailed plans been worked out to insure that present enrollees will not be cut off in the middle of their training?

Has the decision to cut back been fully considered from all viewpoints, with proper procedures followed, and after consultation with those experienced in the program?

Congress has an obligation to ask those and other questions. And Congress has a right to receive and consider answers before major changes and sharp cutbacks are made. Congress established the program and authorizes and appropriates funds in the first place. We should not now be preempted.

I am disturbed at many aspects of the decision to close over half of the Job Corps centers. Although OEO runs the Program and has full experience and expertise, OEO was not consulted by the Department of Labor on what centers were to be closed. This is astounding, when we note that the Job Corps had not yet even been delegated to the Department of Labor. There were serious inconsistencies in the camp rating system—for example, in the arbitrary decision to close 50 conservation centers without even comparing their individual effectiveness with other Job Corps centers.

We have no evidence that the proposed urban mini-urban centers will be effective. And in any case, they will not be ready to serve those who even today are being closed out of Job Corps centers.

Conflicting reports on the success of the Job Corps—especially the GAO report which is critical and the Harris report which is favorable—have not been fully analyzed. Indeed, the Department of Labor did not even wait for the Harris report before deciding on the cuts.

Much emphasis has been placed on the GAO report, and its reservations about the Job Corps program in general, and conservation centers in particular.

In fact, there are serious shortcomings to the report which cast doubt over its conclusions and negate its usefulness.

First, it is based on an inadequate sample. Two out of six—or 33 percent—of the men's centers were studied. Two out of eighteen—or 11 percent of the women's centers were studied. But only five out of 82—or six percent—of the conservation centers were studied. The 6-percent sample is simply too small to draw any meaningful or general conclusions.

Moreover, even those five conservation centers chosen were not representative. Average length of stay by a corpsmen is a critical factor for success in the Job Corps. For all conservation centers during the period studied, the average was 6.3 months.

But at the centers reviewed in the GAO report, the average ranged from 3.9 months to a top of 6.1 months. So even the top was below the average for all centers.

The Department of Labor subsequently chose to shut down four of the five centers studied, further indicating that this was a substandard sample.

The GAO report had no objective control group against which to measure achievements of job corps trainees.

However, the GAO report did attempt to make comparisons with "no-shows"—those who signed up to go into the Job Corps but then did not go through with it. But in comparing Job Corps trainees with "no-shows," the GAO skipped over clear evidence from its very own figures which demonstrated the value of the Job Corps. Average hourly wage increase—comparing time of entry to 1 year after graduation—for trainees in men's centers was 42 cents an hour. For trainees in conservation centers it was 43 cents an hour. But for "no-shows," the increase was only 23 cents an hour. Even with adjustments for inflation, Job Corps trainees had far greater income increases than "no-shows."

Mr. President, I raise these points not because I necessarily favor the Job Corps as the only approach to these problems. Certainly we must consider new approaches and be receptive to changes and improvements. But we must not act precipitously, or without adequate planning. The points I raise reflect my concern at the discrepancies and confusion and lack of full planning in connection with the Job Corps cuts.

Especially in light of these and other problems, I think that Congress should have an opportunity to review the conflicting evidence and draw its own conclusions about the Job Corps. In the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, we have already had several days of hearings and are working hard on extension of the Economic Opportunity Act. The House is also considering OEO legislation. I feel that programs should not be radically changed until Congress has had a chance to follow through on this work.

That is why I speak on this resolution today. That is why I oppose weakening the resolution. That is why I shall vote in favor of Senate Resolution 194 in its original form.

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I have long had grave reservations about the Job Corps program. The per capita cost for enrollees is difficult to justify. Under the Manpower and Development Training Act, on-the-job training is provided at an approximate cost of $1,000 per person and institutional training in vocational schools is provided at a cost of about $1,900 per trainee. Vocational education offered through regular school channels runs less than $100 per pupil. Yet the per capita cost for a Job Corps enrollee is $7,000 to $8,000.

I believe that we should provide opportunity for less fortunate young people to increase their skills, to learn new ones, and to take remedial courses. This can, however, be done more effectively and more economically through channels other than the Corps.

For these reasons, I voted in 1967 for an amendment to abolish the Job Corps and to increase the authorization for vocational education legislation. To date, no new information has been presented to modify my previous reservations and concerns about the Job Corps program.

I am, nevertheless, supporting the pending resolution for several reasons.

First, the timing of the curtailment could not be worse. The camps are being closed on relatively short notice. Their closure will disrupt the plans of a number of young men and women. They are being closed on the verge of summer—a time when numerous young persons are left on the streets, without the opportunity or guidance to make constructive use of their time.

Second, I believe the legislative branch of the Government should have a role in decisions such as this. The President undoubtedly has the right to recommend action. He has the responsibility to seek reorganization of governmental programs in order to effect efficiency and economy. In doing so, however, he should consult with Congress which is accountable for the authorization and appropriation processes, both of which it will be called upon to exercise in the upcoming months with regard to this program.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, our attention has been called several times to the President's remarks on February 19 concerning the work of the Office of Economic Opportunity. What you gentlemen have quoted the President as having said is this:

> How the work begun by OEO can best be carried forward is a subject on which many views deserve to be heard both from within Congress, and among those many others who are interested and affected, including especially the poor themselves. By sending my proposals well before the Act's 1970 expiration, I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion.

Certainly, all of us subscribe to the objectives of the war on poverty—to motivate, educate and train young men and women to lead useful, constructive lives and to be self-supporting. The argument that revolves around this question is, Are there better ways of reaching these young people?

As all of us now realize, the war on poverty has not accomplished what all of us had hoped it would—elimination of poverty in the wealthiest nation on earth, and elevation of the poor to self-support and self-respect. Much of the program is excellent in theory, but has lost something in its practical application. Now, while none of us expected these programs, one of which is the Job Corps, to achieve a miracle of success overnight, we did hope for more rapid progress than we have had.

Many people in this country feel the theories failed through improper administration of the programs. The theories often made for encouraging headlines, but the applied theories often resulted in the kind of headlines proponents of a program would like to see buried on page 61 of the newspaper.

We talk of hunger in this Nation, and of the plight of the poor. The Nixon administration, with the cooperation of Congress, is going to improve these conditions. The poor have been hungry for a long time in this country. They are tired of waiting, they are tired of hearing glowing promises—and they are tired of hearing about a program that got started years ago and has yet to solve the problem.

That is why the President, acting on the advice of many experts who have studied the accomplishments of the OEO at length, has announced a restructuring of this agency and the placement of the Job Corps program under the Department of Labor. The President said he wanted to hear many views from within Congress—and he has not defaulted in allowing the time for us to be heard. The target date for transfer of the Job Corps program to the Labor Department is July 1. There still is time for all views to be presented. Many of us have presented our views already. One such view—and one which I have endorsed—is that the problem of finding good, permanent employment for the jobless can best be solved by finding the actual jobs for these Americans—and not only by training them for some job which may not even exist in the part of the country in which they plan to live.

I do not believe the intent of the Job Corps program was to provide a mass relocation of the citizens of this country. No; I believe the intent was to provide people the training they need to be productive citizens in their own States and counties, or parishes.

We have a Job Corps center in my State. It is a conservation center, and it is one of those marked for closing. We are not happy to lose this facility in our State, where we need every job and every dollar we can find to keep the wolf from the door. This center has been of some help to the economy of Natrona County, it has provided a few much-needed jobs—and the conservation and park and recreation work of the center has been most welcome in several counties of central Wyoming. But we also know that these

young men training in Wyoming are not going to be able to find jobs as conservationists or rangers of forest fire fighters when they return to their homes in the heart of New York City, Chicago, or Washington, D.C. We do know that the purpose of the Job Corps program is to have an end result of putting capable Americans who want to work in jobs in their own communities.

The future of thousands of Young Americans is not something we can discuss here on the basis of political considerations, or the loss of some income to your State or mine. Put yourself in the shoes of an underprivileged American if he is one of the ones fortunate enough to have shoes. You have family and friends in your own neighborhood. You feel that you have the right to live your life with these people, and you also want to have a respectable job and be able to enjoy some of what is good in America. You are told that you will be trained so that you can find such a job and acquire some of what most Americans expect.

Well, you are shipped a thousand miles from home and trained. You become competent in whatever you are trained for, and then return home. You are going to be more discouraged than ever when you learn that after all your hard work and training, you are just as unfit to fill a job in your community as you were when you left home.

The Nixon administration inherited at least two wars, and one of them was most unwelcome. But the new administration is not running up a white flag in either of these wars. The restructuring of the Job Corps is a revitalization—a new offensive in the war on poverty. In the conduct of any war, it is more advisable to switch strategy than to unconditionally surrender. To continue with a failing strategy is to concede defeat.

The resolution we discuss today asks that the restructuring of the Job Corps be delayed, or as we call it, "deferred." The poor, the jobless, and young Americans do not want a delay—they want action. The President has outlined his views, after hearing from the poor and all who have, over the past months, expressed their views. And the restructuring is the kind of action that will provide more jobs. Senator SMITH and gentlemen, this is not the time to fight a delaying action. It is time for positive action.

The people of America are complaining about the taxes they pay. They do not mind paying if they can see results. But they have not seen the results they had hoped for in the war on poverty. The average American has not seen them, and the poor have not seen them.

You do not have to be an elephant to remember the criticisms launched early in the Job Corps program by the people of the United States. I remember them well, because I had the duty of being Governor of Wyoming when the decisions had to be made on whether Job Corps centers could be located in the State of Wyoming. There was great opposition to the location of these centers in Wyoming. And in certain counties there was nearly unanimous objection to location of the centers there. We finally decided to locate one in Natrona County. Here, the people of Casper seemed—of all places proposed—most inclined to accept the idea, most willing to do all things necessary to insure its success. But support and opposition were still divided.

Many felt the character of the youth in the program would be a harmful influence in the communities. But we went ahead with the program. There were some unpleasant incidents, and these involved some of the teachers as well as some of the trainees. But overall, there has not been much unfavorable publicity over the conduct of the trainees at Casper, Wyo. However, it is my understanding that there have been major problems at other centers, and that some communities have petitioned for the centers to be closed because of this.

While progress has been made, many believe it has been slow and inordinately expensive. Comparisons are often made, illustrating that the cost of the Job Corps program, measured in terms of corpsmen trained and motivated to become self-supporting, is excessively high, exceeding costs of a year's schooling at America's most prestigious colleges and universities.

One of the arguments we faced in Wyoming against location of a center there was the high cost per trainee. The charge was made that two students could attend Harvard for a year on what it cost to keep one trainee in the Job Corps for a year. Well, I do not know what it costs to send a boy to Harvard for a year.

The distinguished junior Senator from California has supplied me with the Government statistics that it cost $4,863 per trainee at the Job Corps center in Wyoming. This would send several students to the University of Wyoming for a year.

The figure Senator CRANSTON provided to me is exactly the one quoted to me by the Office of Economic Opportunity on April 15, 1969—that is to say, again, $4,863 per trainee, per year. The OEO spokesman also emphasized to me that this was the calendar year figure, as opposed to the fiscal year figure because—and I quote:

> We prefer to use the calendar year because initial outlays are heavier at the beginning of a fiscal year, than at the start of a calendar year.

Now, I am not sure just what that means, unless the total cost per trainee is not included in the calendar year figure.

On the same day, April 15, I called the Department of Labor to see what figure they had for a fiscal year cost per trainee. Now, at that time, the Labor Department had not known for very many days that the Department was slated to take over the Job Corps, and it could be that the OEO had not yet provided the Labor Department with all the facts. Nevertheless, the Labor Department spokesman told me that the cost per trainee at the Wyoming center per year was "just over $7,000." The Labor Department figure was based on the fiscal year, as opposed to the calendar year.

We checked back with the Job Corps people in the OEO that same day to see why the figures did not match up. The OEO spokesman said of the $7,000 figure the Labor Department had, "They must be using the fiscal year figure."

Now, when we look for the cost in a Government project, we are supposed to know the full cost—including the hidden cost. It had not occurred to me before that fiscal year costs should remain hidden costs. But if they are hidden—in any agency of the Government—we need to find them.

The distinguished junior Senator from California referred me to page 5 of the survey of ex-Job Corpsmen conducted by Mr. Louis Harris and his associates. Mr. Harris has an excellent reputation, and the accuracy of his surveys is well known. I am sure this survey meets the same high standards of excellence for which his firm is known.

Now, on page 5 we find a table which shows the status of the trainees 6 months prior to enrollment in the Job Corps program, and 6 months after. I wonder how many of you have had opportunity to study Mr. Harris' survey, which was presented to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Mr. CRANSTON provided me with this copy, and I am grateful for it because it points out some basic facts we need to know about the Job Corps program.

This table appears to me to be a key one. It breaks the trainees down into three groups—those who went to the men's urban centers, those who went to the men's conservation centers, and those who went to the women's centers—and I hope they got the right sexes at the proper centers. Some of what we have been reading lately would indicate there have been sex problems in the program, regardless of whether the sexes were kept separated.

But we are not here to talk about those kinds of problems in the program today, because those are administrative problems. What we want to determine here is the value of the program to the poor and the jobless. The goal of the program, as I understand it, is to place the jobless in permanent jobs. And this table, on page 5 of Mr. Harris' report, shows us that.

The Job Corps center we have in Wyoming is a men's conservation center, so that is the sort of center we have been most familiar with and that is what I am looking at in the table. Now, over on the right-hand side—in the next to last vertical column, we see the change in the unemployment picture in percentages, 6 months after trainees have completed the course at a conservation center. The table shows that unemployment among these young men decreased by 12 percent. On the face of it, that would look like 12 out of every 100 men in the program who did not have jobs upon entering the program had found jobs after the training.

This would not be a very good return on the dollar, even though we would be glad if the program had produced jobs for 12 people out of a hundred.

But let us look at the breakdown, comparing the "Before Job Corps (1)" statistics with "Current Status (2)" 6 months after training.

Before, 35 of each hundred were working. Six months later, 40 were working. Five more men had jobs.

Before entering, 18 were in school compared to five working and going to school, and 10 in school exclusively.

But apparently, the big drop in unemployment, from 14 to 32, was nearly all accounted for by the five in military service and the six in other positive placement—which Mr. Harris explains as: Ill, confined for one reason or another and unable to work, reentering or re-entered the Job Corps, including those accepted and waiting to enter Armed Forces or school and female not working or otherwise placed due to marriage or fulfilling full time family responsibility.

Further, the individual views filed with regard to Senate Resolution 194 make an important point:

As pointed out by Mr. Staats, however, the GAO study and the Harris eight-center study counted former trainees as placed who were in the armed services, ill, married or imprisoned, as well as those who were working, while the Harris OEO study, in addition to these, counted as placed those young people who 12 months after leaving the Job Corps training had been accepted and were still waiting to enter the Armed Forces or school and also females who were not working because they were fulfilling full-time family responsibilities.

This indicates that the statistics used in the studies are strongly suspect.

What about those actually employed—excluding military service and other positive placement?

Before Job Corps, 35 had jobs, 18 were in school; after 6 months, 40 had jobs, five were working and in school, and 10 were in school only.

This means that five more are working only, and there has been a drop of those in school from 18 to 15.

The individual views in this minority report disclose that for 1968, over $318 million was spent on operation of the Job Corps camps. This averages out to somewhere in excess of $8,000 per trainee, and this is not the kind of return the taxpayers of the United States expect on their dollar when they tell us to do all we can for the poor of this country—but to spend their money wisely. It would appear that the tax money put into this program might go a lot further toward accomplishing the objective, if redirected.

We can look at the figures for the men's urban centers, also, and we see that the percentage figure on this table for change in unemployment is 21 percent. But again, with six in the military and 14 in other positive placement, only one remains unaccounted for. Seven more are employed out of each 100 who have been trained in men's urban centers.

And this is the reason the Nixon administration wants to try a new approach. The present program is not producing the results it is intended to produce. Many of the jobless are still jobless, the poor are still poor, and the welfare roles have not decreased appreciably.

I say, let us give the new administration a chance to try something that might work, instead of pursuing a course which we know has not worked very well.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I wish to speak on behalf of the 4,500 young women currently in training at the seven women's Job Corps centers that the administration intends to close, and on behalf of the additional thousands of young women who will never have the opportunity to receive Job Corps training unless the administration's closure order is suspended.

I speak, too, on behalf of American taxpayers now and in the future whose tax burden could have been lightened if these young women had received the training that would make them useful and productive citizens and taxpayers instead of welfare recipients.

Finally, Mr. President, I speak on behalf of the tens of thousands of children that these young women will eventually bear and whose place in the chain of inherited poverty is guaranteed unless their mothers can break free.

In the approximately 4 years that the Job Corps women's centers have been in operation, they have trained thousands of young women in a variety of skills. Moreover, the Job Corps' residential concept permits treating the whole person. Many of the trainees have never had the advantage of even a minimal amount of medical and dental care. These deficiencies are remedied as a part of the program.

Nearly every one of them suffers from severe educational disabilities. Seventy-two percent did not finish high school. On the average, the girls enrolled for this training completed 10 grades of school, but had reading abilities equivalent to only the sixth-grade level. The Job Corps has been successfully in upgrading the reading, writing, and mathematical skills of many of them to a point where they are able to hold a job. As one young girl wrote me:

When I came in the Job Corps, I was in Level 3 in reading and now I am in advanced reading. When I came in, I was doing only multiplication, and I have now been able to do fractions. The people who I work with have all tried to encourage me to get more education.

The improvements worked by the Job Corps in skills, earning capacities, health, and education are all measurable accomplishments. But perhaps the greatest accomplishment has been that of human renewal. This means simply that these young women have learned to respect themselves and, equally important, to command the respect of others. It means that they can hope to have stable homes rather than a series of temporary alliances born of desperation, and all the human degradation and social cost they entail. It means they can rear their children in dignity rather than defiance.

My own view of the value of Job Corps training is based on first-hand evidence gained from my own investigation of the Job Corps center for women in my home city of St. Louis.

At a cost which compares favorably with the operating costs of other women's centers, St. Louis Job Corps Center has produced, over the past 2½ years, young women who have been trained in the fields of health occupations, graphic arts, business and clerical occupations, and retailing and merchandising. The success of this center is demonstrated by the fact that the average length of stay is 9.3 months, one of the highest in all the women's centers. Ninety-two percent of its graduates have been placed in jobs at average earnings of $1.72 an hour. Thus, these young women who were for the most part dependent on welfare and other kinds of relief prior to training, are now making on the average of $3,447 a year. They have been transferred from society's dependents to society's contributors.

To cite just one example of the placement success achieved by the St. Louis center, the Greater Miami Printing Industry Association has offered to place any of the graduates trained in the graphic arts.

An important part of the St. Louis program has been training young women as nurses' aides and licensed practical nurses. The plight of the hospitals in being unable to secure sufficiently qualified personnel has been widely publicized. The St. Louis program has been an outstanding success in helping to meet this need. Its graduates are sought by hospitals in St. Louis and elsewhere.

An attorney in St. Louis who is responsible for prosecuting matters before the St. Louis juvenile court has written me a letter containing an impressive testimonial for the Job Corps program:

I am appalled by the lack of resources local communities offer for teenagers. There are prisons and State Training Schools or nothing. Now there is Job Corps. I believe in Job Corps: Job Corps helps those persons that all other agencies reject. Job Corps offers pride and recognition to persons who have failed at home and in school; Job Corps offers a skill to teenagers who really want to work, and Job Corps helps young people to assume the responsibilities of adulthood. If Job Corps has ever failed, it is because of the impossibility of undoing the damage of what a neglectful society has done.

The St. Louis program has met with general approval in the community. Earlier this year Alphonso J. Cervantes, mayor of St. Louis, stated:

We are very happy to have the Job Corps in this area and we are even more gratified that the Job Corps will conduct a strong recruitment program in this area. I am more than happy to cooperate in your great work.

Despite this successful record, the administration now proposes to close seven of the 18 women's Job Corps centers, including the previously mentioned St. Louis center. In taking this action, the administration did not seek the views of Congress; nor did it contemplate congressional consent, even though President Nixon's message to Congress of February 19, 1969, stated his intention to encourage "full debate and discussion" on the entire poverty program.

The effect of the Secretary of Labor's closure announcement on the women's Job Corps centers has been shattering. The attrition rate at those centers to be closed has doubled since the Secretary's announcement on April 11. Even at those centers scheduled to remain open, there has been a substantial increase in the attrition rate. It seems obvious that many young people who once saw the Job Corps as the single hopeful prospect in their lives, now view the administration's proposal as having extinguished that glimmer of hope.

The Secretary of Labor has said that all the current Job Corps enrollees at the centers to be closed will be transferred

into the remaining centers if they so choose. At least four things are wrong with this statement in terms of the women's centers:

First, projecting the highest possible attrition rates at the remaining centers, there will still be 500 Job Corpswomen for whom there will be no space.

Second, while there may be physical space for the remaining enrollees who wish to transfer, there will be a shortage of from 1,200 to 1,500 vocational spaces at the remaining centers. This means, simply, that a girl transferring from the St. Louis center may be able to find space at, for example, the Excelsior Springs center, but there is a very definite prospect that she will not be able to continue with the same vocational training she began in St. Louis.

Third, there is the indefinable emotional factor of moving some of the trainees to yet another part of the country, bearing in mind that the trainees may well have been somewhat fearful or reluctant to come to the center, in the first place, and may find the closing of a center to be an easy excuse to return home.

Fourth, the accommodation of transferees can be accomplished only by a complete termination of new enrollment at all centers. There are hundreds of girls who have been accepted for training, but who now cannot enroll until some time in the distant future because of the closing of these centers and the resultant transfers to centers remaining open.

Let me emphasize that all of these young women have voluntarily joined the Job Corps program—they were not drafted—no one forced them in. They want a chance to improve themselves, and they have enough ambition and enough courage to seek it.

I think it is inevitable that the denial of this opportunity in the Job Corps will be so discouraging that the availability of training slots at some future time will no longer find them still seeking that chance.

There have been conflicting and occasionally bewildering reports and counterreports bearing on the efficiency of the Job Corps program and the extent to which its goals have been achieved. It is evident that the program has deficiencies, but it is equally evident that each year of operation has brought significant improvements and lower costs.

I support the resolution not only because I believe the Job Corps offers a unique opportunity for disadvantaged young men and women, but, more important, because I believe that Congress should have an opportunity to give careful consideration to proposed radical revisions in programs established by Congress.

The President has said that a comprehensive manpower training bill will be presented in the near future. The Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, of which the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) is chairman, already has before it the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969, which provide a basis for congressional consideration of all aspects of the poverty program.

Thus, there will be ample opportunity for Congress to weigh the pros and cons of the Job Corps program in the normal legislative process.

It may be that Congress will ultimately determine that some change in the program is desirable. But let us insure that any such decision is made with full deliberation, not in haste, and with a chance to sift out all of the facts from a mass of often conflicting data.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I have joined many Senators in raising my voice in protest over the precipitate and ill-conceived action of the administration in closing 59 Job Corps centers throughout the Nation.

Since the announcement on April 11, 1969, I have received hundreds of letters from concerned public officials, citizens, and Job Corps enrollees in opposition to the closings.

These letters speak an eloquent and often heartbreaking plea for continuation of a program which has held out hope for the severely disadvantaged young people of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that a representative selection of letters be printed in the RECORD.

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

GEIGER BROS.,
Lewiston, Maine, April 15, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR ED: As a near neighbor, so to speak, of the Poland Spring Job Corps (my summer camp is on Middle Range Pond), I feel that I ought to express to you my opinion regarding the projected closing of this facility.

I was not much of an enthusiast when the Job Corps first established itself at Poland Springs, as you may remember. And until the water pollution problem had been attended to, I grew less enthusiastic by the day.

But the situation has levelled off. We have found that our new neighbors do not really disturb the peace of the realm nor the beauties of the landscape. And it does seem to me that to close this functioning unit, now equipped to carry on without much further investment, is most unfortunate. It is unquestionably offering instruction, opportunity and hope to human beings who are desperately in need of them. It is a social asset for the nation, and an economic asset for the State of Maine.

Those of us who live within a stone's throw of Poland Spring are no longer in a mood for stone-throwing. We'd like to see the Job Corps continue in active residence!

Sincerely,

RAY GEIGER,
President.

LEWISTON, MAINE,
April 17, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR: I am taking a moment to express my thoughts on the proposed closing of the Poland Spring Job Center.

Though the girls' stay has been brief it has enriched my family's life immeasurably. I have two high school teen agers and children of eight and ten. I have spent my life speaking of tolerance, compassion and understanding of the underprivileged and oppressed. We were very privileged to have made the acquaintance of several colored girls that gave us the opportunity to have my children see first hand since we do not have the opportunity to meet many colored people in Maine, that we are all the same, only that social conditions have made the difference.

My two teenagers had the opportunity to get together to try to organize some inter-social activities. Any white person was quite apprehensive about meeting in an all black surrounding but after doing so were enthused and impressed with their friendliness.

As for my two youngest, my wife and I, we've had girls invited for Thanksgiving, Christmas, several weekends and much of our time is spent visiting them. A great amount of mutual affection has developed between us through these visits and discussion. The girls have discussed problems and outlooks quite freely.

Our visits to the Job Center and their visits with us have shown us that this project has given them new hope and outlook on life and also that without this hope there is much ferment as there is among our own white youngsters, but with more justification. As I consider the black social problem as the most pressing one of our time I think it's very important every avenue of conciliation be pursued.

To sum up what I am trying to say is that the impact that these girls have made on us is going to have a far wider effect than on my own immediate family. I feel that my children will advocate, defend and promote better understanding to all that surround because they have a genuine love and understanding made possible by the contact with these girls. As for myself and my wife, we are always ready to talk to anybody that is receptive about the qualities and advantages of the Job Corps and its students.

In short I would deem it a very sad and grave mistake to close the center.

Respectfully,

RAYMOND A. ANDERSON,
A Very Concerned Citizen.

HAVERHILL, MASS.,
April 14, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I would like to register my complaint against the closing of the three Job Corps Training Centers in New England.

I know how much good they are doing by teaching a trade to the under-privileged as I know several Job Corps girls personally.

Please consider the future of these youngsters.

Thank you,

MRS. R. ROSENGARD.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: It was with a great deal of sorrow that I heard of the Job Corps closing at Poland Spring and Acadia. It seems to me from living in the area and having some knowledge of what they have accomplished, that we have helped these young people become useful citizens and they in turn have helped us to help the economy of Maine.

The millions of dollars at these two installations put into circulation in Maine is sorely needed and has helped our tax structure remain where it is. From the community point of view, the girls at Poland Spring Job Corps Center have done a great deal to alleviate the help situation in such places as Pineland Hospital, Mercy Hospital, in Portland, and the Central Maine General and St. Mary's Hospitals in Lewiston. They have also done a great deal in helping the school systems of Auburn, Lewiston and Poland in learning how to be Teachers' Aides and have given unstintingly of themselves in many other community project. I am sure if you will look up their record, you will be impressed with how much they have done go-

ing so far as to help staff a child-care center for working mothers.

I urge you to use all your influence and your vote to help us maintain the Job Corps Centers at Poland Spring and Acadia.

Very sincerely,

Raymond Bzier, Raymond Clifford, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton Monson, Joseph Wirthmore, Ervin Ward, Howard Lunt, Charles Sherman, Mr. and Mrs. Russell L. Sansbury, Mrs. Olive Grundy Curtis, Ruth Verrill, Laurence Dyer, Betty S. Dyer, James W. Logan, Miss Rene Morton, Mr. Lucien Fournier, R. F. Parsons, James T. Swoll, Daniel C. Wakefield.

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF
OPERATING ENGINEERS,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Recent news stories regarding proposed cutbacks in the Job Corps program have caused serious concern among the members of our union. Our membership of 360,000 has supported the concept of a "latter-day CCC" since first proposed in Congress a number of years ago. We were very pleased to see the idea become a reality, in the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers.

Not only have we supported the Job Corps in principle, we have supported it in action. Since 1966, our International Union has provided training as heavy equipment operators for sixty-five to seventy Corpsmen annually at Jacobs Creek, Tennessee. In July of 1968, we extended this program to the Conservation Center at Anaconda, Montana where we have a trainee census of about fifty. We have placed almost all of the Jacobs Creek graduates in union jobs across the country, and anticipate placing some one hundred more graduates from Jacobs Creek and Anaconda this summer. I am attaching typewritten copies of several of the many letters received by the Center staff from young men who have gone to work and become taxpayers instead of "tax eaters."

While not all Job Corps graduates can tell as significant a story, there is one overriding reason that this program should remain intact. About sixty per cent of the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center entrants have reading achievements below grade level 3.5, making them—for all intents and purposes—functionally illiterate. Where will they go? Our society cannot afford to carry them forever and they are not capable of caring for themselves.

I earnestly solicit your assistance in maintaining the conservation centers so that we, along with others, may continue to help these youngsters who want to help themselves.

Very truly yours,

HUNTER P. WHARTON,
General President.

CLINTON, IOWA,
April 11, 1969.

DEAR SIR: Do you realize what will happen by cutting out Job Corps? I don't think you do. The Job Corps has helped us a lot.

Some of us didn't have a future until now. Some of us never had it so good. We are being helped to help ourselves and some of us are taking advantage of this opportunity.

You may have always had it made. I didn't. I had to fight for what I've received. You all ready somebody had only to ask. You never had to worry about where your next meal was to come from, the clothes on your back or a roof over your head. You have yours. Why not let us keep this chance to better ourselves. Not all of us came from a situation like the one I just finished talking about, but we all need a chance.

Job Corps is to help the nation as a whole. We, members of Job Corps, are being useful instead of being out on the streets trying to make a living without any education.

We want Job Corps to stay open. It is needed!

I am going to tell you about myself and how Job Corps has helped me.

My name is Shirley Ann Favors, I am 18 years old, I am from Georgia. I never lived with my mother. I was raised by my Great Aunts. All my life I was passed from one to the other until I graduate from High School. I wanted and still do to go to college but I couldn't go because my relatives refused to help me. I want to succeed in life, so I came to Job Corp. I am in Clinton, Iowa. I am in the Business & Clerical Department. I hope someday to be a secretary. That has been my dream. Being here is turning my dreams into reality. I have hope once again, if you do close Job Corps what would I do? Tell me what's going to happen to us. There are some centers that need to be closed but not this one in Clinton, Iowa. It's helping. Why not let the centers that are operating efficiently stay open? We, the young people need your help.

We want to be somebody, not a nobody.

Please let us do our thing in Job Corps.

"Do Our Thing In Job Corps."

We need your help.

Thank you.

SHIRLEY FAVORS,
Corpswoman, Clinton Job Corps.

ST. THOMAS CHURCH,
Camden, Maine, April 12, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I was stunned to learn of the closing of the Job Corps centers in Maine. I have written to Richard Nixon about this.

Please register the protest of many of us here in Camden.

Arbitrary "economic" cutting is going to badly hurt our nation not only in Maine but throughout the country and increase the tensions between "the haves" and "the have nots." While Vietnam appears as the #1 issue, I fear our Nation is going to be at a boiling point if unemployment and lack of concern for the racially deprived and economically needed are overlooked.

Please do all you can to pressure Sen. Gaylord Nelson's committee to act on these unwise moves.

Meanwhile here in Knox County, we in the clergy, shall do all we can, by local efforts, to aid those in need—financially, morally and in spirit—by action as well as awareness.

Good luck to you in your dedication to good government.

Sincerely,

HARRY I. LAUER, Jr.

ARLINGTON, VA.,
April 12, 1969.

DEAR SIR: As a VISTA volunteer, who spent thirteen months at a Job Corps Conservation Center, I am appalled at the closing of over half the Job Corps Centers in the country. Anyone who has been deeply involved with a Job Corps Center and the individual corpsmen cannot help feel that beneath the euphemisms of the Administration lies either ignorance of the program and the young men it serves, or a lack of commitment towards the disadvantaged youth of this country.

In analyses of the Job Corps program, the assumption is usually made that the corpsmen are generally residents of northern urban ghettos. This is not so. I know in the northwest, the majority of our corpsmen were southern Negroes. This is the biggest justification for the intention of a national residential program, for we were far more successful with the southern Negro than any other ethnic geographical group. By contrast one L.A. corpsman once said, "Man, why do I have to do all this. Man, I know a pimp at home with a third grade education, drives a Cadillac, wears diamond rings."

For the southern, poor, largely from rural Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and South Carolina, Job Corps is almost the only poverty program available for those who want to do more than pick cotton for the rest of their lives. As stipulated by the 1964 OEO Act, the governor has veto power over each poverty project within the state—and consequently there are almost no N.Y.C. programs, few C.A.P.'s and no General Motors in the rural South. Oregon has 70 Vista volunteers; Mississippi has 0.

Of approximately 300 southern corpsmen who came in my thirteen months at Wolf Creek Job Corps Conservation Center in Oregon, four were reading above a sixth grade level. The medium level was second grade, and the mode fell in a beginning reading level. President Nixon, the roots of poverty are deep, far deeper than most of us can imagine. Learning a job skill is the easiest obstacle to overcome, for the same physical approach to life, coupled with intense hostility, which makes the disadvantaged youth so difficult to school and socialize, often makes him an excellent worker. Sure we spent $5,000 per corpsman but our corpsman needed extensive dental care which for over 80% of our corpsmen was the first care they had had in ten years. And these "dudes" must have a residential program, for, when you are from a family of nine, with an income of $2,700 (The Wolf Creek southern average) and your old man (if you had one) pulled you out of school in order to bring home some extra money, getting away from home can do you wonders.

One of Wolf Creek's more articulate corpsman stated his reaction to the possible closing down of centers eloquently. "Man, this country is evil. Look what they did to the Indians and to my people. Howard Hughes makes a couple of thousand bucks every minute and people go hungry in South Carolina. They spend billions of dollars to go around the moon and now they want to put me back in the streets."

Another corpsman in writing "True Story Are (of) My Life" concluded by saying, "Where there (is) a rope, there some hope." If the Administration is truly committed to bringing disadvantaged youth into society but contends Job Corps is too expensive, should not the alternative to Job Corps be functioning in all geographic areas before sending the corpsmen back to the streets. From a list given in the Washington Post of April 12, no mini-centers are slated for the states of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, South Carolina or Georgia. To cut the only rope that the poor Southern youth has now is heartless.

Yours truly,

JON GABEL.

DOWNEAST WICS, INC.,
RESIDENTIAL YOUTH CENTER,
Portland, Maine, April 14, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR ED: I am enclosing with this letter a copy of a night letter that I have dispatched to Mr. Nixon. The contents are self-explanatory.

Since its inception, I have been personally aware of the Poland Springs Job Corps, and generally aware of the Arcadia operation. As a matter of fact, while I was Director of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, we cooperated with the implementation of Poland Springs by furnishing them with Neighborhood Youth Corps' enrollees, both from Portland and West Roxbury, to "dry run" its center for one week. From then on we have always, through Neighborhood Youth Corps, PROP, etc., had excellent relationships with this center. These contacts gave us a continuous insight into its operation. I therefore speak from personal experience and knowledge when I state that Poland Springs is a quality program. This also applies to Arcadia. For instance, when an Arcadia en-

rollee graduated into a higher train center, he was put on a bus which usually stopped in Portland, and at this time, the enrollee would change buses and return to Arcadia. They did a fantastic job in basic education and in changing attitudes.

It is regrettable indeed that the Administration is arbitrarily recouping $100,000,000 through the process of closing down programs in human resources at the expense of recouping $100,000,000 from the sixty billion dollars loss of revenue emanating from tax loop-holes now on the books.

What can we do here on the line to stem actions that once again will discard from society hard-core youth and pump down the drain the gallant and courageous experiments of OEO and other agencies before they can reach valid answers and conclusions.

In closing, I urge the support of your office to press for reconsideration of the Administration's drastic action (without consultation with Congress)—actions which will effect and create another generation of youth, another generation of Welfare recipients, and another generation of young adults incapable of joining a truly productive role in the labor force.

You have been ever since I've known you, the champion of these people.

I hope and trust that your efforts will be successful.

Thank you.

Very cordially yours,

NELSON A. PEPIN,
Executive Director.

APRIL 15, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: This letter is from an admiring non-constituent (now that this national election is over). I was immeasurably distressed by the recent news of impending Job Corps center closures. We can spend 30 billion dollars a year on poor, impoverished people 12,000 miles away; yet the administration reneges on spending 100 million dollars to assist our own country's flesh and blood in attaining a minimal academic competence and a marketable skill. I am sure, Sir, that you are more than capable of illustrating this injustice to the less advantaged youth of our country.

My personal gratitude to you, Sir, for what, I am sure, will be your strenuous efforts to rectify this eminent social injustice.

Sincerely,

GAIL E. REESE.

CLINTON, IOWA,
April 15, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am a Corpwoman enrolled in the Clinton Job Corps Center. I am sure the shocking news about our Center closing has reached you by now.

I am asking you not to let this happened. This is some of us last chance. Don't let us go back into a world of ignorancy. We want to be leaders of tomorrow. We want to do something worthwhile for our country in the future, but without the training, what can we do? Absolutely nothing; without training and skills, we are entirely to nothing that is worthwhile for us.

Here we are being trained in various vocations to obtain a goal. If the center is closed, what can we do?

As the saying goes which is very much true, Opportunity knocks but once, and we feel this is our first and last chance. If this chance is passed by, we will have no other opportunity.

Please don't send us back into a life of poverty and ignorancy.

Please help us.

Sincerely yours,

Miss HATTIE CLARK.

CUMBERLAND CENTER, MAINE,
April 15, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am writing to protest the closing of the Job Corp centers around the country, especially the two in Maine. I feel that these are worthwhile, well-run projects beneficial to the country as well as to the people they help. I feel that it is unfair to close them simply to save money. We will really be losing if we allow the individuals involved to return to their former hopeless state unskilled and feeling discouraged and unwanted. We must let them know that someone cares about them, that their country does have a heart, that life really does offer them something beyond degradation.

As my government representative I hope, that you share my feelings and will work to find a reasonable and fair solution to this problem. I realize that you are very busy, but I think this is important. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

GERTRUDE HICKEY.

APRIL 28, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I urge you to continue to oppose closing Job Corps Centers until adequate facilities are in operation to guarantee continuation of training programs for the hard core unemployed. As I understand, after July 1 it will be impossible to accommodate approximately 10,000 of the boys now in Conservation Centers. Are these boys to be abruptly sent back to the ghetto in the middle of their training without any consideration for their personal feelings?

I am somewhat familiar with the Acadia Center and know the educational program had improved greatly in efficiency and quality within the few months before the announced closing. Since this announcement by Secretary Shultz, the morale of the boys has fallen sharply and within two weeks time about fifty boys have given up and gone home. This is sad.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT O. BINNEWIES.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MAINE,
Brunswick, Maine, April 23, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Maine League of Women Voters is concerned about the abrupt closing of Job Corps centers before adequate substitutes can be set up. For your information, you will find enclosed a letter which was sent from the League to Secretary Shultz explaining our position in detail. We know that according to the *Washington Post* of April 12 you telephoned the President to ask that closing crders be rescinded and we are grateful for your efforts in this matter.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. THOMAS P. RILEY,
Chairman of Human Resources.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF MAINE,
Brunswick, Maine, April 23, 1969.

Hon. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the League of Women Voters of Maine, I am writing to urge that Job Corps Centers should not be closed until adequate and expanded facilities are in operation to guarantee continuation of programs to train the hard core unemployed and underemployed.

League members have supported the Job Corps because they feel that removing young people from environments holding little hope for improvement and placing them in residential settings where both job and basic educational training would be available is worthy of trial. To set up replacement facilities in 30 urban centers by July 1 seems unrealistic. Therefore the League opposes the abrupt closing of Job Corps Centers.

Maine League members have been particularly interested in the conservation center at Arcadia and the women's center at Poland Spring both of which are slated to be closed. Our members in the Mt. Desert Island area have never reported anything but excellent relationships between the community and the trainees at Acadia. Living in the southern part of the state, I can speak from firsthand knowledge of what the Poland Spring girls have done for our state. If living in Maine has given them any insight into the value to one's total outlook on life of living in an environment of natural beauty, what the girls have done for our citizens in return is far more. The majority have been anxious to become a part of our community life. They have worked on fund raising drives, entertained throughout the area, joined in discussion groups particularly with students, arranged flowers for churches and visited in countless homes for weekends and special occasions. They have inspired those of us who had the luck to grow up in supportive environments by their unusual courage. They have impressed us with their determination to lift themselves out of a life of poverty and despair into a productive role in society.

Of course there have been exceptions at both centers in Maine, young people who are problems to the centers and to the state, but we feel that the numbers who have succeeded more than justify the money expended for this rehabilitation and training. It seems to us that withdrawal of promised assistance and opportunity will only make these young people cynical and disillusioned about the depth of the commitment the nation has to overcoming poverty and discrimination.

We believe it is possible that as urban "mini" skills centers are developed, they may prove better able to fill the needs of the severely disadvantaged. The League does not believe that immediate closing of Job Corps centers is in the best interests of the aims of our nation.

Yours very truly,

Mrs. T. P. RILEY,
Chairman, Human Resources.

POLAND SPRING JOB CORPS CENTER FOR WOMEN,
Poland Spring, Maine, April 14, 1969.

Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a staff member at Poland Spring Jobs Corps Center for Women and I am displeased that your Secretary of Labor finds it necessary to close our Center.

I have been at Poland Spring since June 1, 1966 and have seen many young ladies come and go. Most of the young ladies have learned many things besides educational and vocational skills. They have learned things that most adults in our country haven't learned yet and that's being able to live together, despite geographical, racial and ethnic differences.

For a President that is supposed to be so administratively qualified and excellent at setting up organizations, it seems to me that you haven't received all the facts about the Job Corps and have used Job Corps as a political football. You thought you had problems with cities before, but to turn back into the cities 15,000 young people without proper training—are you kidding?

I've worked in Community Action Programs, and other city based programs and they don't work. If young ladies are given proper training they will return to the cities and become better citizens, but to get training in a city and live in the ghetto is difficult and almost impossible because of all the deviant behavior and elements.

Please, Mr. President, I don't care about myself because I can get another job; but

many young people need to have training that they will not be able to get in a non-residential program. It seems to me that when the Labor Department decides to close Job Corps Centers that at least they could do is visit the Centers and talk to the staff and young ladies at the Center.

Mr. President, why don't you and Mr. Shultz visit our Center before you decide to ruin the lives of 1,100 young ladies.

HARRY LISEWSKI, Jr.

POLAND SPRING JOB CORPS CENTER FOR WOMEN,
Poland Spring, Maine, April 15, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am very disappointed and dismayed that you find it necessary to close the Poland Spring (Maine) Job Corps Center for Women plus other centers. If you personally could witness what productive, creative things are happening at Poland Springs, I would judge that you would feel that the Center's advantages greatly outweigh its disadvantages.

A staff member at Poland Spring since it began in April, 1966, I testify to at least three pertinent factors: (1) A residential setting is more conducive to producing the necessary attitudes required by an employable person. (2) Poland Spring, situated in a rural area, contains more strengths than weaknesses when compared with a center in an urban location. (3) Corpswomen who are members of minority racial and ethnic groups find in Job Corps that some white persons do indeed exist who treat them like human beings.

Finally, the fact that most of the 1,100 Corpswomen at Poland Spring sincerely desire to remain at Poland Spring in the Job Corps represents a living testimony to the value of Job Corps training with its many rather intangible benefits.

Respectfully yours,

H. HARVEY HARRINGTON.

AUGUSTA HOUSE,
Augusta, Maine, April 14, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PRESIDENT NIXON: As the manager of the Augusta House and a conservative person by nature, I have observed the Arcadia Job Corps and Poland Spring Job Corps trainees with a great deal of interest. The Arcadia boys have stayed at the Augusta House when they attended socials at Poland Springs. The Job Corps Officials wanted the boys having rooms forty miles away after the socials. I have given the lowest possible rate as I think these centers are doing a lot of good and have tried to help the program.

I have talked with a number of the boys and asked what the Job Corps meant to them. I almost always receive an answer that is very similar to other answers. "This is my last chance to be able to do some kind of work other than a common laborer." One boy said, "I get a job digging a hole, when they start to build the building I can't do anything so I get laid off."

Maine people are independent and very self sufficient. The trainees that associate with local employees that have "never gone on the town," a Maine expression of not accepting welfare, are being exposed to the type of thinking that will do them a lot of good.

I believe the Maine Job Corps Centers are two of the best and urge you to consider their merits when you curtail this program. My experience with the trainees would indicate that these people have been trained to support themselves when they graduate.

Very cordially yours,

RICHARD L. SCHENK,
Manager.

KENNEBUNK, MAINE,
April 4, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Please make every effort to keep the Job Corps Center at Poland Spring, Maine, open. This is a proven workable, and valuable center.

The Job Corps is for the disadvantaged as the G.I. bill was for the veterans of World War II.

I pray that you will be effective in helping to keep open the Job Corps Center at Poland Spring, Maine.

Thank you,

JEAN O'BRIEN PERKINS.

POLAND SPRING, MAINE.

Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am writing you in regard to the proposed closing of the Job Corps Center for Women here at Poland Spring, Me. I have been one of the staff members since February 1966.

I have seen the program developed for the girls here and have watched with interest the way the girls have responded. We have taken great pride here on the number of graduates and the help we have been able to give to so many young women who needed help and guidance for a new way of life. I feel that these young people need such a program as is offered here and that it will be doing a great injustice if this center is allowed to close.

I hope everything possible will be done to keep this center open so that many more young women can obtain the education and help they deserve so very much.

Sincerely,

AVIS M. BAIRD.

POLAND SPRING, MAINE,
April 15, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
The Senate, the Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am a secretary at the Poland Spring Job Corps Center for Women and a native of Auburn, Maine. I feel very sad that the Poland Spring Center is on the list of Job Corps Centers to be closed because of a budget cut.

I have worked at Poland Spring for a year and a half and have enjoyed immensely my work and my contacts with the Corpswomen. I find that so many of the young ladies I have met are grateful for the opportunity to better themselves academically and they really want this second chance.

Please do all you can to help reverse the decision to close Poland Spring. Even though I do not know a large percentage of the Corpswomen or what they will do when they leave here (whether it means going back to their homes or being placed in another program) I cannot help but worry about the well being and futures of these girls when they had such a good chance here to make something of their young lives.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. ROSE KEENE.

POLAND SPRING, MAINE,
April 15, 1969.

Re opposition to proposed closing of Poland Spring Job Corps Center.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: First of all, you might call me partial because I am employed by Poland Spring Job Corps Center. Naturally, I stand to lose by the closing of the center, but I can always find other employment. With 19 years of experience, I feel I am qualified in my profession.

The main issue as I see it is the end of opportunity and hope for a brighter future for the corpswomen enrolled at Poland Spring Job Corps Center. I have seen thousands of girls come through this center in the 2½ years I have been employed here. Sure, we have had a minority of disappointments, but the great majority of these girls (black or white) have gained immensely and have been given an opportunity in life which they wouldn't have had without this program. We have had corpswomen at our home and have found them to be very well mannered and ladylike. Too bad they are condemned on the whole by the actions of a few. Our local paper (The Lewiston Sun-Journal) is quick to print any wrong doing of a corpswoman (including her name) but seldom if ever is there anything mentioned about the good and generous actions of the corpswomen. Our three year old daughter attends the Job Corps Nursery School. We love her very much and certainly wouldn't trust her to incorrectables. Through the efforts of the corpswomen and their instructors, she has learned the equivalent of sub primary.

The above are but a few of the reasons I am strongly opposed to the closing of the Poland Spring Job Corps Center. If our government funds were expended on programs like this one instead of foreign countries and rocket races, our racial and poverty problems would diminish in proportion.

Very truly yours,

MARY C. AREL.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: We have been advised that a severe curtailment of the Job Corps Program is being considered.

Since May of 1968, we have had the opportunity of working very closely with the Job Corps Conservation Centers Program through the Department of Agriculture Forest Service and more recently with the Department of Interior in the operation of seven (7) Carpentry Programs, wherein we are providing related and manipulative experience to sixty (60) of the underprepared and underprivileged youth in each of the seven (7) centers.

Although none of our programs have run the full cycle, we have already placed fifty two (52) young men that we were able to qualify into our apprenticeship programs throughout the country and we expect to place all of the young men now in our programs in the industry upon the completion of their program, some of which will be completed in June, 1969 and others in July, 1969.

Therefore, we request that serious consideration be given to the continuance of the Job Corps Conservation Centers in that we feel an excellent job is being done in the training and placement of young men in gainful employment who will take their place in their community as active citizens and workers in the industry who, otherwise, will be returned to their home community as unskilled workers and thus become a burden, as well as a problem for society.

If curtailment is essential of some of the Conservation Centers, it should be done on a selected basis after full investigation of the quality of training and job placement that has been accomplished at each center.

Sincerely yours,

M. A. HUTCHESON,
General President.

CAMDEN, MAINE,
April 12, 1969.

President RICHARD M. NIXON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am stunned by the announcement of your decision to close approximately 50% of the Job Corps centers. The intended substitution, as announced, of training centers for a smaller number of day students may be less expensive in dollars in the short run, but I cannot see it as a

credible alternative to the present Job Corps program, and I predict that your economies in this area ultimately will become unbelievably expensive in terms of their social results.

Government spending needs to be cut, but the obvious place to make the cuts is where the spending is greatest, for the least return to society, namely, the military establishment. The "security" which our military system provides is indeed questionable in these times of mutual "over-kill" capability, while the obvious and immediate consequence of our military spending is death and destruction in Vietnam, and anguish for the families of our own casualties. Preoccupation with the supposed danger of external enemies has helped this nation to ignore more dangerous domestic situations. Mayor Carl Stokes of Cleveland has expressed very effectively the need for rearranging our national priorities.

I know that it is probably easier politically to cut domestic welfare programs than to curtail the military establishment, but we need leadership in the presidency—a vision which goes somewhat beyond the common preoccupation with immediate profits.

Sincerely,

RALPH E. COOK.

WARD BROS.,
Lewiston, Maine, April 12, 1969.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Many thanks for your letter expressing your views to do something constructive about the Poverty Program, especially in reference to the closing of the Job Corps Centers in many areas.

The decision to close the nearby Poland Spring Center was an irrational afterthought. This type of decision-making is irresponsible, and loaded with politics. It is based on emotional judgment and unfounded fact.

The total poverty program is sound. It is the only positive way to aid the young unfortunate youngster that has indicated his willingness to get out of his environment and do something for himself. But if the present Administration is going to make hasty decisions such as the closing of this particular Center, this alone adds to the "failure and rejection" aspect that these youngsters have been subjected to in their formative years. All they get is rejection.

As to the cost . . . I froth with anger when I see billions spent on defense; on systems that "may not work"; on the immoral war in Vietnam. As a taxpayer, and a heavy one this year, I cannot justify paying my hard earned dollars for the kinds of defense spending that could be used toward helping our unfortunate citizens get a lease on life. The costs of Poverty versus the costs of defense . . . who are we kidding?

Thank you for asking my views. I shall be happy to come to Washington and testify that these Centers should be increased, not eliminated. That the effort to make these centers more productive be tried, rather than disregarded. That more "good old American ingenuity" be used to think positively about these programs rather than drop them in the junk heap.

Senator Muskie is a dear friend. My qualifications, if needed, can be confirmed by a call to his office anytime. If I can be of further assistance by writing or phoning at my own expense, please call on me.

Thank you again.

Respectfully,

LAWRENCE J. WARD.

TOWN OF POLAND, MAINE,
April 12, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: The Board of Selectmen of Poland were shocked to hear of the decision to close the Poland Spring Job Corps for Women.

The "Center" has been well received by area people and we have observed many graduates who have benefited from both the school and the fine location where the girls have the opportunity to live and study in a quiet area away from the slums of the cities in which they were reared.

We strongly protest the manner as well as the degree of appraisal and thought exhibited by the Labor Department in making a decision of this magnitude without at least viewing the entire operation.

The decision to eliminate the largest womens' center in the United States will be felt by the minority groups, the inhabitants of Poland and the State of Maine and the students for many years to come.

The Poland Center makes approximately 400 jobs available to area people, and pays one-fifth of the taxes in this community of approximately 2,000 population.

Truly this is a severe blow to both the Town of Poland and the State of Maine.

Your consideration of this matter will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,
BOARD OF SELECTMEN OF POLAND,
R. A. WATERHOUSE, Jr.,
Secretary.

SEATTLE, WASH.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: I feel it is futile to write anyone in Congress. I'm writing anyway. Closing Job Corps is a tremendous mistake. Save on the military budget!

JERRY CAMPBELL,
An Angry Voter.

CUMBERLAND CENTER, MAINE,
April 13, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: It is with concern for the closing of the Poland Springs Job Corp Center that I am writing.

Through our local church I have had the opportunity of visiting the Center, and have met some of the young women. Their enthusiasm is something that must be seen to be appreciated, and the majority will certainly "graduate" being useful citizens of our country.

It is almost inconceivable that such a thing as closing this most worthwhile way of helping some of our underprivileged class is happening.

Please consider me as one that is against it.

Very truly yours,

NAOMI MEADOWS.

FARMINGTON, MAINE,
April 15, 1968.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I know of your alarm concerning the announced closing of the Poland Springs Job Corps Center and I wish to support you as heartily as one voter can, with the hope that this excellent program will be continued.

I have visited the center and recently have met several of the Corps women enrolled there. I hate to think of their fate if this program is eliminated. Certainly other economies can be effected—and I am for this, believe me, that do not deal so vitally with human rehabilitation. The center's achievement record does not deserve this action!

Good luck!

Sincerely yours,

SARAH K. PRENTISS.

ALFRED, MAINE,
April 12, 1969.

Mr. EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: The announcement yesterday that Poland Spring Job Corps Center is to be closed came as a great blow both to the staff and the 1100 girls who are here.

I have worked at the Center as both a Senior and a Resident Counselor for almost three years. The wonderful results of our program are well-known to me.

Many of our girls have gone on to both good jobs and to further training as nurses or in colleges.

Those girls who could not benefit from the program have been referred to the proper agencies either in their home cities or in their states. Perhaps they never would have received this help if they had not come to Job Corps.

Besides these wonderful results we have had, on the most part a wonderful experience in interracial living both among staff and the corpswomen. This is an important part of our program.

I am also thinking about the economic benefit the Center has brought to this part of Maine. Our state needs this Center.

Most sincerely yours,

MRS. MARY T. STRAYER.

POLAND SPRINGS, MAINE,
April 14, 1969.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Waterville, Maine.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: Enclosed please find a copy of the letter which I felt constrained to write to our President.

I feel, very deeply, the need for the Poland Spring Job Corps, and the others.

For humanitarian reasons.

For economic reasons.

A girl here is only one member of a tree which will grow in several generations to a larger number—perhaps to nearer fifty than one for the country to support on welfare.

Looking at it this way the money spent on a girl at Poland Spring is quite small indeed.

I have seen hundreds here graduate with a vocation and perhaps a G.E.D. high school diploma. Good, quiet girls who never made the papers by disorderly conduct.

This action to close some centers may be a wedge to close others—one by one.

For a thousand girls to be sent home is one thing but the greater thousands that will need Job Corps to keep them from nothingness is another.

Yours truly

MRS. GERTRUDE E. MACLEOD.

POLAND SPRINGS, MAINE,
April 14, 1969.

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES, MR. RICHARD NIXON.

DEAR SIR: There is great consternation among the young girls at the Poland Spring Job Corps Center.

In my three years here I have not seen one of them so stunned unless it was on account of news of a death in the family.

Some say that they cannot possibly return to the intolerable conditions at home without a vocation to help them gain a foothold on life.

I believe that if they opened their hearts and lives to you you would bend every effort to save them, in so far as possible, from their personal and private despair.

Prose really doesn't lend itself to the tragedy that I see in some of these young faces. These words come into my mind although I have not wit nor time to improve the form.

"Orphans of Humanity
Step-children of Life
Return to your troubled homes
Return to your strife.
Young Black, Young Spic
Young Poor White Trash
Don't be so bold—so brash
As to think America holds for you
A first or second chance.
Return without a thought, or care
To a lifetime of reliance
Upon your Country's Welfare."

This could cost up to $190,000.00 for Welfare and $35,000 loss in taxes to the Government per girl.

We have not been able to help every girl who came to us. Psychological causes have made it impossible for light to penetrate many a misguided soul or warped mind.

But even the campaigns of Evangelist Billy Graham, whom I honor, cost vast sums of money and great physical toll. Yet he is grateful to God that some seed falls upon receptive soil.

And Jesus said the poor were always with us. He also gave His disciplines directions for catching the greater supply of fish.

This letter is from an ingrained Republican who grieved when you faced heartbreak and rejoiced in your Victory!

Sincerely yours (and my Country's),

GERTRUDE E. MACLEOD.

MECHANIC FALLS, MAINE.

SENATOR MUSKIE: I am writing to protest the closing of the Poland Spring, Maine, Job Corps.

The Center, as you probably know, is located in a most scenic location and I feel that its environment, good air, the many opportunities to learn, can do much to make the Corps girls feel that they really have, and will desire to have in their future, a brand new and better way of life through learning and earning. I sincerely feel that Poland Spring is an ideal place for this type of center.

It goes without saying that the economy of this area will be strongly affected if the Center is closed. Neither my husband nor myself is employed at the Center but we feel strongly that it should be allowed to continue in operation.

Maine can help these girls and these girls can help Maine!

We ask for your efforts toward the continuance of the Poland Spring Job Corps.

Thank you.

Respectfully,

Mr. and Mrs. F. V. CURTIS.

WEST POLAND, MAINE,
April 13, 1969.

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I hope you accept my apologies for any error in protocol in the writing of this letter, but I felt that the matter at hand warranted its writing, regardless.

I wish to speak of the closing of the Poland Spring Camp Job Corps Center for Women at Poland Spring, Maine. I cannot in all fairess to the Center, the girls, the towns nearby, the State, or this nation, say that this action is in the best interest of all concerned. As a staff member of that center, I have seen for myself the faces of the girls when they heard the news of the action taken by the Department of Labor to close their center. For most, it was the first time in their lives that they were treated with any dignity. For all, it was the greatest chance they would ever receive to make it in this life.

I would like to ask what you intend to do this summer when these girls, and countless boys from the other Job Corps centers, are back on the streets of the nations cities, with the thought in their minds that no one in this world cares whether they live or die, and an incident like the closing of the centers is all the proof they need.

Take a look around you, Mr. Nixon, and look at the lines of tension being pulled tighter and tighter. Take a closer look at the racial prejudice that strains them even more. The cause of such prejudice? Its source? Ignorance, Mr. President. Sheer ignorance. Aside from educating the underprivileged youth of this nation, each Job Corps Center has, by its mere existence, brought about a racial harmony in the youth of America that most adults still need the key to. Through my work at the Poland Spring installation, I have achieved a much greater understanding of the negro and his problems than any ten Presidential Commissions.

If saving money is really your first concern, as is only right when that money doesn't belong to you, then why not consider the cutting of funds allocated for the military, or to foreign aid. You are not blind, Mr. Nixon. You know what the South and Latin American nations REALLY think of the United States. We have for too long, punished ourselves and felt guilty for being the richest nation this world has ever seen. We say, "I'm sorry I'm so rich, but give me a chance, and I'll give it all away as soon as possible." What possible use is the salvation of the world, if we as a nation, can't save ourself?

The Job Corps program is even more valuable when you look at it in the aspect that for every girl or boy that graduates, there is one less person on the welfare lists of this nation. There is a better than likely chance that his or her future husband or wife will be much more capable of raising a family that will not be on welfare. So you can see that the Job Corps program is self-eliminating as it eliminates welfare at its source—poverty. In fact, with the number of graduates from the program who assumes the responsibility for their own welfare, there are more tax dollars coming in than going out to welfare programs over a long period of time. By any means of reason, the Poland Spring Job Corps Center, by virtue of its being the largest, could be run much more effectively and efficiently and at much lower cost than two or three smaller centers scattered throughout the country. Not to mention the savings in operational costs, personnel payroll, fuel and electricity, foodstuffs, plus the advantage of size in the Poland Spring complex. The Center is located a relatively short distance from Lewiston and Auburn, which makes it convenient for the girls' work programs, for shopping trips, for recreational purposes, and the accessibility of supplies for maintaining the center. The Center is large enough to easily accommodate 1200 girls, but small enough to provide the individual attention each girl needs. It is not too close to any major metropolitan area (such as "Cleveland", New York City, Washington, D.C., etc.) but there are airports and bus routes to them. This, it would seem, is ideal, since the emphasis is on avoiding the tensions of the city, and to concentrate on individual development and education. Show me the practicality of closing this center.

It may be important for you to know that I am only 19 years old, I am white, and that I am not poverty stricken. It should be more important for you to know that I am sincere in everything I have said. Job Corps has done wonders for this community in which I live, and in the surrounding communities where I attend college. Through my work at the Poland Spring Job Corps Center, I have grown considerably. This is supposed to be the common reaction of nearly every staff member working with these girls. I wish you would at least come, and see for yourself the tremendous value of this program before making your final decision. Who knows, you might even change the minds of those who continue to condemn this program without knowing what it is really all about!

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

GREGORY A. KEENE.

KEZAR FALLS, MAINE,
April 18, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: We are greatly disturbed by the announcement that the Poland Spring Job Corps is to be closed.

We have visited the Job Corps at Poland Springs and have been amazed at the variety of trades the girls were learning and doing extremely well so that they might go out into the world as useful citizens rather than being turned back to their old environments to squalor and ghetto living and rioting and hopeless futures.

So far as Poland Springs is concerned the Job Corps certainly cannot be tagged as a "flat failure".

Setting up new centres to absorb the boys and girls from those being closed would not be much, if any, saving to the Government as the present facilities are already set up, well equipped and, as far as Poland Springs is concerned, turning out girls who are neat, polite and in a position to live respectable lives and to hold the job of their choice.

Yours very truly,

MARGARET STROUT.
INA N. EMERY.

WPNO,
Auburn, Maine, April 17, 1969.

Congressman WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BILL: Many thanks for your kind note of the fourteenth.

Believe me, if the challenges to the Youth Commission prove to be as vast as they seem to be, I will most certainly be calling upon you for valuable advice.

Incidentally, I would like to be on record as opposed to the closing of the Job Corps Center at Poland Springs. I am not really familiar with our other Job Corps facility, but I have been closely associated with the facility in Poland and feel that while this may not be panacea to our economic ills and ghetto problems, it is at least better than what has come before and better than nothing.

Again, my thanks for your kind note of the fourteenth.

Best regards,

JAMES M. AIKMAN,
Station Manager.

PORTLAND, MAINE,
April 14, 1969.

Hon. KENNETH CURTIS,
Governor of Maine,
Augusta, Maine.

DEAR GOVERNOR CURTIS: The State of Maine has been struck with very sad news upon hearing of the closing of the Poland Spring and Acadia Job Corps Centers. I am very much interested in what we can do to combine our forces in an effort to see the reversal of this decision by the Nixon Administration.

The black, the hardcore and the very poor, which is the very backbone of these Centers, must have all the support we can give them.

If I, in my capacity as an officer of the New England Regional Conference NAACP can be of any service, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD E. TALBOT,
Third Vice President, New England Regional Conference, NAACP.

APRIL 14, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The news of the closing of the Poland Spring and Acadia Job Corps Centers at Poland Spring and Bucksport, Maine, come as a surprise and very sad news. Some of the very people who have put you and your administration into office with faith and trust in the future will be hit the hardest and will feel it the most. People who are trying to learn a better future for themselves so that in turn they will benefit the community and State in which they reside. People who are trying to forget that in the past too many promises by the peoples of this country have been broken, and the people themselves hurt.

To be frank, Black people who are struggling for their self respect, manhood, a place in society, things we shouldn't have to wait until now for, will be moving backwards in a society that stresses progress.

I, in behalf of the New England Conference, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, urge you and your administration to take another deeper look into this most costly decision and reconsider.

Sincerely yours,

GERALD W. TALBOT,
Third Vice President, New England Conference, NAACP.

SEAL HARBOR, MAINE,
April 24, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I believe that most thinking citizens agree as to the importance of maintaining those elements of the Poverty Program that have proved constructive in lessening poverty and in building greater social stability.

Although some reorganization in the administration of the Job Corps may be indicated, the sudden discontinuance of the Job Corps centers, as recently announced, is a severe blow to the long-range goals of the Poverty Program.

The purpose of the Job Corps is linked with the rehabilitation of individual boys and girls whose chances in early life have been minimal. In countless cases, young people, through their experience in the Job Corps, have entered into a new era of hopefulness. The cutting off of a hope before realization is often more dangerous to an individual than the absence of this hope. Our nation is made up of individuals, and social turmoil can result when too many people face bitterness and frustration.

I trust you will use your influence to prevent the implementation of the plan to close the centers.

Sincerely,

ISABEL DUNHAM.

ERIE, PA.,
April 12, 1969.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: In all sincerity, I ask of you, do not become a party to President Nixon's dismemberment of the Job Corps program. The need for this program, and other programs such as this, is today desperate and will become ever more so in the days to come.

In the sense of decency and fairplay, which you have displayed on many occasions in the past, I ask of you, not only to fight strongly against this cut in the number of Job Corps Centers, but to fight even stronger to have the number of these Centers increased.

Yes, there have been some flaws in the operation of these Centers, but to take a second look at the record, one can readily see that the good that has come out of them far overshadows the bad.

But the biggest fallacy of all is this so-called plan to set up training centers close to, and within the cities themselves. The reason for these Job Centers in the first place was to get these young boys and girls away from these cesspools of crime and violence. Now the powers which be, feel that they can be trained in these same enviroments. Who is kidding who?

The training in many of these Centers includes courses in carpentry, auto mechanics, the handling of some heavy duty equipment, etc., along with the working towards a high school equivalency diploma. This varies from Center to Center as well I know, because I have visited a number of them.

With moves such as this, by the Administration in Washington, can so many almost hopeless Americans be blamed for the "long, hot summer?"

Sincerely yours,

GUIDO A. MANCINI,
President, Local 1680, United Steelworkers of America, AFL–CIO.

LEVANT, MAINE,
April 13, 1969.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am sure that the average American, rather than being apathetic, is inarticulate and hesitates to make his feelings known. He is afraid that he may not express himself well. As one of these average Americans the events of the past few days have jolted me enough so that I am forced to try to express my beliefs and opinions to a source that may be able to express them better than I. I am shocked at the callousness of the Administration in closing the Acadia and Poland Springs Job Corps Centers as well as about fifty others. While the President speaks piously of reducing government spending, he advocates the deployment of an Anti Ballistic Missile system that most of the experts don't think will even work. This is at a cost of some six to seven billion dollars. Based on the spiraling cost of the C–5 transport this could easily run to fifteen to twenty billion dollars. By closing the Job Corps Centers he saves some one hundred thirty million dollars at the price of hopelessness and despair on the part of those trainees whe were beginning to see an end to the chain of poverty.

I am sure that the President and his advisors have toured the Centers but I don't believe that they have really seen them. They haven't seen the look in a young man's eyes who has just been accepted by the U.S. Marine Corps when two years before he could neither read nor write and couldn't even be drafted. This has happened not once but many times at the Acadia Center and I am sure that Acadia is not unique in this respect. In visiting Acadia I was impressed by several factors. First, the permanent staff is competent and dedicated. I know that some of them were working as much as one hundred hours a week with the trainees. Secondly, the feeling of hope engendered in the corpsmen was contagious. You could feel it. Thirdly, and not the least important, this outdoor experience in a Conservation Center was the first for many of the ghetto kids. They had found that there was something to life other than concrete and asphalt. This the Nixon administration would take away.

A good many of my tax dollars have gone into the preparation of these Centers and now when the cost of training a young one is beginning to get within reason they want to shut them down. I have been told that it now costs about five thousand dollars to train a Corpsman to a point that he is either ready to assimilate advance training or is ready to become a useful member of society. It costs the tax payer this much each year to maintain each inmate of our State and Federal institutions (penal). Where Senator, are the savings if young men and women that we could train and develop in Job Corps Centers are denied this opportunity and wind up as habitual criminals or perennially on welfare rolls.

Lest you think I am some sort of a do gooder nut, I would like to give you a little of my background. I am a retired Army Artillery Officer with some experience in Nuclear Delivery System, both conventional and missiles. While in the Service I served for several years with the 11th Airborne Division in both this country and Europe as an Airborne Artillery Operations Officer. In Korea I served as an Adviser to the South Korean Army. I have been wounded three times in two wars and have been decorated for gallantry in action once, if you call being so scared that you couldn't run gallant. My wife who classifies herself as a Muskie Republican, as an Army Nurse in Korea did some of the early applied work with the Artificial Kidney.

After retirement, I attended the University of Maine and graduated with a Bachelor of Science Degree in Forestry. Since that time I have been employed as a Service Forester, working with small landowners in the management of their woodlands. In working with these people and with the men who cut the wood I have run head on into the bone grinding poverty that we have not only in Maine but throughout the rural areas of America. This has become even more apparent to me as a member of the Penobscot County Technical Action Panel, which as you know works toward Rural Area Development.

At the risk of sounding maudlin, Senator, I love my country. I feel that it is the finest place in the world to live and raise my children. I have been given the opportunity for education and service and to find fulfillment in not only one but two rewarding careers. I sincerely believe that our Country will not realize her full potential until these same opportunities are available to more of our underprivileged, and in fact may be in grave danger if we don't. It is obvious that the Job Corps is a tool by which many of these youngsters can be reached and helped.

I understand that a man must do what he must do and that you must be guided by your own conscience and knowledge. However, I urge that you oppose the Anti Ballistic Missile System by all possible means and work for the retention of the Job Corps as a viable weapon in the fight against poverty.

As an aside, is it not possible that Maine is being spanked quite publically for having the nerve to produce such outstanding public servants as Smith, Muskie, Hathaway and Kyros. After all to a Californian, nothing can be much good unless it comes from the land of Fruits and Nuts.

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH H. HENDREN.

HARTFORD, CONN.,
April 19, 1969.

Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: It has just been brought to my attention that a proposal to close the Poland Spring Job Corps Center has been brought forward for question. This letter is to ask you to urge Congress for the continuation of the Job Corps program at Poland Spring.

As a former employee of the Center (I worked there last summer, 1968), I feel that I have been fortunate to view the Center and its workings from the inside, and to receive a special insight into many of the problems of our girls through a mutual confidence and respect. For these reasons I wish to promote an effort against the closing of the Job Corps.

I would like to emphasize the fact that the girls are from some of the least desirable environments of this country, and that the Job Corps is possibly their last hope either of leaving those environments or of working to improve them for themselves and their families. The educational opportunities offered by the Job Corps to its participants are exactly what are needed to win the battle against the intolerable poverty that is smothering human beings in this country. I cannot passively support or accept the abolition of a program, the effects of which I feel can and will rescue those innocent children, hungry and cold, who live in filth.

The race problem in this country is one of the main issues involved with and af-

fected by the Job Corps. Through the education offered by the Job Corps, the black American can take his rightful place in society, as a working, tax-paying, law-abiding citizen, and can raise a family, providing all necessities and, hopefully, some luxuries. With the job training provided by this program, the black man can do for himself, without becoming the object of continual public support, which can lead, and not without reason, to public scorn, thus creating further tension. In effect, to cease offering the program which provides the black American with a means of making his own way is to provoke that tension between the races.

I attended the August, 1968 graduation ceremony at the Poland Spring Job Corps Center, at which time approximately fifty women were graduated. I sincerely wish that you, Mr. Muskie, could have seen the faces that I saw that day: I would almost say that light was radiating from them. Those girls were so happy, anxious, proud, and—best of all—ready, that I cannot see this opportunity taken away from them. They truly felt, and still do feel (I have visited several graduates since then) that they did and are doing something not only for themselves personally, but for all of those who have been trapped by the same fate that almost trapped them.

Please urge Congress, Mr. Muskie, not to cut back on the Job Corps program. An abolition of or a cutback on the program not only would affect those who most need the opportunity for self-betterment and self-respect, but also would affect those of us who have been fortunate enough not to be born into those "humbled masses," in that we would be deprived of more self-reliant people. And we must not forget that our children will be affected also: I do not want my children to experience the utter frustration that I have felt, in realizing that this society of plenty can let human beings feel the pangs of hunger, cold, and filth. We are two hundred years late already; let us not be any later.

Thank you.

Most sincerely,

BRUCE HARMON.

BANGOR, MAINE,
April 22, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

SIR: In behalf of the League of Women Voters of Bangor, Maine I urge you to oppose the abrupt closing of more than one-half of the Job Corps centers. The League feels that these centers should remain open until adequate and expanded facilities are in operation to guarantee continuation of programs to train the hard core unemployed and underemployed. The League is concerned that the sudden closings will have a detrimental effect on the attitude of the under-privileged who need to know the Nation has a depth of commitment to overcome poverty and discrimination.

In Maine we are particularly concerned as two excellent facilities at Poland Springs and Bar Harbor are among those designated for closing.

The League sincerely hopes you will actively continue your opposition to these closings.

Respectfully,

SHIRLEY WHITTAKER,
President,
Bangor League of Women Voters.

POWNAL, MAINE,
April 21, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ED: In this letter, I wish to express my concern about the scheduled closing of the Job Corps Training Center, at Poland Spring.

I fully appreciate that the program there, perhaps as elsewhere, has come under criticism in certain quarters, and that the per capita expenditure is considered extravagant by some people.

Be that as it may, we have trained girls from the Job Corps Training Center, during these past couple of years, and I am very much concerned that precipitous dissolution of the program nationwide will have unfortunate repercussions, particularly if no other program simultaneously is being developed to take its place by July 1.

I think the administration owes the public an explanation for its decision and particularly what the alternatives are.

You know, from my previously expressed concern to you, we owe, particularly the black population in this country, some form of substantive compensation for the abuse it has suffered in the past 2½ centuries. This, to my mind, is one of our most urgent and immediate obligations that we must not shun any further.

Also, I feel that we should give top priority to training those (particularly young) people who are presently considered unemployable because of their educational and social status, regardless of whether they are black or white.

Knowing of your own convinctions, I am sure that you will do everything possible.

I am, with warmest wishes,

Sincerely,

PETER W. BOWMAN, M.D.

GORHAM, MAINE.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The enclosed petition is to ask you to do everything you can to see that Poland Spring Job Corps Center be kept open.

Gorham students have been tutoring at Poland Spring for two years now; and the young ladies from Poland Spring have been to Gorham for various activities or just to spend a weekend. People can learn a great deal from one another if they can first meet and get to know each other.

Please do all you can to keep Poland Spring Job Corps Center open. Thank you.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. SIMS.

PETITION

To: Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

We, the undersigned, do respectfully request that the Poland Spring Job Corps Center for Women at Poland Spring, Maine, *not* be closed.

William M. Sims, Gorham; Robert W. Burband, Joan B. Flynt, Harold R. Hurlbert, Rond Henry, Portland, Maine; Ann I. Loving, South Portland, Maine; John Linton, Berwick, Maine; Gregory Brusion, Princeton, Maine; Jean M. Haycock, Poland Spring, Maine; Ann L. Hawkes, Portland, Maine; Harold Hurlbert, Patten, Maine; Eleanor M. Pillsbury, Danvers, Mass.; Bill Hunt, Berwick, Maine; R. Lowe, Indian Island, Maine; Tom Drew, Lebanon, Conn.; John Wallace, Falmouth, Maine; Diana Philpot, N. Windham, Maine; Timothy J. Wooten, Gorham, Maine; Cyrene A. Slegona, Woodbury Hts., N.J.; Laurel Knowles, Hartland, Maine; Suzanne Jackman, Presque Isle, Maine; Eilan Bray, Portland, Maine; Donald Dees, Gorham, Maine; John E. Kortecamp, Dexter, Maine; Sharon J. Onyango, Gorham, Maine.

Ann Snow, West Scarborough, Maine; Sharon Hilbown, So. Berwick, Maine; Eugene P. A. Schleh, Gorham, Maine; John R. Lewis, Westbrook, Maine; Horton W. Emerson, Jr., Gorham, Maine; Robert M. York, Gorham, Maine; Douglas Mosher, Livermore Falls, Maine; Judy Sims, Gorham, Maine; Kay Morrill, Lisbon Falls, Maine; Kathleen Doughty, Yarmouth, Maine; Christine Kelly, Bangor, Maine; Thom Maurais, Sanford, Maine; Cynthia H. Perry, S. Portland, Maine; Leo T. Arsenarp, Gorham, Maine; Mary Margaret Hunt, Island Falls, Maine; Patrick F. Ayotte, Gorham, Maine; Leighton R. Cissey, Boothbay Harbor, Maine; Patricia E. Tracliek, Gorham, Maine; Vincent Delarols, Portland, Maine; Frank Hodges, S. Windham, Maine; Constance Bowque, Lewiston, Maine, Linda Libby, Freeport, Maine; Trudy Kouzounas, Saco, Maine; Brenda McInnis, Augusta, Maine; Richard Aclack, Portland, Maine; Catherine L. Martin, Kittery, Maine; B. P. Rumeby, Cape Elizabeth, Maine; Douglas Siddons, Gorham, Maine; Sue Siddons, Gorham, Maine; Barbara D. Budi, Gorham, Maine.

Anita Bussine, Auburn, Maine; Anthony Cow, Oakland, Maine; Susan Palmer; Pam Johns, Bath, Maine; Donna Lemerich, Sayreville, N.J.; David A. Rolfe, South Portland, Maine; Jeffery Hardy, Lincolnville, Maine; Cheryl Hardy, Portland, Maine; Rosalie Burgess, Levant, Maine; Jennifer Van Fleet, West Rockport, Maine; David Deas, Gorham, Maine; Donald G. Stanley, Jr., Gorham, Maine; Tommy Martin, Douglas Hill, Maine; Richard E. Dyer, Jr., Stockton Springs, Maine; Kirk M. Danberg, Readfield, Maine, Deborah Batchhelder, Reading, Mass.: Donald Turcott, Biddeford, Maine; Gloria Abbott, Rumford Pt., Maine; Victoria Manper, Bangor, Maine; Judith A. Jackson, Portsmouth, N.H.; Stephanie Kneeland, Portsmouth, N.H.; Beth Wilson, Stockton Springs, Maine; James E. Page, Kittery, Maine; Barry A. Glen, Dover-Foxcroft, Maine; Patrick D. Daly, Cape Elizabeth, Maine; Patricia A. Daley, Westbrook, Maine; Melville R. Hanson, Gorham, Maine; C. Thomas Stinson; Gorham, Maine; Cyndee Thilandeau, Gorham, Maine; Bonnie M. Neal, Friendship, Maine.

WALNUT CREEK, CALIF.,
April 21, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: It has come to my attention that President Nixon has decided to close several Job Corps Centers, including the Camp Parks one in Alameda County.

It has been my opinion since this program was initiated that it took kids from eighteen to twenty-one off the streets in *our* impoverished areas and gave them a trade and taught them how to use it to make their lives useful. Are we to let these kids down? Are we to let these kids go by the way-side because they have not learned a trade and cannot find a job? the answer to these questions, of course, is NO! We must give these kids a chance to live a life equal to the rest of Americans. We must make having a job a right for everybody and not a privilege for some, as it is, now.

It is time we started to make sure that everyone has three meals a day in his stomach, a roof over his head and a job to make the first two things possible. With the Job Corps, maybe we can make a start at this.

Sincerely yours,

DAVID C. STARKIE.

POLAND SPRING, MAINE,
April 15, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: There is good and bad in all. No one thing has all good in it. Poland Spring Job Corps is the same way. We have the good in with the bad. But it seems the bad always gets noticed more than the good.

If you came to Poland Spring Job Corps in Maine, you would see a beautiful countryside away from noisy disturbances. If you stayed here day after day you would see girls working hard to finish a vocation, girls graduating month after month and girls getting along in activities. Then again you would notice some trouble makers. There could be something good for the majority of girls if Job Corps was left open.

The expense of closing Poland Spring Job Corps down could be much more to the pub-

lic than 5.3 million a year. Girls may be left out on the streets, some put on welfare and some working in low paid jobs. Some may go back to school but it won't be the same opportunity as they had in Job Corps. I don't know how to express my feelings on this, but it is sort of a magic ecstasy about this place that makes you want to work hard. That is why we are asking your help to keep Poland Spring open.

Sincerely yours,

Miss ILENE STANLEY.

BROTHERHOOD OF PAINTERS, DECORATORS AND PAPERHANGERS OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO,

Washington, D.C., April 15, 1969.

To all Cabinet Members, all Members of the Congress:

I previously wrote to many of you in a much happier vein, informing you of our joint participation with the Job Corps in preparing disadvantaged youth for gainful employment in the Painting and Decorating Industry, with the ultimate goal of fitting this group into the mainstream of our society as employed taxpayers rather than having them face a future as recipients of welfare doles or prison rehabilitation. This appears to no longer be the goal of this Administration.

It saddens and alarms me to see that we are again turning our backs on a major segment of our population; for while we do not like to believe it, we still must recognize that this hardcore, disadvantaged youth group does exist.

We must not stand idly by and see our most precious resource, the youth of this country, wasted from lack of opportunity. It is my studied opinion that one of the very best and most practical ways to refine this flow of undereducated, disadvantaged, raw youth into our machine of progress is through the Job Corps Civilian Conservation Centers Program. This is practical on the job training for a practical job and no substitute has ever been found for this method by any administration since the dawn of the world.

Now is the time to search our conscience as representatives of our people and ask ourselves some basic questions. Is it really more costly to prepare a youth for employment than to keep him in prison, or on the public welfare rolls along with his future family and their future families ad infinitum? I know what my answer and the answer of the membership I am privileged to represent is to this, and hope that you are of the same mind.

Therefore, on behalf of the 210,000 members which I have the honor of representing, I ask that you exercise your influence to have this most critical decision on the part of the Administration either rescinded or modified. I would indeed hate to see the Great American Dream be turned into a nightmare for these now forgotten and disillusioned youth.

With best personal regards, I remain.

Sincerely,

S. FRANK RAFTERY,
General President.

SOUTH WELLFLEET, MASS.,
April 25, 1969.

Re Job Corps reorganization.

Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Mrs. Law and I have been spending three mornings a week for the past two years at the Wellfleet, Mass. Job Corps Conservation Center which is one of the centers proposed to be closed by the Administration. We are opposed to the closing of this center and believe that the change from rural conservation centers into urban areas is a serious mistake. Our opposition may best be illustrated by the two following examples.

There is a boy now at the center from your own state of Maine. He is 16 years of age, grew up in a town on the seaboard, attended public school, and was carried along from grade to grade but never learned to read or write. I would guess that he is about second grade in these skills. Obviously he needs the individual attention and encouragement which all of the boys here receive from the volunteer tutors. Coupled with the real effort which he himself is making we are convinced that he will advance considerably if allowed to continue for a year or two. The closing of this camp in all probability means that he will return to the vicinity from which he came even more discouraged than when he arrived.

The second boy came originally from South America, lived in New York City for about a year, where he attended the Hughes High School on 18th Street. His problem is to learn a new language and I might add that this is true of practically all of the Spanish speaking boys who come here. A recent article by Joseph Alsop in the Boston Globe stated that 40–50% of the pupils at Hughes were experimenting with heroin. I quote a paragraph from this article,

"Just for school kids," said Gales bitterly, "the damn pushers break the regular $5 bags down to $2 bags. Then four kids pool their lunch money—50 cents apiece and share the bag between them instead of eating lunch."

This boy came to Wellfleet about two months ago to escape from this environment. We are of the opinion, based upon our past experience, that he can learn our language adequately in from six months to a year if allowed to continue here.

These are both fine boys and I only select their cases from many others, both black and white, because they are in the camp right now, we have worked with them, and we are somewhat familiar with their background.

The proposed change of emphasis in the overall setup of the Job Corps from conservation to vocational training overlooks the basic fact that the need is first to raise the literacy level of the trainees to a point where they can go on to the so called "skill centers" to be trained for specific jobs. You have to be able to read simple directions. Whatever system is eventually planned must teach these fundamentals if it is to succeed.

Perhaps Wellfleet has been unique in having had a voluntary program such as I have described above but I see no reason why it can not be duplicated in other areas and why should it be abandoned here where it has been a success?

Very sincerely yours,

MALCOLM C. LAW.

POLAND COMMUNITY CHURCH,
Poland, Maine, April 21, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
Senate of the United States of America,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is a note to express my own concern and that of many members of my congregation upon hearing of the Administration's proposal to close the Job Corps center in Poland Spring. We here in Poland who are directly affected by this decision feel that it is an unfortunate one. And I personally feel that it represents the present administration's hypocritical approach to solving the problems of the budget . . . cutbacks should come from the military, the hair-brain ABM System certainly should not be deployed and the oil depletion allowance should be lowered or dropped entirely (Since the oil companies seem bent on not letting Maine have a piece of the pie, why should we be paying their taxes?).

Is the cut-back in the Job-Corps program going to be another example of the triumph of the military-industrial complex (a cliche by now?) over the needs of individuals? I sincerely hope not, for time is running out for Washington. The average American citizen is *rapidly* reaching the limits of his endurance.

With deep appreciation for your courageous views, I am

Sincerely,

Rev. JAMES W. FLETCHER.

ORRINGTON, MAINE,
April 19, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am very disturbed by the closing of the Job Corps Centers in Maine. The Job Corps is a valuable tool of our economy. It is taking unemployed and unemployable youth from poverty situations and making most of them (80%) employable. While the cost may seem high, it will be repaid several times over in taxes which these youths will pay from earnings.

Closing of the Job Corps Centers in Maine will leave no place for rural youth to be trained, unless they are sent to the proposed mini-centers in the large cities. Since these are not in existence now, the interim period will leave these youths with nothing and without hope of anything.

I feel that the Job Corps has already given many youths a chance for a better future, that they will be beneficial citizens in our society. The youths, themselves, are upset and concerned over the proposed closing of the centers. How can we not be?

I know that you are using your influence for the retention of these centers and hope, that by voicing my opinion along with other interested citizens, we can reverse the decision to close the Centers.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. ALTON N. VARNUM.

BANGOR, MAINE,
April 21, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am writing to you as a concerned citizen over the move to close the Job Corps centers in Maine and elsewhere in the country.

I have worked closely with people in Job Corps and I have seen first hand the value that this program has given to deprived citizens or our country. To close these centers would only bring increased hardships on those that now have an opportunity. I also feel that these people will become a burden to our communities when we could make them assets.

The proposed programs to replace Job Corps will not solve the problem but only add fuel to a raging fire. Positive steps must be taken to maintain this worthwhile program.

I urge you to support to the best of your ability the retention of these centers. Let us continue to produce assets to our communities.

Yours truly,

GLENN PAYNE.

FARMINGTON, MAINE,
April 20, 1969.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am distressed at the possibility of closing Maine's Job Corps centers for economy.

Take away subsidies from private airlines. They can stand up alone. Job Corps young people cannot . . . without our support.

Yours sincerely,

KARYL A. CONDIT.

APRIL 24, 1969.
POLAND SPRING, MAINE,
April 23, 1969.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am just one of the many young women who feels that our

Job Corps Center is a victim of unjust discrimination. It is my opinion that our Job Corps Center is one of the best Centers in the United States of America.

I am aware that there may be some prejudice involved in my statement but any one who is a member of any organization that strives for self-improvement tends to show some form of favoritism.

This is not my intended reason for requesting that the Poland Spring Job Corps Center remain open.

I, as so do every other corpswoman stationed here in Maine, feel that our center should remain unclosed. This is Our road to future Success. Or should I say Survival?

Sincerely yours,

LINDA F. CATHEY,
Corpswoman.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: Job Corps for women is a very wonderful thing for us young people today. I think it is unfair of you all to even considering closing Poland Spring Job Corps Center. So I ask you good people to try and keep it open. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

HAZEL GRAY.

APRIL 23, 1969.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I would like to ask you to help us keep Poland Spring JCCW open. Because there is a lot of girls here that is trying to make something out of themselves and I guess you know that if this center closes, there will be more innocent young teenagers out on the street, with nothing to do. There really is a lot I can say to you, but the most important thing is, "Please help us keep Poland Spring JCCW open." The girls here and our parents, I'm sure would really appreciate it.

Sincerely yours,

JOYCE HOWARD,
Co-chairman of Student Government of Poland Spring JCCW.

P.S.—Please help us! Please, answer me back.

APRIL 23, 1969.

MY DEAR SIR: I am writing to stress the importance of Poland Spring Job Corps.

As a corpswoman here, I can only stress it's importance to me.

Now I myself have dropped out school, not knowing it's great importance. I admit this was my stupidity, but I am trying to make it up by trying to further my education at Job Corps.

I feel as though you are trying to deprive me of this opportunity. Not only me but many, who are trying to make something and someone out their lives.

So if letters mean anything to them I ask you Why?

Sincerely Yours,

Miss JUDI COVINGTON.

P.S.—Don't Close Poland Spring.

POLAND SPRING J.C.C.W., MAINE,
April 23, 1969.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I want to finish my vocation and education. Please, keep Poland Spring Job Corps Center open.

I know that this center has a very good rating, and therefor it wasn't in the list to close, and just because a personal reason it's closing now, but we are trying our best to change Mr. Harry's mind about the idea.

Sincerely Yours,

GLADYS PEREZ.

APRIL 23, 1969.

DEAR SIR: As being one of the thousand of C/W here in Poland Spring I think it was very unfair to us because we were rejudged the wrong way, we had a good rate and the others had a bad rate. Do you think it's right. Please help us to remain open.

I don't have much to say but please help us to remain open.

Sincerely Yours,

PATRICIA D. PEEPLES,
A Chairman for Garrison Hall.

POLAND SPRING, J.C.C.W.,
Poland Spring, Maine, April 23, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND S. MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I sincerely hope that this center don't close. Because it gives each person an equal opportunity to better themselves. This center gives everyone a chance to meet new people as well as, to learn ways of other people. I don't think that our rating was unfair. We did pass. So I will close now saying I hope and pray that this center stay open.

Sincerely yours

SALLIE GILLIAM.

POLAND SPRING JOB CORPS, MAINE,
April 22, 1969.

Hon. EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MUSKIE: As a representative of the Poland Spring Job Corps Student government and as a corpsman I am very much concerned as to the future of this centre.

Most of us here at the centre are very appreciative of the opportunity given us and are therefore taking advantage of it. Most of us have greatly benefited from the program which we call our second chance. It helps us to get along with all kinds of people in different situations. In all the training given us helps to mold us into good citizens.

As a result of the above statements we were very much distressed when we heard that our centre was among those to be closed. We believe that the government is robbing us of the opportunity to better our condition.

We are sincerely hoping that the decision to close the centre will be reversed because believe me we are really doing something worthwhile at Poland Spring.

Thanks for reading.

Yours faithfully

MANDLYN LEWIS.

POLAND SPRING, JCCW,
Poland Spring, Maine, April 17, 1969.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

My DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am a Student at the Poland Spring Job Corps for women. We don't want to go home. We like Maine. But the people don't like the girls. We want to stay in the Job Corps. The girls want to get a good education and training. We don't want to go back to the ghetto. We don't have homes and families to go to. What will you do with the girls? I will like to see Job Corps stay open. Please don't close Poland Spring down. You have shown great concern for foreign policies on poverty. But what about your own country * * * have Kid Back home. Who want the Kid to Get a good education to, and your oath of office? If you Personally could come to Maine to see the Job Corps. I want my Daughter to go to Job Corps. What about People of need money back for food and clothing.

Respectfully yours,

CYNTHIA PRESTON.

APRIL 14, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR: My name is Betty Kathleen Jones and I'm in the Job Corps at Roland Spring. The course Im in is veterinary assistant. I like my course very much. It takes from six months to one year tell me how I can finish my course, when I won't be finnished till next year?

Mr. Senator put your self in my place and try to see my point of view. How would you like it if you weren't finished with your course and they said they were closing down Job Corps. I know that you would feal like I do rite now very sad indeed. The course that I'm taking well theres only one other Job Corps that has got it and it is closing down. (which in Omaha, Nebraska.)

Please Mr. Senator try to keep this Job Corps at Poland Springs open. Because the Job Corps is a very good program for young people that have quit school and that are not going back like me. Mr. Senator even if you can't keep it open then Please put the Job Corps under the department of Labor.

Mr. Nixon said that the Job Corps at Poland Springs was going to stay open for another year. why did he say that if he didn't mean it.

Sincerely yours,

BETTY KATHLEEN JONES.

P.S.—Please try and keep this Job Corps at Poland Springs open. Please!!!!!!!

POLAND SPRING JOB CORPS
CENTER FOR WOMEN.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: I am presently enrolled in Job Corps and I am writing to let you know how I and a thousand other girls feel about President Nixon closing sixty-five Job Corps centers.

I am twenty-three years old and have been in Job Corps for two years now and will be graduating shortly. So you can see that the closing of this and other centers will not affect me personally. However, I feel much regret, shock and distress for the girls who are in the program and for those who would be considering on joining Job Corps in the future.

Before coming to Job Corps the future held little meaning for me. I was a shy, quiet and rather an insecure type of person who was unconsciously afraid to face whatever the future had in store for me. I felt beaten and defeated by life and society before I had turned sixteen. Coming to Job Corps has changed my whole outlook on life completely and it has enabled me to develop a wholesome and healthy outlook for everything and everyone around me. Instead of being afraid of the future I now look forward to it and can hardly wait for the next day to come. I have been trained in the field of commercial art and my future financially speaking is very secure.

I shall be getting married this year and I plan to live in Maine. I realize there aren't too many good paying job opportunities in this field open in Maine, but nevertheless, I love this State and hope to use my skill in a way which will benefit the people of Maine however small it should be.

I don't feel President Nixon is fully aware of the poverty situation in this country. These girls on this center are here because they are sick and depressed of the living conditions of their past, of discrimination, poor housing, and schools and of low paying jobs. We didn't come here for a handout—we came to better ourselves so that we may better serve the country we live in—for our future and our children's.

President Nixon wants more effort and money put into the Headstart program—well all I can say is this is a marvelous effort but I hope he doesn't forget that it will be people of our age group who will be the backbone of our country in the very near future.

We are also very aware of the amount of money spent each year for the Job Corps program—and we are also well aware of the fact that the United States Government spends that much alone for one particular kind of bomber plane. How can any country be proud of the fact that they spend billions of dollars on warfare but hesitate to spend just one billion dollars toward a peaceful end, to help her own people so that they can learn to help themselves and others.

There is so much more I could say for Job Corps but I realize your time is valuable and I think my letter speaks enough on how I

feel. We all at Poland Springs Job Corps Center appreciate your efforts in trying to keep open the Job Corps centers and our hopes and prayers are with you.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHA STEWARD.

P.S.—This past election was my first chance to vote and my vote was for you.

Thank you for not letting me down.

Sincerely yours,

MARSHA STEWARD.

HON. W. LEE O'DANIEL, FORMER U.S. SENATOR AND FORMER GOVERNOR OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was with genuine grief that I learned of the death of former U.S. Senator W. Lee O'Daniel, of Texas. Senator O'Daniel passed away yesterday, after an illness of several weeks.

W. Lee O'Daniel, absolutely without any previous political experience, was elected Governor of Texas in 1938, with a clear majority over all opponents in the first primary. He was a unique candidate. He said that his campaign platform was the Golden Rule and the Ten Commandments, and he was aided by the most handsome hillbilly band in Texas, W. Lee O'Daniel's own band.

Senator Morris Sheppard died on April 9, 1941, and Gov. W. Lee O'Daniel, the incumbent Governor, ran for the vacancy and was elected to the U.S. Senate on June 28, 1941. He was reelected to a full term in 1942 and served until January 1949. Twenty-six men have represented Texas in the U.S. Senate, and 39 people have served as Governor of Texas, but only six men have been both Governor of Texas and U.S. Senator from Texas, and W. Lee O'Daniel was one of those.

O'Daniel came out of obscurity to be elected Governor in 1938, and in the general election of 1938 he captured 473,526 out of 485,288 votes cast in that election, winning one of the greatest vote victories in the history of Texas. He was reelected in 1940 for a second term.

W. Lee O'Daniel was one of the most colorful campaigners in the history of Texas. No person who ever saw or heard him campaign in 1938 or 1940 will ever forget him: witty, a quick thinker, quick at rejoinder, urbane, immaculately dressed, with his wife always at his side, beautifully dressed, with a large bouquet of red roses.

His daughter, Molly, and his sons, Pat and Mike, were in the band that accompanied him. In the midst of the depression, they traveled; and with his wit and music and songs, some of which he had composed himself, he lifted the hearts of Texans in the depths of the depression. He made them laugh, and brought smiles and hope to people who had known only the despair of the depression.

Despite all this, when he sought public office again in 1956 and 1958, he was unsuccessful in both bids for the Democratic nomination for Governor.

Mr. President, Senator W. Lee O'Daniel made an imprint on his generation of the political life of my State that will never be forgotten by any of those who lived through it.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MANSFIELD TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the prayer tomorrow the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) be recognized for a period not to exceed 20 minutes.

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

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) tomorrow, statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

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

A RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 194) to express the sense of the Senate in regard to changes in the Job Corps program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to address myself to the pending resolution in a way which is rather unique for me. It is well known that under other circumstances I would probably be on the other side of this particular debate, and it may seem surprising to some Senators that I am on this side. Therefore, I feel it my duty—although I think the debate will probably continue for another day at least—to explain very briefly why I have taken this position, because I deeply believe other Senators may wish to take a position similar to the one that I wish to express here.

Mr. President, as I see it, we have in this situation, the perfectly legitimate and understandable feeling of those who have had successful Job Corps camps in their areas—and we heard from many of them—and the fact that local people like it, and that it is a good and stimulating activity in their communities. We all understand these considerations which induce Senators to be receptive to keeping the installations. As much as we understand and appreciate the individual points of view of Senators—and certainly share them in terms of my own State, I think we have to lay these considerations aside, in order to look at the fundamental thrust.

In my judgment, we must look at the cost-benefit ratio; that is, we must examine the expenditure called for in the Job Corps, in terms of the inadequacy of job slots to deal with the job producing training, which is essential to so many of our youths, especially those in the slums and ghettos of America.

As contrasted with other uses to which the money could be put, is Job Corps training justified on the present scale? I have come to the conclusion that it is not, and that the cost-benefit ratio just does not work out so as to justify the carrying on of the Job Corps to the extent to which it has been carried on.

I, too, am not very happy about an Executive decision to deal with this matter, but sometimes that is the only way in which it is likely to be dealt with. Therefore, I have sought to examine the merits and the end result of the Executive determination rather than the punctilio of whether it should or should not have been left to the Congress.

What primarily motivates me in looking at the question of the cost-benefit ratio is contained at page 225 of the hearing record, which outlines the training opportunities for youth which will be available in 1970 as compared with the training opportunities for youth which were available in fiscal 1969. It is found that there will be more training opportunities available in 1970, notwithstanding the contraction of the Job Corps, than there were in 1969. Also, and very importantly, it is found that the categories where there is a material increase in numbers are categories which urgently need to be encouraged.

One must consider the grave questions which have been raised about the Job Corps: the enormous dropout rate, the fact that at the end of the road only about one-fourth of the people are in the Job Corps and training and, therefore, in a position to really benefit from it, as well as other factors, including cost. One must compare that with the fact that in 1970 it is the JOBS program, which has now gotten rolling with the National Alliance of Businessmen and the Urban Coalition, which has the greatest advantage of bringing youths to jobs. This is the objective of the JOBS program, and not just charity for youths in Job Corps camps, which keeps them off the streets.

It is my view that in terms of the overall objective of training the maximum number of youths with the greatest likelihood of their getting jobs, we can do a better job under the reorganization proposed by the Secretary of Labor than we can do if we keep the Job Corps frozen where it is.

In addition, considering the expense of the Job Corps, I can see much more likelihood of expanding these other forms of job training which lead me directly to jobs, rather than continuing the Job Corps at its present level and using all the moneys for that purpose.

One can find considerable appeal in the tens, dozens, or perhaps hundreds of youths who, in terms of character building for their future, will profit exceedingly from the Job Corps atmosphere. However, we always have this terribly difficult task in Government. Laying that side by side with the other considerations which affect the overall manpower training program—as well as the partic-

ular priorities which the United States should assign in terms of its taxpayers money—it seems to me that one must come to the conclusion that we are on a better platform. I am not satisfied with the aggregate numbers which have been produced by the Secretary of Labor for 1970, nor am I satisfied with the fact that we have not begun to deal with over 300,000 youths that will have to be dealt with in terms of summer employment in an appreciable way. I do not think we have begun to exploit apprenticeships or other means of preparing youths for jobs.

I say that we are on a better platform or plateau for the purpose of accomplishing those results by giving ourselves a little bit more amplitude if we free what is involved in carrying on the Job Corps at its present level than otherwise. That is the reason I have taken the position I have. Fundamentally we can demonstrate the proof of this by individual figures.

Now, Mr. President, in order to carry that out and to be sure that the administration will perform what it promises, I intend to offer as an amendment in the nature of a substitute to what has been offered by the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), a sense of the Senate resolution which will lock in the administration to the assurances which it gave to the committee concerning the phasing out of the almost 17,000 slots in the Job Corps program and I ask unanimous consent that the text of that amendment, No. 20, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment No. 20 was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That it is the sense of the Senate that—

"(1) any phasing out of Job Corps centers shall be carried out in a manner that will insure that equivalent educational, vocational, and related training opportunities are provided for each trainee who is enrolled in any such center and wishes to continue his training, and

"(2) the aggregate of opportunities for job and related training available to disadvantaged youth under Federal manpower training programs shall in no event be less than that for fiscal year 1969."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this will do two things: It will insure that in the phasing out of Job Corps centers, the equivalent—I emphasized that word "equivalent"—educational, vocational, and related training opportunities are provided for each trainee who wishes to continue that training. I emphasize again that word "equivalent." The amendment provides further that the aggregate of opportunities for job and related training under the Federal manpower training program will in no event be less in fiscal 1970 than for fiscal 1969, according to the table which has been given us by Secretary of Labor Shultz. I ask unanimous consent that that table on page 225 of the hearing record be printed in the RECORD.

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

Training opportunities for youth, USDL and Job Corps—fiscal year 1970

[In thousands]

Total youth	787.4
In-school youth	418.8
NYC in-school	109.3
NYC summer	309.3
Out-of-school youth	368.6
JOBS	60.5
MDTA institutional	49.2
MDTA OJT	29.4
JOPS	10.8
NYC out-of-school	75.9
Operation Mainstream	.2
CEP	78.0
WIN	13.5
Title V MDTA	4.1
Job Corps	47.0

Estimated number of out-of-school youth served in manpower programs in fiscal year 1969, by program

Total	362,900
JOBS	28,800
MDTA-institutional	58,600
MDTA–OJT	29,400
NYC-out-of-school	109,200
Operation Mainstream	200
CEP	53,900
WIN	12,800
Jobs Corps	70,000

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, that number will be increased by 5,000 or 6,000, rather than reduced.

Let me point out that I offer my substitute because I believe it only right under the circumstances. This is of deep concern not only to me but also to Members in States where centers are being closed, so that they have profound assurances on the record for their own constituents and for their own consciences that the Senate has expressed itself on the subject and ties the administration into precisely what it has promised to perform.

Mr. President, as I conclude, I emphasize that it shall be my aim to expand job opportunities as well as job training opportunities, that I take what will be done here—if it is successfully consummated—only as a basis for doing more rather than less in that regard; that I am not inhibited by the particular dispositions of the administration except where I think they are right, that I believe that by adopting the substitute which I shall offer in due course, Members will assure themselves that the promise will be performed and that giving assurance in their own communities that the fundamental objectives of manpower training and jobs will be even better served than they have been up to now.

Mr. President, one of the most crying needs in the whole field of the struggle against poverty and hunger, and the struggle to get on top of the welfare problem in this country, is to afford the greatest and the most flexible as well as the most intelligent handling of job training and job-getting opportunities. It is because I believe that this will be best promoted through the course which has now been started and is being put together that I have taken the position I have in the committee and on the floor of the Senate.

To those who would go along these lines, let me give them the deep and firm assurance—as a ranking member on the committee, in whose work I am constantly engaged, a job which I have succeeded in taking over from the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER)—that I shall be indefatigable in seeing that the opportunities for training, and the opportunities for jobs, are constantly widened. I am not a bit satisfied with the total figures now. I want to increase them. I am acting as I am because I believe that is the best path to attain that result.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) whose leadership has been shown in this area.

I have remained in the Chamber all afternoon and have listened to the colloquy which has taken place and to the statements on this issue. We have heard evidence from the advocates that the program is successful. We have also heard evidence from those opposed to the program that it is not a success. We have heard statements concerning new needs and a new course of action which must be adopted.

In a number of the statements we have talked about the problem, but no one has put his finger on the problem. The problem can be easily defined: We are talking about an appropriation of $280 million which is to be decreased by $100 million—that is, in excess of 30 percent.

Mr. President, we can talk about the semantics of the program, but I submit that a program that is that hard hit, in excess of 30 percent, has been gutted. That is exactly what has happened.

We can talk about what we hope will occur in the future with additional appropriations, but the effort that this Nation is putting forth on this most serious problem is being cut drastically, to the point of a crippling blow.

Mr. JAVITS. I know that the Senator would want all the facts to be before the Senate. I might say to him, and I ask the Senator whether he is not aware of the fact that the Secretary of Labor was asked precisely these questions in the sharpest way. It is only fair that his answer should be incorporated in the RECORD at the same time. It was the Secretary's response that a budget increase of more than $200 million in the JOBS program is being proposed. Under those circumstances, one may differ with the Senator. I have no quarrel with the administration. I present my view. He presents his view.

I have no quarrel with the administration on whether the Job Corps can or should be shut down or whether this is the optimum way to deal with this particular problem. But, I do not believe it can be done on the basis of niggling and short-changing.

It is a fact that what the administration is doing is moving in another direction in terms of jobs and job training. It is showing that by its approach to the JOBS program.

Mr. GRAVEL. I would only add, with the permission of the Senator from Ari-

zona (Mr. GOLDWATER), on the question of the increased funding effected by the Secretary of Labor, whether it is a contemplated budget increase in the future.

Mr. JAVITS. He says as follows on page 228 of the hearings:

I might say we are proposing an increase in the budget for the JOBS program from $200 million to $420 million.

Tomorrow I shall place in the RECORD the exact status of that request as compared with what they are doing about the Job Corps.

Mr. GRAVEL. I can only say to the distinguished Senator from New York that the day the administration comes down with a $100 million increase in this program, which I feel is so vital to the Nation, I shall welcome it on the floor and I will be glad to help them in that regard. But the only way it can be viewed now is that it is a cut in excess of 30 percent in what is a very vital program.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, first I want to express my thanks to those who have supported the resolution which I have introduced this afternoon.

I also want to thank the opponents who have spoken, specifically, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN). I thank them for their approach and for the care and interest they have displayed. All of us agree upon one thing, and that is the great need to provide opportunities for young Americans who have not had the chance to develop, standing alone on their own two feet, whether through the Job Corps or through something like it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement commenting on the substitute which the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), has announced his intention of offering.

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

REASONS FOR OPPOSING SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT TO JOB CORPS RESOLUTION (S. RES. 194)

1. The proposition that every displaced enrolee should have another job training slot seems unexceptionable on its face. But it completely misses the central theme of S. Res. 194—Congressional prerogative.

2. The substitute misses the point that this decision was hastily conceived and implemented without adequate provision for thousands of young men and women both in the camps to be closed and already processed who have been shut off. Unfortunately, significant damage has already been done by the shut-down decision. Of the 16,300 youths in camps to be closed when the decision was announced, 2,200 have already been transferred and 2,200 have left, presumably for home—1,400 of whom have reportedly expressed interest, but not yet been placed, in other manpower programs. Many of these disheartened youngsters left before an opportunity for discussion with the Job Corps or State employment counsellors about transfers or positions in Labor Department manpower programs back home. It thus comes far too late now to offer them other training slots.

3. Moreover, this sort of job training guarantee is not really capable of realization. First, as to transfer within the Job Corps, the fact that the slot might be in an entirely different skill training and half-way across the country in a strange place with strange faces undoubtedly has discouraged, and will discourage many displaced enrollees from accepting such transfers. Labor Department statistics just released show that already 6,200 displaced enrollees with incomplete training have chosen not to stay on in the Job Corps. The Job Corps drop-out rate in closed centers is up about 75% since the announcement. Recent estimates of availability of matched training slots within the Job Corps show that about 66% of those in women's centers, 35% of those in conservation camps and 20% of those in men's centers who will wish to remain in the Job Corps will *not* receive a comparable skill training assignment.

4. As to the possibility of placement in Labor manpower programs, testimony before the Subcommittee failed to demonstrate that many of the manpower programs were designed for youngsters under eighteen or any who, as 80% or more of Job Corps enrollees, were functionally illiterate. Indeed, it is for exactly that reason that enrollees generally were not placed in such programs in the first place. Nevertheless, the Labor Department has blithely announced that it expected 62,100 slots in these not really comparable programs to open up in the next three months. It said nothing about comparability or these slots being available in the towns to which displaced enrollees will be returning. Finally, there seems to be considerable evidence that openings in these programs are not now available in many urban areas—in Baltimore and on the west coast, for example.

5. Nor would the substitute recognize the difficulties which will be created at ongoing Job Corps camps receiving transferred enrollees. Last year when about one-quarter of the number of centers were closed, unfortunate difficulties were created by the negative attitudes of many transferees. It seems undeniable now that, given the confusion surrounding the present shut down order and the far more extensive dispersion of transferees, ongoing centers will be significantly retarded in their attempts to serve those already enrolled there as well as those transferred in.

6. In sum, the substitute fails to express the question of principle that the way the decision was made—in haste and without appropriate consultation within the Executive branch or opportunity for Congress to review it meaningfully—was wrong. Those already stripped of hope by these actions are entitled to have the U.S. Senate stand on principle and not quietly acquiesce in the *fait accompli* with which it has been presented. That may, indeed, be little solace to the already displaced, disheartened ex-Corpsman now back to the street, but it at least tells him that we strongly object to the callous way he or she has been treated and are trying our best to remedy the situation in a realistic way for as many as possible.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, today we are considering a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate which would attempt to block the improvements in programs for training disadvantaged youths which were recommended by Secretary of Labor Shultz.

Mr. President, I want to make clear that I have due regard for the sincerity and the dedication of the management of the Job Training Corps; as well as those who have spoken out on their behalf.

However, ever since President Nixon announced his intention to close 59 of the 106 Job Corps centers around the Nation, there has been some activity in an attempt to justify their retention. Voices have been raised which confuse, rather than clarify issues. The motives of President Nixon and his Secretary of Labor have been questioned and the impact of the decision has been misjudged.

The issue presented is not whether we attempt to assist and train disadvantaged youth or not. The issue is how to train more youth, how to train them better, and how to do it at less cost per trainee to the taxpayers.

It is results which count, Mr. President, and not necessarily the tools used to accomplish these results. We should not become so addicted to, or sold on, a particular program that we are blind to the need for change to the point that we would resist reasonable attempts at improvement.

The purpose of the Job Corps is to train disadvantaged youths to become productive members of this society. Although the Job Corps concept was well motivated and well intentioned, I am afraid we must face a rather harsh fact that it simply has not worked well enough to justify its retention in its present form.

It must be made clear, contrary to the claims of some, the Secretary of Labor's action in closing Job Corps centers will not deprive enrollees of training. Secretary Shultz has pledged that every Job Corps enrollee in a center to be closed will have the opportunity to transfer to another center or to enroll in another manpower program.

Secretary Shultz, in his appearance before the House Committee on Education and Labor, established the following facts:

Reduction in the number of youths served in Job Corps centers during the course of the coming year will be more than offset by the increased enrollment in other manpower programs. Under President Nixon's budget for 1970 some 368,000 youths will receive training; this figure is 5,700 more than are receiving training during fiscal 1969.

Since more, rather than less, disadvantaged youths will receive training as a result of the Secretary's action, clearly the charge that this action will deprive disadvantaged youths of training is erroneous.

The real issue that we have before us is how can we best help our disadvantaged youth. The Secretary of Labor has studied this matter carefully and has determined that in view of the high cost per enrollee of the Job Corps as compared with other training programs, more young people can be trained if the more expensive Job Corps programs are curtailed. This is sound reasoning, and I support his decision.

In addition to the high cost of residential training, both the failure of recruitment efforts and the short training stays for the Job Corps centers raise doubts about the value of the program. In fiscal 1969, about $10 million was budgeted for recruitment and yet 28 percent of those young people accepted for the Job Corps never arrived at the training center. Those who did arrive had a very high dropout rate. Almost 40 percent of the enrollees dropped out in the first 90 days during 1968. The Secretary's analysis of

the Job Corps' failures is fortified by the recently released report of the General Accounting Office. The study found:

It is questionable whether the Job Corps training has resulted in a substantial economic benefit thus far for those youths who participated in the program.

It was further concluded:

We have doubt, however, that, in light of our finding and the cost of this type of training, that resources now being applied to the Job Corps program can be fully justified.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the programs planned by the Labor Department to replace the Job Corps are sound and will produce the better results which we all desire.

My support of the Secretary's proposal was fortified by the very enlightening testimony on this subject before the House Education and Labor Task Force on Poverty on May 7.

The House committee heard testimony of officials of Northern Systems, a company which had operated a Job Corps center in Lincoln, Nebr., and is currently operating the Washington Job Opportunities in the business sector program.

Mr. President, the officials of this company felt that, based on actual experience with both residential and nonresidential training centers, the nonresidential JOBS program was superior, in most cases, to the residential training concept of the Job Corps. Mr. Grantham, vice president of Northern Systems, said:

I would like to reemphasize the fact that with the exception of the residential component, the training program which is now functioning here at the Washington JOBS Center, is precisely the same training program which was functioning at the Lincoln Job Corps Center. So here we have an excellent example of the impact of the loss of a residential setting with respect to trainees and how it impacts upon their capability to be trained and to receive behavioral skills and to get and hold a job after they complete the training program.

After operating this program for over a year, it is our expert judgment that with the exception of the relatively few cases (i.e., extremely difficult home situations, need for excessive remedial education, et cetera), the great majority of the young men which we were processing in our Lincoln Center on a residential basis can be handled just as well or even better in our Washington JOBS Center.

Mr. President, since I am concerned more with helping disadvantaged youths than I am with retaining established programs of some questionability I will cast my vote against Senate Resolution 194. I encourage my colleagues, who genuinely care about helping these young people, to join with me in rejecting this resolution which is designed to perpetuate the mistakes of the past at the expense of the disadvantaged youths of today and tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. J. O. Grantham and Mr. Welcome Bryant before the House Task Force on Poverty be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF J. O. GRANTHAM AND WELCOME BRYANT ON H.R. 513, EXTENSION OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT, WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 1969, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TASK FORCE ON POVERTY OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Task Force met at 9:10 a.m., pursuant to recess, in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Carl D. Perkins (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Perkins, Hawkins, Ford, Mink, Meeds, Stokes, Clay, Ayres, Quie, Bell, Erlenborn, Scherle, Dellenback, Steiger Collins and Landgrebe.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will come to order. A quorum is present.

Go ahead and call witnesses and introduce them Mr. Quie.

Mr. QUIE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

This morning we have Mr. Grantham, of Northern Systems; and Welcome Bryant, who is the Director of the Washington JOBS Center; and Mr. Gerry Matson, also of Northern Systems.

Mr. Chairman, I am particularly interested in these witnesses because Northern Systems had the contract of the Lincoln Job Corps Center and Mr. Welcome Bryant was the Director of that center.

When that center was closed, they then put everything on a semi-trailer and moved it out to Washington to the Washington JOBS Center and have been training people there. I went out and visited the Washington JOBS Center and have been particularly interested in the story that they have to tell and the job they have done.

I think this will be extremely beneficial to us.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to join with my colleague and welcome all of you gentlemen here. I have always felt that it was a great mistake to close down the Job Corps permanently. That has been my view, because we have no suitable facility to take the place. But I will be delighted to hear from you witnesses and join my distinguished colleague in welcoming you here.

STATEMENT OF J. O. GRANTHAM, VICE PRESIDENT, NORTHERN SYSTEMS, ACCOMPANIED BY WELCOME BRYANT, DIRECTOR, WASHINGTON JOBS CENTER; AND GERRY MATSON, DIRECTOR OF ADMINISTRATION, NORTHERN SYSTEMS CO.

Mr. GRANTHAM. Mr. Chairman, Congressman Quie and members of the committee:

We are very pleased to be here today to discuss with you our efforts in the training of the hard-core unemployed and the experience we have gained from the deep involvement in manpower training on a national basis for the past three years.

Representing Northern Systems Company today along with myself are Mr. Welcome Bryant, currently the Director of the Washington JOBS Center; and Mr. Gerry Matson, Director of Administration for Northern Systems Company. The three of us would be pleased to answer any questions or provide any additional information this committee may desire upon the conclusion of my statement.

Northern Systems Company is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Northern Natural Gas Company, a major natural gas transmission and distribution company, whose corporate offices are located in Omaha, Nebraska.

Northern Systems Company was originally founded in 1966. Since its origin it has expanded its activities to include many national manpower training programs, having operated a major urban Job Corps center in Lincoln, Nebraska—three MA–1 (prevocational training and placement of hard-core unemployed) programs in Houston, Detroit and Los Angeles—a training and job development center for 1,400 hard-core unemployed in Washington, D.C., a pre-vocational training center for the Human Resources Development Corporation in St. Louis, and a large number of subcontracts with private firms engaged in the JOBS program sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen.

Mr. Chairman and members of this committee, in view of the fact that we did operate an urban Job Corps center and then close it down only to reconstitute it in an urban setting here in Washington, D.C. over a year ago, we believe that we can best serve our appearance here today by providing information relative to this. What we have done is, in fact, what the Secretary of Labor is proposing to do with the cutting back of Job Corps and providing alternate training in an urban setting. I would like at this time to address myself to the basic differences between our Job Corps operation and the operation of our JOBS Center here in Washington, D.C.

Chairman PERKINS. That is the reason I am very interested in hearing that explanation. Go ahead.

Mr. GRANTHAM. The training program at our Washington JOBS Center is designed to take young men and women who are residents of the ghetto and give them the necessary skill and behavioral capabilities to get and hold a job in society. This is also the general objective of the Job Corps.

The training program at our Washington JOBS Center is designed to place on 1,400 jobs the necessary individuals to occupy these slots for one year. On a trainee basis this figure is comparable to our urban center in Lincoln, which called for a capacity of 1,150 trainees.

I would like to reemphasize the fact that with the exception of the residential component, the training program which is now functioning here at the Washington JOBS Center, is precisely the same training program which was functioning at the Lincoln Job Corps Center. So here we have an excellent example of the impact of the loss of a residential setting with respect to trainees and how it impacts upon their capability to be trained and to receive behavioral skills and to get and hold a job after they complete the training program.

After operating this program for over a year, it is our expert judgment that with the exception of the relatively few cases (i.e., extremely difficult home situations, need for excessive remedial education, et cetera), the great majority of the young men which we were processing in our Lincoln Center on a residential basis can be handled just as well or even better in our Washington JOBS Center.

Chairman PERKINS. You mean let them stay there in the daytime and take the training, but not stay there during the week? They don't have a bed in your center?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct. They come at eight o'clock in the morning and leave at five in the afternoon and go back home in the evening.

Chairman PERKINS. Go ahead.

Mr. GRANTHAM. For example:

1. The initial trauma of homesickness and adjustment to a strange area is, of course, eliminated in the recruiting and orientation phase of our Washington program. Here the young men come in from their home areas, spend eight hours at the center, and then return to their homes in the evening.

2. Training which these young men receive moves along at a pace equal to or better than the training pace at our center in Lincoln. For example, the average length of stay of a young man at our Lincoln center was 5.5 months, while the average length of stay of a young man at our Washington JOBS Center is three months.

3. The motivation displayed by these young men in our urban center in Lincoln in contrast to the Washington JOBS Center is about equal. The spirit which can be built up in an urban Job Corps center which leads to heavy identification and, incidentally, somewhat of a reluctant feeling to leave the center and go back into the real world, is offset here in

Washington by the fact that the trainees know from the day they enter training, that they will indeed have a job waiting for them when they leave the program.

This fact of having a job in the home area from which they come, and with a firm which is already known to them, is to the trainee a very high motivational factor. This point is further emphasized by the fact that at our urban Job Corps center in Lincoln the dropout rate was 44 percent. Here in Washington the dropout rate is 27 percent.

4. Now as to the quality of the Corpsmen in contrast to the trainees in our JOBS Center here in Washington. We can categorize that the type of trainee handled in our Washington JOBS Center is much tougher than the Corpsmen which we receved in our urban Job Corps center in Lincoln. In fact, the rules and regulations of Job Corps were tough enough such that many of the young men who have prison records and are on parole and who are doing well in our Washington JOBS Center could not even get into an urban Jobs Corps center.

5. But probably the most important point, which in the final analysis is the objective of all manpower programs in the nation pertains to getting a job and holding it. In the end it is the job and how long the man stays on it which is the final test of the success of the program.

We can say that, based on our experience, it is much easier and more effective to obtain jobs, and to keep young men employed at a center like our Washington JOBS Center rather than one like the Urban Job Corps center in Lincoln.

From a programmatic standpoint, the ability of the staff to work with employers in the area, to place the young men on key jobs and watch how they perform for six to eight months makes all the difference in the world in keeping the men in the job market rather than having them become disillusioned and return to the life pattern they had displayed prior to coming into training.

Here in our Washington JOBS centers when a young man or woman goes on a job, the job coach goes along the first day, checks on the trainee at the end of the second day, and the third day again and then once a week for six weeks. If at any time, during this period, the trainee gets into trouble, has a question or for one reason or another leaves the job, the job coach follows him, finds out what the difficulty was, works with the trainee, provides another job, and sees to it that he or she is, indeed, stable in the job market.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, this is extremely important as it takes more than the training and the assimilation of job experience, as important as they are, to make a lasting difference. A trainee has to get into the job market and stay there for a while in order to find out what the world of work is all about. This followup procedure, which we have at the Washington JOBS Center, is in our judgment the key to effective manpower programs. If you do not work with the trainees when they first go into the job market and help them get through the shakedown period associated with the job, then you may lose all that you were working for.

So, ladies and gentlemen, we can say, based on experience, that improvements can be made in the manpower programs in this country and they can be made in the direction which is being recommended by this Administration. Our experience here in Washington attests to this.

I wish to thank the distinguished Chairman and members of this committee for your attentiveness and would like to offer a personal invitation to each committee member to visit our training center here in Washington.

Thank you.

Chairman PERKINS. How long have you had the Job Corps skill center established here in Washington?

Mr. GRANTHAM. We have finished approximately one year of operation now, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. This is an aftermath of the Job Corps center that you used to operate for the Government?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct. The training system, many of the staff, which were located and involved in our Lincoln Job Corps Center were brought here.

Chairman PERKINS. And after you had put together that know-how, you transferred it over to the private skill center that you now operate?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. You are operating here in the District of Columbia?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. What is the average cost per enrollee that you enroll in the vicinity here of the District of Columbia?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The average cost in this initial year of operation is a little under $4,000 per man-year.

Chairman PERKINS. But that does not include any remedial education, does it?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes, sir. We give remedial work to the young men and women at the center to the extent they need it to go on the job and be successful on the job.

Chairman PERKINS. What percent of your enrollees up to the present time are high school graduates?

Mr. GRANTHAM. I would like to have Mr. Bryant answer that.

Mr. BRYANT. I would say less than 15 percent are high school graduates. Most of the young men and women that we have in the program are dropouts and some of them are young men who have, and women, who have been in Job Corps over the country. But from the standpoint of educational qualifications, we have a similar situation here as we had in Lincoln in terms of the educational level of the people involved.

Chairman PERKINS. What problems have you had in connection with recruitment?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is a very interesting question and one that I believe Mr. Bryant can answer very effectively because it points to one of the advantages of our being here in an urban area.

Mr. BRYANT. I think the advantage that we have had here in the recruitment standpoint that we didn't have when I ran the Lincoln Job Corps Center is the fact that we work with the agencies within the city and in Washington, for example, we work with the concentrating employment group.

We get help through the United Planning Organization and the USES, the U.S. Employment Service, provides recruits for us. We also get recruits from the ministers. We have a group of ministers in town who have patience and they also send trainees in to us.

Chairman PERKINS. That is the way that recruitment has taken place in the Job Corps. You have adopted about the same method of recruitment that is presently going on in the Job Corps?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes, to an extent. The only difference is that the recruitment program here, where we use the agencies right in town, we are very close to our source. We have the opportunity, for example, if we need additional recruits to get on the phone and call to the agencies right here in the city to increase the number that we need. In other words, we have a more flexible position here than we did in the Job Corps center, because we are dealing directly with our resource here within the same locale. Whereas, in the Lincoln area, for example, my first point of contact was Kansas City for the flow and then we got it from all over the country.

Chairman PERKINS. Let me ask you this question: You do not provide any medical care at your center, do you?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The medical care is provided. There is an initial medical examination. However, we do work with the agencies in town where we find that there is a medical problem and we do refer them to other agencies in town.

Chairman PERKINS. Who pays those bills?

Mr. GRANTHAM. They are paid by the groups that we are referred to. If we refer a man to the Howard University Clinic, then they are paid by the clinic. If we are referred to the Dental Clinic or the Health Department in Washington, these costs are paid by the existing agencies that provide this type of services.

Chairman PERKINS. By existing agencies that provide this type of service?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. Has your center been filled to capacity ever since you have opened it?

Mr. GRANTHAM. No. It hasn't been filled to capacity ever since it opened, because as with Job Corps, you have to phase up to work toward your peak. But now we are filled to over-capacity.

Chairman PERKINS. How many of these enrollees do you fill? How would you take care of any of these enrollees from these other places since they must have a residential center that has a bed?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Mr. Chairman, with respect to that, those that would need a residential area, the particular site out there does have a residential capability and we can, of course, have a number of beds totaling around 400 if this was needed.

Chairman PERKINS. Say you could take 400 of these youngsters that are going to be taken from a camp that is being closed. How much additional money would it take, in addition to the $4,000, to give them a bed and board and so forth and so on, medical and dental care and any other rehabilitation services necessary?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Mr. Chairman, of course that particular question we have not researched. We can only say that our on-going operation here, our on-going costs are going to be reduced considerably because of our experience and the effectiveness and the efficiency of the program will be increasing.

Chairman PERKINS. That is the point. How do you know that you are going to have a more efficient operation? You tell me. You have not researched the cost in addition to the $4,000 that it will take to give a boy a bed, his food, clothing, and medical, and dental care and all other rehabilitative services that youngster should have?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Only this, sir: I was referring to the fact that with respect to our present program as presently constituted, it would be dropping to around $3300 for our on-going operation, a decrease of around $700.

Chairman PERKINS. But that doesn't include——

Mr. GRANTHAM. That doesn't include what might be incurred as an additional cost associated with a residential operation. That we would be very happy to insert into the record if it would be your wish.

Chairman PERKINS. You don't know how long it would take you, though, to do that type of research, do you, to give us a figure that would be accurate?

Mr. GRANTHAM. One day, two days, sir. We have our old data from our Lincoln Job Corps Center that we can translate.

Chairman PERKINS. Would you say it would be double the $4,000?

Mr. GRANTHAM. No, not at all.

Mr. BRYANT. In terms of the $4,000, I think it might be well to note that within this $4,000, the trainees involved in this particular program get $1.60 an hour while they are in training or about $64 a week, which is much in excess of what the young men received in Job Corps.

Within this $4,000, we are talking about better than $200 a month in trainee wages to provide some of the subsistence that they need. So thinking about the amount of money that we give them for this, you see we would be able to provide a residential program and clothing at a figure less than the cost to do it in the Lincoln Job Corps Center.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to compliment you on opening up the center. But still this does not, in my judgment, take care of the situation that we have in the country. We need all of these so-called skill centers in these metropolitan areas that you can recruit and so forth, and place them in jobs.

We have a shortage of those facilities. I am delighted that you took the know-how that you acquired in connection with the operation of the Job Corps center and took that personnel that was skilled in the area, and opened up a private center. I think it is good.

But, at the same time, the boy from the rural area, the rural areas that I represent—this skill center is not a substitute for the Job Corps, because this boy has got to have a bed. He has got to have food and clothing. He has got to have all types of medical and dental facilities. He has got to have training and remedial education and all of these things and comprehensive in nature.

Since you are not able to give us a figure as to how much all of this would cost in addition to the $4,000 that it presently costs to do the training of a boy that doesn't stay there, who only stays there during the day and takes some training, I don't think it is a comparable situation at the present time.

We need skill centers like you are operating. I want to compliment you on that. I think you are doing a great job. But at the same time, I am worried about these boys that have no place to go, who are going to be turned out of the Job Corps.

Don't you think it would be a much smoother operation if we let these skill centers like your own get into operation and develop into a residential center where you can keep them there during the week and look over them 24 hours a day and set up your technique in giving them medical and dental care and rehabilitative services? And to expand along that line, don't you think then that you would be in a better position to tell us whether this center is actually a substitute for the Job Corps and don't you think it would be wiser for us to not phase out the Job Corps and not disband on the Job Corps until we have these skill centers that I have described in actual operation in the country?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Mr. Chairman, the point we would make in answer to your question is only that we have found based on our experience here in contrast to our experience in running an urban Job Corps center that much of the work that you talk about isn't needed for a large number of the potential trainees coming out of the innercity.

I am not arguing on the other side that there isn't a place for a residential component. There definitely is. It should, indeed, have its on-going place in our manpower programs in this country. But a far greater number of the young men from our innercity can benefit and can get the necessary tools, if you will, and the necessary support, if you will, to move back into the innercity and to hold jobs and to improve the economy and the whole environment from which they come by getting what we call nonresidential training close at hand.

Chairman PERKINS. I want to compliment you for making that statement. I agree that there is a place for both. You and I both know there is a great shortage of training facilities in the country today. You are not going to have any problem about keeping that center filled.

But the inner-city people are a little bit more fortunate of the unfortunate group, which you are going to serve. I think you will agree with that, won't you?

Mr. GRANTHAM. It is about a break-even point, sir. The young men that are referred to our center here, for example, over 60 percent of them have been on parole or on probation. They are from a very tough area.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Quie?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, when you were asking the question of closing of some of the Job Corps centers and some of these individuals who do not want to be transferred or cannot be transferred to another Job Corps center, but have been assured by the Department of Labor that either there will be a job waiting for them or some other training program; let's assume that there are some Washington Job Corps enrollees in some of the camps or centers that are going to be closed.

Do you feel that they would need necessarily a residential component, if they are in effect residents of the City of Washington and, therefore, would fit in with the enrollees who are in your program similar to the ones who previously were in Job Corps, who are now also training under your program?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Sir, we have had over 100 Job Corps trainees come into our program at our Washington JOBS Center already and most of them do not need a residential setting in order to be able to get the necessary training and the necessary behavioral work to get and hold a job.

Basically they come with some training. The real thing they need is to quickly get a job and to be followed on that job as we do in our job followup program that we described in our testimony.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask, Mr. Bryant, when you were Director of the Job Corps center in Lincoln, how many, do you think, needed the residential component in order to benefit from the training program? How many do you think could have gotten along without a residential component if a training program was available to them similar to what you have here in Washington?

Mr. BRYANT. At the Lincoln Job Corps, I felt that 85 percent of the young men who were in the residential program with support could have operated very well in a nonresidential program. I have several concerns: (1) Many of the young men that I worked with there liked the support in their home area. After working with them for 15 months, the way I did, I found out that it would be just as important to provide success images for them and for their other friends in the communities that they came from. So I felt that 85 percent of the young men that I had in the Lincoln Job Corps Center with support could have operated very well in a nonresidential setting, provided they were provided other types of support that they needed.

There were more than 15 percent of them which came from homes so severe that they had to have a residential setting in order to make them a part of the economic or job market.

Mr. QUIE. How about the acceptance of the community here in Washington? You first had to go out to businesses and find jobs, because I notice from your testimony that you assured the young men of a job before they started their training. Have you seen a change in the attitude of the business community from when you went out to explain to them a program that hadn't started yet and a program now that has been operating just about a year?

Mr. BRYANT. I think we have seen a change, and I think this is another plus to this type of program, because with Job Corps they had support when they were sent back into the area to be placed. But in this particular setting we are giving them an opportunity to work with the businessman, to give them a chance to see the activities that are going on at the center and two relate to the training while he is on the job and relate to the businessman.

So I think the thing that happens here we have been able to tie the trainee to his community economically and we have opened new inroads for him in the business community, because businessmen, after the boys have had training and have gone to work for them, they begin to really understand what you mean when you talk about hard-core.

There was not a real understanding of what you meant when you talked about hard-core men and women. There was some reluctance on their part to really get involved. But with the program the way we have it now, where we invite the businessmen out to see the program, where we have employer advisers out to talk to the employers about "What problems do you find with our trainees how can we better support them?"

This has tended to tie the business community to an on-going program, therefore giving better support to the young men out in the field working.

Mr. QUIE. In the Lincoln Center, you train in certain skills, undoubtedly, and there are certain skills that you train in here. Are they the same? For instance, your training in culinary arts, auto mechanics and the building and construction trades, were they the same in Lincoln as they are here?

Mr. BRYANT. We ran the same line in Lincoln as we run here except another thing has happened here. Because we are working with the business community, we have been able to respond to specific needs. For example, a group of businessmen were interested in carpet laying. They came out and said, "we need young men to lay carpets." We were able to put in a program responding to their particular need on carpeting.

Other than that, we have hardwood flooring that we didn't have at Lincoln. These are programs we put in in response to the business community. We do have a clerical line here for the young ladies that we didn't have in Lincoln.

We didn't have a coeducational program in Lincoln.

Mr. QUIE. When the business community wanted the carpet laying program, which is different than you had in Lincoln, have you graduated some from it so you could compare the ability of your graduates with the people who are on the job?

Mr. BRYANT. We have had graduates. We have a very interesting thing happen.

The Carpet Laying Association came out and asked us to institute the particular program. We got a call from the association three weeks ago, saying they would like for their journeymen to come out at night and go through a brushup course.

I think the thing that happened when they asked us to create this course for them and told us what it took to bring this program together, and we were able to give them the program, they found out that some of the techniques that we developed would have some benefit for the journeymen.

So not only have they been pleased with the trainees, but they have also asked us to provide some support for the journeymen in this particular area.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, they wanted the journeyman to be able to lay carpet as well as your graduates were able to lay carpet when they went on the job.

Mr. BRYANT. We really don't want to brag that much. I think we developed some techniques that would be of some value to the journeymen.

Mr. QUIE. You also stressed the follow-through, Mr. Grantham, when they were placed on the job. What kind of follow-through did you have with your enrollees as

they went to all parts of the country to go back home again out of Lincoln?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Very, very little. It was very difficult. We had a job development section in our Lincoln Job Corps Center, but since most of the graduates were scattering all over the country, it was practically impossible and about the only way we could communicate was by mail.

Mr. QUIE. By mail?

Mr. GRANTHAM. By mail or by telephone.

Mr. QUIE. That is some followthrough.

Mr. BRYANT. Might I say, Congressman Quie, another problem you have, if you understand the problems of the ghetto when you are not working with it, and we have seen it here, it is not very difficult to lose young men when they go back to their homes 300 to 500 miles away from you. Because this is a very fluid population.

A great deal of fluidity takes place within this population. They are hard to find. I know in the school system, I would have a young man or woman move five or six times during the school year. We would try to correspond by letter and work with the employment agencies in the area to get whatever information we could about what was happening to them.

Mr. QUIE. How many young men have gone through your training program?

Mr. BRYANT. In a year we have about 2300 who have gone through the training program. We have about 457 in the program today.

Mr. QUIE. How many did you have at your Lincoln Center?

Mr. BRYANT. The peak capacity there was 1150 when we were operating at full.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, a skill center such as you are running here can be comparable in size or in handling numbers of trainees as an urban center.

Mr. BRYANT. In terms of production, yes.

Mr. GRANTHAM. Even larger.

Mr. QUIE. Even more so?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. You indicated that their average length of stay at Lincoln was 5.5 months and here the average length of stay is three months. What about their training skills or ability to handle the job when they left between the two?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The training program that we have here, Congressman, is an innovative program that works very, very well with this population. They learn a skill and they learn it fast. Not only do they learn the skill, but they also learn the behavioral control requirements as well as tolerance to stress.

So when they come out of our training program, they do indeed go on a job that is a bona fide job that they have been specifically trained for and have checked out according to industry standard before they go on that job.

Mr. QUIE. What about the speed of setting up your center here? You closed the Lincoln Center and you set up here. How easy is this or what problems did you have or what kind of length of time are we talking about. What kind of costs do we have in that?

Mr. GRANTHAM. We must smile a little bit because a week after we signed our contract, the civil disturbances broke out here in D.C. and there was a need manifested by the Mayor for an early startup. So within two weeks we had an office operating out of the Training Center at Bladensburg Road.

Within six weeks we were taking trainees into the program. We brought the training materials and training equipment from Lincoln here and reconstituted them in our program here. We brought them out on advance and in a very, very small amount of time, actually, we were operational out here.

The cost associated with that was minimal, because we were using practically all the equipment and materials and 80 members of the staff for that matter.

Mr. QUIE. You moved the equipment out here and were able to find a location to set it up in the buildings there?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct, with a minimal amount of rehabilitation.

Mr. BRYANT. If you would like dates, for example, we got the notice that the closing date was the 15th of March. By the sixth of April we had started our lineup, by the sixth of May we were taking people in already. That is moving it across the country, finding a site, and the whole work from the time of the March 15th when were going to close.

So actually in terms of moving it across the country and setting it up, we were able to do it quite quickly.

Mr. QUIE. You mention in your testimony also you don't have the problem of homesickness and adjustment in the area here in Washington, because they are living in the surroundings that they did in Lincoln.

There is a huge dropout in the Job Corps. It keeps coming back to us that there are special behaviorial problems. Have you any comparison also, Mr. Bryant, in handling the enrollees and handling behavioral problems there in Lincoln as compared to here in Washington?

Mr. BRYANT. In terms of the behavioral problems, again we must go back to the training system that we use. It is a total training system where we have behavioral experiences worked into it. We have a minimum amount of behavioral problems in Lincoln, but we have the perennial problems of homesickness, the young men coming from rural areas, young men really away from home for the first time in strange settings.

So we had a great deal of homesickness, of trying to get adjusted to one environment, knowing that they come from another type of environment. So we had these peculiar problems. However, in the Washington Center we don't have these problems because the thing that we do is to give them the type of techniques necessary to survive in the environment that they come from.

So we are working on a different basis. We are taking them from their local locale. We are giving them experiences to use in this locale, not only from the standpoint of living in the environment of the home, but in the work environment. So we don't have the same problem here that we had there.

Mr. GRANTHAM. It is much easier to deal with the behavioral problems in a nonresidential setting than it is in a residential setting.

Mr. QUIE. When I was out there at the center, I thought it was a unique program that I hadn't been before in the method in which you trained. I wish you would tell us so we could have it on the record the system of monitors that you use in the training program, the training stations and the monitors which you didn't explain fully in your testimony.

Mr. GRANTHAM. This particular program is, indeed, an innovative program and a departure from traditional methods of training and education. I guess we would liken it most closely to the concept of a Link trainer which is used to train pilots for the aviation industry, because what we do is create a Link trainer, if you will, for responsible living through the systems approach and through simulation methods we actually created ahead of time all the experiences or a majority of them that the young man or woman will receive on a job, so that they can get prior experience and how to deal with this in addition to the skills that they need in order to handle their jobs.

This requires a very careful amount of design. In fact, it requires the same intensity of design that you would in designing a missile component, but the results are worth it.

This particular method where we take the young men in and where they move through training stations, where they physically move every day, where they get the backup information which they need for the training assignment in the afternoon, in the morning, where all the information is relevant and will be immediately used, all of this is designed into this program and it has a very dramatic effect upon their motivation and their willingness to stay in the program and to stay on the job.

And the monitoring process is very unique, wherein the young men once they pass a certain checkout station so that they have attained a certain skill capability themselves, are then fed back into the program as monitors or teachers, if you will, and they teach their own peers.

This has a very fine motivating effect in that they, in addition to getting the enjoyment of teaching, get reinforced as to what they have learned. As we all know, we learn best that which we teach.

This also has an impact of reducing the requirement for our own instructional staff and reduces the cost of instruction as the trainees themselves teach themselves.

Mr. QUIE. We have heard a great deal on academic subjects, people saying that they really didn't know the subject until they taught it. I haven't heard of this or seen it before in teaching vocational or occupational skills. So as far as you know is this a unique and different program or are there some things like it?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Many of the components which we used were first used in the military, but configured in a social setting this is the only one that we know of in the country.

Mr. QUIE. The last question I would ask you, Mr. Bryant, is do you recall from the Lincoln Center how many came from rural areas and how many from urban areas? This goes back to the Chairman's question again.

Mr. BRYANT. In the Lincoln Center, we had them from about 43 states, Congressman Quie. The larger number were from the urban areas, the exact percentage I don't have. But the larger numbers which we had were from the urban areas. We got our largest inputs from St. Louis, Kansas City and the larger areas.

Our rural boys came from around Iowa, Missouri and this type of area. Then we have a very large influx of young men from the South, Alabama, like Florida, which was the second largest group we got in Nebraska. But they were from the ghettos by and large, but the preponderance of them were from the ghettos of the larger cities North and South and we got some from the West Coast.

Mr. QUIE. I recall the figure from all of the Job Corps centers, 25 percent coming from rural areas. You have 75 percent from urban areas. This was a total of all the picture. I was wondering how it was in Lincoln.

Mr. BRYANT. This was pretty close.

Chairman PERKINS. Mr. Steiger?

Mr. STEIGER. I wonder whether you have available or can you recall the cost for the transfer from Lincoln to Washington?

When you closed the Job Corps center as it existed in Lincoln and opened this center.

Mr. GRANTHAM. Practically all of the materials and equipment that existed at our Lincoln Job Corps Center were either used by us in our transfer to Washington, D.C. or transferred to other Job Corps centers. The exact cost of this I have no way of finding out or knowing. But it cost us approximately $36,000 to move our equipment from Lincoln to Washington, D.C., but that is the only precise number I have.

Mr. STEIGER. You have had extensive experience in the manpower field. I wonder if you want to comment on the role of private enterprise and whether or not there is, in fact, a place for a profit-making organization in what is essentially a social field?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Congressman, we have thought about that question extensively, because we are indeed in a cutting-edge type of operation where very few private firms are operating. It is not an easy area to succeed in and to make a contribution in. However, we

have seen this: That the peculiar capabilities of private industry, that of being able to innovate, willing to use their own investment, willing to put in their management expertise and their control mechanisms to reduce cost and the very real item of competition has a very key role to play, it seems to us, in our social programs to date.

I can recall the very impact of competition and what it means in terms of reducing costs. I referred earlier to our participation in the National Alliance of Businessmen Program.

And I can't help but recall the fact that as we were initially quoting prices to the firms that would buy our business or would buy our expertise, we were quoting in the neighborhood of, say, $2,000 per project. We were finding our competitors were quoting $1,800.

We said, "Well, this is no good. We have got to find out why." Well, the conclusion of all that is that now through competition we were quoting down around $1,000 for the same kind of work brought about primarily through the aggressive competition of private firms wanting to get business in this area.

So in our judgment there is a great role for private industry in this field. The only thing is that, in return for the service rendered for the effectiveness of our programs, there must be a reasonable return in order for us to justify our existence in this.

We look forward to a greater and more comprehensive role for ourselves, because we do indeed feel that in terms of being able to innovate, in terms of being able to compete, there is no comparison or there is no substitution for private industry.

Mr. STEIGER. Perhaps Mr. Quie asked this question and I regret that I was not here for your initial statement, though I did have a chance to review it and really know the fantastic work you are doing.

Have you got any kind of information that relates to the wages of those who have been enrolled in your program after they have gone through it when they go into other jobs?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Our data indicates that the average wage of the men who have graduated from our program and women is over $2.25 an hour. Considering the $1.60 an hour minimum, that gives you some idea of the impact of the training and the effective placement of our program.

Mr. STEIGER. Most of your enrollees come from this area?

Mr. GRANTHAM. All of them do come from this area.

Mr. STEIGER. The placement takes——

Mr. GRANTHAM. Takes place right in the industrial firms here in the greater metropolitan area of Washington, D.C.

Mr. STEIGER. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman PERKINS. How long did you operate the Lincoln Center?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Approximately a year and a half, sir, before it was closed down.

Chairman PERKINS. You were closed out by the Government, I presume, when the cutback came?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Our Lincoln Center was selected as one of the four to be closed, that is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. That was selected and you were cut back in, when, in '67?

Mr. GRANTHAM. In March of '68, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. You came down here and set up immediately almost?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. Did you enter into a contract with the District of Columbia about the facilities that you were going to use, the building?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The facilities we used were furnished by the General Services Administration through the Department of Labor.

Chairman PERKINS. Through the Department of Labor?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes.

Chairman PERKINS. What kind of contract do you have with the Department of Labor?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The arrangement that we have here in Washington, D.C. is this way: We were working with the Washington, D.C. Board of Trade, which is the major spokesman for business and industry here in the city. They have the prime contract with the Labor Department.

Chairman PERKINS. Who has the prime contract?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The Washington, D.C. Board of Trade has the prime contract.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you subcontract with the Washington, D.C. Board of Trade?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. What kind of rent do you have to pay on these facilities?

Mr. GRANTHAM. We don't pay any rent.

Chairman PERKINS. The building you are in, who owns it?

Mr. GRANTHAM. The General Services Administration.

Chairman PERKINS. But they let you have that free of rent?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct.

Chairman PERKINS. You have no maintenance upkeep other than just the ordinary maintenance?

Mr. GRANTHAM We have the utilities and the normal maintenance associated with occupying the facilities.

Chairman PERKINS. Utilities and normal maintenance, but a renovation job such as painting or things of that type you do not have to do that, do you?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Yes, we had to do all the renovation, all the adaption of the facilities for our own training. This we had to do at our own cost.

Chairman PERKINS. But you don't pay rent?

Mr. GRANTHAM. That is correct, nor did we pay rent at our Lincoln Job Corps Center.

Chairman PERKINS. The capacity of this center presently is what?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Our present contract calls for 1400 jobs within a year. At one time we were taking up to over 100 trainees per week and the capacity of the center is that and more.

Chairman PERKINS. So your center is filled presently?

Mr. GRANTHAM. No, sir; it is not. It is beginning to phase out, because the training portion of our present contract is coming to a close and we are actually taking in fewer now than we are capable of taking in.

Chairman PERKINS. Do you know whether you are going to get a renewed contract?

Mr. GRANTHAM. We are aggressively pursuing that, sir.

Chairman PERKINS. Will it be with the Washington Board of Trade or with the Department of Labor?

Mr. GRANTHAM. Both of these organizations will be involved in the on-going contract.

Chairman PERKINS. Thank you very much.

Are there any further questions? I want to compliment all of you gentlemen for your appearance here today. You have been helpful to the committee.

SAFEGUARD ANTI-BALLISTIC-MISSILE SYSTEM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, today it is my intention to speak at some length and in some detail in support of the Nixon administration's request for authority to proceed with the development of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system for the United States.

I will address myself again—and maybe again and again—on this subject. I am concerned in this matter because I do not believe that the ABM dispute has been explained fully enough nor often enough nor properly to the American people—and they, after all, are the persons most concerned.

It is my considered opinion that we are here debating the most important question to come before this Congress in many years. I say this because, despite its many technical aspects and its possible non-workability, we are speaking here about an ultimate system to protect this Nation's deterrent capabilities and to defend 200 million American lives against the possibility of an enemy nuclear attack.

Being no scientific expert, I cannot—nor will I try to—assure this body that I believe the safeguard system is the final answer to the possibility of an enemy attack nor even that I am convinced the safeguard system is the most effective ABM device we could proceed with at this time. It may well be that safeguard will not be the system ultimately deployed.

But we are not here talking about alternatives. The critics of safeguard offer no substitutes in the form of defensive hardware. They would like us to reject safeguard and rely on Soviet intentions. No, Mr. President, let us make no mistake about this.

What this debate boils down to is whether this country is to have even a rudimentary counterpart to the elaborate, three-stage, Soviet defense system known as Galosh. The debate is over whether we have something to match against Soviet defenses or nothing at all. And let us make it very clear we are not here talking about an offensive weapon system.

Mr. President, mention has been made in this debate, and I believe it was by the distinguished senior Senator from Arizona, my friend and colleague, PAUL FANNIN, of a "nuclear Pearl Harbor." The contention has been that, unless we proceed with the Safeguard or some other comparable system, we run the risk of sustaining a disasterous sneak attack. I do not believe it is alarming or emotional to suggest that if we make no pretense to erect a missile defense in this country we must bear in mind the unhappy occurrences on December 7, 1941. It could happen again unless we are vigilant and prepared.

As I see it, this debate has a symbolic nature as well as a pragmatic side. I begin to sense that the ABM controversy arises at a time when we are actually at a crossroads in this Nation's approach to the entire subject of national security and worldwide commitments in the name of freedom.

In effect, our choice is either to move ahead and keep abreast of the times, or harken back to that period in the twenties and thirties when isolationism, disarmament, and the downgrading of the military and the ROTC were being pushed the same as they are now. And conditions today have some marked similarities. People are tired of war. Many yearn for the comforting isolated days of an earlier era. Many want to risk again the dangers of unilateral disarmament in the face of rising armed strength in the potential enemy camps.

This is completely understandable, Mr. President, but it is regrettable that the opponents of Safeguard must appeal to this human temptation in their deter-

mined and deliberate attempts to achieve what they mistakenly believe would be a more comfortable balance of power between this country and the Soviet Union.

The forces which today are mounting a concerted attack on almost every item in this Nation's defense budget are also making a test case of the ABM controversy.

Thus, we are seeing all of the arguments against military activity, defense projects, security measures lumped together in the attempt to defeat congressional approval for an American ABM.

We are today hearing the same kind of arguments that were used 20 years ago in a futile attempt to get this Nation to forego the development of a hydrogen bomb while our Russian adversaries in the cold war pushed ahead with their own H bomb.

The critics of an American ABM system tell us "ad nauseam" that, if we are to approve even the most rudimentary ABM system, we will single-handedly become responsible for escalating the nuclear arms race.

These so-called experts overlook, conveniently—seldom even mention—the fact that the Russians have been building their own ABM system for 5 years without provoking escalation of the arms race. When the Russians began their deployment, our Defense Department scarcely moved a hair. In fact, it took Secretary McNamara several years even to concede what the Armed Services Committees of both the House and Senate and all intelligence agencies throughout the world knew for a fact: That the Russians had begun to erect a system for defending Leningrad, Moscow, and other areas of Russian territory from the possibility of an attack from beyond her shores.

It was not until last year, when the Russians began an advanced phase of their ABM deployment, that Mr. McNamara saw fit to recommend that maybe it would not be a bad idea to explore the idea of a little protection for the United States. As you well know, it was this decision which brought about the recommendation for the start of the Sentinel ABM system in this country.

Mr. President, I have sat through many hours of testimony in the Senate Armed Services Committee on the question of whether it is feasible for the United States to proceed with the Safeguard ABM. In addition to that, I have read a great many thousands of words on this subject, and a large percentage of what I have heard and read have been arguments against the Nixon administration's first major defense project. And I am struck by the similarity of the arguments that run through all the papers and treatises that have been presented, especially those from the scientific community and the academic world, in opposition to this proposal. Boiled down, they all come around in various degrees of directness to an expressed fear that something we do in the field of defense may upset or irritate the Soviet Union.

We are told with an amazing, if questionable certitude, that approval of the Safeguard ABM system will destroy the possibility of our engaging in arms limitations talks with the Soviet Union. This has no basis in truth. The fact of the matter actually is that the Russians did not even entertain the idea of such negotiations until after we announced our determination to build a missile defense.

President Nixon himself has called attention to the fact that the Soviets signified their willingness to engage in arms limitations talks exactly 4 days after the Pentagon announced its recommendation for the Sentinel system. Not only that, but the Soviets scarcely showed any interest in the ABM argument in this country until its opponents became so emotional and hysterical in their attempts to block the Nixon administration's Safeguard proposal.

Students of Russian periodicals pointed out that the Russians never even commented adversely on our determination to go ahead with a purely defensive system until they became aware of the heat and hostility which was being aroused against an American ABM by the leftwing elements in this country.

Only in recent weeks, have periodicals such as Isvestia and Pravda taken up the question of why the United States should not build a defense for its nuclear deterrent. And then these Russian papers appeared to be taking their cue from the ABM critics in this country rather than from any self-held Kremlin opposition.

In this connection it was interesting to note that the May 7 edition of the Washington Post carried about eight columns of type on the report prepared for Senator EDWARD KENNEDY by two opponents of the ABM system. The conclusion seemed to be that the ABM system proposed by the Nixon administration probably would not work and would appear to the Soviet Union as an escalation of the arms race. However, buried on page A7 of that same paper under a tiny little headline which read "Russians Belittle ABM as Threat," the Washington Post published these two highly interesting and significant paragraphs:

> At a reception at the Soviet Embassy last night, various Russians scoffed at the idea that the ABM deployment was a "provocative" act.
>
> They said that the government regards the Safeguard ABM—as it regards its own ABM deployment around Moscow—as a "silly" waste of money.

And, of course, Soviet Premier Kosygin when he was here and held his meeting with President Johnson said:

> It seems to me that defensive measures do not accelerate the arms race.

If the Russians are truly interested in arms limitations agreements, they can demonstrate this interest easily enough. All they have to do is to remove or destroy their own ABM system so that we will not have to build one to reach that level of "parity" about which Secretary McNamara and his aides always spoke. I must remind you that we have to assume that the Russians are sincere if we are going to credit any of the arguments of the American left which claim that the true road to peace in our times lies through speedy negotiations with the Soviet Union. We have to believe that they are as desirous of avoiding an escalation of the arms race as are the opponents of the American ABM system. And the only sound and logical way for the Russians to avoid such escalation is for them to stop building defense systems which the United States may not be permitted to duplicate.

Consequently, Mr. President, I do not believe it is unreasonable to assume that we would forgo all considerations or construction of an ABM system—whether it be called Sentinel or Safeguard, whether it be described as "thick" or "thin"—the minute the Soviet Union prove to us that they are dismantling their defensive advantage over the United States. If they have the right to expect us to forgo the building of a defense system in the interest of easing world tensions and avoid arms buildup, why have we not the right to expect some kind of demonstration to prove faith on their part.

We have heard from a great many alleged experts that the Russian system does not count because it is already probably outmoded and obsolete. If this is the case, and there is no certainty of it, the Russians should not object to dismantling what is already old-fashioned to make sure that the United States does not build a completely modern and up-to-date system.

Mr. President, I have tried throughout the hearings before the Senate Armed Services Committee to find what real evidence we have or anyone has to support the belief that if we do not abandon the building of an ABM, the Russians will refuse to discuss arms limitations. So far, I have been unable to get anything from the opponents of the ABM but their own personal and emotional guesses. I do not think this is good enough, when we are discussing a system of defense which may mean the difference in any final test of millions of American lives. I do not think the guesses and the presumptions of the men of science are important enough for us to cancel the balance of power in a divided world. I do not believe the emotional arguments against war and against violence and in favor of wiping out poverty are good enough, when it comes to a question of maintaining the safety of the American people and the leadership of a freedom-loving nation in today's shaky world.

When you come to the arguments that we cannot be sure that a Safeguard system or any other proposed American ABM system would be workable and effective, we must ask ourselves an important question—why can we not tell? The answer to this can be found in the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. I might repeat, Mr. President, in further answer to that question, the statement of Dr. DuBridge I quoted the other day, when he said, "It not only will work, it is working, and we have had results with it."

This treaty, which the U.S. Senate approved in good faith, was designed to facilitate the development of peaceful agreements. But it was adopted after the Russians had made their own high altitude missile tests and reached their very important conclusions and before the United States conducted such tests. This

little problem in timing has left the Russians with a pretty good idea of what will work and what will not work in the whole area of antimissile missiles. It also leaves the United States with a high percentage of doubt and no certainty on this equally important question. In other words, we cannot test.

I might say here that both the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty were adopted to a large extent in the belief that they would help to bring about meaningful arms limitations negotiations between East and West. It has now been some years since the adoption of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and we are not closer to the adoption of firm arms limitation agreements than we were then as a result of its passage. There is no reason to believe that the Nonproliferation Treaty ratification has hastened the development of such agreements. Now we are told that the way to get talks going is to reject the Safeguard system. If that does not work, Mr. President, what will they tell us next? Will they suggest that the way to get arms limitation talks started will be to reduce our supply of ICBM's while the Russians increase theirs? Will they suggest that we cancel more weapons systems while the Russians develop additional ones? Will they ask us to sink our Navy while the Russians build more ships? In other words, Mr. President, how far are we expected to go along this one-way street of trying to arrange a peace in our time that the Soviet Union and Communist China seemingly have no interest in at all?

Mr. President, in connection with Soviet present and future strength, I believe that we should pay more than casual attention to a recent statement by Prof. Eugene Wigner, who is the only physicist ever awarded the so-called big four for high achievement in this field. I speak, of course, of the Nobel Prize for Physics, the National Medal of Science, the Fermi Award, and the Atoms for Peace Award. Professor Wigner goes into the whole question of nuclear strength of the United States and the U.S.S.R. in considerable depth. He says that the total explosive power available in missiles in the U.S.S.R. is higher than ours by almost 20 percent. After we convert to multiple independent reentry vehicles, the Soviet missile strength will be 30 percent higher than ours. The conversion will, of course, increase the probability of our missiles penetrating the defenses of the U.S.S.R. over the present probabilities of such penetration.

Professor Wigner acknowledged that it would be difficult for his data to be reconciled with statements of former Defense Secretaries Robert McNamara and Clark Clifford both of whom gave the impression that our nuclear strength exceeds that of the U.S.S.R. by a factor of about four. Then, Professor Wigner explains:

> However, if you read their statements they say explicitly that they compared numbers of warheads. In this regard, we really are ahead of the USSR, Although the British Institute for Strategic Studies estimates they will catch up with us by mid-year.

It is also well understood, Mr. President, that the U.S.S.R. is now ahead of the United States when it comes to total missiles, and I include in this estimate not only ICBM's, but intermediate missiles as well, and has been for more than a year.

Whatever figures we take, Mr. President, it certainly should appear obvious to all concerned that the Russians' strength in nuclear power, megatonnage, area coverage, warhead multiples and conventional arms has been increasing by leaps and bounds for the past 2½ years, while our supplies have remained stagnant.

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

Mr. GOLDWATER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. There was discussion of the possibilities as to what could be done to assure disarmament, when the then Senator Hubert H. Humphrey, later the Vice President and Democratic candidate for President, was chairman of the Disarmament Subcommittee, one of this Nation's top military officers appeared before his subcommittee and said that the kind of struggle that goes on from day to day between the major powers of this world is something like a game of no-limit poker—the kind of game where you need lots of blue chips.

He said:

> As a practical matter, I just do not have any blue chips that I could afford to give away, at least not unless the other fellow is going to surrender some of his blue chips back.

When one side has a missile defense, and the other side has no missile defense, it would seem to me that it is not only like playing the game where you have fewer blue chips than the other fellow has, so that you really cannot afford to call the size bet he might be willing to make; but it is also like playing a game where you have only four cards face up, while he has four cards face up and one card face down. In a game like that he plays with both more cards and more chips.

If we must confront a major power like the Soviet Union, when it thinks it has a good missile defense and we do not know how good it is, but we have none we are at a terrible disadvantage in a major power confrontation.

There is one other thing that I have not heard the Senator go into. Perhaps he has already discussed it. That is the danger that would face this Nation when some lesser, and perhaps less responsible, power gains a missile with an atomic warhead. A while back, as the Senator knows, we had a major confrontation with regard to atomic missiles on warheads in Cuba. We know how irresponsible the Cuban Government can be in respect to the kidnaping of airplanes and refusing to send them back. Some of this can be regarded as an act of war.

The Senator knows of the very irresponsible dictator of North Korea. Perhaps the Russians may be too responsible to let those powers have missiles with nuclear warheads capable of striking the United States. But we have no assurance that Communist China would not provide such weapons.

If we have no defense, what do we do if an irresponsible dictator, who perhaps has only a dozen missiles, proceeds to let them fly against our cities? We are totally at his mercy.

The kind of defense the President has in mind could be easily broadened to give us the capability of at least defending our major cities, some of which have at least 7 million people, and defending our retaliatory capabilities with some missiles which could shoot down from 15 to 30 missiles that might be launched at us.

It is not very likely that at any time within the next 10 or 15 years Red China would be willing to give Cuba or North Korea any more missiles because they probably would not have that many to spare.

The problem is multiplied, however, when you have zero defense, no defense at all.

Once in awhile someone has to take charge and run the country if it is going to succeed at all.

Sometimes we must have a singleness of purpose. I enjoy telling stories about my Uncle Earl who was a very practical man and a very successful politician. He was loved by a great number of people. He was elected Governor of Louisiana four times. His homely expressions had a way of catching on.

Once when we had a difference of opinion, he said:

> Russell, if you are not running anything but a peanut stand, somebody must take charge and run it or you will go broke.

We have a Commander in Chief who has the responsibility of protecting the lives of more than 200 million people. The same sentiments were expressed by the previous Commander in Chief who had the same responsibility.

The Senator from Arizona is very much aware of the problem because he was a candidate for President and had to consider the same problem. It is absolutely foolhardy to risk having to confront a power that has the capability of the Soviet Union if it can defend itself and we cannot.

In my judgment, the only possible explanation must lie in the minds of those people who think that we should unilaterally disarm. We have heard some of that conversation around the Chamber from time to time, concerning unilateral disarmament. Where do those people get the idea that the Communists of the Soviet Union or Red China are more interested in assuring our future than we?

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I might say that the Senator from Louisiana in his usually frank and analytical way has hit on the very good example of a poker game. Certainly one does not run a bluff with a man who has five cards when one has only four.

Mr. LONG. Especially if his cards are face down.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. In this international poker game, every time we have called their bluff, they have backed down. We called their hand in Cuba and they backed down. We called their hand in Guatemala and they backed down. We called their hand in the Formosa Straits and

they quit. We did the same thing in Lebanon.

Every time the United States has acted as a world leader should act and said, "Take one more step and you have had it," the enemy has turned around and gone the other way.

I hope that we can enter into meaningful negotiations with Russia to the end that we will rid ourselves of nuclear weapons.

I am very happy to report that in her usual wise way the Senator from Maine (Mrs. SMITH) has proposed time and again before the scientists who have appeared before the Committee on Armed Services that we try to get started on getting the Russians to work with us on some of these spaceships and maybe then get into arms talks. However, if we continue to assume that Russia, with her great strength—which is greater than ours in practically every field that we know of—is going to sit down and talk with us when she knows she is stronger than we, I am afraid that we will be sadly misled.

Mr. President, with regard to the remarks of the Senator about the Commander in Chief, I recall the days when, with a rather slim chance of being President, I campaigned for the office. It used to scare the daylights out of me when I considered the responsibility. Here we have a Commander in Chief who said that in his opinion, backed up by the opinion of the people who understand the field—both in uniform and in out—the system will work and the new systems will be better. If he wants it, this is the Commander in Chief's decision. It is not like the debate had here today where we can get a little emotional or practical on each side. This is the request of the Commander in Chief. It is his opinion. We should back up his hand and the hand of our country when it comes to negotiations with the Russians. Certainly I intend to support him. I think it is a wise decision.

I am certainly glad to receive the support today of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, for all we know we may very well be voting to back the hand of a future President, be he Democratic or Republican. The present President must look down the road 4 or 5 years from now to consider what the problem will be then. Whatever we vote today takes planning, time, money, construction sites, and equipment. It takes a while for things to be worked out.

The Senator has discussed one illustration with me. There is one other that occurs to me. That concerns the fact that when we have two teams that have a good offense—I do not care whether it is basketball, football, or tennis—if both teams have a strong enough offense that every time the team has the ball it scores, and the other team does the same thing, then the team which can keep the other fellows from scoring every time will win. That does not mean that the team must keep the opponent from scoring at all.

We hope that our missiles and warheads will never be used against any power and that no power will ever use its missiles against us. It is hoped that they will never be used by either side. However, in the kind of major power confrontations that have occurred, as the Senator has pointed out, the situations have worked out to our advantage.

If the enemy knows that we have no defense and that we cannot intercept even one of his atomic warheads, he would be at a very great advantage. This is the kind of thing that nations have to plan far in advance.

I had no doubt as to what the Senator's position would be after he had thought it over. The Senator was an Air Force officer. I was in the Navy. When we first started trying to defend the amphibious craft with antiaircraft weapons, we hit more of our own boats than airplanes by at least 10 for 1.

I recall that when we landed in Sicily, the enemy showed their utter contempt for our marksmanship at night by flying right between our ships, with the running lights on, to make us shoot at them. Our boys would shoot at them, which is a sure way to miss, because if you do not shoot in front of them, you will miss them. We would just rake our nearby snips back and forth with machinegun fire, some of it being 20-millimeter machineguns.

After we had been at it for awhile, especially after the proximity fuses and radar control aiming pieces were developed, it was pure suicide for any plane to try to come through and attack in that sort of situation.

Mr. GOLDWATER. The Senator is correct. I would like to use another comparison.

I remember in the early days of World War II when radar was discovered, and it was not even called radar. They did not know what to call it. It was a radio direction finder. The arguments were that no one except a highly trained scientist could ever learn to run one of these things; that a GI or a Navy gob could never learn to run it; that it had to be a highly trained man with a doctor's degree.

If we had listened to those people then, where would we be today? Today we have a radar that can be put in a small airplane.

I say to those people who say the system will not work that it is working. I am not saying that it will get down to the point at which some Senator can run it. It will never become that simple. But it will be something that our troops can handle.

I thank the Senator for helping me in this presentation this afternoon.

The Senator from Rhode Island has been waiting for the floor for a long time, but I will yield at this time to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, all the Members of this body should be greatly indebted for the contribution that the Senator from Arizona has been making this afternoon on this subject. He always merits close attention whenever he talks about any aspect of national defense and the defense posture generally, and that includes affirmative as well as negative aspects. Certainly, in this debate, which is so important to the future of the country, we should be very indebted.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, we are not moving ahead in any of the offensive fields that the Russians are pushing along in, and now some people would like us to forego any attempt to establish a defense for our nuclear deterrent as well as for our people.

The way to make sure there are no negotiations with the Soviet Union is to reject the Safeguard system. I agree with Premier Kosygin and most military experts that defensive measures are not provocative. I believe the deployment of an ABM system will help rather than hinder disarmament and accommodation with the Soviet Union.

But I believe, Mr. President, we are speaking here about something much more fundamental than the possible reaction of another government to an act of ours. We are speaking here of safety, of an attempt to protect the security of millions of people, many of whom could be wiped out by a single nuclear attack. I believe that people or groups who raise specious, hypothetical arguments about cost, workability, enemy reaction, and other factors involved in the Safeguard decision are gambling with the security of their country and the safety of their fellowmen.

It is my considered belief that if anyone of us in this Chamber, regardless of how he presently feels about the ABM system, were suddenly tomorrow to find himself President of the United States he would be obligated and duty bound to propose a missile defense system at least partially comparable to the one that has been in the process of erection for the past 5 years in the Soviet Union.

It is one thing to stand outside the arena of direct responsibility and inveigh against the large expenditures that would be required for an American ABM system; it is quite another thing to be personally responsible for the safety of 200 million American men, women, and children.

THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in a recent radio and television report to my constituents, I expressed my support of President Nixon's position on the defense missile system, the Safeguard system. My guest on that program was a leading and respected expert in this field, our colleague, the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON). Senator JACKSON stated the case for Safeguard, clearly and empirically.

In making his decision, the President considered several options. The one he selected was to begin "measured construction on an active defense of our retaliatory forces." He has proposed construction for the initial phase at Minuteman fields at two Air Force bases—Malmstrom, Mont., and Grand Forks, N. Dak.

The President noted that this is a substantial change in the earlier program. The result of this measured approach will be a reduction of the budget request for this project of about one-half that of the previous administration.

My support of the President's position is based primarily on three fundamental considerations.

The first results from the real uncertainty as to just what are the capabilities and intentions of Russia and Red China. Defensive measures must recognize adverse possibilities.

Second is the fact that only operational experience can produce the answers to many of the technical issues involved. For this reason, the President felt the safety of our country required proceeding now. Recent activity by Russia and the Chinese threat, he determined, makes any delay unwise.

Finally, the decision is not irreversible, implementation can be halted or the program can be modified, depending on events, including prospects of arms-limitation talks. President Nixon has emphasized that the program will be subject to continuing review and will be further modified in light of such review.

In stressing that the program was not provocative, that it was defensive only, the President indicated that he was mindful of his pledge to make every effort to move from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of my discussion with Senator JACKSON on Safeguard be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with discussions of the subject published in the Omaha World-Herald and the Hastings Daily Tribune.

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

RADIO-TELEVISION PROGRAM OF SENATOR ROMAN L. HRUSKA, SUNDAY, MAY 11, 1969

Senator HRUSKA. Because today's program has to do with the anti-ballistic missile system and defense generally. I have asked one of the most respected and highly qualified of my colleagues in the field of national security to be with us. Senator Henry M. Jackson has been in the Congress since January of 1941. For 12 years he served in the House of Representatives and since 1953 he has represented the State of Washington in the Senate of the United States. He is Chairman of the Interior Committee and also serves on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Government Operations Committee. In addition, he is a very active and knowledgeable member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. He was seriously considered for the post of Secretary of Defense in the Nixon Administration, and that testifies, it seems to me, to the high standing which he has in this area.

It's with a great deal of pleasure that I present to you Senator Henry M. Jackson. Welcome to our program, "Scoop."

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, Roman. I'm really delighted and honored to participate in your program today. I've great respect for the fine job you've done in the Senate, and I look forward to an opportunity to discuss some of the important national security issues, especially as they relate to the present controversy on the ABM.

Senator HRUSKA. I'm very grateful to you.

You know, ladies and gentlemen, for the past several decades the United States has been building defensive as well as offensive systems to protect us from potential aggressors. We know about the development of nuclear weaponry, for example, and about the delivery systems for such weapons. We know about the Polaris submarine and about the stockpiles for materiel, ammunition and arms of different kinds. We know of the strategic and tactical air forces and the early warning system. Debates and discussions have emerged as a result of this military posture which we have elected to maintain.

Currently, we are engaged in a discussion of the anti-ballistic system—the ABM it is called. Its mission is to defend against missiles aimed at the United States. President Johnson, before he left office, recommended an ABM system for deployment. President Nixon has recommended a modified system, and today my intention is to discuss that system with Senator Jackson.

It has been the subject of my study for a long time. I've gone into the reports of the scientists and the reports of the military and have discussed it with my colleagues who are knowledgeable in the field and who know its past history. I have followed the hearings before the congressional committees.

With a great deal of deliberation and after long, thoughtful consideration, I have decided to support President Nixon's recommendations in this matter. A difficult decision, to be sure, but in my opinion very, very necessary.

Senator Jackson, one of the first questions always asked is, "Why is an ABM system necessary?" What would you say in answer?

Senator JACKSON. The basic purpose of the anti-ballistic missile system is to protect our nuclear deterrent. In other words, the credibility of the American nuclear deterrent must never be in doubt. It is the American nuclear capability that has preserved the peace since the end of World War II, in the sense of avoiding what could be a thermonuclear holocaust, and it is the posture that we have maintained that has prevented our adversaries from starting a nuclear conflict. We're now in the position where we must act to protect our Minuteman missile sites and our SAC bomber bases. This is what President Nixon had in mind when he approved and sent to the Congress a program for the so-called Safeguard ABM system.

Senator HRUSKA. Of course, it has never been our intention to send the first missile salvo from America to Russia or to China or to any other aggressor.

Senator JACKSON. Our missiles are not designed as first strike weapons. They are missiles designed to retaliate. I want to emphasize that. It's only after the enemy has made an attack on us that we would respond not by hitting their missile sites, because their silos would have been emptied, but by striking their cities. In my judgment, it is this fact that deters the Russians from movement.

Senator HRUSKA. As I understand the thinking, after a first strike by the enemy, we would be hopeful of surviving with sufficient missiles to retaliate. Is it true that the ABM, as we now envision it, would fit into this thinking?

Senator JACKSON. The primary mission of the Safeguard ABM system is to protect our Minuteman missile sites so that we will have enough Minuteman missiles left, should an enemy make a Pearl Harbor strike on the United States, to give a credible, a believable response to the adversary.

Senator HRUSKA. One of the arguments of the opponents is that the system won't work. Is there any basis for this statement?

Senator JACKSON. I'm glad you mentioned that. Twenty years this fall I was named to the late Brien McMahon's subcommittee on the hydrogen bomb. There were five of us on that subcommittee of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee, and we were to recommend whether we should go ahead with the hydrogen bomb. The arguments being made by some of the top scientists in the country at that time were, first of all, the Russians wouldn't build one anyway; second, there wasn't a need for one; and third, if you made one it wouldn't work. It's the same arguments 20 years later.

Senator HRUSKA. And weren't similar arguments attached to the Polaris?

Senator JACKSON. That's right. And if we had followed those advisers. I fear for the Western world what would have happened.

I think it's quite clear that this system is purely defensive. We're asking only the means by which we can protect and defend our Minuteman sites. Even Mr. Kosygin, the Premier of Russia, said in 1967 that ABMs are defensive. They're not provocative. They don't add to the arms race. Yet you hear arguments that deployment will speed up the arms race, and that it's provocative.

Another argument is that the Russians won't talk arms-limitation if we deploy. You remember last year in the debate the opponents claimed that if we went ahead with the system, Russia wouldn't talk. Well, we voted to go ahead with it on Monday and on Thursday they asked for talks.

Senator HRUSKA. I remember that.

Senator JACKSON. The party that hopes to negotiate an effective agreement with Russia had better be in a position of strength.

Senator HRUSKA. Next we come to the matter of cost. The argument is advanced that money ought to be spent for the benefit of people and the betterment of conditions in our cities rather than for military purposes. I'm sure everyone would prefer that, if it could be safely done. However, as I view it, one of the first duties of a nation is to survive, and if we find abroad a potential enemy that might use its capabilities to try to make war upon us, we'd better be prepared. Do you agree with that, Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. Yes, there's no question about that. The first priority in this world of ours and in our country is the protection of individual liberty, to preserve it and to extend it. That's the first priority. Everything else must be subservient to that. And I hasten to add, Roman, that we're spending less today on strategic offensive and defensive weapons than we were spending in Fiscal Year 1962—$11.3 billion back then. President Nixon's budget beginning July 1 in this area is $8.3 billion. When you adjust for inflation, in terms of constant dollars, it's more than a 50 percent reduction. And yet you hear people say that we've increased it. We have not increased spending in this area, and this is a crucial area.

Senator HRUSKA. You've mentioned already the matter of provocation. Isn't it a fact that the Russians have been for years engaged in deploying the ABM system?

Senator JACKSON. That's right. They started deploying their ABM system in 1962. They were the first to deploy, first to develop and first to test fire. Russia is the only country to test fire an ABM under nuclear conditions. They did so when they broke the nuclear test moratorium in September of 1961.

Senator HRUSKA. So we're about seven years late. However, not too late, are we?

Senator JACKSON. That's right. We'll have a better system and a more effective one, I think, if we can proceed now.

Senator HRUSKA. Another thing of some concern that we haven't touched on yet is the role that China will play one of these days in this field of nuclear warfare. I know your committee has gone into that in depth.

Senator JACKSON. Yes we have, and it's quite clear that the Russians are concerned about the Chinese missile threat in the 1974–1976 time frame. They're already revising their radars in Russia to cover a possible attack from China. Now I think there's some hope that we could get the Russians to agree to limit the number of anti-ballistic missiles, but I don't think they are going to dismantle all of them because of the Chinese problem.

Senator HRUSKA. Yes.

Senator JACKSON. And in my judgment, it's just horse sense that the Russians aren't

going to talk about a limitation on ABMs when they have the system and we don't have it. It doesn't make sense.

Senator HRUSKA. We have nothing to trade, do we?

Senator JACKSON. We have nothing to trade. Why should they give up something they have and we don't have? And I think it's a matter of prudence that we proceed to protect our deterrent.

Senator HRUSKA. If the opponents of ABM deployment are correct, we would be able to use the money for other purposes. But if they should be wrong, we would be in a hazardous situation, risking domination or even destruction at the hands of an enemy.

Senator JACKSON. That's right. And we must remember that the men who are running the Kremlin these days are moving back toward Stalinism. There's more persecution, greater denial of individual liberty in the Soviet Union than in any previous period since the days of Stalin. What they did to Czechoslovakia, I think, is just a prelude to what they would do to the free Western world if they had an opportunity.

Senator HRUSKA. As I have said, I have concluded that the President's position is sound. It deserves support. Our safety and world position will be greatly improved, if the congressional approval sought is granted.

Thank you, Senator Jackson, for being on this program with me.

Senator JACKSON. Thank you, Roman, I've enjoyed every minute of it.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, May 2, 1969]

LAIRD'S PICTURE

One of the chief criticisms of Defense Secretary Melvin Laird's approach to the ABM issue is that he comes on too strongly. It is said that he overstates the need and overestimates the liklihood that the Soviet Union is trying to attain a first-strike capability.

Persons who criticize Laird on these grounds probably will find fresh ammunition in a speech he made last weekend in Florida.

Laird said he has gauged the Soviets' levels of technical accomplishment. He said:

"Upon the best information available to me as secretary of defense, I must conclude that the Soviet Union has the capability of achieving by the mid-1970s a superiority over the presently authorized and programmed forces of the United States in all areas—offensive strategic forces, defensive strategic forces and conventional forces."

He said that in the past two years the Soviet Union has more than tripled its force of intercontinental ballistic missiles from 250 to 900, and this year will have more than the United States' 1,054 land-based weapons.

In addition, Laird said, the Soviets could during the same period, increase their fleet of Polaris-type submarines to more than the United States 41.

He also said U.S. intelligence estimates that the Soviet Union "can deploy anywhere from 200 to 2,000 ABM missiles" by the mid-1970s.

Laird paints a grim picture. Whether he paints with too broad a brush cannot be determined with precision; he draws on intelligence sources which are not available to the ABM opposition.

There is a political picture Laird did not mention. It involves the character of the ledership of the Soviet Union.

At present there is significant evidence that a hard-line leadership, typified by the marshals who played such a strong hand in Czechoslovakia, is in the ascendancy.

The evidence includes the Russian decision to deploy the SS9 missile, the USSR's recent mysterious fleet exercises in the North Atlantic and possibly even the border clashes with the Chinese. These developments, among others, indicate that Soviet policy at present is in the hands of men who approximate Stalin more closely than is comfortable for American interests.

No one knows for sure just how Soviet leadership will evolve in the next five to 10 years. But recent history seems to indicate that the Kremlin's policies are hardening, with the military establishment taking the lead.

A push for attainment of clear strategic superiority over the United States would be much more likely to come about under such leadership. As Laird has said, such a push seems to be in progress, making it imperative for the United States to strengthen its position by proceeding with the President's ABM plan.

[From the Hastings (Nebr.) Daily Tribune, Apr. 29, 1969]

NIXON SEEKS TO GUARANTEE NATION WILL HAVE GREAT RETALIATORY POWER

Planning strategy for World War III is called "thinking about the unthinkable." Not only is a nuclear war too horrible to contemplate but there are so many variables and unknown quantities that it is almost impossible to know what would really happen in the event some nation actually initiated a missile attack on another.

Underlying President Nixon's proposal for a limited antiballistic missile system to protect the nation's missile sites is one basic assumption—that an enemy, to have any hope of winning would have to give first priority to wiping out or crippling his opponent's retaliatory strength.

Thus it follows logically that an ABM system that guarantees, or makes an enemy believe it guarantees, that some of our retaliatory strength would survive a first strike would be an effective means of staying his hand and preserving peace.

It is particularly important at this juncture because, according to the latest report from the American Security Council, Russia already has its own ABM system well advanced and is apparently testing the far more sophisticated problems of defending against space weapons.

"This would give Russia great additional lead time, even if the United States plan for a Safeguard system around some of our Minuteman silos is approved immediately," the Security Council said.

The United States Air Defense Command has definite evidence that late last year the Soviet Union tested its antispace defenses by putting satellites into orbit and then destroying them with other satellites.

Some of the Russian claims about its improvement of its antimissile defenses are discounted by critics of ABM on the grounds that there is no definite knowledge as to just what the Russians do have. But there is sufficient evidence to support the fact that the Soviet Union does have antiballistic forces in being and the United States does not. No United States commander can assure the people of America that they have a defense against nuclear war because the United States has not allowed its military to provide such defenses.

Some critics of President Nixon's ABM proposal say that just because the Soviet Union has devoted so much attention to a Russia ABM is no reason why the United States must follow suit.

But these same critics owe it to themselves and the American people to ask why the Soviet leadership considered it to be desirable or necessary to develop the elaborate defense it apparently has. If the ABM is so "costly, useless and meaningless" as some critics say, then why have the Russians pushed ahead so fast in building their own ABM and more?

Until the question is fully answered, supporters of the ABM defense concept in the United States have a right to keep asking: Why should the Russian people have a monopoly on defense against nuclear war?

The United States must have as many people thinking about the unthinkable as does Russia. That is the belief of President Nixon and he is seeking to give them a system that will help overcome some of their fears.

[From the Omaha (Nebr.) World-Herald, Apr. 9, 1969]

TO ERR WITH WHOM?

Most of the serious trouble the United States has gotten into in modern times has been the result of making faulty judgments as to the intentions and capabilities of its enemies.

The United States guessed wrong on how long it would take the Soviet Union to develop atomic and hydrogen bombs.

It was assumed that Red China was too primitive to devise nuclear weapons. The guessers forgot that Chinese minds are among the best in the world; China surprised everyone by setting off a nuclear explosion in 1964.

Time after time, our nation's leaders have assumed that our Communist adversaries would or wouldn't, could or couldn't—and they have been wrong.

The current assumption, forwarded so ardently by the leading opponents of President Nixon's ABM proposal, is that it is unthinkable that the Soviet Union would strive for a first-strike capability.

A first-strike posture would require enough nuclear weapons to eliminate substantially the American nuclear forces in a surprise attack, leaving the United States incapable of retaliating.

It has been declared that neither nation can ever achieve a first-strike capability, and that therefore the United States doesn't need the Safeguard system to defend its missile sites.

Defense Secretary Melvin Laird thinks otherwise. He has warned that the Russians do appear to be building for a first strike.

Developments in three Soviet weapons programs seem to bear out Laird's position.

The Soviet Union is building its hunter-killer submarine fleet at the rate of more than seven a year. In a few years the Soviets will have enough of these vessels to shadow all the American Polaris Missile-firing subs.

The Soviet Union also is building Polaris-type missile subs. In four or five years it could have a fleet to rival the American force of 41 Polaris vessels. Soviet submarine missiles could strike American bomber bases without giving sufficient warning to get the planes off the ground.

Finally, there is the SS9, the gigantic Soviet intercontinental ballistic missile. The Russians now have about 200 of them, and they are still building. It is estimated there will be about 500 of them by 1973. Each SS9 is believed to be capable of carrying 10 to 25 megatons of nuclear explosives. Laird said Monday the Soviet Union is testing a triple-warhead nose cone for the SS9, which would greatly increase its striking power.

Against these hard facts, the comfortable assumptions of the ABM opponents are flimsy indeed.

Laird may be wrong. But the facts seem to lean in favor of his arguments. It would be safer for the nation to err with Laird, if he is wrong, and err on the side of preparedness, than to err with the ABM opponents and go along with what could be the ultimate false assumption.

ABM AND WAR-IS-HELL HANG-UP

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

WASHINGTON.—In the unfolding debate over proceeding with an antiballistic missile

system, the arguments against President Nixon's proposal fall into four main groups.

Some of the objections are scientific: The things won't work when the button is pressed. Other objections are financial: In terms of cost-effectiveness, even the modified plan is too costly. Still other arguments arise from political considerations: An American ABM system will escalate the arms race and present a new threat to the Soviet Union.

Finally, one hears a tactical-strategic case: By the time our ABMs could be made operational, even if they worked to perfection, changes in the technology of weaponry will have made the missiles obsolete.

On careful examination, each of these arguments falls apart. The scientific objections, for example, are essentially an echo of the old argument against a hydrogen bomb; but the bomb worked. The problems of mounting an ABM system are fearfully complex, to be sure, but so were the problems of developing a moonshoot. If there can be no iron-clad guarantee of successful design, in the absence of an actual test, the guarantees are reasonably solid.

The financial arguments are the least impressive. President Nixon's recommendation is for an $800 million investment, but more than half of this—roughly $450 million—is for research and development.

Virtually all the opponents have conceded the necessity for continuing research. The fight on budgetary grounds thus boils down to $350 million only. In terms of national security, this is peanuts.

Perhaps the loudest complaint is that by going ahead with an antiballistic missile system, the United States in some fashion will escalate the arms race with the Soviet Union. This is nonsense.

In its "Washingon Report" for April 21, the prestigious American Security Council provides stunning documentation—documentation from Soviet sources themselves—of the Soviet Union's own antimissile defenses. It is not necessary, in this regard, to make guesses of future strength. "The fact remains," says the Council, "they have ABM forces in being and we do not."

The tactical-strategic arguments are highly speculative. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, the President and his advisers have had to act upon the intelligence available now.

By every indication, the Kremlin is proceeding steadily with deployment of its fantastic SS9 missiles. These terrifying weapons, carrying 20- to 25-megaton warheads, are much larger than our own intercontinental ballistic missiles. They represent the threat that must be countered now—and by "now," we are talking of 1973, when the first minimal phase of the proposed Safeguard system is complete.

In the end, none of the familiar, rational arguments can prevail. What the opponents really are saying, out of their hearts and not their heads, is simply that war is hell.

Of course war is hell. If we lived in a perfect world, all nations would beat their swords into plowshares. We would defuse our missiles, scrap our bombers and dump every weapon in the depths of the seas. But presidents—and senators— have an obligation to deal with hell as it is, and not with heaven as it might be.

The President's recommendations for an antiballistic missile system are the very least that he could make, in good conscience, as commander-in-chief, charged with keeping our nation secure The most telling criticism, in truth, is not that Nixon is proposing too much, but that he is proposing too little.

In any event, the President has looked at realities; he has not closed his eyes. No one can ask more than this of a troubled Congress; but the conutry cannot settle for less than this, either.

A RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 194) to express the sense of the Senate in regard to changes in the Job Corps program.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I rise to support the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) in his sense of the Senate resolution concerning a postponement of the Job Corps action on the part of the administration.

The points pro and con have been covered in the debate, and I wish to identify myself as a strong proponent of the resolution.

ORDER OF RECOGNITION OF SENATORS

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I believe Presiding Officers should be informed that the purpose of the list at the desk is to indicate what Senators are to be called to speak if the Senate is about to adjourn, but that, under the rules of the Senate, the Senator first on his feet, seeking recognition, is the one who should be recognized.

I am not directing these remarks at the present Presiding Officer, but referring to the general rule, because I note that this habit of following a list is coming into too much use. I believe we should return to the regular rule, which is that the Senator first on his feet seeking recognition is recognized first, and that the purpose of the list is to avoid the Senate's adjourning before a particular Senator can be called.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks that have just been made by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island.

I have noted particularly this year that the practice of having a list of names at the desk has seemed to grow over that of previous years. We have heretofore had lists of names at the desk from time to time, but the rules of the Senate do not make any provision for recognition of a Senator by virtue of his name's having been placed on a list.

Rule XIX, paragraph 1, provides that the Presiding Officer shall recognize the Senator who shall first address him, and I would hope that we would not permit the erosion of this rule. It is possible for a Senator, under the practice that is coming more and more into vogue, to place his name on the list at the Presiding Officer's desk, return to the office and work for 2 or 3 hours, feeling assured that when his name is about to be reached on the list, he will be notified, and can be on the floor and get immediate recognition; whereas, a Senator who has been diligent in remaining on the floor all afternoon, as has the Senator from Rhode Island, will not be recognized in accordance with rule XIX.

I have sat in the Chamber day after day and watched this rule being eroded; and I would like to express the hope that Senators who preside—and my remarks are not, I want to say, as did the Senator from Rhode Island, meant to be directed to the present Presiding Officer—whoever they may be, will follow the Senate rule and recognize Senators in accordance with the rule.

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

Mr. PELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG. While the Senator is addressing himself to that subject, I would hope that one of these days we might be able to prevail upon our Rules Committee to consider a number of not consequential but helpful changes to our rules in order to help us expedite our business, so that we could get on with it more effectively.

One thing that especially concerns the junior Senator from Louisiana is that many times, because of some absentees and the failure of the side that has the most absentees to be able to obtain pairs for all their absentees, Senators insist on a matter going over to the following day and then they go over to the following day at a time when there is no other business to take up.

We were fighting over a measure involving campaign expenditures 2 years ago, and six votes were taken. My side won three times and the other side won three times. It depended on which side had the most absentees. If we had had the entire membership of the Senate present, it would have been a tie vote.

That kind of thing could go on forever. If we could reach an agreement on any basis, once it is cleared that a Senator wishes to vote in a certain way, that could be achieved by any one of a dozen mechanisms, or we could agree that both sides would pair their absentees, provided they knew how Senators wanted to vote.

I suppose the Senator from Rhode Island has used a similar technique in some of the committees on which he serves, and I know it is followed on some of the committees on which I serve. It is a helpful means by which to get on with business. We might even go to the extent when we are in doubt, of getting on the telephone and contacting a Senator who might be addressing his State legislature or some group on a matter involving, perhaps, the Federal-State relationship. We might get the Senator on the telephone, permit most sides to explain their positions, and then ask the Senator how he wants to vote to break the tie.

However, in the Senate Chamber we are still stuck with the obsolete way of doing business. If a Senator gives a pair it looks as if both Senators did not vote. That is the difficulty in giving pairs. Someone might say, "Don't let them vote today, fellows. We will keep the conversation going until tomorrow." Sometimes that procedure goes on indefinitely. I assume that during sessions of the Sen-

ate it must cost us at least 10 days of our time, and that is valuable time.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I completely agree with the Senator. We are one of the few legislative bodies in the world that does not make full use of the regular pair so that two men can be away to take care of business.

Mr. LONG. I used to tell friends if they wanted to help me on something I would be glad to return the favor when I apparently could but that there was no use asking me to help them unless it was going to be a close vote. On a close vote I would be glad to return the favor, but if I were going to lose by a big vote it did not matter and if I were going to win by a big vote they could vote how they wanted because I had plenty of votes anyway. That is the point of view of a practical legislator.

However, when one gets down to the close votes where neither side wants to lose because one of their men is out of town or in the hospital, from time to time we will have Senators request that nothing happen until they return.

I recall situations where a Senator wanted to be present to vote on something and he may have left instructions that nothing important happen until he gets back. Then, if anything does happen, he stands up and proposes to object to every unanimous-consent request for the next 6 months because he felt the faith was not kept with him.

When the vote is going to be close anyway, why should a Senator who is going to be absent not be accorded a pair so that his position will be recorded. Then, both would be shown as voting. It would be easier to accord the absent Senator a pair.

Mr. PELL. I agree and I would support the idea if the opportunity presented itself.

Mr. LONG. I shall draft the rule and submit it and if the Senator gets a hearing on his proposal we can have a hearing on it as well.

GREECE: GOVERNMENT BY TORTURE—AN ARTICLE BY CHRISTOPHER S. WREN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the May 27 issue of Look magazine, which is out tomorrow carries an article entitled "Greece: Government by Torture," by Look senior editor Christopher S. Wren. The article tells a shocking story of torture under the Greek military regime which took power 2 years ago. Mr. Wren notes, at the beginning of the article:

> Torture has taken place in Greece on victims who number into the thousands. Under a frightened unpopular military regime, torture goes on today.

He then goes on to describe some specific examples.

Mr. Wren concludes his article, I should note, with this comment:

> We are spending around $40 million a year of American taxpayers' money for aid to a government that rules by torture. Do we really want to do that?

I was interested to note, too, that of the eight names of torturers mentioned in the article, six had been cited by me on this floor last October 12, 1968. These are Messrs. Lambrou, Karapanayiotis, Spanos, Babalis, and Mallios.

Mr. Wren's article needs no further comment from me. It speaks for itself. While it is not pleasant reading, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article be placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article published in the May 7 issue of the New York Times under the headline "European Ministers Warn Greek Regime," an editorial from the May 8 issue of the Times entitled "Warning to the Junta," and an editorial from the Providence Evening Bulletin entitled, "Greece Under the Heel."

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

(See exhibits 2, 3, and 4.)

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the article written by Drew Middleton from London, reports that the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe has warned the Greek Government that its internal policies violate the principles of human rights on which the Council was founded. Mr. Middleton notes that the Committee has postponed a decision on the expulsion of Greece from the Council but has adopted a resolution citing the Assembly's finding that the Greek military regime violates the conditions for membership on the Council, one of which is that every member of the Council must accept the principles of the rule of law and of the enjoyment for its citizens of human rights and fundamental freedoms. Mr. Middleton mentions the fact that a subcommittee of the Council's Human Rights Commission will resume hearings next month on allegations of torture of political prisoners of Greece. I intend to continue to follow these hearings with close attention and to inform Members of the Senate of the group's conclusions.

Mr. President, I have spoken out many times on the floor in the past 2 years on the subject of torture in Greece. The effect of torture on a people is sinister and pervasive. It intimidates through fear and silences by terror. While I have no way of knowing personally to what extent torture is still being used as an instrument of control by Greek officials, I find the recurrent reports of torture most alarming and disturbing.

I would like to point out at this time, Mr. President, that we have not had an Ambassador in Greece since January 20. As we recognize the current regime, and do business with it on a full range of political and economic matters, including certain forms of military assistance, it does not strike me as wise to leave this post unfilled. I hope that the new administration will appoint a tough-minded, nonmilitary man to this important position immediately. We need to have a strong voice in Athens—and an experienced ear.

EXHIBIT 1

GREECE: GOVERNMENT BY TORTURE

(By Christopher Wren)

I didn't believe it. The reports of torture filtering out of Greece for two years since the military coup were so grotesque as to seem unreal. It took a trip inside Greece to change my mind. In Athens, businessmen, priests, army officers, lawyers, housewives and students persuaded me. A succession of former political prisoners described every ordeal in detail and let me see, and touch, the scars. Now I am convinced. Torture has taken place in Greece on victims who number into the thousands. Under a frightened, unpopular military regime, torture goes on today.

Pericles Korovessis, a 28-year-old Athens actor, told me he didn't believe the stories either, until *Asphalia*, the Greek security police put him through what it likes to call the "machine of truth."

One Monday morning at 3 a.m., five armed plainclothesmen burst into his apartment. Odyssef Spanos, the leader, told the others what to look for: "Every thick book is a Communist book." The police seized ten folk-song tapes, a BBC English lesson, a typewriter, and the classics of Aristotle, Sophocles and Aeschylus. They took their evidence and Pericles Korovessis, in an unmarked black sedan down to the big *Asphalia* headquarters on Bouboulinas St.

Korovessis was hustled upstairs to a small office. Spanos told him, "I want to know everything you've done." "It's a horrible mistake," explained Korovessis. "I'll be released in the morning." Spanos hit him in the mouth, drawing blood. "If you dirty my shirt," warned Spanos, "you'll pay for it."

They took Korovessis up to the small room on the roof terrace where interrogation takes place. In the middle was a wooden bench, its top polished with use. They tied him down on it. One man held his chest. Another picked up a shovel handle. He began pounding Korovessis on the soles of his dangling feet.

The technique is called *falanga*. At Bouboulinas St., the victim's shoes are routinely left on. This minimizes telling scars, prolongs the beating time, and is especially painful, because swelling feet eventually pop the shoes apart. "Do you like this?" the torturer asked. "This is just a sample." Korovessis tried vainly to arch his feet until the shoes were too swollen full. Screaming, he lost count of the *falanga* strokes.

With stick, Spanos daintly hoisted a urine-soaked rag from a toilet hole at one side of the room. An assistant stopped him: "Sir, it's my job. That's too dirty for you." Korovessis passed out as the wet rag was jammed inside his mouth.

When he came to, they asked if he had anything to tell them. Then they started on his feet again. Korovessis still remembers: "It was so horrible that I thought somebody was beating me on the head. It's as if they beat you all over. After a while, I couldn't even cry." He passed out again, came to and vomited. They untied him. One policeman said: "Look, you've dirtied the floor. You must lick it up."

Korovessis couldn't stand. His shoes had split to reveal flesh "like unbaked dough." Two men dragged him down to the basement past policemen chatting about yesterday's soccer match. They put him in a windowless cell without food or water.

The next day, they took him upstairs again. Spanos' superior, Constantine Karapanayiotis, confided: "We know you're not a Communist because your family is royalist. We want you to help us. Give us the name of two friends you don't like." Korovessis refused. "Everybody who comes here talks," Karapanayiotis warned. "You're not spoiling the record."

Basile Lambrou, the dapper *Asphalia* director, walked in. "I'm the boss," he announced. "It's useless trying to play hero because everybody here speaks." Korovessis said he would protest when he got out. "You'll never be able to," Lambrou laughed. "Everybody believes us and not you. It's very easy for us to humilitate you. We are

the government, and you are nothing. The government isn't alone. Behind the government are the Americans. The whole world is in two parts—the Russians and the Americans. *We* are the Americans. Be grateful we've only tortured you a little. In Russia, they'd kill you."

Lambrou, other victims confirm, displays a facial twitch when he gets excited. His jaw began jerking when Korovessis told him he had nothing to say. "Then say a prayer," Lambrou snapped.

Karapanayiotis gestured: "I'll give you to Gravaritis and he'll kill you. He enjoys it."

Basile Gravaritis, paunchy and smiling, took over. He stroked Korovessis' shoulder. "Why fight the boss?" he soothed. "Tell the whole story. It'll be good for you." Suddenly, he grabbed Korovessis by the hair and slammed his head against the wall.

Gravaritis ordered his assistants to take Korovessis back up to the room on the terrace. He stamped on his prisoner's instep. The blood came out.

They tied Korovessis back on the bench. Gravaritis hung up his coat and rolled his sleeves "like a priest preparing for a ceremony." He began *falanga,* this time with an iron pipe. After ten blows, he paused to say: "Your right foot is already broken. If you want to save the other, tell the truth now." The beating resumed. "I even felt pain in my fingernails," Korovessis recalls today.

He fainted, then revived. Gravaritis walked over: "I'm so sorry, are you all right?" He slapped Korovessis across the face, then with two fingers slowly pressed his victim's eyes back into his skull.

They untied Korovessis, and began flailing his shins and knees with the iron bar. Gravaritis dragged him around the room by the hair, smashing his face against one knee. A tooth fell out. They took him outside, pretended to toss him off the roof and brought him back inside the room.

Korovessis feigned unconsciousness, until his testicles were slugged with the bar. "Oh, you're all right," grinned Gravaritis. They spread Korovessis down over the bench. Gravaritis shoved the iron bar into his rectum, tearing the skin. Korovessis blacked out. He came to in the corner. Gravaritis was carefully combing his hair in the window's reflection. He looked down at Korovessis. "We've become tired of this kind of man," he said.

Lambrou and his associates came in and kicked at Korovessis. Karapanayiotis seared his mouth with a hot pepper, broke it open, and stuck the pieces into his eyes and nose. Another man poured American detergent down his throat, and, finally, propped a cigarette into his lips as he lay writhing. Everyone laughed. "You see what happens to people who don't like democracy," Lambrou lectured.

An army ambulance carried Korovessis to the No. 401 Military Hospital in central Athens. But he got no medical attention. Instead, daily, he was wheeled from his bed into a room, strapped to a leather chair, and tortured with electricity from a "black box." Several men in white smocks watched to determine how much shock his heart could stand. "This little machine could make you feel like nothing," Korovessis remembers. "I shook like a piece of paper." Lambrou dropped in once to chat. "Your soul is tortured because you have many sins," he suggested. "Write them down and save your soul."

Korovessis never talked, because, he insists, he had nothing to tell. After a week, he was taken back to Bouboulinas St., then through a succession of prisons. Six months after he was picked up, he was finally released. He had been charged, with nothing, convicted of nothing. Still, he was forbidden to work and had to see the police twice a week.

Pericles Korovessis can speak now because he has escaped from Greece with his wife. I studied nearly 200 cases like his, in personal interviews and smuggled reports. The people I met in Athens had names. Most victims are anonymous, like the "bloody amorphous mass" that one young laborer told me was dumped into the next cell and remained without food and water when he left six days later. The majority are still in prison. Those released have been forced to sign statements that they were not tortured.

Falanga is the basic torture. In Athens, the victim is tied to a bench or chair. In Salonika, he is stripped below the waist and laid on his back, with his feet between the sling and stock of an American M1 rifle. Two men hoist the rifle, twisting it to immobilize his feet. A third slams away at the exposed soles. "The pain is like an electric shock," one student told me. "It goes up into your heart and bangs inside your head." When the victim passes out, he is made to stand up and jump. This brings the circulation—and pain—back. Then *falanga* begins again, swelling the entire leg. Everybody I talked to said he urinated blood afterward.

That isn't all. Suspects are often stripped naked, an old Gestapo trick to break resistance. There have been mock executions, sometimes over an open grave. Karapanayiotis gave one student a forced enema with detergent, boasting: "We'll pull your bowels out of your mouth." A Salonika girl was dangled from a helicopter and dipped into the Aegean Sea until she talked. A prominent lawyer was hung by his feet. A quiet, long-haired brunette was deflowered with a broom handle. I learned of a film maker who had his moustache burned off. At the *Asphalia* station in central Piraeus, the Athens port, vice director Sotiris Kouvas gets results from a heavy metal ring that he slips over the suspect's skull, then tightens slowly with metal screws.

Electric torture to the toes, neck and genitals is commonplace. But psychological terror frequently works best. At one jail a clanging bell keeps prisoners awake. Threats of rape or sodomy are also effective. A 35-year-old spinster resisted 14 bouts of *falanga.* She broke when her torturers stripped her and began to molest her. She has since tried to hang herself.

The government forbids anyone to help the family of a man taken to jail. He becomes more vulnerable if he has to worry about them. An army major was buried up to his neck and saw his son beaten before him. Paul Zannas, director of the Salonika Film Festival, was not tortured. But when his 13-year-old son tried to bring him a French newspaper, *Le Monde,* in prison, the boy was thrashed by a jailer in front of Zannas.

Georgia Pangopoulou was arrested with her fiancé, Constantine Meletis. They were tortured in adjacent rooms of a military barracks in Salonika, so they could hear each other scream. An officer crisscrossed her face with a knife. "Go to the mirror and see how pretty you look," he ordered her. Meletis remembers a man named Baras being beaten so badly next door that with each new blow he could only "grunt like an ox." At the Bouboulinas St. jail, an actress, Kitty Arseni, listened to one *falanga* session overhead. She counted 200 blows.

A student's wife, two months pregnant, miscarried after *falanga.* One prisoner at Bouboulinas St. told me some men could only crawl to the daily toilet. One young man was so battered that when his girl friend saw him, she vomited.

How could such torture be condoned? Bear in mind that the colonel's coup on April 21, 1967, defied the Greek people, the government, the king and even the generals, who had postponed their own planned coup. Today, I was told in Greece, only five percent of the population backs the junta. Another five percent may collaborate. But 25 percent of the people strongly oppose it. The remaining two-thirds, including the peasants, are sitting on the sidelines.

In two years, the colonels have failed to solidify any significant support from the Greeks. They have to expose and smash all opposition, or the precarious dictatorship will collapse. As one priest puts it, "They govern Greece like a battalion and nothing more."

The target for torture has been those the junta fears most—the intellectuals, the young and the non-Communist leftists. Nearly all the torture victims I met were educated. *Asphalia* is especially worried about resistance groups like the radical Patriotic Front, the moderate Democratic Defence, and the students' *Rigas Feraios.*

The torture is calculated to create fear as well as get information. Doctors are warned not to treat released victims; if they do, their telephone service can be cut. Feeding the children of a man in jail is "association with Communists" that will send you to prison yourself. Ex-prisoners cannot hold a job without *Asphalia's* approval. The *Asphalia* budget has doubled since the coup much of the increase going to pay informers.

The four-story, brown-shuttered *Asphalia* building across from the National Archeological Museum on Bouboulinas St., with gray jeeps parked along its sidewalk, has become a landmark. At first, a motorcycle engine was run at night to drown out screams from the terrace. Now, the building is so infamous that most torture has been relocated to suburban stations. The windowless basement cells are still used, as is the three-room basement at 16 Rethymnou St., several blocks away, where the overflow of prisoners from Bouboulinas St. has been stored.

The once-elite commandos, decimated by a purge after the coup, carry out the worst atrocities at the Dionysos military camp outside Athens. One green-beret raiding-force officer confirmed the tortures took place. There is a tree there where prisoners are hung by their wrists, which are manacled behind their backs. In winter, prisoners have been doused with water and left hanging overnight.

Even in Athens, prisoners have been frequently denied food, water and blankets. A young girl told me she got along by lapping water from the toilet. Provisions sent by families have sometimes been kept by the police. One 22-year-old girl stayed in solitary confinement for six months because she spit at Lambrou, but shorter isolation periods are common. I learned of prisoners left in handcuffs for days, weeks, even months. In one case, the man's flesh swelled over the handcuffs, hiding them.

The torture ends with prison. Anyone sentenced to Averhoff or Aegina prisons, or the island concentration camp at Leros, faces hardship, but not *falanga.* A military officer presides at the trials. Lawyers don't see their clients until just beforehand. Any references to torture, as when Yannis Petropoulos, a construction worker, showed his mutilated feet on the witness stand, are stricken from the record. Sentences are heavy. A law student, later amnestied with other prisoners, told me he got 20 years for possessing two leaflets. Young demonstrators at former Prime Minister George Papandreou's funeral drew up to four and a half years. A man who called the government a "junta" in a grocery-store conversation went to prison. So did a priest who asked his congregation to give their Easter dinners to the families of those in jail.

The torture has tapered off from the first bloody year after the coup, but the same torturers keep cropping up in the most recent accounts: Lambrou, Gravaritis, Karapanayiotis, Spanos, Petros Babalis, and the sexual torture specialist, Evanghelos Mallios, at Bouboulinas St. alone. Nicholas Kioupis, a fat, bespectacled *Asphalia* doctor, inspects victims to advise how much more torture they will take.

Besides Korovessis, I met only one other victim, a young cabinetmaker, who held out.

The broken ones are far more bitter. A student who blurted the name of his best friend recalls: "I tried not to think of speaking. Even naked and tied, I was so much more than the people beating me. Then there was an emptiness, and I found myself talking."

The dictatorship refuses to admit that torture goes on. It calls anyone who raises the fact Communist or homosexual or both. Yet, Amnesty International, a London-based organization concerned about political prisoners, confirmed almost a year and a half ago that there was torture. Sweden, Norway, Denmark and the Netherlands have filed charges against Greece in the Council of Europe for violation of the Human Rights Convention, which forbids degrading treatment of prisoners. A subcommission of the Council went to Greece in March. It was refused access to the prisoners and prisons it had requested. Now, a showdown is brewing that could result in Greece's expulsion from the Council.

The Greek Government brought an ex-prisoner, Constantine Meletis, under armed guard to rebut the torture charges at the Council's hearing last November in Strasbourg, France. He escaped to testify that he had in fact been tortured. I saw him in Oslo, where he now lives under Norwegian police protection. His jaw is still crooked from being broken with a submachine-gun magazine when he was arrested a year ago. *Asphalia* has been collecting pictures of him at home. They plan to get him.

In Washington, D.C., Sen. Claiborne Pell has brought up the subject of torture a half-dozen times on the Senate floor. "Torture has been used as an instrument to keep the Greek people scared," Senator Pell believes. "It will get worse if we extend full military assistance, and they think we're not horrified. We should hold up assistance until we know the torture has been stopped."

American military aid to Greece was suspended after the coup; now the money is flowing again, but our Government refuses to say how much. The consensus is that we need Greece in NATO. Yet one of Greece's top military men insisted to me that, since its 2,000 best officers were purged by the junta, the Greek armed forces have become nearly worthless. "Before," he said, "Greece gave NATO ten infantry divisions, one armored division and the raiding forces. Now, it all adds up to zero, because today, there's no morale, no discipline, no spirit left."

The people of Greece believe the tortures would end if the United States just spoke out. One woman challenged: "I can't understand why Americans want democracy in their country, but smile upon people who destroy democracy in my country. Democracy is not just for the Americans." The irony is that American aid has become identified with the tortures. American M1 rifles have been used in the *falanga* beatings. Some of the interrogator's desks at Bouboulinas St. bear the clasped-hands emblem of the U.S. AID program. Unconscious victims have been lugged from the terrace there down to the basement ("A slaughterhouse of broken bodies" one prisoner called it) in gray American hospital blankets with "U.S." in prominent black letters. The torturers, who smoke American cigarettes while they work, like to give the impression they are only doing a job for the Americans. Most of the victims I talked to believed that Lambrou and Mallios, among others, were trained in the United States, though there is no evidence of this. No wonder Pericles Korovessis, now a homeless, penniless exile, asks: "Is Lambrou your spokesman? What has happened to the American dream?"

Before I left Athens, I had dinner with a bearded Orthodox priest. "When a foreigner comes to Greece," he said, "he sees the sun and the sky, and he thinks things are going fine. In reality, inside these people you see on the streets is a hatred that is eating them away. There is going to be such an explosion here as no one is expecting."

The reckoning of the tortures is yet to come. Look for the educated and the young to shift so far left that the junta's baseless charge of Communism becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. Look for what one Greek calls "the mathematical certainty of anarchy," culminating in a revolt, conceivably Soviet-backed, against the dictatorship. Look for the condemnation and probable expulsion of Greece from the Council of Europe. Look eventually for a split within NATO itself, lining Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands and even Italy against the United States and its corrupted ally. Look for anti-Americanism to spread through a people who were once loyal friends.

We are spending around $40 million a year of American taxpayers' money for aid to a government that rules by torture. Do we really want to do that?

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1969]

EUROPEAN MINISTERS WARN GREEK REGIME

(By Drew Middleton)

LONDON, May 6.—The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe warned the Greek Government today that its internal policies violated the principles of human rights on which the Council was founded.

After a three-hour debate the committee approved by 13 to 2 a four-point resolution that in effect warns Greece that she is in danger of expulsion from the Council.

Greece and Cyprus voted against the resolution and France, Switzerland and Turkey abstained.

At its 20th anniversary meeting the ministerial committee endorsed multilateral contacts with Eastern Europe as contributions to a detente with the Communist bloc.

"The policy of a detente should be continued," the committee reported in a communique, even though the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia had impeded progress.

The Council of Europe is an 18-nation intergovernmental group formed in 1949 with the aim of furthering European unity. It consists of a Committee of Ministers representing the various governments and a Consultative Assembly whose members are chosen by the national parliaments.

In January the Consultative Assembly, meeting in Strasbourg, France, recommended the exclusion of Greece from the Council. Greece denounced the resolution as prejudiced.

HARMONY IS STRESSED

The two-day anniversary meeting of the ministerial committee was concluded at Lancaster House this afternoon. The session was notable in two respects, participants said.

Positive steps toward European political unity in this first post-de Gaulle conference could be discussed "in terms of reality rather than vague hopes," one Foreign Minister said.

There also was an obvious desire in this more optimistic atmosphere not to take action that would rupture European harmony.

This was believed to be one of the reasons the committee postponed until its next meeting in December a decision on the expulsion of Greece from the Council, adopting the four-point resolution instead.

The resolution cites the Consultative Assembly's finding that the Greek military regime violates the conditions for membership in the Council as set out under Article 3 of the Statute of the Council of Europe.

READY FOR DECISION

The article provides that every member of the Council must accept the principle of the rule of law and of the enjoyment of all persons within the jurisdiction of the government of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The ministerial committee also declared in the resolution that it was "ready" to make a decision on Greece at its next meeting and expressed the hope that the report of the Commission on Human Rights would be available to the committee as soon as possible.

A subcommittee of the European Human Rights Commission will resume hearings in Strasbourg, France, next month on allegations of torture of political prisoners in Greece.

The ministerial committee spent much of the afternoon session discussing the political aspects of European economic integrations.

Progress in this field, it is widely believed, depends on the policy of the future French government Foreign Minister Willy Brandt of West Germany and others cautioned against giving the French the impression they were under any kind of pressure.

Prime Minister Wilson, who yesterday reasserted Britain's desire to enter the Common Market, was similarly cautious while answering questions in the House of Commons.

Mr. Wilson said that Britain "must take this matter fairly slowly and cooly" until the situation in France is clearer. There are still "enormous difficulties" facing British entry, the Prime Minister said.

[From the New York Times, May 7, 1969]

ACTRESS IN PLEA TO GREEKS

ATHENS, May 6.—Anna Synodinou, one of the foremost Greek dramatic actresses, appealed to Greeks today for action to help restore freedom in Greece after two years of military rule.

The 42-year-old actress, who has refused to appear on the Greek stage since the military regime took power in 1967, said she was demonstrating in this way her "opposition to the suppression of the freedom of speech" in her country. She expressed her views in a statement issued to the foreign press.

"I address myself with all my heart and my full voice, to all those—Greeks and strangers—who believe in a peaceful and creative life," she wrote. "Help restore freedom in Greece. Help rehabilitate human dignity."

EXHIBIT 3

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1969]

WARNING TO THE JUNTA

The Council of Europe has warned Greece's junta to restore basic human rights by December or face expulsion from the eighteen-nation body. Greek democrats had hoped that the Council at its twentieth anniversary meeting in London would at least suspend Athens; but the colonels would be wise to take this milder action for the conditional reprieve it was.

Up for consideration in London was the recommendation of a huge majority of the Consultative Assembly of the Council that Greece be ousted for "serious violation of the conditions of membership" regarding the rule of law and human rights. The foreign ministers postponed action until their December meeting however, partly to get a report from the Council's Human Rights Commission on alleged torturing of Greek political prisoners. They were also reluctant to rock the European boat further after the shock of President de Gaulle's exit in France.

At any rate, these colonels now have seven months in which to restore basic liberties and put Greece on the road back to democracy and the rule of law. It would solve many problems—for Greece, the Council of Europe, NATO and also for the United States—if Colonel Papadopoulos and his henchmen took this opportunity to carry out a few of their promises.

EXHIBIT 4

[From the Providence (R.I.) Evening Bulletin, May 9, 1968]

GREECE UNDER THE HEEL

In denouncing the Greek government's suppresion of freedom, the Council of Min-

isters of the Council of Europe has struck a note of truth in an evasive world. That they held off a vote on expelling Greece from the 18-member council indicated perhaps their hope that conditions in Greece may improve in the next six months.

But in declaring that the policies of the totalitarian regime in Athens violated the principles of human rights on which the council was founded, the ministers did what many Americans have wished their own government would do. In recognizing the Papadopoulos military dictatorship and in offering it assistance, this nation seems to many to have condoned the suppression of free speech, the imprisonment of political enemies, the denial of popular government.

Greece is a member of NATO, part of the defense of Western and Southern Europe against Russian expansionism. But the fact that Greece occupies a strategic location in the planning of the NATO joint command should not be permitted to override considerations of human decency. If the Council of Ministers has rebuked the Athens regime, it is time the United States used all the pressure at its command to push the Greek colonels into a return to representative government.

DISPOSAL OF CHEMICAL WEAPONS IN THE ATLANTIC OCEAN BY DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on Thursday last, as I am sure many of my colleagues will recall, the New York Times reported that the Department of the Army plans to dispose of several thousand tons of chemical weapons by dumping them into the Atlantic Ocean at a distance of 250 miles offshore and at a depth of 7,200 feet.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Roy Reed's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

CONGRESSMEN PROTEST RAIL PLAN TO CARRY POISON GAS TO ATLANTIC

(By Roy Reed)

WASHINGTON, May 7.—The Army is considering the transportation of a large quantity of obsolete, but still lethal, poison gas across the country in railroad cars to be dumped in the Atlantic Ocean.

Under a proposal that the Army says is being discussed—and which a New York Congressman says has been decided on—the gas would be shipped by railroad from the Rocky Mountain Arsenal near Denver and the Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland to the Naval Ammunition Depot at Earle, N.J. There it would be loaded onto four old Liberty ships, towed 250 miles out to sea and sunk with the ships.

Earle is 20 miles across the lower bay from the southern tip of Manhattan.

The proposal was attacked today by Representative Richard D. McCarthy, Democrat of upstate New York, who made it public, and by Senator Harrison A. Williams Jr., Democrat of New Jersey.

The two men, in letters and telegrams, urged the Defense Department to stop what Senator Williams called "this very hazardous operation" because of the danger to human life along the railroad routes and at the port, as well as the potential hazard to marine life in the Atlantic.

The Pentagon replied this afternoon that, although it had not decided to go ahead with the proposal, disposal by this method would be the safest it could devise.

Mr. McCarthy said his source of information, which he did not divulge, insisted that the military had already decided on the train plan of disposal.

Meanwhile, Representative Henry S. Reuss, Democrat of Wisconsin, announced that Congressional hearings would begin May 20 on the possible dangers of open-air testing of chemical warfare agents.

The hearings will cover the accident last year in Utah in which about 7,000 sheep died in the vicinity of an Army nerve gas test.

Ramparts magazine, in its June issue now going on sale, reviews that accident and warns that a similar accident that could involve human life may occur in Utah from an infestation of a Latin-American virus that was brought to the state by the Army.

Representative McCarthy and Senator Williams said they had learned that the Department of Transportation had issued a permit to allow the gas to be transported by rail.

Mr. McCarthy said the permit had been issued with a waiver of a customary safety requirement. Cylinders carrying toxic material ordinarily are tested under water pressure for valve leaks.

A Transportation Department spokesman said it would be more dangerous to empty the already-filled World War II cylinders than to let them go through untested.

Mr. McCarthy said most of the cylinders involved had not been tested since World War II.

An Army spokesman said the Army had disposed of obsolete gases by the train-to-sea method "several times," most recently in August, 1968. He said there had never been an accident.

Mr. McCarthy said he had learned of accidental spilling of a military-made chemical agent called phosgene in four separate incidents in the Midwest during the last year. He said details of the accidents were hard to find because of a policy of secrecy surrounding chemical warfare agents.

Pentagon spokesmen said a decision on disposal of the obsolete gas would be made only after consultation with scientific and technical experts and with other government agencies.

They said 27,000 tons of material, including containers, was involved and the movement would require 90 to 120 days, beginning later this month.

Maj. Gen. Wendell Coats, the Army's Chief of Public Information, said the material was about half GP nerve gas and half mustard gas. The nerve agent is in Air Force bombs, the mustard gas in cylinders of three-eighths-inch thick steel.

General Coats said the cylinders would be packed on the railroad cars in vermiculite to absorb any spill of the deadly liquid.

He said that any significant pollution of the sea would be "virtually impossible" from the dumping. The gas would rest on the sea bottom at a depth of about 7,200 feet, he said.

In the unlikely event of a ruptured cylinder, General Coats said, the poison would be dangerous for only 185 hours, after which it would be absorbed by the water and rendered harmless. He said the Army calculated that it would take water at that depth 400 years to rise to the surface.

He said the operation would cost $2.9-million.

An alternative would be to burn the material in the arsenals, and that would take "a period of years," he said.

"Our people calculate the train method is the safest way of getting rid of this material," he stated.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, while the primary focus of this article is to raise the general issue of the transport and the disposal of chemical and biological weapons, I wish to draw attention to the specific question—does the United States have the right to use the ocean space environment as a dumping ground for obsolete lethal gases? I bring up this question because the area selected by the U.S. Army is not only beyond our territorial sea but, indeed, it lies beyond our Continental Shelf. In other words, the disposal site is clearly beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the United States, and, yet, by carrying out this proposed plan, the United States will be asserting de facto, if limited, jurisdiction over that selected portion of the ocean deeps and the seabed thereof, and I might add, it will be asserting this jurisdiction for a very questionable purpose.

Mr. President, as one of the congressional advisers to the United Nations Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed, I have closely followed the discussion on this issue, and I would remind the Department of the Army that the United States has gone on record at the United Nations as giving its full support to the principle that the seabed beyond the present limits of national jurisdiction shall be utilized in the interests and for the benefit of all mankind. In addition, during the last session of the General Assembly, the United States cosponsored a major resolution calling on the United Nations Secretariat to undertake a general study of the problem of marine pollution. Also, I think it should be recalled that, during the past session of the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference, the United States stated that mass destruction weaponry, including chemical and biological weapons, must be prohibited from emplacement in the ocean floor.

While I do not in any way mean to suggest that the Army's plan to dispose of the chemical weapons in question can be equated with the emplacement of weapons on the ocean floor, or that the action contemplated is ipso facto synonomous with marine pollution, or even that the Army's plan must necessarily be contrary to the interests of mankind, I do suggest that, if the Army implements this course of action, the credibility of our pronouncements before the United Nations and the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference could be impaired.

Like all great powers, Mr. President, the United States cannot have it both ways and still enjoy the trust and confidence of the other nations of the world; we cannot berate Peru for trying to protect the fisheries within its 200-mile coastal belt, while we maintain that freedom of the high seas permits us the jurisdictional authority to dump lethal gases 250 miles from our coast. We cannot seek to overcome the problems of marine pollution, or to exploit the marine environment in the interests of mankind, or to use the seabed exclusively for peaceful purposes, while at the same time we retain the right, under customary law of the sea, to utilize ocean space in any way we see fit, including the disposal of some of the most ghastly weapons ever produced by man. In short, how legitimate is our leadership in the field of oceanology, when on the one hand we call upon the world community to fashion a new legal and political framework for the development and exploitation of the international marine environment, and on the other we ourselves seek refuge among the old rules when we find them convenient to our purposes.

Mr. President, for several years now, I have urged my colleagues to give serious thought to the need for an ocean

space treaty, such as I have reintroduced during this session of the Congress. The type of treaty which I have suggested would provide for the peaceful and orderly development of ocean space, and in large measure would establish a meaningful basis for a solution to the kind of problem which I have mentioned today. I know that all of us would feel much less apprehensive about the Army's proposed plan of disposal if it were sanctioned by a majority of the members of the international community, or if the plan itself were approved by an international body of experts. We have neither, but the fact that we have not sought such approval explains the crisis of our times in the way we conduct our international relations.

THE TURBOTRAIN—THE MODERN PASSENGER TRAIN

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, recently, I had an opportunity to travel from New York City to my home State of Rhode Island on a regularly scheduled run of the turbotrain, the modern passenger trains being operated by the Penn Central Co. under the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act of 1965.

Mr. President, I had a pleasant, agreeable, and I would even say a delightful ride. I am extremely glad that these trains finally are on the track.

However, there are three very important steps that I would hope the Penn Central Co. would take as quickly as possible. They are steps that I consider necessary to the full and valid test of public acceptance that Congress envisioned when it approved this demonstration program.

The first, and to my mind most important, is to permit the Penn Central engineers to run the turbotrains at the speeds of which they are capable, consonant with reasonable safety.

I am personally convinced that, with no relocation or straightening of the twisting New Haven right-of-way, the turbotrains could make the trip from New York to Boston in 3 hours flat, compared with the current 3-hour and 55-minute schedule.

These trains were imaginatively designed and built by United Aircraft Corp. specifically to ride the present right-of-way with its many curves and bumps. I, in fact, believe that if the track were straightened and improved, if grade crossings were eliminated, and if the right-of-way were fenced, the turbotrain could cut the Boston to New York running time to the 2 hours that I have always held out as a target. Indeed, I think it is time we started giving very careful consideration to a program of right-of-way improvements to make such true high-speed runs possible with full safety.

I think it quite probable we would find the cost of such improvements more than offset by the public benefits in convenience and time savings, and in relieving the strain on overcrowded conditions in other transportation facilities. I for one, would be prepared to give my full support to such a program of roadbed and right-of-way improvements.

In the meantime, however, I see no reason why the most advantageous use should not be made of the existing roadbed and the turbotrain capabilities. I strongly urge the management of the Penn Central to unleash their engineers and permit these trains to make the run in three hours, as I believe they can.

Secondly, the turbotrain continues to operate on a minimal schedule of frequency—one round trip each day. It is vitally important to a valid demonstration that the number of daily runs be increased as soon as possible to the four roundtrips anticipated in planning for this project.

The third point I wish to raise involves the effort being made to inform the public of the turbotrain services through advertising. Up to the present time, there has been scarcely any effort made by the Penn Central at advertising the service. But despite these three failings—the relatively slow speeds, the infrequent service, and the lack of advertising effort by the Penn Central, the turbotrains are being well patronized. That is a clear, if early, indication that New Englanders want improved rail passenger service, and want it very badly.

I would hope very strongly that the Penn Central will move quickly to cut the running time, and increase the frequency of service for the turbotrains. When these steps are accomplished, I would expect the Penn Central to present a forceful informative advertising campaign, and I would point out that the High-Speed Ground Transportation Act authorized the use of project funds for such informational advertising.

The Penn Central Co. should take the initiative in these three steps I have urged. At the same time, we must remember that this demonstration is being conducted by the Penn Central under a Department of Transportation contract. The present limited service is being run under a temporary 150-day agreement. If the Penn Central has not acted sooner, I would urge that the improvements I have urged today be required by the new contract for the turbotrain demonstration.

FEDERAL AID TO HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in this morning's Washington Post, there is published an editorial which succinctly sets forth the shortcomings of the proposed budget allocations as related to Federal aid to higher education. I ask unanimous consent that this fine statement be printed in the RECORD.

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

FEDERAL DISINHERITANCE

There is not going to be much benevolence for colleges or for college students in the 1970 fiscal year if President Nixon's proposed budget is approved by Congress. Perhaps the parsimony has something to do with the widespread student feeling that the older generation really does not care quite so much for education as it likes to pretend it does. At any rate, the Federal aid to higher education cupboard looks pretty bare.

The National Defense Student Loans have been cut by slightly more than one-third from the level promised by the Johnson Administration—from $270 million to $155 million. These low-interest, long-term loans benefit lower and middle-class families; over half a million students now depend upon them. The College Work-Study program, designed to provide decent paying jobs for needy students working their way through college, has been cut by 31 per cent, from $211 million to $146 million. Educational Opportunity Grants have been cut in half. These grants are awarded to children of poor families to help them pay basic college costs. This cut alone would deprive more than 100,000 needy students, intellectually qualified for higher education, of the financial means to attend college unless the already overtaxed colleges themselves can somehow, offer them scholarships.

"My Administration," President Nixon said when he was campaigning for election, "will commit itself to the proposition that no young American who is qualified to go to college will be prevented from doing so because he cannot afford it. I will support existing programs which aid needy students, and will call for their expansion when it is indicated . . . I intend to make the new Administration one which will not allow men's worlds to remain closed to those who need only money."

It is not only for fiscal 1970 that the Nixon Administration is now closing men's worlds. Funds to promote the Higher Education Facilities Act also have been drastically reduced—a reduction which will mean inescapably that colleges will lack the physical plant to accommodate young men and women seeking higher education in the years ahead. Commissions on Higher Education set up in all parts of the country have recommended substantial Federal grants and loans for construction purposes. Funds for Title I of the Act, designed to promote the building of undergraduate academic facilities, have been slashed to a minor fraction of what the commissions recommended; under the proposed budget, only $43 million is requested for this program, of which about $60,000 might be allocated to the District of Columbia. This will not go very far in financing the $17 million planned by D.C. colleges and universities for the construction of academic facilities in fiscal 1970. The President's budget recommends no funds at all for the construction of graduate academic facilities.

Can this Nation reclaim the trust and allegiance of its young by disinheriting them?

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I can assure you that the concern about the underfunding of higher education is not just from the Washington Post. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Education of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I am in receipt of all too many letters explicitly stating just how the cutback in funds will hurt developing colleges and universities; ruin student aid programs; and thwart growing and diversified curriculums.

How does one explain to a young student, who has been accepted at college that the Federal Government cannot afford to loan him or her $400 for tuition. How can we in good conscience allow the curtailing of programs, as is evidenced by the table prepared by the American Council on Education, which denotes that Student Aid Funds available to be dispersed amount to only 67 percent of the requests received? I ask unanimous consent that the table I am speaking of, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STUDENT AID FUNDS FOR 1969–70 AMOUNT TO 67 PERCENT OF REQUESTS

Funds for three major Federal student aid programs in the coming 1969–70 academic

year amount to only 67 percent of the approved requests from colleges and universities, according to information obtained from the U.S. Office of Education.

An estimated $461 million will be available in the coming academic year for the three programs—the National Defense Student Loan (NDSL), College Work-Study (CWS), and Educational Opportunity Grants (EOG) programs. This compares with $682 million in approved requests from higher education institutions. The institutions originally asked for $814 million, but regional panels which reviewed their requests approved only the $682 million figure.

As the following chart shows, for the current academic year, available funds met 80 percent of approved requests, and for the preceding year met 85 percent. Figures shown are in millions of dollars for each of the three programs. The figures for the EOG program are divided into three parts: (1) new, or initial year grants, (2) renewal grants, and (3) bonuses previously allowed recipients who maintained an academic standing in the upper half of their class.

	1967–68			1968–69			1969–70		
	Institutional request	Panel approved	Available funds	Institutional request	Panel approved	Available funds	Institutional request	Panel approved	Available funds
NDSL	$243	$230	$190	$270	$247	$190	$318	$273	[1] $155
CWS	174	159	131	233	198	162	275	219	[2] 161
EOG:									
Initial	65	57	50	83	73	68	120	99	54
Renewal	48	48	48	72	70	69	101	91	91
Bonus	11	11	11	19	17	1			
Total	541	505	430	677	605	490	814	682	461

[1] Since the NDSL is funded from current fiscal year appropriations, the actual amount available will not be known until the HEW appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 is passed. The $155,000,000, figure is the amount requested in the budget for the 1970 fiscal year.
[2] The CWS program during an academic year is funded in part from the current fiscal year appropriations and partfrom the previous fiscal year, so the exact amount available for the latter part of the coming academic year will not be known until the fiscal 1970 HEW appropriation bill is passed. The EOG program for the coming academic year is funded entirely from money already appropriated.

The estimated funds for the NDSL program would provide loans for about 398,000 students, compared with 442,000 in the current academic year. The EOG funds will aid 280,600 students, 100,200 through initial year grants and 180,400 with renewal grants. This compares with EOG aid to 271,100 students this year—140,500 with initial grants and 130,600 with renewal grants. The USOE estimates that the CWS funds will provide assistance to about 375,000 students, compared with 395,000 this year.

On pages 4 and 5 appear state-by-state breakdowns of institutional requests for the three programs (initial year awards only for EOG), the amounts approved by the review panels, and the estimated percentage of approved requests to be met by funds available. All three charts are subject to some degree of adjustment later. The EOG chart shows a total of $68.1 million for initial year grants, rather than $54 million on the overall chart above. The $54 million figure assumes that all renewal grants would be funded in full, while the $68.1 million figure does not. The USOE is permitting institutions to make initial year awards up to a total of $68.1 million with the proviso that institutions can transfer initial year funds to renewal year awards if necessary to meet their obligations to returning students.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND NATIONAL AFFAIRS

	National defense student loan program, 1969–70				College work-study program, 1969–70			Educational opportunity grants—initial awards, 1969–70			
	Institutional request	Panel approved	Funds available	Percent	Institutional request	Panel approved	Estimated percent	Institutional request	Panel approved	Funds available	Percent
Total	$317,873,424	$273,322,121	$155,000,000		$274,969,531	$219,327,606	74	$119,549,871	$98,707,386	$68,137,040	
Alabama	5,559,358	4,567,605	2,205,761	48.82	7,597,656	5,251,083	87	3,020,511	2,427,697	1,135,047	48.00
Alaska	112,658	112,658	66,443	58.98	377,443	318,000	60	55,500	47,500	29,874	62.89
Arizona	3,602,825	3,283,433	1,751,328	56.59	2,725,957	2,221,318	68	1,492,625	1,189,700	704,789	66.19
Arkansas	3,146,082	2,618,760	1,475,439	56.81	5,070,279	4,319,866	61	1,483,480	1,155,815	659,784	57.40
California	26,869,187	23,824,224	15,617,366	67.63	29,079,401	24,133,981	60	10,216,455	8,593,000	6,743,199	82.43
Colorado	5,268,638	5,217,574	2,271,173	45.33	3,730,432	3,695,386	60	1,803,586	1,726,095	892,782	59.16
Connecticut	3,474,497	3,465,331	1,936,537	55.88	3,373,069	2,723,998	56	1,041,300	960,500	849,996	90.65
Delaware	719,722	399,874	296,000	74.02	431,962	345,900	90	362,150	356,100	91,728	48.00
District of Columbia	3,412,894	2,276,734	1,313,675	62.98	3,350,656	1,894,303	62	515,320	500,850	500,850	100.00
Florida	7,658,976	6,566,140	3,685,089	56.12	7,042,950	5,492,481	85	3,289,079	2,428,592	1,598,722	68.23
Georgia	4,911,080	4,366,779	2,624,771	61.28	4,595,480	3,631,244	100	2,361,625	2,038,868	1,161,031	58.34
Hawaii	618,704	604,103	400,396	100.00	719,023	675,652	70	150,600	150,600	150,600	100.00
Idaho	996,507	926,156	645,988	69.75	1,229,970	1,008,333	60	268,100	268,100	266,533	100.00
Illinois	14,035,951	13,580,918	7,662,447	57.06	12,497,003	10,804,793	60	4,745,427	4,469,097	3,407,795	77.51
Indiana	10,587,483	9,935,285	4,314,574	44.89	3,938,725	3,482,860	100	2,551,212	2,315,534	1,877,875	81.11
Iowa	7,664,962	6,666,606	3,015,537	45.31	3,619,479	2,817,245	94	2,148,190	1,611,150	1,340,735	85.48
Kansas	5,330,815	4,809,668	2,637,901	54.92	3,854,041	3,123,134	61	2,087,700	1,586,960	1,175,557	75.14
Kentucky	4,938,555	4,166,986	2,418,499	59.35	5,537,984	3,942,215	68	2,032,482	1,683,903	1,085,531	65.16
Louisiana	4,223,499	3,675,058	2,906,134	79.82	4,650,012	3,972,817	100	1,477,120	1,343,375	1,306,701	97.27
Maine	1,659,655	1,556,080	625,202	40.93	1,345,324	1,191,334	65	428,150	401,650	278,601	69.99
Maryland	3,253,403	2,720,395	2,297,195	84.44	2,205,869	1,889,368	100	1,156,781	845,396	842,156	100.00
Massachusetts	16,007,471	13,665,368	5,725,832	42.66	14,332,324	11,870,188	61	3,158,550	2,853,150	2,548,358	92.32
Michigan	12,886,155	12,492,915	7,039,070	56.63	7,618,731	6,634,181	92	4,867,077	4,453,144	3,078,074	71.08
Minnesota	8,116,187	7,790,918	3,684,454	47.82	5,697,491	4,901,434	65	2,826,220	2,425,335	1,650,323	68.31
Mississippi	5,661,412	3,895,456	1,861,287	47.78	6,164,722	4,573,362	80	2,755,604	1,755,164	817,867	49.00
Missouri	8,019,845	7,189,538	3,970,379	55.57	4,976,479	4,216,213	95	2,742,753	2,237,482	1,777,335	79.91
Montana	1,476,878	1,296,170	700,015	54.01	4,665,171	4,357,031	63	645,575	593,125	306,299	53.06
Nebraska	2,775,618	2,561,908	1,495,750	58.76	2,030,892	1,830,031	64	1,137,560	899,640	638,428	75.23
Nevada	597,271	425,181	181,360	42.65	674,700	591,120	59	173,700	129,000	81,540	63.21
New Hampshire	1,807,757	1,440,152	647,734	44.98	1,818,546	1,272,394	61	568,950	456,350	285,438	63.82
New Jersey	5,517,808	4,544,329	2,747,066	62.12	5,163,952	3,823,740	92	2,289,997	1,831,329	1,183,635	68.03
New Mexico	1,915,723	1,817,018	830,641	45.71	2,760,706	2,153,498	61	850,752	723,269	368,360	53.41
New York	28,589,688	22,451,081	12,249,659	55.23	23,769,289	16,024,591	66	13,094,063	11,320,412	5,182,117	49.94
North Carolina	7,574,469	5,428,245	3,683,025	68.74	8,162,010	5,963,738	96	4,626,755	2,675,519	1,618,187	61.44
North Dakota	2,671,731	2,060,068	764,158	37.61	1,565,317	1,404,887	60	654,280	532,080	343,050	64.57
Ohio	16,678,208	15,265,021	7,545,745	50.49	7,565,418	6,473,408	100	3,973,301	3,624,911	3,368,761	93.52
Oklahoma	6,840,031	4,663,340	2,653,213	58.08	5,234,045	3,857,006	67	2,035,393	1,450,453	1,192,999	82.25
Oregon	4,178,373	3,569,683	2,050,780	60.60	8,394,234	5,461,138	62	2,019,366	1,406,798	906,164	65.65
Pennsylvania	14,692,558	12,351,520	7,811,837	64.28	9,283,305	6,964,743	100	4,158,533	3,474,995	3,470,860	100.00
Rhode Island	2,146,595	1,824,845	881,298	48.29	843,351	732,351	95	567,350	533,450	392,189	74.28
South Carolina	3,135,451	2,759,676	1,472,346	55.78	2,340,031	1,917,515	100	1,915,035	1,387,763	625,139	48.00
South Dakota	2,654,367	2,210,969	746,942	34.53	1,656,623	1,285,548	62	573,710	474,550	335,837	70.77
Tennessee	7,307,343	6,313,274	3,178,017	51.66	7,021,569	5,646,593	67	4,049,235	3,174,574	1,498,476	48.00
Texas	13,574,275	9,583,747	8,555,051	97.77	12,945,427	10,749,095	90	6,124,748	4,862,424	3,829,301	79.11
Utah	1,458,984	1,367,227	1,367,227	100.00	2,685,170	1,912,858	60	857,283	738,035	738,035	100.00
Vermont	1,069,963	994,633	492,990	49.57	667,952	532,918	77	421,800	361,450	221,634	61.32
Virginia	4,192,709	3,534,096	2,525,919	71.93	3,277,185	2,652,399	100	1,621,547	1,229,372	1,118,206	92.38
Washington	5,268,473	4,896,912	3,236,407	67.14	5,019,294	4,222,168	62	1,927,688	1,806,573	1,447,211	80.55
West Virginia	2,715,884	2,161,456	1,474,448	68.22	2,666,698	2,193,643	90	1,034,066	842,965	662,995	78.65
Wisconsin	8,355,066	7,741,458	3,894,018	50.70	7,279,561	6,482,705	60	3,686,449	3,294,898	1,729,120	53.14
Wyoming	651,783	647,653	331,979	51.26	898,302	873,478	59	326,323	297,994	143,729	50.09
Guam					131,922	131,922	100	12,600	12,600	10,576	83.94
Puerto Rico	1,283,845	1,031,845	1,030,685	99.89	666,299	666,299	100	1,159,215	741,100	463,411	62.53
Virgin Islands	6,052	6,052	3,213	53.09	20,100	20,100	100	7,000	7,000	3,500	50.00

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I call upon the administration to review its priorities and give thought to full funding for all educational programs. It is an investment which we cannot allow to lapse.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11:30 A.M.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, under the order previously entered, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 13, 1969, at 11:30 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 12, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Richard Funkhouser, of New Jersey, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Gabon Republic.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. Maurice F. Weisner, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. John B. Colwell, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt, U.S. Marine Corps, for appointment to the grade of general while serving as Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named midshipmen (Naval Academy) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Guy H. Able III
Paul L. Achenbach, Jr.
Bruce C. Adams
John H. Adams
Robert H. Adamson
Christopher L. Addison
Robert A. Ahrens
David J. Alexander
Paul A. Alfieri
Charles E. Allen
Harry K. Allison
Barry M. Amos
Robert J. Amundson
Gerald J. Anderson, Jr.
Jonathan L. Anderson
Edward P. Anglim
Stanley R. Antrim, Jr.
Anthony F. Apollaro
Hubert E. Archambo, Jr.
Eric A. Arlien
Harold R. Armet
Keith J. Arneson
Robert G. Arnold
John M. Atturio
John C. Auriemma
Douglas P. Ayers
James W. Ayres, Jr.
James A. Babb
Mario J. Bagaglio, Jr.
Robert W. Ballew
James S. Bangert
Edward G. Bannat
Mark Barbero
Arnold W. Barden, Jr.
James H. Barnett
Frank O. Barrett III
Ronnie L. Barrow
Brian J. Barry
Richard J. Bartlett
James E. Baskerville
Richard E. Batdorf
John C. Bathgate
Hugh N. Batten, Jr.
Duane P. Battles
Robert O. Baylis
Bradley S. Beall
Thomas J. Belichic
Albert E. Bennett, Jr.
Robert D. Bennett
Claire M. Beucler
Charles T. Biddle, Jr.
George E. Bieda
Terrence L. Bingman
Douglas S. Bishop
John E. Bishop
Peter D. Blackledge
Robert D. Blakely
John W. Blaue
Nelson A. Blish
John H. Bodine
David E. Bogosian
Dwight K. Bohm
Michael J. Bohoskey
James A. Boland
John F. Bone
Oliver A. Boucher, Jr.
Joseph C. Boudreaux III
John C. Bowen
Robert W. Boynton
William A. Bramley III
Jerome S. Branum
Wayne J. Braunstein
William L. Breckinridge VI
Edward M. Brelsford
Lawrence J. Brenner
Eric D. Bries
Gale D. Brink
Randolph M. Brooks
William E. Brooks III
John C. Broome
Gregory C. Brown
John S. Brown
Norman F. Brown
Richard F. Brown, Jr.
Robert B. Brown
Gregory W. Brubeck
William L. Bruckner, Jr.
Stanley W. Bryant
John S. Buckingham
Paul J. Bugelski
Richard L. Bulger
John M. Bunker
Charles T. Burbage
Thomas J. Burdick
Dennis P. Burke
Stephen M. Burkhalter
David S. Burlin
Dennis E. Burton
Dennis R. Bussey
Charles L. Butler
Charles T. Butler III
Robert W. Byles
Thomas M. Byrne
George W. Cairnes III
Leonard J. Callan
Patrick F. Callan
Gerald E. Campbell
Christopher J. Carlson
James R. Carlson
Hubert M. Carmichael, Jr.
John X. Carrier II
Charles R. Carroll
David E. Carter
Bobby W. Carver
Richard A. Cataldi
John F. Cates, Jr.
Lawrence J. Cavaiola
Thomas J. Cavanaugh
Kenneth C. Cech
Michael A. Chafee
Peter S. Chalfant
Eric J. Challain
Dudley H. Chase
John M. Chevrier
Ronald L. Christenson
Carl S. Christiansen
Albert T. Church III
William M. Cima
Alfred L. Cipriani
Kevin S. Clancy
Michael R. Clapsadl
John F. Clark
Michael B. Clark
Thomas F. Cleverdon
William F. Clifford
John M. Cochrane
James E. Code
Anthony V. Colantoni
Walter D. Coleman, Jr.
William E. Coleman
Dennis F. Colin
John P. Collins
Robert W. Conger, Jr.
William C. Conkle
Albert S. Conlon
Kevin P. Connors
Philip F. Connors
John W. Conrad
Harry P. Consaul III
Philip O. Conti
Pemberton Cooley III
Thomas J. Corcoran
William K. Coxe, Jr.
Jeffrey D. Crawford
Charles T. Creekman, Jr.
Dale W. Crisp
Marvin H. Crisp
John M. Croake
Thomas P. Cruser
Robert R. Cuccias, Jr.
James P. Culet
Terrence V. Cullen
Frederick T. Cumminger III
Walter J. Cummings
William E. Cummins, Jr.
Robert F. Cunliffe
Frank J. Curnow
David K. Daggett
Thomas J. Daley
Richard A. D'arezzo
Bruce C. Davey
James A. Davidson
Henry G. Davison
Thomas R. Day
Clifford L. Deets
David G. Deininger
Richard M. Dempsey
Norman R. Depp
Peter J. Devries, Jr.
Ronald A. Dibble
Lawrence F. Diddlemeyer
Terry M. Dillon
Michael T. Dinnegan, Jr.
Augusto J. Dionizio, Jr.
Maurice H. Docton
Kenneth E. Dodge
Gerald T. Doempke
James E. Dolan, Jr.
Michael F. Donilon
John E. Donovan
Andrew S. Dowd, Jr.
Gerald J. Downey, Jr.
Christopher B. Doyel
David O. Drew
Eddie L. Duckworth
David F. Dudek
Harrison G. Dudley, Jr.
Russell A. Duke, Jr.
James N. Eagle II
George H. Eastwood
Ronald G. Eby
Lawrence I. Eckerman
Jack K. Edgar
Carl H. Edmonds
David A. Ehemann
Kenton W. Elderkin
Patrick W. Elliott
James O. Ellis, Jr.
Craig W. Elmore
Brian D. Engler
David M. Enman
Steven C. Epperson
Melvin R. Etheridge, Jr.
Thomas H. Etter
Harold R. Eustis
John C. Everett
Ward S. Everhart
Thomas E. Fahy
Larry W. Falls
Leo J. Faneuf III
John H. Feder
Thomas R. Fedyszyn
James L. Feeney
John A. Felten
John D. Fernie
Edwin B. Finison
Myles A. Fisher
Jeffrey H. Flannery
Richard P. Floyd, Jr.
George W. Foote
Mark L. Ford
Anthony M. Fortino
Robert M. Fortson III
Thomas V. Fowler
Robert E. Frangione
John C. Franzoni, Jr.
Donald E. Freed
William Y. Frentzel II
Joseph J. Fulbright, Jr.
Frederick M. Furland
Gerald L. Gallagher
Antone J. Gallaher
Albert J. R. Galus
Richard D. Gano
John E. Gantley
Donald E. Garavito
Lester O. Gardner, Jr.
Spencer L. Garrett
Maurice A. Gauthier
Fred A. Geisler
Michael P. Gembol
Michael G. Genrich
Danny L. George
Louis J. Giannotti
Thomas R. Gibbs
Scott G. Gier
James T. Gierucki
Robert C. Gillaspie
Thomas R. Gillespie II
Walter R. Giraldi
Wayne E. Girardet
Dennis W. Glass
Gary C. Goodmundson
Hugh G. Goodwin
George M. Gordon
Howard P. Gorman, Jr.
Robert M. Gray
Gordon M. Green
Joseph M. Greene, Jr.
William R. Grimm
Edward F. Gritzen II
David E. Grove
Terry L. Grumley
James R. Guilfoyle
Gregg G. Gullickson
Ronald D. Gumbert, Jr.
Joseph M. Gunter
James E. Gutmann
Edward J. Hackett
Michael J. Haddon
Thomas F. Hagan
Alan R. Hager
Michael R. Hall
Michael T. Hallett
Howard J. Halliday, Jr.
Thomas E. Halwachs
James W. Hamburg
Gregory L. Hansen
Stephan A. Hanvey
Michael A. Harbin
Clay W. Hardin
Deck E. Harrell
James D. Harris
John D. Harris, Jr.
Robert F. Hartman III
John B. Hawkins, Jr.
Robert K. Hawkins, Jr.
John P. Hazelrig
Lonnie P. Hearne
Michael L. Heidel
Gary W. Hein
Jeffrey M. Hellrung
David M. Heming
Randall S. Henderson
Roger H. Henderson
Roger W. Herrman
Simon A. Hershon
Michael D. Hess
Michael J. Hester
Benjamin H. Hicks, Jr.
Harold S. Hicks, Jr.
James B. Higgins
James C. Higgins III
Simeon G. Higgins, Jr.
John E. Hilburn
Ronald E. Hills
Richard S. Hillyer
Jarvis G. Hilton
Robert C. Hinckley
Jonathan T. Hine, Jr.
Charles A. Hoffman
Clinton N. Holeman
Thomas J. Holleman
Michael K. Hollis
Michael L. Honey
Eric C. Honour
James A. Hooper IV
Thomas F. House, Jr.
Bryan Hrabosky, Jr.
Steven A. Hudock
James H. Huff III
Conway L. Hunt
William D. Hurley
Robert L. Hutchings
John R. Hutchison
Umberto C. Iacuaniello II
John W. Jacobs
Ronald Jadlocki
William R. James
Philip C. Jamison
Jack Hays Janes
Michael P. Jarina
David C. Jarrett
Gerald W. Jenkins
David B. Jennings
Franklin J. Jensen, Jr.
Michael K. Johannsen
James A. Johnesee
Charles C. Johnson
Stephen D. Johnson
Thomas P. Johnson
Paul S. Johnston
Fred W. Jones
Fredrick E. Jones
Gregory B. Jones
Meade A. Jones, Jr.
Michael K. Jones
Michael O. Jones
Stephen W. Josephson
Charles L. Joslin III
David S. Juarin
Royal D. Joslin
George W. Jurand
William F. Kachergus, Jr.
John D. H. Kane III
George J. Kanupka III
Charles C. Karlan
John J. Kearley
James T. Kearns
Leo J. Kelleher III
Joseph F. Keller
James B. Kelley
James M. Kenney
William Kernan, Jr.
Gregory J. Kieffer
Milo J. Kilmer II
James M. Kimmel
Ralph H. Kindelberger
Earl E. Kindstrom
Brian E. Kinsley
James D. Kirby
Thomas M. Kirby
Douglas C. Kirk
Richard G. Kirkland
Jerome D. Kislia
Howard K. Kline
Thomas E. Klocek
Robert C. Klosterman
Robert B. Klugh
Roland B. Knapp
Robert D. Knowlton
James Knubel
Kenneth W. Koch
Frank R. Kockler
Robert G. Kokstein
Jerry D. Kolman
Donald C. Kosloff
Nile R. Kraft
Theodore C. Kral
James Kras
Clifford L. Kratt
Duane Krum
Peter W. Kruse
Henry J. Kucinski, Jr.
Robert Kuginskie

William D. Kuntz
Stephen J. Kuppe
John A. LaTourrette
Ronald L. Ladd
Thomas W. LaForce
Jack W. Lahren
Philip C. Lame
Alan L. Lane
Kenneth E. Lange
Samuel H. Larsen
James W. Latham
Glenn D. Lattig
Roland D. Laurenzo
Dale B. Lawson
William J. Laz, Jr.
Stephen J. Leaman
Robert L. Ledbetter III
Edward J. Lehre
Robert J. Lemke
Craig M. Lemrow
Ronald P. Lessmann
Michael F. Lettieri
Billy M. Lewis
John M. Lewis II
Stephen L. Lieberman
Douglas V. Liebschner
Creighton D. Lilly, Jr.
Stephen M. Lind
Dan H. Lochner
Robert J. Logan
Richard W. Long
Michael T. Lops
John M. Lounge
Freddie P. Lounsberry
David M. Lumsden
Richard I. Lyles III
Edward A. Lyons II
William P. McCauley
Calvin P. McClain, Jr.
William C. McClain, Jr.
Malcolm W. McClellan, Jr.
Leonard D. McCumber, Jr.
Robert J. McDevitt
James F. McGovern
Steven W. McHenry
James B. McIlvaine
George S. McInchok, Jr.
Charles E. McKeldin, Jr.
Owen D. McLean
David L. McLintock
Edwin H. McMahon, Jr.
William S. McMurry
Maurice M. McNeil, Jr.
Oscar N. McNeil, Jr.
David A. McPherson
Thomas W. McQueen
Joseph S. MacDougall
Robert D. MacIver
William A. Mackey, Jr.
John C. Maggi
David B. Maher, Jr.
John P. Maley
Michael J. Malone
Robert D. Mansfield
Paul A. Marsh
John J. Marshall
John R. Marshall
Jack "E" Martin
James W. Martin
Richard W. Martin
Guy T. Mascari
John M. Masica
Eric E. Matchette III
George W. Mather
Barry J. Mathis
Neil G. Mathison
Heinz G. Maurer
Glenn J. Maus, Jr.
George G. Maxwell
James H. Maxwell
Hamilton K. Maynard
Robert E. Mayo
William R. Medford
Paul R. Meeker
Albert G. Mertz
Thomas D. Meteer
Frederick H. Michaelis, Jr.
Michael J. Milchanowski
John T. Miles
John H. Miller
William R. Miller
John G. Mitchell
Thomas W. Mitchell, Jr.
Robert L. Moeller, Jr.
James W. Moffit, Jr.
James W. Molloy
George M. Moore
Harry R. Moore II
Mitchell D. Moore
Robert D. Moore
Terry A. Moore
Wayne T. Moore
Gary W. Moran
Michael Carter Morgan
Michael Charles Morgan
Newton H. Morgan, Jr.
Michael F. Morrell
Raymond J. Morris, Jr.
Ronald P. Moseley
William J. C. Moses
Gerald A. Motta
Ronald R. Mueller
Douglas F. Muir
John F. Mulderig
Alden F. Mullins, Jr.
Robert D. Mullins
Jay M. Munninghoff
Thomas P. Murach
Dennis M. Murphy
Edward J. Murzinski
Donald H. Nash
John D. Nash
Thomas R. Nastro
Charles W. Nation, Jr.
David A. Neale
Earnest L. Neighbors III
Robert R. Neumann
Michael S. Newman
John W. Newton
William H. Newton III
James J. Norconk, Jr.
Paul D. Oberender
John M. O'Brien
Gerald J. O'Donnell
John F. Ohlinger
Timothy W. Oliver
Barry W. O'Neal
Edward J. O'Neil
Carl H. Oosterman
Lynn C. Orfgen
Brian O'Rourke
Gary J. Overbeck
Gregg R. Overbeck
David C. Overheim
Michael J. Packard
James R. Paddock
John B. Padgett III
David W. Parsons
James W. Pattison
Michael A. Payne
Robert T. Pearce, Jr.
Charles E. Pehl
John K. Pell
Richard K. Perkins
Bryan L. Person
Jerome L. Petykowski
Landon B. Phillips, Jr.
Robert W. Phillips, Jr.
Thomas L. Phillips
Monroe G. Piland III
Carroll A. Pitman
Ronald L. Pitman
Dennis W. Plank
Edwin A. Platt
John R. Plett
Rudy E. Plummer
William P. Poirier
Gary R. Polansky
Michael W. Pole
Charles F. Posey
Miles B. Potter
Edwin S. Potts
John E. Prairie
John R. Pratchios
Gene H. Price
Walter W. Price III
William A. Proses
David L. Prosser
George M. Prout
Michael J. Provencher
Richard F. Puckett
Frederick D. Puncke, Jr.
Charles H. Quandel
Stephen M. Quennoz
Gregory F. Quillinan
Marshall E. Rachmiel
Robert L. Rachor, Jr.
Leslie J. Reading
James A. Reaghard
Roy W. Reeber
Richard R. Reece
William C. Reed
Ronald E. Reedy
Thomas B. Reeve, Jr.
James A. Reid
Robert G. Reid, Jr.
Peter R. Renfree
Robert L. Reusche II
Richard J. Rhoades
Robert E. Riera, Jr.
Joseph C. Rieth, Jr.
Roy C. Rieve
Michael P. Rishel
Bernard U. Ritzert, Jr.
Richard A. Robbins
Francis A. Roberts
William L. Robinson
John A. Roeder
William W. Rogalski, Jr.
Roger K. Roosa
David O. Rose
Paul F. Ross
Louis F. Rubano
David H. Ruddock
Richard K. Rufner
Charles P. Rush
Robert C. Russell, Jr.
George R. Sadler
Michael R. Salewske
John L. Sams
Robert J. Sanderson
Valentino Santos
George S. Sara
Michael A. Saraniero
William C. Sauls, Jr.
Gerald J. Saunders
Thomas F. Sauntry
Lawrence M. Schadegg
Charles A. Schaefer
Robert M. Scharnus
Paul H. Scherf, Jr.
Robert T. Schram
William V. Schwarzenbach
Edward G. Schwier
Roger L. Scofield
Andrew M. Scott
Donald M. Scott
John C. Scrapper
John J. Scully
Ronald M. Sedgley
Kenneth W. Seltmann
Peter M. Settle
Patrick M. Sherbak
John R. Shinovich, Jr.
Stephen S. Shumlas
Stanley A. Shustak, Jr.
William F. Sigler
Eric C. Simmons
Nils A. Sjostrom
James B. Slaight IV
Michael L. Slonecker
Baker A. Smith
Charles A. Smith
Gary L. Smith
James C. Smith III
Michael S. Smith
Michael T. Smith
Peter M. Smith
Thomas H. Smith, Jr.
Charles F. Snyder III
James L. Solberg
Bradley W. Spahr
Brian L. Specht
James W. Speer
Robert G. Sprigg
David A. Spriggs
Wesley C. Stanfield
Frank E. Stenstrom
John Z. Stepien
Guy H. Stevens, Jr.
Jack M. Stevens, Jr.
James D. Stevens
William H. Stieglitz
John J. Stockdale
Jackson A. Stockton, Jr.
Ralph H. Stoll
Robert F. Stoss
Michael G. Strand
John H. Strauss
Patrick A. Stroop
Roy H. Suberly, Jr.
John D. Sullivan
Patrick D. Sullivan
Timothy J. Sullivan
Michael T. Swanson
Paul A. Swanson
William A. Tait
Carl M. Tankersley
Walter M. Teesdale
Terrence N. Tehan
George P. Terwilliger
Kenneth W. Tevebaugh II
Arthur G. Teves
Roland C. Thatcher III
Lawrence S. Thomson
Denis C. Tierney
Steven G. Tinsley
Donald D. Tippett
Benjamin W. Tipton III
Robert A. Tolhurst, Jr.
Thomas P. Tonden
David A. Townsend
Lawrence W. Townsend
David C. Trimble, Jr.
Paul C. Tsamtsis
James H. Tulley, Jr.
Archie A. Turner III
George N. Tzavaras
Ray M. Umbarger
Mark A. Unhjem
Thomas E. Utegaard
Thommy H. VanBrunt
Andrew G. VanSant
Julian T. VanWinkle
Roger P. VeHorn
Richard J. Veltman
Thomas J. Verrengia
David G. Vetter
Edward J. Waitt, Jr.
Edward G. Wallace
James G. Wallfred
James M. Walters
Thomas J. Wandishin
Terry S. Wanner
James C. Ward
James Gearey Ward
Mark A. Warner
Paul G. Warner
Richard G. Warren
James F. Watson
Michael J. Watson
Neal W. Weisberg
Patrick T. Welsh
George F. Wenchel
Glenn R. Whaley
Alan J. Whitby
John S. White
Nestor D. White
Charles R. Wienke
Scott G. Wiggett
Donald E. Wilcox, Jr.
George A. Wildridge, Jr.
Thomas J. Wilkes, Jr.
Harold A. Williams
Russell L. Willis, Jr.
John W. Wilson
Samuel E. Wilson III
William R. Wilson
Keith A. Winters
Gerald T. Witowski
Thomas J. Wojciechowski
Richard A. Wolf
William B. Wood, Jr.
Berryman E. Woodruff III
John G. Woods
Richard A. Woodworth
Michael J. Worley
Richard A. Wrobel
Michael E. Wulf
Lawrence R. Yarnell, Jr.
Dennis A. Yatras
John R. Young
Richard A. Young
Michael E. Younker
Alfred E. Yudes, Jr.
David B. Zerfoss
Peter B. Zuidema

The following-named U.S. Army Cadets to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard S. Ploss
Clifford "T" Rock, Jr.
William Alphonse Schroeder III

The following named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

David V. Edling
Lief W. Erickson
Joseph W. Haddock III
Kenneth J. Hollett
James B. Horsley
Edward L. Niebruegge, Jr.
Timothy L. Stewart

The following named (Naval enlisted scientific education program candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bert M. Anderson
Jonathan E. Browning
David L. Francis
Stephen A. Hulsizer
Richard A. Miller III
David F. Warren

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Robert F. Birtcil, Jr.
Thomas J. Merlo
Francis J. Robertello

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

John F. Clymer
Robert D. Staub

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jim D. Anderson
Stephen S. Arendale
Thomas A. Augustine, Jr.
David A. Cross
John L. Curry
Brian D. Geary
Kevin T. Geraci
John B. Giedraitis
George G. Hancock II
David F. Harder
Fred T. Kimbrell, Jr.
Charles R. King
Brian G. McAlary
Alice M. Martinson
Clyde K. Meade
Joseph H. Robinson
Philip R. Severy
Charles E. Stuckey

Nicolas E. Walsh (Air Force cadet) to be a permanent ensign in the line of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Aanerud, Kenneth D.
Abbot, Charles S.
Abel, Arthur P.
Abraham, Michael, III
Abston, "J" "B"
Acker, James E.
Ackerson, Jeffrey T.
Adams, Edgar W.
Adams, John B.
Adams, Kenneth K.
Adams, Merchant S.
Adams, Robert B., Jr.
Adams, Russel M.
Adkins, Freeman F.
Aeschleman, Vance E., Jr.
Affeld, Richard L.
Aiken, Edwin W.
Aker, Robert E., Jr.
Akst, "H" Gordon
Albright, David L.
Albritton, William H.
Alcon, Charles A.
Alexander, Samuel J.
Alleman, Alfred D.
Allen, Layton S., Jr.
Alley, Stephen D.
Almon, John S.
Ameel, Frederick D.
Amerine, David B.
Amme, Richard D.
Anderson, Gene G.
Anderson, William A.
Andersook, Walter
Andrade, John R.
Andrews, Michael W.
Andrews, Roger M.
Andruchow, Paul
Angel, James B.
Angleton, John M.
Antle, William S., III
Applewhite, Barry A.
Appling, Bobby C.
Arbogast, John E.
Arendt, Steven M.
Arje, Andrew C.
Arkwright, Gale T.
Armstrong, Roland J.
Arnold, Gavin D.
Arnold John K.
Arrington, Farlin W.
Arthur, James C.
Ash, Richard W.
Ashworth, David B.
Aubrey, Richard C.
Austin, Julian L.
Bach, Ronald C.
Badger, Richard L.
Bagby, Joseph T.
Bahn, Theodore I.
Bailey, John G.
Bailing, Timothy D.
Baird, Leo J. M.
Baker, Dennis
Baker, James W.
Baker, Richard F.
Bald, Reynald A.
Ball, John G.
Ballew, Jackie C.
Balsam, Carl E.
Bandy, Robert F.
Baranowski, William
Barber, Robert L.
Barbero, Frank, Jr.
Barchi, Richard H.
Barnes, John W., Jr.
Barnett, Burnice E., Jr.
Barnett, Peter A.
Barnette, Richard T.
Barnhart, Carl F.
Barr, William S.
Barry, Thomas J.
Bartel, Edward D.
Barton, Jon H.
Bates, George M.
Bauer, Russell C.
Baum, Scott R.
Baumhardt, Robert J.
Beachy, John S.
Beakes, John H., Jr.
Beal, Robert E.
Beard, Timothy R.
Beattie, David J.
Beaulier, Jerome E.
Beck, Andrew C., II
Beck, Robert L.
Becker, George L.
Beckett, Robert S.
Bedford, Thomas J., Jr.
Beeby, Gered H.
Beede, William P.
Beesley, James B.
Bell, Adolf H.
Beith, William R.
Belangia, William R.
Bell, Roy M. R.
Bellas, Robert C., Jr.
Bellman, Terry R.
Benator, Barry I.
Benedict, Crawford L.
Bennett, Sterling N.
Benson, Frank A.
Benton, Robert R., Jr.
Benzin, Robert W.
Bereza, Richard A.
Berg, Steven K.
Bergen, Laurence M., Jr.
Berkebile, Donald F.
Berkline, Kelly R.
Bernard, Gilbert C., Jr.
Bernier, Joseph P.
Bernier, Thomas R.
Betts, Craig R.
Beveridge, Bernard E.
Bickel, Roger B.
Biery, George M., II
Bill, David S., III
Bina, William F., III
Birchfield, Robert B.
Birkmaier, William B., Jr.
Bishop, Ernest F.
Bishop, John W., Jr.
Bisti, Joseph C.
Bitten, Ernest J.
Bixler, Michael B.
Bixler, Paul W.
Black, Evan "J."
Blair, Foster J., II
Blakeney, James H.
Blanchard, Mark W.
Bledsoe, Samuel
Blekicki, Walter C.
Blinn, Gary R.
Blocksom, Roland D., Jr.
Blount, Thomas E., Jr.
Bock, Thomas H.
Bockhold, George, Jr.
Bogert, Gary M.
Bohling, Peter H.
Bokesch, William M.
Bona, Richard A.
Bone, Robert E.
Boone, Victor F.
Bopp, Frederick, III
Bouck, David W.
Boughner, Thomas K.
Bowden, Gurnie G.
Bowenkamp, Robert D.
Bowman, Frank L.
Bowser, Rex J.
Boyce, Brian F.
Boyd, Cecil A. K., II
Boyd, Thomas A.
Boyette, James R.
Boyhan, Thomas C.
Boyle, David W.
Boynton, Robert W., Jr.
Bozzelli, Philip A.
Braden, James D.
Brady, Terrence J.
Brady, Thomas M.
Branco, Robert J.
Brennan, Neil H.
Breuer, David P.
Brice, Robert G.
Brilliant, Irwin J.
Brindle, Mark P.
Brinn, Stephen J.
Brinser, John R.
Brittenham, John C.
Brix, Christian W., Jr.
Brockman, Robert J.
Broderick, Thomas P.
Brooks, Nicholas G.
Brooks, Robert A.
Broome, Norval L.
Broomall, Anthony W.
Brosee, Manfred N.
Broughton, Thomas G.
Brown, Michael I.
Brown, Richard E.
Brown, Ronald N.
Browning, David L.
Brownley, Lawrence L.
Brudno, Robert J.
Bruggeman, Alan R.
Brunk, Thomas E.
Bryant, David A.
Bryant, Franklin S.
Bryant, Lee W.
Buchanan, William J.
Bucher, Lawrence C.
Buckingham, James R.
Buckley, Victor P.
Buege, Paul S.
Buletza, Peter G.
Bumann, Timothy P.
Bunch, Gerald D.
Bunge, Thomas E.
Burger, James F.
Burke, Bryan, J.
Burke, James G.
Burke, Joseph J.
Burkett, Jerome P.
Burkhart, Harold J.
Burkhart, James R., II
Burkhead, Franklin, Jr.
Burnett, Roger A.
Burnham, Eugene C.
Burns, Barry E.
Burns, Franklin, J.
Burns, Raymond S.
Burrill, Clair G., Jr.
Burrill, David R.
Burton, Gary L.
Byam, John W., Jr.
Byard, Larry F.
Byerly, Robert S.
Byron, Roger W.
Caiazza, Albert W.
Cairnes, Charles W., Jr.
Caldwell, Dwight B.
Caldwell, Leonard A.
Callaghan, James M.
Callahan, Patrick A.
Calvert, Eric S.
Campbell, Bruce W.
Campbell, Horace J.
Canaday, Brent A.
Cannon, Thomas M.
Cantor, Terry R.
Capper, Dean R.
Capute, Joseph R.
Caraway, John B., III
Carbone, Nicholas D.
Carlberg, Richard F.
Carlson, Edward J.
Carlson, Richard E.
Carlson, Russell C.
Carroll, James N.
Carroll, Thomas V.
Carson, Ross H.
Carter, Rodger B.
Carter, William C.
Castle, William K., Jr.
Catello, George M.
Catron, Arnold E.
Caudill, Garland W.
Ceruzzi, Michael L.
Cetta, Nicholas J.
Chagnon, Andre J.
Chalke, George P., Jr.
Chandler, Carder D.
Chandler, Michael S.
Chapman, Gary C.
Chapman, Michael R.
Charles, John R.
Cheek, Robert L.
Chessman, Gary A.
Chew, Chett T.
Childs, Stephen R.
Christianson, Robert A.
Churchill, Edwin T.
Ciccarelli, Chester A.
Claassen, Lawrence L. "J"
Clancy, James P.
Clark, Guinn G.
Clark, Jack "C"
Clark, James R.
Clark, John M.
Clark, John M., Jr.
Clark, Thomas A.
Clark, Thomas F., Jr.
Clarke, Joseph D., IV
Claude, David L.
Clayton, William B., III
Clegg, Marshall C.
Clement, Marc A.
Clemins, Archie R.
Cline, Gary K.
Clinton, John W.
Clothier, Thomas J.
Coers, Mardis M.
Coffin, Charles E., III
Cohen, Jacob, Jr.
Cole, Otis R., III
Colley, Donald V.
Coltrane, Glenn G.
Compton, James E.
Conery, George F., Jr.
Coneway, Clinton J.
Conn, George R. W.
Connolly, John M.
Connor, Dennis R.
Cook, Curtis B.
Cook, Robert A.
Coonan, John J., Jr.
Cooper, Clark R.
Cooper, Patrick E.
Copeland, Larry M.
Copenbarger, Paul D.
Cordell, Jeryl W.
Corder, Henry R., Jr.
Costello, John J.
Costello, Terrence W., III
Cotter, Paul S.
Courts, David P.
Covey, Charles C.
Cowardin, James H.
Cox, Mariner G.
Cox, Milford C., Jr.
Cox, Thomas J.
Crable, Paul A.
Crabtree, Carlton P.
Cragg, Eugene E., Jr.
Crain, Richard N.
Cramer, Charles R.
Creasser, William N., Jr.
Creighton, John O.
Crenshaw, William R., Jr.
Cress, Donald M.
Cress, James T., Jr.
Cripe, Paul L.
Crisp, Howard L.
Croclata, Joseph P.
Crockett, Alan K.
Crockett, James O.
Cronan, Charles E., Jr.
Cronyn, Brian S.
Crosby, Dennis A.
Crosby, George R.
Crosby, Ted
Cross, Lawrence A., Jr.
Crouch, William H., Jr.
Crum, Roy L.
Cruse, Charles H.
Cruser, Peter J.
Cuddington, Michael E.
Cullen, Timothy E.
Culp, William G.
Cummings, David L.
Curran, John P.
Current, Max C.
Curtin, James E.
Curtis, Stephen E.
Dadd, Alan M.
Dahlstrom, John R.
Daley, Michael J.
Dallmeyer, Richard L.
Dalporto, William F.
Daly, Beverly A.
Daniels, Harold E., Jr.
Darden, Arthur C., Jr.
Davidson, Richard J.
Davis, Clay S., Jr.
Davis, Robert W.
Davison, Joseph W.
Dawe, George F., Jr.
Day, Franklin J.
Day, Gerald W.
Deal, Leonard J., Jr.
Dech, "C" Michael
Deda, Donald J.
Deegan, Michael E.
Dehart, William O.
Denegre, Thomas B., III
Denney, David C.
Dennis, Patrick J.
Denton, Richard J.
Depompei, Daniel A.
Depoy, Jimmy G.
Desantis, Victor A.
Devine, James D.
Devoss, Gary G.
Dickerson, Barry S.
Difilippo, William J.
Dillow, Gary E.
Dilorenzo, Leonard A.
Dimmig, Gary L.
Dirienzo, Louis R.
Ditzler, Kirk J.
Dobscha, Frank J., Jr.
Dodge, Marvin M.
Dolan, Paul T.
Dollar, Stephen E.
Dolson, Richard C.
Donaldson, David B.
Donaldson, Paul H.
Donley, Michael J.
Donnelly, Michael P.
Donnelly, Walter P., Jr.
Dornsife, William P.
Dorsett, Hubert "G"
Dove, Curtis R., Jr.
Dowdy, William L., III
Dogwilla, Frank M., Jr.
Downey, John B.
Downton, Charles E., II
Doyle, Dennis M.
Doyle, Edward T.
Doyle, Gerard F.
Doyle, Thomas V.
Dozier, Frank S.
Drake, John B.
Draper, John J., III
Drinan, Alan H.
Driscoll, Robert G.
Driver, Roy K.
Droz, Donald G.
Druist, George F.
Drummond, Dennis G.
Dubois, Wayne D.
Dudley, Scott B.
Duffy, John F.
Duke, James K.
Duke, William C., Jr.
Durick, Robert E., Jr.
Duserick, Frank G.
Duwe, Henry C.
Dye, Gary T.
Dyer, Bruce P.
Earhart, John D., Jr.
Eckstorm, David E.
Eddinger, Thomas J., Jr.
Eden, Charles G. H.
Edmondson, Gary Duane
Edwards, James E.
Edwards, Robert B.
Eicens, Imants D.
Eiland, Leonard M., Jr.
Eisenhardt, William B.
Elliott, Thomas F.
Ellis, John R.
Ellis, Robert L., Jr.
Ellis, Thomas H.
Ellison, James E.
Ellison, Thomas H.
Elsesser, James R., Jr.
Elwell, Robert G.
Elwing, Daniel T.
Emery, Robert H.
Engelken, James K.
Engstrom, John T.
Ensign, Donald E.
Epstein, Steven W.
Erckmann, William J., Jr.
Ericson, Keith G.
Ernst, Larry L.
Eshleman, Donald E.
Esty, Harvey L.
Eubanks, Thomas I.
Evans, Howard C.
Evans, Kirk E.
Evans, Leslie F.
Evans, Samuel H.
Eyer, Jon T.
Fadden, William N.
Fairchild, Lawrence V.
Farmer, Clinton J.
Farrell, Richard K.
Fawkes, Delany
Fay, Robert M.
Feeherry, Edward J., Jr.
Feher, David T.
Fehrenbacher, Michael R.
Felger, Thomas R.
Felton, Lewis A.
Felty, Joseph W. R.

Fenstermaker, Roy E., Jr.
Ferdon, Frank C.
Ferenchick, Paul T.
Ferguson, Robert P.
Ferree, William M.
Ferreira, David M.
Field, Michael E.
Finn, Daniel F.
Fish, Lawrence E.
Fisher, Dwight D.
Fisher, Robert B., Jr.
Fisk, Alan E.
Fiske, Gary W.
Fitch, David A.
Fitzgerald, Sharon L.
Fitzgibbons, Thomas A.
Flaherty, Timothy J.
Flanders, Graeme L.
Flannery, Michael
Flatley, Brian A. J.
Fleming, James W.
Flora, Brian G.
Flowers, Gerald E.
Flowers, Orville A.
Flude, John W., Jr.
Font, William F., Jr.
Foote, Jerry L.
Foote, Morris C.
Forrester, Joseph G., II
Forsythe, John R.
Foster, Jesse R.
Foster, John L.
Foushee, Sam L., Jr.
Fowler, Edward M.
Fox, James F.
France, Robert T.
Francis, Burt R., Jr.
Francis, David L.
Franklin, Ronald E.
Franson, William E., Jr.
Frantz, James J.
Frantz, John P.
Franzitta, Anthony M.
Freaner, Claude W.
Frederiksen, John T.
Frederickson, John A.
Freiband, James M.
Freise, Roger W.
French, John R.
Frick, Kenneth E.
Friday, Charles F.
Friedman, Paul G.
Frikker, Peter M.
Fritschner, Walter J.
Fritz, Michael A.
Fritzius, Robert S.
Froistad, Larry A.
Fryar, Bruce C.
Fuentez, Raymond M.
Fullerton, William R.
Futch, Edward I.
Gabber, Wilhelm M.
Gadberry, Raymond E., Jr.
Gaffney, William T.
Galinsky, James M.
Gallagher, Michael J.
Gallagher, William J., Jr.
Gallo, Robert M.
Galvin, James J.
Gammill, Jerry V.
Garfield, Raymond, Jr.
Garrick, Barney F., Jr.
Garrison, Mark C.
Gartley, Markham L.
Gary, Michael A.
Gaskin, Peter J., II
Gaston, Tommy E.
Gebeaux, Robert J.
Geib, William R.
Gibbons, Francis W.
Gibbs, Raymond W.
Giblin, James F., Jr.
Gibson, Terrell A.
Gibson, Thomas L.
Giddings, Lawrence D.
Gilder, Jerry Q.
Gill, Robert P.
Gillard, James H.
Gillespie, Thomas F.
Gillogly, Harold J., Jr.
Gilmore, Webb R.
Gingrich, Thomas "J"
Ginsburg, Peter A.
Glenn, Robert C.
Glover, William S., Jr.
Gnerlich, Charles H.
Godwin, Ronald H.
Goedjen, Russell C. "J"
Goff, Edgar S., Jr.
Golden, Robert T.
Goldfried, Robert M.
Gonding, Robert L.
Gonzalez, Pedro
Goodgion, Gilbert
Gooding, Leroy A.
Goodrich, William A.
Gordon, Ian S.
Gorman, James R.
Goryanec, George T., III
Gosline, Robert B., Jr.
Grace, Donald N.
Grace, Joseph P.
Grant, Harold E.
Gravelle, Paul J.
Graves, David M.
Graves, Larry A.
Gray, Gary R.
Gray, Will P.
Green, Maurice D., Jr.
Green, William G.
Greenamyer, Richard D.
Greene, Jonathan M.
Greengard, Howard H.
Greenleaf, Joseph G.
Gregg, Frederick M., II
Gregg, John S.
Grieve, David J.
Griffin, Gerald L., Jr.
Griffith, William D.
Grim, Thomas H.
Grossbeck, Martin L.
Grostick, John L.
Grothe, George W.
Growney, Richard J.
Gruber, Larry E.
Grutzius, Charles R.
Gurgel, David L.
Gurley, Ronald K.
Gustafson, William J.
Haberzetle, James D.
Hack, William F.
Hagen, James B.
Haggerty, Daniel B., Jr.
Hahn, Robert C.
Halberstadt, Paul E., Jr.
Haley, James R.
Haley, Willard J.
Hall, David P.
Hall, David T.
Hall, Steven C.
Halliburton, Joe M.
Hallinan, Thomas J.
Hamann, Errol D.
Hamilton, Robert L., Jr.
Hammer, Douglas L.
Hammond, Reginald G.
Hancock, William C.
Hanley, Gerald S.
Hanley, Wayne R.
Hansborough, Lash D.
Hansen, George R., Jr.
Hansen, Leo E., Jr.
Hanson, Peter H.
Harbeson, Richard F.
Harding, Stanley L.
Hardy, Donald F., II
Hardy, Randall W.
Hardy, Thomas G.
Harmon, Daniel J., Jr.
Hartnett, Timothy, J.
Hartsfield, David L.
Hartzell, Cleon L., Jr.
Hartzell, Ray K. M.
Harvey, Charles K.
Harvey, Douglas N.
Harvey, John C.
Harvey, Phillip I.
Haskins, Michael D.
Haslett, Donald B.
Hasson, Joseph J., Jr.
Hastreiter, John R.
Hattan, Robert L.
Haughney, Charles J.
Hayes, Channing W., Jr.
Hayes, Francis M., Jr.
Hayzlett, Dennis C.
Head, Charles R.
Healy, Martin J.
Helm, Richard E.
Helmsin, Francis K., Jr.
Hempey, Richard J.
Hendershot, Alan R.
Henderson, Harry G.
Hendrickson, James
Henkel, Kent K.
Henny, David C.
Henry, George M.
Henzi, Robert M.
Hern, Lawrence R.
Herr, William M, Jr.
Herrera, Henry F.
Herscher, Carl D.
Hertel, Michael M.
Hess, George D.
Hess, Paul D.
Hicks, Ricky L.
Hicks, Wayne E.
Hierl, David J.
Higginbotham, John M.
Higgins, Walter M., III
Higgs, Thomas L.
Hill, Billy J.
Hill, Roymond K.
Hill, Roger B.
Hiltabidle, John H.
Himchak, David P.
Hintz, Donald C.
Hitt, Roy E., Jr.
Hobbs, Richard R.
Hobson, Duane D.
Hoch, Christopher M.
Hochhalter, Melvin E.
Hoddy, John R.
Hodge, Jerome B.
Hodges, William C.
Hoepfner, Karl T.
Hoff, Kenneth L., Jr.
Hoffer, Charles A.
Hoffman, Joel J.
Hoffmeyer, James A.
Hogg, Andrew L., Jr.
Holbert, William H.
Holbrook, Robert S.
Holland, Michael R.
Holler, Eugene J., Jr.
Holloman, John T.
Holm, Stanley R., Jr.
Holst, Robert W.
Holty, Robert M.
Honse, Robert W.
Hood, Robert S.
Horahan, Francis E.
Horn, William A.
Horner, Timothy F.
Horrell, James E.
Hoskins, Robert A.
Hosp, Steven P.
Hough, James A.
House, Thomas E.
Howard, Stephen T.
Howe, Kenneth G.
Howell, Buford F.
Howton, Harry M.
Hoxie, Stephen S.
Huber, Paul M.
Hubert, Richard G.
Hudson, Warren P.
Huffman, Thomas B.
Hufty, Jack G., Jr.
Hughes, Frank C.
Hughes, Herschel, Jr.
Hughes, John S.
Hughes, Joseph D.
Hughes, Kirby E., II
Hughes, Richard K.
Hull, Robert C.
Hulse, Richard L.
Humphrey, Alan W.
Hunt, Andrew W., Jr.
Hunt, Charles A.
Hura, Myron
Hurlock, Ronald J.
Iafrate, Francis
Ickes, Robert W.
Ing, James D. K.
Ingraham, Duncan N.
Ingraham, William H.
Inlow, Rush O.
Inlow, William R.
Iwasko, George W., Jr.
Jack, Robert "E"
Jackson, James O.
Jackson, John D.
Jacobi, Benjamin R.
James, Dennis P.
James, Wiley F., III
Janes, Marc, Jr.
Janulis, Peter J.
Jenkins, Charles E.
Jensen, William L.
Jeremiah, William L.
Jessico, Charles M., Jr.
Jezierny, Thomas J.
Johnson, Bruce H.
Johnson, Charles E.
Johnson, Curtiss D.
Johnson, Donald M.
Johnson, George K. III
Johnson, Paul A.
Johnson, Paul N. T.
Johnson, Pierce J.
Johnson, Robert G., Jr.
Johnson, Robert F.
Johnston, Thomas J., Jr.
Jones, Arthur D., III
Jones, Charles R.
Jones, Charles E., III
Jones, Francis T.
Jones, James R., Jr.
Jones, James A., III
Jones, Ronald W.
Jones, Timothy G.
Jordan, Gerald H.
Jordan, Michael F.
Jordan, Robert L.
Jordan, Ronald R.
Josephson, David W.
Josi, Roy W.
Joslyn, Robert A.
Judelson, Alan W.
Julian, Benjamin E.
Kain, Joseph E., Jr.
Kalosis, Stephen F.
Kamp, Gary R.
Kamrath, Robert A.
Kane, Leonard "K", II
Kanive, Robert F. R.
Kappa, John R.
Kappel, Leslie G.
Kappes, James R.
Kardell, David D.
Kauffman, Horace C., Jr.
Kauffman, Carl F.
Kaufhold, Francis F.
Kaye, George T.
Kazlauskas, Walter V.
Keefe, George E., Jr.
Keeley, Robert M.
Keiller, Stuart J.
Keiper, James T.
Keiser, Ronald L.
Keith, Larry B.
Kelley, James J., Jr.
Kelly, Donn K.
Kelly, Howard K.
Kelly, James P.
Kelly, Michael C.
Kemlein, Donald F., Jr.
Kenny, John F., Jr.
Kenty, Jay W.
Kern, Donald S.
Kerr, Gerald L., III
Kerstein, David L.
Kerwick, Raymond J.
Kidd, Robert B.
Kildebeck, Thomas C.
Kilgo, Martin D.
Kilgore, Sidney J., III
Kimball, Grant P.
Kimmel, Thomas K., Jr.
Kinard, David M.
Kincaid, James E.
King, Roland E., Jr.
King, William B.
Kingsley, Oliver D., Jr.
Kircher, David R.
Kish, John D.
Kitchen, Gary D.
Klahr, Owen A.
Klein, George A., III
Klimchak, Andrew J., Jr.
Klinkhamer, David J.
Klostermann, Kenneth E.
Kluessendorf, Fred K.
Knott, Gerald W.
Knust, Fred P.
Kobylk, Nicholai S.
Kochanski, Joseph J.
Kokoruda, David J.
Konetzni, Albert H. Jr.
Kopplin, John F.
Korbet, Michael T.
Kosnik, Edward F.
Kostar, William L.
Kowalick, Stephen J., Jr.
Kraker, Donald L.
Krause, John D.
Krejci, Emil J.
Krekel, Thomas W.
Kress, Michael M.
Krienke, Loren T.
Krol, Robert A.
Krum, Stephen G.
Kuechle, John D., Jr.
Kuehn, Rodney E.
Kunkel, James E.
Kupka, Stephen G.
Kurth, Robert P.
Labow, Joel C.
Labrecque, Robert J.
Lah, Raymond G. M.
Laino, William P.
Lange, Jerome B.
Langill, Frank S.
Larkins, James M., Jr.
Larson, John M.
Lassiter, Ronald L.
Lathen, Donald F.
Latta, Donald G., Jr.
Lattin, Terrance L.
Lautenschlager, Karl B.
Law, Douglas E.
Lawless, John M.
Leach, Jerry W.
Leber, George M., Jr.
Lechner, Bruce E.
Lee, Donald A.
Lehman, Henry C.
Leidecker, Gary F.
Lemons, James R.
Leo, John A., III
Leonard, Fred P., III
Leonard, Robert E.
Leonard, William N., Jr.
Leonard, William J., Jr.
Leroy, Dennis K.
Letter, Thomas M.
Levinson, James R.
Lewis, James C.
Lewis, Robert H.
Lewis, Thomas M.
Lienhard, John B.
Lightstone, Robert M.
Linch, William D., Jr.
Lindsay, William T.
Lineburg, George W., Jr.
Lines, Richard A.
Ling, John H.,
Linton, Parker S., III
Lipfert, Ralph H.
Lipscomb, Warren N., Jr.
Lisle, John T.
Livingston, Richard A.
Lockwood, Bruce W.
Lomacchio, Thomas D., Jr.
Long, Edward C., III
Long, James A., III
Lonsdale, Frederick
Loome, James M.
Lopacinski, James M.
Lopez, Manuel R.
Lorden, John J., Jr.
Lothrop, Peter S.
Loughran, Joseph P., Jr.
Lovelady, David E.
Lovett, Kenneth D.
Lueneburg, Raymond L.
Lundberg, William D.
Luther, Walter W., Jr.
Lutz, Frederick R.
Lynch, John D.
Lyon, Douglas V.
Lyons, Joseph E., Jr.
MacConnell, John L.
Mack, Jonathan T.
MacKenzie, Donald K.
MacOnkey, Thomas J. Jr.
MacPherson, George W.
MacVean, Stephen S.
Magner, Rodney E.
Magnuson, Ronald R.
Maher, Jerome T., Jr.
Mahlstedt, Paul W.
Maitland, James E.
Maixner, Harold V., Jr.
Makela, Bruce G.
Malavar, Frank M.
Mallett, Carl V.
Mallini, Joseph J., Jr.
Maloney, Elbert S., Jr.
Mandel, Eric
Mandeville, Donald E.
Mandich, Joseph
Manes, Michael R.
Maniscalco, James A.
Manskar, Dennis R.
Maras, John W.

Marfiak, Thomas F.
Margeson, Walter L., Jr.
Markowski, Frank J., Jr.
Markusic, Michael L.
Marsh, Walter C.
Marsh, William R.
Marsh, William T., Jr.
Martin, Port R.
Martin, Ricard W.
Martin, Thomas G.
Martineau, Paul W., Jr.
Martinek, Charles A.
Marzano, Richard M.
Mason, Charles P., III
Mason, James W.
Mason, John H.
Massey, James B., III
Massicot, William H.
Masters, Quentin S.
Mathers, William M.
Mathis, Troy E., Jr.
Matthews, Jan D.
Matthews, John L.
Matthews, Thomas F.
Mattis, David W.
Maule, Francis E., III
Mauney, Fleming
Maupin, David O.
Maxwell, John S.
Maxwell, Ronald L.
Maxwell, William H.
May, Douglas E.
Mayer, Conrad J.
Mayhue, Richard L.
Maynard, James D.
Mazach, John J.
McAdams, Gayle R.
McAdams, Glenn E.
McAuley, James W., Jr.
McCaffrey, John P.
McCague, James D.
McCallie, Spencer W.
McCarty, John B.
McConnell, William S.
McCoy, Robert B.
McCray, Stephen S.
McCullen, Clarence H.
McCullough, Carl P.
McCumber, Ralph R., Jr.
McCune, William E.
McDonald, Raymond A.
McDonald, Richard D.
McDonnell, Gordon R.
McDowell, Elmer J.
McElvein, David B.
McFadden, Owen C., Jr.
McGann, William H., Jr.
McGarry, Charles N.
McGee, Terry R.
McGee, William E.
McGehee, Robert B.
McGibbon, Charles A.
McGinty, Richard C.
McGlinn, James E.
McGoldrick, John D., Jr.
McGraw, Bennette D.
McKendrick, John D., Jr.
McKenna, Patrick J.
McKenney, Edward A.
McKenzie, Brian D.
McKie, David E.
McKinney, Ronald L.
McLendon, James B.
McMenamin, William J.
McMenimen, Lawrence L.
McMunn, Mary K.
McNally, William J., III
McQuaid, Michael J.
McRae, Charles R.
Mears, Michael L.
Meintzer, Robert E.
Melnyk, George R.
Meloney, Michael B.
Mendenhall, Corwin G., III
Menke, James E.
Mercer, William E.
Merriman, Stephen C.
Messina, Edward F.
Metcalf, Douglas C.
Metro, Joseph P., Jr.
Michaux, Richard L.
Michelson, Gregory M.
Miess, Samuel A.
Miller, James E.
Miller, Nicholas P.
Miller, Richard D.
Miller, Robert J.
Miller, Stephen A.
Miller, Wayne H.
Miller, Wayne M.
Mills, Robert C.
Minarick, Joseph W., II
Minton, Joseph K.
Mintun, Tom L.
Mitchell, Charles S., IV
Mitchell, John M.
Mitchell, Ralph M., Jr.
Mittendorff, Gerald E.
Mobley, Joseph S.
Mock, Floyd L., Jr.
Mohan, James F.
Moller, Mikkel
Mollet, Robert E.
Molloy, Clifford F., Jr.
Mondy, Ralph L.
Monell, Gilbert F., Jr.
Montano, William B.
Montgomery, George W.
Montgomery, Michael F.
Moore, Billy G.
Moore, George M.
Moosally, Fred P., Jr.
Morey, David N., III
Morgan, Edward E.
Morgan, James F., Jr.
Morgan, Roy S.
Morgan, Vernon M.
Morgan, Warren E., Jr.
Morrill, Philip J.
Morris, Milton D.
Morris, Ralph R.
Morse, David W.
Mosby, William R., IV
Moses, Dale H.
Mosier, David W., Jr.
Muldoon, Patrick M.
Mulhall, Robert B.
Mulvany, Michael S.
Munn, Joe A.
Murphy, Andrew M.
Murphy, Daniel J., Jr.
Murphy, Dennis E.
Murphy, James K., Jr.
Murphy, Robert J.
Murphy, Thomas E.
Murphy, Timothy A.
Murray, James R.
Murray, Robert E.
Myers, Henry B., Jr.
Mynett, Harold J.
Naber, Michael E.
Nagy, Carl F.
Naye, John R.
Nealley, Alan W.
Nearing, Robert W.
Nelson, Dennis G.
Nelson, Harold E., Jr.
Nelson, Kenneth S.
Nelson, Robert M., Jr.
Nesbit, Thomas B.
Neumeister, John E., III
Newcomb, Richard D.
Newell, James K., III
Newman, Donald E.
Nichols, John W., III
Nichols, Loring B.
Nicholson, Samuel T.
Niss, Steven D.
Nolta, Franklin L.
Noonan, Patrick J.
Norman, Donald S.
Norman, Phillip J.
Norton, David H.
Norton, John E.
Nuessle, Francis E., Jr.
Nutwell, Robert M.
Oberg, Neal S.
O'Brien, Gerard M.
O'Brien, Kathleen M.
O'Brien, Thomas E.
O'Donovan, Alfred J., III
O'Dwyer, William
Offutt, James H., III
Ogar, Walter T., III
Ogden, Richard W.
Ohlert, Edward J.
O'Keefe, Richard B.
O'Keefe, Thomas S., Jr.
Olden, Irvin L.
Oliver, Daniel T.
Olsen, Curtis W.
Olsen, Richard A.
O'Malley, John F.
Oman, Robert G.
Omohundro, Michael J.
O'Neil, Haines A.
Orcutt, John A.
O'Reilley, Dennis P.
Orkins, James E.
Orser, William S.
Orvis, James W.
Osani, Joseph R.
O'Shea, Michael G.
Ott, Marvin M.
Owens, James T., III
Oxford, Thomas P.
Paine, Robert G., III
Palazzo, Anthony J., Jr.
Palmer, Donald A.
Parchinski, Eugene A.
Parisen, Richard L.
Parish, Philip W.
Parker, Henry S., III
Parker, Leonard A., Jr.
Parker, Richard E.
Parsoneault, Jerald L.
Parsons, Frederick C., II
Parsons, Joe C.
Pasquini, Leonard A.
Patch, David A.
Paul, Thomas W.
Paulsen, William G.
Payne, Tommy E.
Peabody, Edward L.
Pedersen, Gordon D.
Pedersen, Jack L.
Pelletier, Dennis R.
Pender, Orland J., Jr.
Pennington, Charles W.
Peppard, Terry F.
Perakis, James A.
Percival, Robert C.
Peresich, Dan L.
Pergler, Robert A.
Perkins, Robert E.
Perry, Albert K.
Perry, Frank R.
Persels, Jimmy B.
Petering, George W.
Peters, Dennis L.
Peterson, Alan T.
Peterson, William C.
Petillo, James T.
Petrucka, Paul M.
Pfaff, John F.
Pfeifer, Charles G.
Phelan, Joseph F.
Phillips, Larry W.
Phillips, William T., III
Phillips, William L., Jr.
Phipps, John W.
Piazza, Frank P., Jr.
Picken, Joseph C., III
Pickett, Robert D., Jr.
Pierce, Peter W.
Pierce, Richard B., Jr.
Pilecek, Kenneth C.
Piper, Harry L.
Pitely, George J.
Pitman, Edgar L., II
Planitzer, Russell E.
Plante, Robert J.
Plis, Kenneth J.
Ploeger, Robert B.
Plotkin, Richard A.
Plummer, Ronald E.
Poggi, Steven N.
Poiencot, Glenn P.
Polanski, Charles M.
Polsenski, Martin J., Jr.
Pomeroy, John S.
Porter, Thomas J.
Posenecker, William W.
Posoli, John B.
Pospisil, John M.
Postle, Douglas C.
Potter, Stephen C.
Powell, Harry C., Jr.
Powell, James M., Jr.
Powell, William P.
Power, Oliver K., III
Pratt, Augustus K., Jr.
Predtechenskis, Leonids
Prep, Victor M., Jr.
Price, Leland H.
Prickett, David C., Jr.
Prout, James G., III
Prusaitis, Gerald J.
Puckett, Don S.
Puffer, James W.
Pulsifer, Edward K.
Puppe, Russell A.
Pursley, Robert E., III
Quinn, Neal A., Jr.
Quirk, David J.
Radcliffe, William M., Jr.
Ragland, Thomas C.
Raker, Edward A.
Raleigh, Richard E.
Randall, Jeffrey W.
Randolph, Robert G.
Rauch, Kenneth N.
Rawson, Warren A., Jr.
Ray, Robert N.
Reass, Richard M.
Redd, John S.
Reddington, Christopher M.
Redington, Michael P.
Reeb, John E.
Reeder, Terry L.
Regmund, William C., Jr.
Regnier, James M.
Reid, Thomas H.
Reinhart, Frederick M.
Remer, Bryan E.
Rempt, Rodney P.
Rendine, Paul
Renne, Merline M.
Reynolds, Tom H., Jr.
Ribble, William M.
Rice, John A.
Rice, Paul D.
Rice, Theodore L.
Richardson, Glenn F., Jr.
Richardson, David W.
Richardson, Peter B.
Ries, Kenneth L.
Rigstad, Dennis A.
Rist, Austin M.
Ritchey, Stephen L.
Ritter, Douglas B.
Rivamonte, Lorenzo A.
Roberts, Charles R.
Robertson, John E.
Robertson, Kenneth C.
Robertson, Stephen R.
Robinson, William P.
Robison, Frances D.
Rochelle, William B.
Rockwell, John H., III
Rodriguez, Antonio J.
Rogers, David E.
Rogers, Frank W., III
Rogers, Ross F., III
Rohrkemper, Stephen F.
Roland, John R., Jr.
Roller, Charles L.
Rollins, Richard E.
Ronchetto, John R., Jr.
Roodhouse, Alan M.
Rooney, Daniel J.
Rorick, Jay T., Jr.
Rosiak, James A.
Ross, Paul D., Jr.
Roth, Milton D., Jr.
Rowe, Donald
Royal, Gilbert V., Jr.
Rubright, David G.
Rudell, Frederick L.
Ruehl, Victor E., III
Ruff, Richard K.
Runkle, Thomas C.
Runqurunquist, Ulf W.
Ruppel, Jack C. L.
Russ, Stephen J.
Russell, James M.
Russo, John A.
Ruth, David J.
Ryan, Carl J., Jr.
Ryan, James J.
Ryan, Michael R.
Ryan, Terrence P.
Sabaitis, Eugene J.
Sadd, David J.
Sage, David M., Jr.
Sage, Fred W., III
Sage, Leland C. C.
Sager, Harlan R.
Saints, Stuart K.
Salinas, Daniel, II
Salmon, Richard C.
Sams, Bonum B., Jr.
Sandberg, Christopher F.
Sanders, James C.
Sanders, Marvin L.
Sanders, Robert T.
Sandquist, Fred C.
Sapp, Vincent D.
Saracino, Quentin M.
Sarich, Ace J.
Saunders, Richard E.
Savage, John D.
Sawyer, Thomas D.
Scalcucci, Francis S.
Scarbrough, Robert R.
Schaede, Harry R.
Schaefer, Charles R.
Scheerer, Raymond H.
Schlehuser, Charles H.
Schlein, Paul B.
Schmidt, Gary E.
Schoch, William L.
Schoen, Gary W.
Schoeppner, Leonard J.
Schofield, Paul L.
Scholz, Ronald W.
Schoolfield, Ernest L.
Schuder, Danny E.
Schuler, Paul G.
Schultz, Dale E.
Schuster, Michael A.
Schwartz, Norbert V., Jr.
Schwedt, Mervyn A.
Schwering, Richard J.
Scott, Donald E.
Scott, Murrel C., Jr.
Scott, Robert P.
Scrivener, Orlin R.
Searcy, Kinchen J.
Sears, Jay A.
Sears, Scott L.
Seery, John J.
Seiden, Steven S. S.
Seward, Lachlan W.
Seward, Theodore C., Jr.
Sexton, Noah P., II
Seymour, Terry I.
Shannon, James O.
Sharp, Harry G., III
Shea, John P., III
Shearer, Richard P.
Sheedy, Patrick J., Jr.
Sheeley, Royal E.
Sheffield, Robert C.
Shelar, Eugene, Jr.
Shelton, Leonard G., Jr.
Sherman, Granville, III
Sherman, Marshall R.
Shields, Scott J.
Shipe, Edwin E., III
Shook, Raymond R.
Shrawder, Steven D.
Shubert, William M., Jr.
Shyjka, Frank
Sibold, Brian B.
Sidney, Richard W.
Siems, Norman E., Jr.
Sigler, John F.
Sigler, Titus S.
Silloway, Richard F.
Silverman, Samuel I.
Simmons, Robert T.
Simmons, William A.
Simms, Donald L.
Simms, Larry L.
Simonpietri, Andre C., Jr.
Simonsen, Charles M.
Sinisi, Jon M.
Sinness, Kenneth R.
Siwinski, Edmund L.
Sladek, James A.
Slagle, Norman H.
Slear, David G., III
Slowik, Sylvester H.
Smart, Robert V.
Smisek, Thomas J.
Smith, Billy J.
Smith, David A., Jr.
Smith, David B.
Smith, Frank L.
Smith, Gary W.
Smith, James H.
Smith, Kenneth C., Jr.
Smith, Norman A.
Smith, Richard W.
Smith, Ronald E.
Smith, Thomas J.
Snaider, Richard P.
Snitzer, Richard E.
Snyder, John W., Jr.
Snyder, Luther W., Jr.
Snyder, Warren B.
Snyder, William T. D.
Sosnicky, Andrew P.

Soule, George H., Jr.
Southerland, Mark J.
Spadafora, William H.
Spayde, Roger C.
Specht, Harry, F., Jr.
Spelbring, Daryl C.
Spencer, David J.
Spencer, Robert W.
Spicer, Tadd E.
Spikes, Clayton H.
Sproul, William D.
Stabb, John A.
Stahl, Robert A.
Stanko, Theodore R., Jr.
Stankowski, Robert J., Jr.
Stanley, Harold G.
Starostecki, Richard W.
Starr, Duane M.
Starr, Ronald W.
Staudte, Paul V.
Steen, David S.
Steenburgh, Charles J.
Steffen, Nicholas J.
Stein, David A.
Steinman, Larry W.
Sterling, Stoughton, III
Stevens, Richard G.
Stevens, Ronald F., Jr.
Stevens, Thomas R.
Stevenson, Ernest H.
Stewart, Alford M., Jr.
Stewart, Jamie "B", Jr.
Stewart, John C.
Stewart, Joseph S., II
Stewart, Lawrence "L"
Stillabower, Michael "E"
Stinnett, Jack F.
Stiteler, Fred Z.
Stoneberg, Lawrence C.
Storck, Donald G., Jr.
Stott, Laurence R.
Strain, Paul F.
Stratis, George K.
Stratton, Charles L.
Strausbaugh, Thomas L.
Strayhorn, Robert E.
Strickland, Henry W.
Strother, John W.
Strouse, James L.
Stuart, Jay C.
Stuckey, James G.
Stumm, Albert F., Jr.
Sturm, William P.
Sulfaro, John J.
Sullivan, Dennis B.
Sullivan, James V., Jr.
Sullivan, Robert A.
Summa, Angelo J.
Summers, Gary R.
Svalya, Phillip G.
Swain, Charles L.
Swank, Jeffrey L.
Swanson, John F.
Swartwood, James M.
Sweeney, James D.
Sweeney, Michael J.
Swiantek, Francis M.
Swinger, Alan W.
Swingle, Robert D.
Tackney, David T.
Tanber, Terry N.
Tappan, Benjamin, III
Tarr, Robert J., Jr.
Tarro, Arthur S.
Tate, James K., IV
Tattersall, Alan P.
Taylor, Billy B.
Taylor, Hugh M.
Taylor, Royce D.
Taylor, Rufus L., III
Taylor, William E., Jr.
Taylor, William L.
Teed, Richard B.
Temme, Robert L., Jr.
Tercek, Robert L.
Terebessy, Terry J.
Terrill, Thomas J.
Tersteeg, Douglas J.
Thaete, Harry A., III
Thielen, Bruce E.
Thole, Michael J.
Thomas, Orville G.
Thomas, Richard S.
Thompson, Douglas E.
Thompson, Edward C.
Thompson, Jesse B., Jr.
Thompson, Jesse L.
Thompson, John R.
Thompson, Joseph R.
Thompson, Norman R.
Thompson, Oland D.
Thompson, Ronald M.
Thompson, William E.
Thonerfelt, Reuben T.
Thorstad, Arthur A.
Titcomb, Robert E.
Titus, Dale N.
Toedter, Wendel W.
Tomasko, John A., III
Tomlinson, William J.
Tonkin, Russell J.
Toriello, Andrew N., Jr.
Toth, Michael A.
Totushek, John B.
Touve, Bruce N.
Townsend, John W.
Tracey, Michael T.
Transue, Michael J.
Treadway, Edward R.
Treter, Douglas E.
Trodahl, Howard F.
Trueman, Larry D.
Truesdell, William C., Jr.
Tucker, Marvin H.
Tuley, Michael T.
Tummonds, Paul A.
Tuzzolo, Patrick A.
Uhrie, Richard J., Jr.,
Unks, Robert S.
Upp, Robert R.
Urbani, Donald L.
Ustick, Perry W., Jr.
Utter, James H.
Valley, Bruce L.
Vangilder, George T.
Vanloy, Alan E.
Vanteslaar, Paul S.
Vanzanten, Barend L.
Vasey, William C.
Vaughan, Douglas D.
Vellines, Harry F.
Vernallis, Jeffrey T.
Verratti, Robert N.
Vidosic, Richard P.
Vincent, George A., III
Vorwald, William J.
Votava, Charles F., III
Waddell, Michael W.
Wade, James I.
Wadsworth, Donald A.
Wagensell, Lawrence L.
Waggoner, David T.
Wagner, Keith A.
Wainwright, Stanley D., Jr.
Walberg, Peter E.
Walker, David M.
Walker, David R.
Walker, Thomas H., Jr.
Walker, William H.
Wallace, Reuben H., Jr.
Wallace, William T., Jr.
Walls, Thomas L.
Walls, William H.
Walsh, David F.
Walsh, Emmet M.
Walsh, Thomas J.
Walts, Charles R.
Waltz, Alfred J.
Ward, Douglas E.
Ward, Lewis A.
Waring, Thomas
Waschbusch, John F.
Waterman, Charles E.
Watson, David
Watts, Bruce R.
Waylett, William J., Jr.
Weathers, Cleve O.
Weber, Craig S.
Weber, Steven D.
Webster, Paul E.
Weeks, Charles J., Jr.
Weigand, Karl R., Jr.
Weil, Donald
Weiler, Herold J., III
Weinzapfel, Kenneth H.
Weissner, William W.
Welch, James T.
Wells, Jack L.
Wendel, William H., Jr.
West, William R.
Wetzel, Kenneth R.
Whalen, John F., III
Wheary, Eugene P.
Wheeler, David L.
Wheeler, Mark W.
Wheeler, William R.
Whitcomb, Giles M.
White, Allen H., Jr.
White, James W.
White, Joseph R.
White, Robert D.
Whitley, Robert B.
Whittemore, Frank C.
Whittemore, Michael A. N.
Widener, Douglas G.
Wieezerek, Stephen G.
Wier, Joel A., III
Wiese, Clifford A.
Wiggers, Francis E., Jr.
Wiggins, Joseph L., Jr.
Dilcock, John L., Jr.
Wiles, Marvin B. C.
Willard, Robert B.
Willever, Kent A.
Willhite, Allen L.
Williams, Clyde R.
Williams, Gregory B.
Williams, Frank L.
Williams, Kenneth R.
Williams, Richard P.
Williams, Robert E., Jr.
Williams, Thomas J., Jr.
Williams, Thomas P.
Williams, Thomas R.
Williamson, Francis T., Jr.
Williamson, John C.
Wilmarth, Lance A.
Wilson, Donald L.
Wilson, Eldon S.
Wilson, John F.
Wilson, Martin B.
Windle, Ralph E.
Wingfield, Thomas J., III
Winners, Donald L.
Wise, Billy B.
Wise, Bobby G.
Wisniewski, John L.
Witt, Ronald C.
Wittenberg, Robert R.
Woerner, James P., Jr.
Wolf, Robert W.
Wolford, Norman H.
Wolsoncroft, Thomas R.
Wong, Peter W.
Wood, Gordon L., Jr.
Wood, William A.
Wooden, Harry H., Jr.
Woodfin, Richard H., Jr.
Woodson, Walter B., III
Woolrich, Raymond D.
Wortham, Thomas R., Jr.
Worthington, Jack C.
Worthley, John A.
Worthy, Charles D., Jr.
Wright, George M.
Wright, James E.
Wright, Peter W.
Wurster, Ronald F.
Wyman, Bruce D.
York, Richard J.
Young, Brian W.
Young, Donald M.
Zallnick, Anthony F., Jr.
Zando, Paul J.
Zeddies, Armand A.
Ziegler, Philip E.
Zientek, Steve M.
Zondorak, William M.
Zopf, Garrett A.
Zucker, Clayton G.
Zuga, Leonard F.
Zuhr, Kenneth C.
Zumsteg, Howard O., Jr.
Zvacek, Robert D.
Zveare, Dennis L.
Amann, Lorraine F.
Beale, Carolyn B.
Byerly, Kathleen D.
Demarest, Paula A.
Dieter, Janet M.
Gabbrielli, Laura S.
Gabryshak, Betty J.
Grayson, Deidra L.
Greiner, Ann C.
Hatch, Marilyn J.
Herley, Martha S.
Hitch, Linda L.
Hollister, Donna S.
Huttenbrauck, Gail E.
Lee, Patricia A.
Lyons, Dorthy E.
Maguire, Jean F.
Maloney, Mary E. P.
Pope, Diane J.
Powers, Mary E.
Reilly, Christine M.
Roney, Patricia M.
Shaw, Christela A.
Trussell, Ellen A.
Urban, Deanna I.
Voos, Sybil A.
Williams, Mary L.
Yont, Mary P.
Zalesky, Sarah A.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allega, Timothy J.
Allen, Daniel W., Jr.
Auerbach, Eugene E.
Baird, Paul T.
Balding, Anthony D.
Barnett, Orlando T.
Barrett, Sean C.
Beckner, David L.
Benbow, Robert T.
Benton, Billy B.
Biggerstaff, Robert E.
Bingham, Alfred A., III
Bond, Robert C.
Bray, Richard L.
Burmeister, Edward D., Jr.
Cassidy, John P.
Cassidy, William F.
Chamberlin, Edward R.
Chenault, David W.
Clary, Neal T., Jr.
Cloud, Burt M., Jr.
Coleman, James S., III
Connelly, Stephen A.
Conradteberlin, Viggo P.
Crognale, Stanley J., Jr.
Daley, Robert W.
Davis, Kenneth E., Jr.
Dexter, Stephen T.
Dobbert, Clarence F.
Doubleday, Ross J.
Dreher, Darrell L.
Dreyer, Leo P.
Droms, William G.
Drowty, Dennis R.
Duff, Donald D.
Dunteman, James M.
Early, Lawrence J., Jr.
Edgerton, Donald K.
Erickson, William V.
Evans, Michael J.
Findley, Norma P., III
Franyo, Richard L.
Gibson, John J.
Gruver, William R.
Guth, Michael H.
Havener, William J.
Haverty, Lawrence J., Jr.
Hickey, William V. Jr.
Higgins, William F., Jr.
Hilton, David E.
Ingram, John C.
Ireland, Dennis W.
James, Daniel V., Jr.
Johnson, William F., Jr.
Joye, Erwin M.
Kalas, Frank J., Jr.
Karg, Herbert W., Jr.
Keenan, Frederick
Keller, Frank B.
Kelley, Charles E., Jr.
Kelly, James M.
Kennedy, William E., Jr.
Killian, Charles E.
Kinsey, Joseph W.
Kolodziej, Victor D.
Lang, Thomas F.
Leniart, Peter J.
Libby, Kurt W.
Lincoln, Samuel A., III
Lingle, Jan C.
Loveday, Leonard N.
Lynch, Peter J., III
Lynn, Wayne R.
Mahn, Gary L.
Maloney, Francis L., Jr.
Mangin, Garrett N., II
Martens, Richard L.
Martin, James M.
McCabe, Raymond L., Jr.
McCook, Kevin W.
McTyre, Harry E., Jr.
Melton, Harold K.
Middleton, George R.
Mills, Kenneth B.
Molino, Robert L.
Morisky, Richard J.
Muir, Anthony M.
Neale, John C.
Niblock, Edward G.
Nicol, Robert L.
Norton, Phillip G.
Ogrosky, Charles E., III
Ott, Gene F.
Parks, Michael B.
Patterson, Alexander Z., II
Patton, John C.
Pettis, David W., Jr.
Potts, John A.
Potts, Norbert J.
Regan, John J.
Reis, Peter S.
Rouzer, William W.
Sandalls, William T., Jr.
Saylor, Clarence M., Jr.
Scarola, Joseph R.
Schechter, Kenneth A.
Schnepf, Charles A.
Schramm, Frederick C., Jr.
Scott, Jerry W.
Scudi, John T.
Semet, Robert J.
Senn, Lavern K.
Siegel, Gary
Slane, Robert L.
Smith, Ronald E.
Sprague, Douglas R.
Stafford, Michael D.
Stanton, William H.
Sutherland, John W.
Sutherland, Michael T.
Thomas, William J., Jr.
Tompkins, Alan M.
Tracy, Richard T.
Ulirich, James M.
Vaughan, Larry E.
Velte, Duane R.
Volkmann, John M.
Wagner, David L.
Watson, Andrew J.
Webber, Carl M.
Whitlock, Robert E.
Williams, Edward L., III
Winston, Robert D., Jr.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Altstaetter, James L.
Ames, William D.
Buchanan, Robert D., Jr.
Burkett, Hugh A.
Cooney, Thomas A.
Fesler, Jeffrey B.
Furich, Robert P.
Garrigan, James T.
Geibel, Bruce B.
Guinosso, Andrew J.
Hoff, Michael L.
Jones, Lloyd K.
Koons, James E.
Larsen, Quentin J.
Leubecker, Stephen T.
Lowery, Edward J., Jr.
McCormack, Richard F.
Milner, Ronald A.
Morss, James C.
Palmborg, James G.
Ramsey, James M.
Royal, Clifford H.
Rudegeair, Edward A.
Sherron, John T.
Shoup, George M., Jr.
Siler, Richard T.
Somers, Allen H.
Sopko, David C.

Spence, Gordon D., Jr.
Walter, Harold W.
Wong, Stephen E. C.
Yanuck, Rudolph R., Jr.
Zaist, William J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bondi, Kenneth R.
Brant, Robert H.
Brees, Philip H.
Evans, Patricia R.
Howard, Ivan D.
McManaman, Vincent L.
Profita, Salvatore J.
Sholdt, Lester L.

NURSE CORPS

Cords, Marvin D.
Mitchell, Mary C.

Lt. Comdr. Lowell J. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to the grade of commander in the Medical Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bloustine, Stanley A.
Davis, McWilliam H.
Forsthoefel, Frank E.
Freeman, Richard E.
Hoskins, William J.
Howard, Noel S.
Hutchins, Charles H.
Manion, James L.
Murray, Melville C.
O'Neill, John J.
Stone, William C.
Vidoloff, John C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Ashford, Ervin A.
Barbour, Nathaniel S.
Betzner, Hugh W., Jr.
Brouwer, Daniel C.
Carter, Lee S.
Chenery, Robert L.
Chudalski, Michael K.
Cook, John C.
Ensch, John C.
Fortenberry, Henry C.
Gladston, Steele
Hogan, John B., Jr.
Huff, Gerald L., Jr.
Huffman, Curtis W., Jr.
Jogan, Stephen
Johnson, Thomas R.
Johnston, Howard P.
Kaufman, Edwin J.
Kowlok, Gerald W.
Lischke, Erwin L., Jr.
Lockard, John A.
May, Donald L.
Milham, Russell O.
Morgan, Donald L.
Nichols, James R.
Parkinson, Robert
Pattarozzi, Norman J.
Peoples, Philip M.
Pfaff, George J.
Pfister, Stephen J.
Randall, Richard F.
Roy, James C.
Saenz, Roland A.
Schneider, Paul T.
Shoemaker, Stephen C.
Steele, Joseph H., III
Sutton, Ronnie N.
Thiele, James F.
Vallee, Ronald A.
Walker, David C.
White, Richard L.
Whitmore, John T.
Wiley, Richard A.
Wuthrich, Lawrence G.
Zuncich, Joseph L.

SUPPLY CORPS

Campbell, Robert R.
Christopherson, Wilhelm G.
Gibson, Blair E.
Harper, Charles H.
MacArthur, Chester B.
Myers, William M.

CIVIL ENGINEERING CORPS

Coston, Oscar L., Jr.
Wright, Hubert D., Jr.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Bird, Noel T.
Milliken, Paul R.
Newman, Reginald E.

NURSE CORPS

Quayle, Leo C.

Lt. (j.g.) Joanne L. Schmitt, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Barbour, Nathaniel S.
Benton, Robert R., Jr.
Chudalski, Michael K.
Churchill, Edwin T.
Cooney, Christopher J.
Daines, Gary L.
Davis, Herman E.
Hennessey, William J., Jr.
Huffman, Curtis W., Jr.
Kaufman, Edwin J.
Kuehn, Ronald E.
Lisle, John T.
Lockard, John A.
Martin, Charles F., II
Millward, John E.
Morgan, Donald L.
Orvis, James W.
Peoples, Philip M.
Pfister, Stephen J.
Schmidt, Clifford L.
Smith, Gary W.
Steele, Joseph H., III
Walker, David C.
Ward, Lewis A.
Wiley, Richard A.
Yates, Cornelius H., III

SUPPLY CORPS

Campbell, Richard P., Jr.
Chiomento, Thomas V., Jr.
Christopherson, Wilhelm G.
Heiselberg, Gary L.
MacArthur, Chester B.
McKechnie, Arnold W., Jr.
Schechter, Kenneth A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Gardner, James K.
Jensen, Allen H.
Kennedy, Ronald E.
Nash, David J.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Carpenter, Gordon L.

NURSE CORPS

Jackson, Charles R.

Lt. Comdr. Leyon D. Sakey, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant and the temporary grade of lieutenant commander.

Lt. Carl H. Horst, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Jarosz, Thomas J.
Koppenhaver, Larry N.
Standish, John A.
Wellumson, Douglas R.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and the temporary grade of lieutenant:

Moore, Seley E.
Reynolds, George B.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Graves, Larry A.
Weissner, William W.

Lt. (j.g.) Ray K. M. Hartzell, Supply Corps, United States Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the Navy in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade).

The following-named officers of the Supply Corps, U.S. Navy, for transfer to and appointment in the line of the U.S. Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Frederick, Ronald J.
Hartzell, Ray K. M.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps of the Navy in the permanent grade of ensign:

Allen, Randall C.
Atkins, John W., III
Averett, Gary L.
Berthy, Leslie C.
Carter, Robert K.
Cole, Barry W.
Culver, Joseph E.
Dinga, John P.
Dittmann, Harry G.
Every, Robert E.
Graves, Larry A.
Hager, Hampton, C., Jr.
Jordan, Larry J.
Kellum, William C.
McQueen, James D., Jr.
Tate, David J.
Thiele, John C.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of ensign:

Lemon, Harvey B.
Mason, Robert D.

John P. Budrenich, U.S. Navy, for promotion to chief warrant officer, W–3, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for promotion to chief warrant officer, W–4, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Aldrich, Marvin M.
Allen, Raymond S.
Allerdings, Robert D.
Bacha, Michael
Bailey, Howard L.
Baker, Oscar M.
Baney, Richard L.
Bates, Arthur H.
Bishop, John F.
Booth, Thomas G.
Boucher, Leonard R.
Briody, John H.
Burns, John C.
Butler, Kelly, Jr.
Cady, Howard P.
Carr, Robert G.
Chandler, Neil B.
Chastain, Edward C.
Chesmore, Kenneth L.
Cochrane, James E.
Cote, Roland F.
Davenport, William K.
Dolan, John
Durland, Ray M.
Durren, Richard L.
Enzminger, Kenneth A.
Epoch, Paul
Ferguson, John R.
Fickett, Lawrence E.
Fortney, Doyle W.
Friel, Joseph A., Jr.
Ganey, Walter F.
Gerbis, Daniel
Claab, George W.
Gonzalez, Ernest G.
Haldeman, Leonard D.
Hanna, Adrian L.
Hathcock, Milton T.
Havens, William F.
Healy, Gordon R.
Hillhouse, William C.
Huffman, James W.
Hyatt, Gerald C.
Isebrands, Arthur B.
Jacobs, Meredith D.
Jaggard, Joseph F.
Jensen, Dana C.
Johnson, Charles J.
Johnson, Roland L.
Jones, John D.
Jones, William W.
Kellner, Edward J.
Ketterer, Frank R.
King, Alfred E.
Kinnie, Phillip B., Jr.
Kitch, Dale
Kraft, James R.
Kremsner, Carl J.
Kulik, Charles A.
Lamb, Gerald M.
Landon, Stewart N.
Lovett, Owen, Jr.
Luther, Bert S.
Mathews, Donald B.
McKinley, Robert N.
Meyer, Harry W.
Mitchell, Harold J.
Monaghan, Jerome A.
Murphy, William J.
Myers, Paul R., Jr.
Myers, Wayne E.
Nadal, Jaime B.
Neely, Benjamin C.
Neil, Richard C.
Nelson, Warren H.
Newton, Killraine, Jr.
Oates, Bob, Jr.
Olmsted, Stanley H.
Orr, Charles P.
Overly, Robert W. D.
Parris, Eddie R.
Parrish, Solomon A.
Patton, Kuemen B.
Perkins, Daniel J.
Pettigrew, Melvin N.
Player, Charles E.
Powell, Morrison, Jr.
Preston, William J.
Quicker, Joseph M.
Rathke, John E.
Reber, Forrest C.
Robinson, Paul
Roche, Patrick J.
Salamon, William
Scales, John W., Jr.
Scarlett, Bernard
Schardein, Edgar A.
Schmidt, Christopher G., Jr.
Schuman, Daniel D.
Shaffer, Charles T.
Sluss, Charles S.
Smallwood, Frank W., Jr.
Smith, George D.
Soler, Carlos R.
Steadman, Joseph D.
Stowers, Bernard L.
Tarkington, Dewey A.
Terry, Donald L.
Thornley, Robert, Jr.
Torres, Edward G.
Turetz, Richard
Turner, Jack "D"
Wagner, Charles P., Jr.
Whitcomb, Winfield J.
Wilkes, Roy W.
Wilson, Joseph M., II
Witte, Ernest R.
Wyatt, Robert N.
Yarbrough, Lawrence B.
Youngdahl, Robert J.

Lt. Joseph H. Frates, Chaplain Corps, U.S. Navy, for temporary promotion to lieutenant commander, Chaplain Corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

Lt. (j.g.) William R. Broadwell, U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to lieutenant (junior grade) in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Michael R. Andrew
Robert B. Anyon

Terry J. Atherton
Barry L. Babcock
Mark C. Baker
Peter M. Bluhm
Robert A. Bollenbacher
William S. Bozeman
Charles S. Browning, Jr.
Gregory L. Carr
Vincent E. Clarke
John T. Conly
Edward J. Cordes, Jr.
Richard G. Cowper
Valier J. Daigle
David E. Daube
Roderick F. Davis
Donald M. Dietz
Philip A. Erickson
Robert L. Ferriman
Thomas O. Fincher
James E. Force
Stephan D. Frank
Peter M. Fried
Michael A. Fusco, III
Ronald N. Gerber
Patrick A. Hammond
David C. Harding
James W. Hargrove
Jeffrey K. Harris
Hamilton D. Hearn
Paul C. Henshaw
Calvin C. Humberd, Jr.
Peter B. Johnston
John P. Ketz
William F. Kracke
Stephen D. Kraft
Kenneth A. Krumholz
James R. Laughead
Warren D. Lynn
Tommy G. McDowell
Randall J. McEwen
William B. McGoey, Jr.
Peter C. McLaughlin
Michael Manning
Elton J. Martin, Jr.
Gregory R. Masters
Scott H. Mayer
James M. Mleziva
Thomas A. Morrison
Jerry M. Naeve
Gregory M. Nazaruk
Gary S. Nelson
Thomas G. Olsen
Stephen J. Parham
James E. Pulbratek
Thomas M. Regan, Jr.
Robert M. Reinauer
Thomas W. Sadler
Paul F. Schmitt
Charles W. Schrack
James E. Shauberger
Michael W. Sheehy
George M. Sheppard
Edward J. Sherwood
Warren E. Small
Alan L. Stocklmeir
William L. Todd
Vincent J. Valva, Jr.
Richard F. Wall
Edward J. Walsh, Jr.
Joe F. Wilkinson, Jr.
Frank R. Wilson
William E. Wowak
Richard L. Yoder
Carlos M. Yordan, Jr.
Terence K. Young

The following-named (Naval enlisted scientific education program candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or staff corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Raymond F. Fike
Robert J. Giannaris
David E. Hamilton
Raymond L. Hargis
Ronald G. Higdon
Keith A. Hirt
Kenneth W. Key
Ralph E. Lambright
Douglas T. Lowe
Larry A. Lukens
Richard L. Pellegrino
Robert G. Williscroft

*Howard A. Platt (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant and a temporary lieutenant commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*Indicates ad interim appointment issued.

Stephen H. McCoy (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

*John D. Berryman
Robert E. Chambers
*John B. Cotton
*David B. Danzer
*Lawrence D. Dorr
*Matthew W. Duncan
*Christian E. Hageseth
*William J. Hoglund
*Ralph H. Kaiser
*Gerdi "D" Kelsey
*William H. Labunetz
*Paul J. McKee
*Prudencio Mendez, Jr.
*David M. Murphy
*James A. Murphy
*Thomas S. Parvin
*Thomas E. Rader
*Joseph M. Ryan
*James M. Thomas
*Andrew C. Von Eschenbach

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Adam E. Feret, Jr.
Thomas C. Licking.
*Glenn Lamar Paulk.

*Donald J. White (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be reverted to permanent chief warrant officers W–3 and temporary chief warrant officers W–4 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Max A. Harrell.
Samuel F. Keller, Jr.
James S. Rose.

Frank E. Kline, U.S. Navy retired officer, to be a lieutenant, limited duty only (avionics) in the line of the Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

G. McMurtrie Godley, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Laos.

U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGES

George Harrold Carswell, of Florida, to be U.S. circuit judge for the fifth circuit vice a new position created under Public Law 90–347.

John F. Kilkenny, of Oregon, to be U.S. circuit judge for the ninth circuit vice a new position, Public Law 90–347, approved June 18, 1968.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 12, 1969:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Sherman F. Furey, Jr., of Idaho, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Idaho for the term of 4 years.

Thomas K. Kaulukukui, of Hawaii, to be U.S. marshal for the district of Hawaii for the term of 4 years.

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

George Meany, of Maryland, to be a member of the board of directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1972.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVE ON THE NATO COUNCIL

Robert Ellsworth, of Kansas, to be U.S. Permanent Representative on the Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, with the rank and status of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

AMBASSADORS

Shelby Davis, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Switzerland.

Malcolm Toon, of Maryland, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

Fred L. Hadsel, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Somali Republic.

Guilford Dudley, Jr., of Tennessee, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Denmark.

U.S. NAVY

Rear Adm. Arthur R. Gralla, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of 10 U.S.C. 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

PRAISE THE LORD AND PASS THE AMMUNITION

HON. RICHARD (DICK) ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1969

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, it was a distinct privilege for me to be the featured speaker at the 50th anniversary prayer breakfast of the American Legion Convention in St. Louis, Mo., last Saturday, hosted by Missouri's Governor, the Honorable Warren E. Hearnes, and at the request of the Executive National Committee of American Legion, I am inserting my remarks at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PASS THE AMMUNITION

(Address of Congressman RICHARD H. ICHORD, chairman, House Committee on Internal Security, before the American Legion, 50th Anniversary Prayer Breakfast, the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo., May 10, 1969)

Some things are fitting and proper.

Among those most fitting and proper is that this breakfast should be here in St. Louis, for Missouri and St. Louis are honored that the American Legion was founded at a caucus here May 8 through 10th, 1919. And it is fitting and proper that the Governor of our State, a chief executive who stands firmly for the principles and ideals of the American Legion should be our host.

Let me say to my visiting fellow Legionnaires who may not be intimately acquainted with the Governor of the State of Missouri that your host is not only a man who voices the call for law and order, he does not hesitate to take the decisive action to enforce law and order.

It is fitting, too, I believe that we should take up the cry made famous a few years ago, when a beleaguered chaplain shouted out the words, "Praise the Lord and pass the ammunition." For it is time, past time, I would emphasize, for us to "praise the Lord" for this great nation which is ours, the great institutions which we have built, and then to "pass the ammunition" to those who would defend this nation and its institutions, including our great colleges and universities. We do not have a perfect nation. We have our ills and deficiencies, serious ills and deficiencies, but we can still thank our Creator for the privilege of living in a nation which has given more people greater freedom and more material comforts than any other country in the history of man.

When I speak of "ammunition," I speak not of shells and bullets, nor of mortars and men on the firing line. I speak of "ammunition" which can help us to establish the kind of internal structure that makes and keeps a nation worthy of its people.

Today, this country is fighting a great internal battle—a battle which has sprung up because of the gap between ideal and fulfillment, principle and opportunity, spirit and power. It has become most difficult to find the valid relationship between these extremes. The battles being fought are perhaps not as clear cut as the ones in which the men of the American Legion have been involved in World Wars I and II and the Korean and