

military courts. We cannot again fight a foreign war because of our explosive domestic situation. This will allow my compatriots abroad to consume the remainder of mankind. Domestically my activities will increase in intensity. Public travel will become a nightmare of uncertainty, water supplies will be poisoned, all firearms will be collected from the populace, the police will become openly friendly to me and terrorize rather than protect, licensing of all kinds will be only to those friendly to me (imagine what cooperation I can get from you with a threat to revoke your auto operation privileges), taxes will be raised higher and higher and squandered to break America economically, the sick and elderly will suffer deprivation, starvation, and extinction through decline in purchasing power.

SHALL USE THE CARROT AND THE STICK

I shall use the carrot and the stick. My followers will be rewarded, my enemies crushed. Only a miraculously organized and strong opposition can possibly stop me now. I have no fear that it will arise as Americans are frightfully disorganized and are more concerned in conserving what little they have left, through further compromise, then in fighting for what they have lost. Cooperate in your downfall, give me your minds and your bodies, and I just may allow you to retain life. I am well ahead of schedule in my 40 year plan. By 1986 freedom, liberty and democracy will be gone from the face of the earth, and you are responsible.

LOLA BELLE HOLMES: PATRIOT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 12, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the students at LSU in my district were treated to a rare and refreshing lecture last month when Lola Belle Holmes spoke on their campus. Her hard-hitting message was that the war in the streets about us, as yet undeclared, is planned in Moscow, and is being financed by the so-called war on poverty.

So that our colleagues can benefit from the dynamic message of this fearless American, I submit a flier covering her billing and the news release of her lecture from the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate for May 1, 1969, for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

LOLA BELLE HOLMES: "THE REVOLUTION IS PLANNED"

"The revolution, with its bombs, riots, fires and death is being financed by the War on Poverty."

For every war there are heroes. When a need arises, unlikely people step to the fore to demonstrate unlikely courage, bravery and ability. Such a person is Lola Belle Holmes. She has known for a good while that there is a war in progress, one where a sinister conspiracy makes war against free people everywhere.

Lola Belle Holmes has been in the front lines of this war since 1956 when she infiltrated the Communist apparatus for the F.B.I. For seven long years she took orders from Moscow and reported all to the authorities. She rose to positions of prominence in the Communist-created Negro organizations and in the Communist Party itself. In 1963, she surfaced to give testimony before various government bureaus.

She continues in the front lines of this war, though in a markedly different way. For now Lola Belle Holmes is trying to reach fellow Americans whom she maintains "are in the midst of a revolution of such magnitude that it is like a giant octopus with its tentacles spreading into every walk of life." From her past associations, from continuous knowledge of the strategy of subversion and from an awareness that comes from front-line duty, she has pinpointed the source of the revolution—"The United States Government through its Office of Economic Opportunity is supplying our enemies with the means to destroy our country."

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, May 1, 1969]

NEGRO WOMAN SAYS COMMUNISTS SPARK CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

(By Dick Wright)

Mrs. Lola Bell Holmes is a Negro woman from Louisiana who has been most of her life up North and doesn't go for civil rights movements because she says they are planned and fostered by the Communist Party.

And she said the "war on poverty" is financing a communist-inspired revolution in the United States today.

Mrs. Holmes also denounced Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. who she said "the Communist Party reached out and dumped on Negroes."

She declared that Communists planned and wrote the 1965 voting rights bill.

ONE MORE KNIFE

"The coming Negro trouble," she said, "is but one more knife" of the Communists in America.

Mrs. Holmes also predicted a depression "that could make the 1930s look like the good old days."

"I am a Christian and was raised a Christian. I believe in the American way of life," she said. She added that she believes in freedom and that "after analyzing communism, I came to the conclusion it was a detriment . . . to the Negro people."

Mrs. Holmes spoke at a meeting sponsored by the LSU Young Americans for Freedom. Mike Connelly, YAF president, introduced her as a woman who has spent six and a half years as a Communist for the FBI in Illinois.

DEPLORED STUDENT PAUCITY

Most of the crowd were what Connelly described as "townspeople" and deplored the fact that so few students were present to hear Mrs. Holmes.

"Every poster we put up (on campus) gets torn down by somebody," Connelly said. But there were some students there, some who strongly disagreed with Mrs. Holmes' view of civil rights activity. There were about half a dozen Negro students on hand.

During her speech, Mrs. Holmes denounced charges of police brutality as a Communist tactic. After her talk a Negro student asked

her what she thought of policemen who supposedly shot a Negro boy who rode his bicycle into the area where a Montgomery church was bombed.

"Did you see it?" said Mrs. Holmes.

"Maybe the police thought the boy bombed the church I don't know the situation. How do I know that you are telling the truth?"

She suggested that maybe the boy refused to stop when ordered to do so.

Mrs. Holmes gave a major portion of her hour and a half speech to denouncing the Office of Economic Opportunity and how its money fosters allegedly communist front organizations. She also denounced rioting and burning in Negro ghettos acts which she said were in some cases abetted by anti-poverty workers.

"When the smoke clears the OEO boys emerge to declare that the riots are caused by poverty" she said.

"After each new riot the public is treated to double talk."

She also scored the "riot commission" or "Kerner Report" and said it was a "big thick volume with lots of pictures and doubletalk."

She said that everything the report stated met agreement from Gus Hall (a leader in the American Communist Party.)

"I honestly believe Gus Hall cannot be duped," she said.

ADVOCATES NEGROES WORK HARD

Mrs. Holmes advocated that Negroes get jobs, work hard and get an education and she said she believed in American capitalism. The war on poverty, she declared, is providing "billions to finance the revolution, your destruction."

"You are in the midst of revolution," she said.

"It is like a giant octopus . . . financed by your dollars."

Asked how the people could stop the anti-poverty program, when elected congressmen don't seem to pay attention to the voter, Mrs. Holmes said Americans still had the right to impeach elected officials. Another member of the audience stood up and said:

"Our congressman from this district is on our side and has been on our side all the time."

"Here's a man who you should support," Mrs. Holmes said.

Asked about the Students for a Democratic Society, Mrs. Holmes said she doesn't know too much about them, except that she had read in a report from FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, that "they planned to blow up some government facilities."

She suggested to the audience they do all they could to keep an SDS chapter from forming at LSU. The SDS, she said, are getting worse than the W.E.B. DuBois Club, a Marxist-oriented group once popular on campuses.

Asked about her feelings on the Ku Klux Klan, Mrs. Holmes said, "I never heard them advocating the overthrow of the government." But she quickly added that she doesn't approve of violence.

Saying she knew little about the Klan, she added, "I can't go under the sheets and find out."

At one point in her talk, when she had been heckled briefly by some students, Mrs. Holmes told the group:

"If you kill me for telling the truth, then I don't care because I'll go home to my God and be free."

SENATE—Tuesday, May 13, 1969

The Senate met at 11:30 a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

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

Trust in the Lord with all thine heart; and lean not upon thine own understanding. Proverbs 3: 5.

Almighty God, we thank Thee this day that Thou hast gathered our people into a great nation and established their free-

dom under Thy sovereignty. Let not our goodly heritage fade or the bright vision of service to all mankind be disowned. Deepen the root of our life in everlasting righteousness. Make us equal to our high trust; reverent in the use of freedom;

just in the exercise of power; generous in the protection of the weak. May wisdom and morality be the stability of our times; and our deepest trust be in Thee, Lord of the nations and King of Kings. Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the Chair recognizes the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), for not exceeding 20 minutes. The Senator from Montana.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 12, 1969, be dispensed with.

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

ABM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the debate on the Safeguard ABM that has occurred to date and the testimony that has been given have resulted in a conflict and not a consensus of views. No confluence of opinion has developed, no winnowing process has yet clearly divided the convincing from the confusing. As far as the technical merits of the Safeguard system are concerned, we do not yet have the lucid guidelines we need for a prudent judgment.

To be sure, there has been a consensus of sorts. There is virtual unanimity, for example, that an ABM system for the protection of cities would not be much good against an all-out nuclear attack and there is substantial agreement that, regardless of what decision is made with respect to deployment, research and development of antimissile defenses should continue.

The differences over the technical efficacy of Safeguard constitute, however, only one segment of the problem. More significant is whether our deployment of Safeguard will upset international stability, whether it will provoke an escalation in the arms race, and whether it will assist or handicap proposed negotiations with the Soviet Union on strategic delivery vehicles.

One of the critical questions for which we seek an answer is: Will the deployment of the Safeguard provoke another round in the arms race? Will it be escalatory? It has become virtually a truism that arms races are dangerous and can lead to war. It is even more significant that they can be very costly in terms of national resources and that, despite the cost, after each upward spiral is turned by the competitors in the race,

the security of none is any greater. All too frequently, the rivals continue to balance each other, only at a more heavily armed and more expensive level. Arms racing, in short, can be an extravagant facility for all concerned.

The United States admittedly has at times been a victim of the temptation to dissipate its resources in arms racing. The "bomber gap" of the fifties and the "missile gap" of the early sixties are well-known instances in which the United States reacted to what were thought to be weapons advances on the other side but which later did not materialize. The Soviet Government, too, has frequently reacted by expansions of its strategic weapons with the aim of matching or even outrunning the United States. There is no evidence that the action-reaction syndrome has been purged from the psychology of either the United States or the Soviet Union. A provocative weapons advance on either side today can be expected to trigger very much the same kind of counterreaction as it did 5, 10, or 15 years ago.

Yet we slowly learn. One of the more encouraging aspects of the current Safeguard proposal is the conscious effort of American defense officials to devise a weapons system that is intended to be nonprovocative and nonescalatory. The President, the Secretary of Defense, and other officials have portrayed the installation of the Safeguard as a defensive, not an offensive, measure and have concluded, as the President has said, that "the Soviet Union cannot interpret this as escalating the arms race." Unfortunately, the conclusion does not necessarily derive from the premise.

Distinctions between so-called "offensive" and "defensive" weapons are often semantic, not real. During negotiations in the League of Nations in the 1920's and 1930's the attempt to distinguish between such weapons was a failure, one which contributed importantly to the stillbirth of those negotiations. Although "defensive," the Safeguard system is designed to protect and preserve an "offensive" weapon. How the Soviet Government chooses to react may hinge very little on whether it perceives the Safeguard system as "defensive" or "offensive" in a strictly military sense. The fact is it is another weapons system which has an impact on overall strategic and political relations. The Soviet Union may well conclude that it has to compensate for this American initiative, not so much because of military logic but because of broader political imperatives. All of our experience with the international interaction between national military establishments leads to the conclusion that we cannot be dogmatic in asserting that the Safeguard will not have an escalatory effect. Indeed, if we are calculating prudently, then we must anticipate the opposite. If it does, then, it could seriously prejudice endeavors to arrive at an understanding with the Soviet Government on limiting strategic armaments.

There is also a serious question whether the Soviet Government may not be engaged in a weapons deployment that could gravely prejudice the possibility of negotiating an agreement on strategic

armaments. I refer to its deployment of the SS-9, an ICBM with a warhead reported to be as large as 20 to 25 megatons. The Secretary of Defense has sought to justify the Safeguard proposal on the grounds that the SS-9 deployment indicates the Soviet Union is striving for a first-strike capability against the United States. A certain portion of the Minuteman force must be safeguarded, he argues, in order to insure its survival and to maintain our capability for assured destruction against the Soviet Union.

I do not intend to take issue with the principle of assured destruction as the core of national deterrent policy. Nor, if the alleged Soviet threat is valid, do I necessarily quarrel with the thesis that it may be desirable to defend a portion of our offensive strike force in order to make certain we retain a capability of assured destruction. But the suddenness with which the threat of the SS-9 has been conjured up necessitates a close examination.

It is disconcerting that Mr. Laird's disclosures come close on the heels of another Department of Defense appraisal of the national strategic posture that was formulated in entirely different terms. It is disturbing that one Secretary of Defense can communicate to the Congress one intelligence conclusion regarding the Soviet Union and another Secretary of Defense, only 2 months later, presumably relying upon the same data, the same intelligence organization, and the same estimate, can arrive at a substantially different conclusion.

The last posture statement of Secretary Clark Clifford, which appeared in mid-January of this year, declares that "even against the highest Soviet threat" projected in the national intelligence estimate, the U.S. strategic forces programed over the next few years could destroy in a second strike more than two-fifths of the Soviet population and about three-fourths of their industrial capacity. This, the Secretary confirmed, was sufficient assured destruction capability to comprise an adequate deterrent.

The Secretary warned, however, that we must be prepared to cope with unexpected developments in the Soviet strategic threat and take appropriate actions to hedge against them. One of the unexpected contingencies foreseen by the Secretary was the possibility of development of a Soviet ICBM with a target kill capability that would be able to destroy a large number of U.S. land-based missiles in hard silos. But he saw no need to take countermeasures against this possibility until there was evidence that the threat was beginning to emerge. Yet in March, Secretary Laird perceived such a threat and decided to revamp the Sentinel system not only by changing the object of its defense from the cities to Minuteman, but also by placing the emphasis on the Soviet Union, rather than Communist China, as the principal adversary. The villain responsible for this switch in scripts was the SS-9 which was described as being deployed at a menacing rate.

But the SS-9 is nothing new. Its existence has been known for some years and its increasing deployment has been observed. Did some new element sud-

denly stimulate the fears of the Defense Secretary? He mentioned evidence as recent as last December of Soviet deployment of the SS-9. But are we to believe that Secretary Clifford's assessment in January was not made with full awareness of the SS-9 deployment and its potential? If the Defense Department in January deemed that the Soviet deployment of SS-9's implied such a formidable threat to our offensive missiles, if they considered it a first-strike force, why did not Secretary Clifford's statement reflect that judgment? Was some radically new intelligence gained between January and March? Was a new estimate made by the intelligence community which dramatically enlarged the Soviet threat in those two intervening months? I do not find in Secretary Laird's public utterances claims of either significant new data or a new national intelligence estimate.

Since his first disclosure of the threat of the SS-9, the Defense Secretary has asserted he referred only to a Soviet capability and not to an intention. Moreover, the Secretary of State has disclaimed a belief that the Soviet Government intends a first strike against the United States. In any case the Defense Secretary is not referring to a Soviet first-strike capability that exists now but only to one which might exist in the mid-1970's, assuming that present trends of deployment continue over a period of years. He has, in a word, assumed just about the worst possible projection of Soviet deployment, and then has reacted as though it were certain to become a reality.

But we have seen these projections of Soviet capabilities go awry all too many times. Too many times before we have overreacted to a theoretical projection which never became a tangible fact. I have already cited the well-known bomber and missile gaps. I would also like to point out that when the Sentinel ABM system was proposed in 1967, it was predicated on projections of Chinese and Soviet deployments which did not materialize. It was then estimated that the Soviet ICBM deployment would level off. According to Secretary Laird, it did not. But now the Safeguard proposal is predicated on the assumption that it will continue. But what if it levels off?

There are many reasons to expect that it might. According to Under Secretary of Defense Packard the Soviet ICBM force has attained "parity" with our own, and it is reasonable to suppose that the Soviet Union might have sought this level as a precondition for negotiations on a strategic arms agreement with the United States. It would not be realistic on our part to expect they would agree to freeze armaments at less than parity. And they are not so unrealistic as to dream that we would accept a ratio that was unbalanced in their favor.

Both we and they should grasp and ponder the fact that we are at a decisive milestone. A state of approximate strategic balance now obtains between the two sides. Each has sufficiency of strategic power to deter the other. If at this critical moment either tries to gain an advantage by introducing new strategic systems or by substantially enlarging ex-

isting deployments, then the present stability could be upset. And there would be no prospect that it could be regained, at least not until another major round in the arms race had been completed, perhaps years hence and at dire economic, social, and political costs.

The immediate manifestation of the deployment or nondeployment of Safeguard will be its possible effects upon the long-pending negotiations on strategic delivery vehicles. I fear that the Safeguard proposal has already had a baleful effect upon the decision to start these parleys. The major survey of defense policy which the new administration apparently is now conducting seems to have become an obstacle to the diplomacy of "nonconfrontation and negotiation" which President Nixon established as the main thrust of his administration's foreign policy. "Late spring or early summer"—the announced time for beginning the talks—is a vague deadline which contrasts sharply with the urgency of the hard sell to win approval of appropriations for the Safeguard ABM in the fiscal year beginning July 1. The enthusiasms for building the weapon compares starkly with the dawdling pace of the preparations alleged to be necessary for U.S. entry into the talks. Actually preparations for strategic talks have been underway for several years—the United States first made the proposal for freezing strategic delivery vehicles in January 1964, and was ready to start negotiating in the summer of last year. Why should it be necessary to pull everything up by the roots again just to see if it is alive and well? Let us get on with the talks. Let us set a date—a date in early June. This will dispel suspicion that the United States is reluctant to undertake these talks and is more in favor of expanding than constricting the arms race.

On April 25, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a chart comparing the relative nuclear strength between the United States and the Soviet Union. Shown rather graphically is the growth rate that has maintained this balance of nuclear terror; it is an ugly picture that has not changed significantly for years. In the same insertion, I suggested that in view of the questions raised about the feasibility of the system, its exorbitant costs, reliability, and so forth, rather than begin the Safeguard deployment even in a limited fashion it would be a better course at this time to hold off this phase pending a good-faith effort to open disarmament talks with the Soviet Union. At the same time I said our missile defense research and development efforts could go forward, thereby keeping viable the option to begin a deployment if and when it is clear that talks will not be productive and that the Safeguard system is technologically feasible.

The need now, it seems to me, is to move promptly on negotiations and to try to maximize the chances for their success. To that end, it might be helpful if talks were begun by the Soviet Union and the United States, with simultaneous declarations calling for an interim moratorium on further deployment of all strategic weapons. It would be my hope

that this Nation would consider taking the initiative by inviting the Soviet Union to join us without delay in a temporary freeze of this kind pending talks which would be designed to make the freeze permanent. In that fashion both nations would underscore the mutuality of interest which can exist—which, in fact, does exist—in bringing to a close this costly, wasteful, and futile competition in nuclear armaments. It would be my further hope that the initiative, which is suggested, would be pursued by the executive branch before the consideration of the Safeguard deployment reaches a point of no return in the Senate.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, has given us a statement on the implications that deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system at this time would have for this country. He has struck at the key issues with clarity and wisdom.

Underneath the technical complexity and difficult judgments about missile technology lies a simple truth. It is this—we are at a moment in time, the first time in the quarter of a century of the nuclear age, where it may be possible to halt the nuclear arms race with all the danger it holds for all our people and for the world. Already, we are informed, the equivalent in nuclear power of more than 15 tons of TNT hovers over the head of every man, woman, and child on the earth.

We who oppose deployment of the ABM at this time are asking for a brief delay in the arms race during which the United States can enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union to determine whether it is possible—either by formal or tacit agreement—to halt the arms race, or whether it is necessary to go on as in the past, piling up more and more deadly nuclear weapons.

The United States can defer deployment of the ABM for three principal reasons:

First. It presently has an overwhelming retaliatory capability—an ability to destroy the Soviet Union. This capability can be maintained even if the Soviet Union continues the development of nuclear weapons at its maximum capacity through the mid-1970's.

Second. A reasonable analysis of the intelligence available is that there is no new or present danger to our deterrent.

Third. The ABM system proposed by the administration, is the subject of so much responsible doubt about its feasibility for missile site protection that a delay of deployment would serve the Nation well. The most effective strategic response to a real threat to our deterrent could be developed in the time our Government is seeking a halt in the nuclear arms race, rather than in haste to build and deploy an ineffective system.

In conclusion, it is my hope that the administration will heed the wise words of the majority leader. There is no desire of those opposed to the ABM deployment to confront the administration politically. Reasonable solutions are still possible. The United States can enter into negotiations with the Soviet Union

with confidence in its existing and preponderant strength. The United States can do so with the knowledge that if negotiations fail, we have the resources and time to do what is necessary to insure the credibility of our deterrent and awesome, if uncertain, security.

It is my view that delay can be taken in safety. It is my view that a brief delay to determine if a halt in the nuclear weapons race is possible is the course of reason, the course of responsibility, and the duty of a great country.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Kentucky for the brief statement he has just made. He has said more in a few words than I said in many. He has stated the case better and more succinctly. I join with him in the postulate that this is not a political matter, that this is something in which we are all vitally interested regardless of politics, and that those of us who oppose the system do not doubt the honesty and integrity of those who are in favor of it.

It is a matter of judgment which must be faced up to and on which a decision must be made. I join the Senator from Kentucky in saying that we ought to undertake to start negotiations if it is at all possible, and that they ought to be undertaken in good faith. If results are not forthcoming and good faith is not displayed, then we ought to get busy and enlarge the deterrent.

I do not believe that a delay would cause any difficulty. I think it would yield much good. If an agreement to halt arms race can be brought about through the two superpowers, it would mean that in this country we would be able to divert funds to the needs of the cities and to the needs of various segments of our population which must be met and faced up to. In that way we shall bring about a balance in our sense of responsibilities, which in the long run will react to the welfare of this Nation as a whole.

I again commend the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky, who has taken the leadership in this matter over several years and who has done a lot of good groundwork to bolster the case he has presented on occasion to the Senate.

I assure the Senator once again that this is not a political matter. It is not a matter of a gain or loss for either the Republican or Democratic Party. It is a matter in the best interest of the country. Regardless of its effect on either party or on any candidate, it is the issue which should have priority at all times.

Let us at least make an effort. Let us go ahead and see if we cannot do something which would benefit mankind; instead of continually building and building and acting and reacting with missiles and other systems, which can do nothing but bring destruction on mankind as a whole.

We have a great responsibility in the Senate. Let us face up to it and build for peace and not for disaster; or at least let us try to move toward the elimination of that which is designed to destroy people.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar under New Report.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAVEL in the chair). The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS

The bill clerk read the nomination of Frank Q. Nebeker, of Virginia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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 the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. 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.

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION AND RADIO AMENDMENTS OF 1969

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 156, S. 1242.

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

The BILL CLERK. A bill (S. 1242) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television or radio broadcasting facilities and the provisions relating to support of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

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

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 1242

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 "Educational Television and Radio Amendments of 1969".

FIVE-YEAR EXTENSION OF CONSTRUCTION PROVISIONS

SEC. 2. (a) Section 391 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 391) is amended by striking out "and" before "\$15,000,000" and by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", and such sums as may be necessary for each of the next five fiscal years".

(b) The last sentence of such section is amended by striking out "July 1, 1971" and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1976".

ONE-YEAR EXTENSION OF FINANCING OF CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

SEC. 3. (a) Paragraph (1) of subsection (k) of section 396 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 396) is amended by inserting "and for the next fiscal year the sum of \$20,000,000" after "\$9,000,000".

(b) Paragraph (2) of such subsection is amended by inserting "or the next fiscal year" after "June 30, 1969".

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with a limitation of 3 minutes for each Senator.

OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE BROUGHT HOME FROM KOREA

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, for more than 16 years since the end of the Korean conflict we have maintained thousands of GI's, marines, and airmen in South Korea. Today, there are more than 56,000 American servicemen stationed there, most of them along the demilitarized zone on the 38th parallel separating South Korea and North Korea. These men should be returned to the United States as soon as possible. I mean all of them except for a few thousand military advisers and observers.

In the years following the Korean conflict there was justification for our continuing a strong military presence in South Korea. It was obvious that the Armed Forces of the South at that time and for possibly 5 or 10 years would by themselves have been unable to repel a second attack from the North.

The fact is that today South Korea has a regular army of 550,000 men, the fifth largest standing army in the world. North Korea has a standing army of but 345,000 men. There are 17,000 men in the South Korean Navy and only 9,000 in that of North Korea. South Korea has 30,000 men trained as marines while North Korea has none. In addition, the reserve forces of South Korea number 2,550,000 men who drill at least twice a week. North Korea has a reserve force of but 1,200,000 men. The Republic of Korea—ROK—standing army and reserves are well equipped with the most modern weapons.

The only category of arms in which North Korea exceeds South Korea is in its air force of 30,000 men, 530 fighter planes, 60 light bombers, 20 helicopters, and 27 transport planes. The South Korean air force is composed of 23,000 men, 195 fighter planes, 10 reconnaissance planes, and 22 transport planes.

Furthermore, South Korea with 28,650,000 people is twice as populous as North Korea with its 11,400,000 people. Its economy is booming and the degree of its economic growth is tremendous as compared to that of North Korea, a poverty stricken nation.

Since 1951 the United States has given more than \$3 billion in military assistance to South Korea. In addition we have given \$4.6 billion in economic aid to that country. Its increasing prosperity is in large part a result of our help.

South Korea is the only nation in the world to provide substantial armed forces to assist us in Vietnam. More than 53,000 Republic of Korea soldiers are now fighting in Vietnam alongside our forces. According to our military experts, they have fought hard and well. Many have been killed and wounded in combat. The famed ROK Tiger Division has earned the respect of its allies and foes as have other units in the ROK armed forces now in combat in South Vietnam.

Of course, these troops were transported to South Vietnam on American ships and planes and are maintained there entirely at the expense of American taxpayers. Of course, South Korea, in reality a client nation of the United States, was given hundreds of millions of dollars in addition to military and economic assistance as a quid pro quo for these troops we are paying and maintaining while they are rendering valuable assistance in helping maintain the Saigon militarist regime of Thieu and Ky in power. It is undisputed that the forces of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam, or VC, has the support of a large majority, probably 80 percent, of the inhabitants of South Vietnam.

On two occasions in recent years I had the opportunity to visit South Korea. Compared to all we know about North Korea, it is a prosperous nation. Compared to the United States, it is a poor nation. North Korea in such a comparison would be regarded as a poverty-stricken backward nation. I visited with our GI's and marines along the 38th parallel at Panmunjom and elsewhere and saw for myself the hard conditions under which they live during their tour of duty. It is very questionable whether it is necessary that we continue to maintain any Armed Forces in South Korea.

It is clear that our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam will end in a matter of time. I am hopeful that President Nixon will order the withdrawal of sizable numbers of men from South Vietnam within the next few months. In any event, it is a question of a year or 2 years at the most before we withdraw completely from that ugly civil war in which we should never have become engaged in the first place.

At that time, and it should be much before then, the 53,000 South Korean troops in South Vietnam will also be returned to their homeland. There can then no longer be any justification whatever for our continuing to station thousands of young Americans in South Korea. They should be returned home immediately upon the return of ROK forces from South Vietnam, or before.

South Korea will then undeniably have the military and naval strength to defend itself against any possible attack from the north. In the very unlikely event of that occurring, our warplanes stationed in Japan and Okinawa are only a few minutes distant from Korea and could readily come to the assistance of the South Korean Air Force, if that assistance were required.

Administration officials, particularly those in the Defense Department, should begin immediate planning for withdrawal of our forces from South Korea

and that withdrawal should be coincident with the return home of South Korean forces now in South Vietnam or at approximately the same time. This would be an important first step in reducing tensions in the Far East, in determining just what are our vital national interests in that part of the world and in the reevaluation of our entire Asiatic policy which must and will result with our disengagement from Vietnam. That disengagement and withdrawal should have been made before now. With the armed forces of the Soviet Union and Communist China fighting each other along their common border of more than 6,500 miles there is no longer any valid fear of a huge monolithic threat of aggression in Southeast Asia from the combined forces of the two great Communist powers.

Mr. President, the United States does not have a mandate from Almighty God to police the entire world. We saved South Korea from Communist aggression and in the years since we have enabled that little country to defend itself against any possible future attack. It is time for South Korea to stand on its own two feet.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

CONSTITUTIONAL RESTRAINTS ON ACTION REGARDING SUPREME COURT JUSTICES

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, for the last 2 weeks, the Supreme Court has once again been the center of public discussion, as it has been so often in our history. There is general agreement that the situation which now exists amounts to a crisis for the Supreme Court of a seriousness rarely matched in our history. In such circumstances, the obligations placed upon each Member of Congress, on the President, and the Court itself require thoughtful consideration and a strict adherence to the Constitution.

Much is at stake. More is involved even than the reputation and integrity of the High Court. The very independence of the Court may be threatened. We must all rise above passing temptations and insure that however this matter is resolved, the damage to the Supreme Court will be minimized.

The Constitution provides that all Federal judges shall retain office during "good behavior," which means that judges have tenure for life. Excepting only resignation or retirement, there is only one method by which a Federal judge can be relieved of office—that is by impeachment according to article II, section 4.

Under the impeachment provisions, the House of Representatives must bring charges that a Federal official has committed "treason, bribery, or other high crimes and misdemeanors." The Senate has the sole power to try impeachments brought by the House, and a two-thirds vote is necessary for conviction. The responsibility placed upon the Senate is an awesome one. Only once before, in 1805, was a Supreme Court Justice brought to the well of the Senate. This was the impeachment of Justice Samuel Chase, who was charged with rendering decisions which his political opponents disliked. However, a Senate composed largely of his political enemies refused to convict Justice Chase. The precedent established was that judges could be impeached only for violations of law, and not for their political views or for decisions they handed down while on the bench. This precedent is a foundation stone of the independence of the Supreme Court. While the Court is not and never should be immune from criticism for its decisions, it should remain safe from retribution based upon partisan politics.

The responsibility of the Senate to sit in judgment in impeachment cases imposes an obligation to act in the highest traditions of judicial propriety. In such a proceeding, each Member sits as a judge, and care must be taken not to prejudge the issue, or to appear to prejudge it by taking a public position. In spite of the recent demands for investigations and inquiries, the Senate should move cautiously in view of its ultimate constitutional responsibility. In this matter, the Senate must await the action of the other body, for the Constitution gives to the House of Representatives the initiative in these matters.

The restraints placed upon the President by the Constitution are even more strict than those placed on the Senate. The Constitution gives the President the power to appoint Supreme Court Justices with the advice and consent of the Senate. But it confers no role on the President in matters of removal. A Federal judge is immune from action by the President, and care should be taken in all cases not to establish any precedent suggesting that the President has any power or influence to discharge a member of the judiciary from office.

Restraints are also imposed on the courts themselves. Each judge is an independent officer. His authority stems directly from the Constitution. Judges are not dependent for their positions on the good will or tolerance of their brethren on the courts. It would be most unfortunate if the independence of the judiciary were weakened by making judges subject to the opinions of other members of the judiciary. Courts are ill-equipped to discipline their own members, and it would be an unfortunate development if any court or judge—even the Chief Justice—had any role in resolving questions such as the one we now face.

This serious crisis will eventually be resolved, if not by voluntary action, then by operation of constitutional procedures. In the meantime, I would hope that every public official would carefully measure his public behavior by the dic-

tates of his conscience and by the requirements of the Constitution.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. ERVIN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am glad that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has brought out the point he has. I suppose every Senator has been questioned many times by members of the press and others as to what he thinks Mr. Justice Fortas should do under the present difficult situation which exists. The Senator from Florida has had one answer to all of those inquiries, and I think that answer has been in accord with the suggestion which is now made by the Senator from North Carolina.

The Senator from Florida has stated that since the Senate does have the duty under the Constitution of trying impeachments brought by the other House, and since at least two Members of the other House have publicly announced that they are considering offering a resolution of impeachment, the Senator from Florida would confine himself simply to stating that in his judgment the complained of action of Mr. Justice Fortas is unwise and that the matter of what he should do is primarily a matter for his conscience and his own decision at this time.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for having brought out the point very clearly that the Senate is in the peculiarly difficult position of having to sit both as a jury and a judge in the event impeachment proceedings should be brought. I certainly have no information that they will be brought but as long as Members of the other body are talking about bringing them, I think we should be doubly careful in our expressions.

For that reason, I made the expressions which I have just indicated and thank the Senator for having made this matter one of public record in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Again, I congratulate the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank my very good friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Florida, for his remarks.

The position stated by him is exactly the same as the position I undertook to express a moment ago.

THE URGENCY OF RATIFYING THE UNITED NATIONS HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION ON GENOCIDE

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the crime of genocide is one that has plagued mankind since the earliest historical times. Mankind has consistently turned upon his fellow man and attempted to destroy his institutions, his customs, and often even to end his life. History is filled with examples of such actions, among them being the butchery by the Assyrian armies, the utter destruction of Carthaginian people by the Romans, the pillaging of the hordes of Attila and of Genghis Khan, and so on up to what can be termed the modern period.

During the last two centuries it appeared that mankind had at last become "civilized" and such horrible butcheries occurred with less frequency. Even the waging of war was governed by a certain set of codes and international laws.

Then, in this century, when a man felt he could at last turn to his neighbor and assure him that never again could such brutal savagery exist, genocide reared its ugly head on a scale of brutality never before equalled in the annals of history. The inhuman, efficient attempt of Hitler's Nazi Germany to completely eradicate the Jews occurred just in the last 30 years. The existence of the concentration camps is terrifying proof that genocide can again be practiced by a people that thinks it is civilized, and that responsible people must act to prevent any future action comparable to the unthinkable crime of the Nazi's.

It is to the credit of humanity that action was swiftly taken by the United Nations soon after the horror of Germany was revealed. The Human Rights Convention on Genocide was ratified by the United Nations before the decade of the forties was out, and since that time many nations have manifested their beliefs by ratifying the convention.

The United States was among those nations that bewailed the actions of the Nazis and was one of the powers that conducted the postwar trials at Nuremberg. Yet the U.S. Senate has not ratified this Convention which seeks to outlaw any such future occurrence. There is no excuse for any further delay on the part of the United States on such a crucial matter. Now is the time for the Senate to ratify the United Nations Human Rights Convention on Genocide.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S DRAFT REFORM MESSAGE

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services, and of the Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittees on Education, and Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I applaud President Nixon's draft reform message. My position on these committees has given me a particularly good vantage point to see the military, manpower, educational, and human implications of the draft.

Like the President, I hope the day will soon come when the draft will be unnecessary. I am hopeful that the study by the President's Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force, which the President appointed on March 27, will prove the feasibility of moving to an all-volunteer army. Until we are able to end the war in Vietnam, the all-volunteer army appears unlikely. President Nixon has rightly made this difficult task the top priority of his new administration.

In the meantime, it is incumbent upon us to do everything we can to provide a draft system that is as equitable as possible. The President's message does just that. The message calls for the drafting of the youngest first, limits the period of time a young man will be vulnerable, provides for the selecting process through a random system, continues the undergraduate student deferments,

allows graduate students to complete the full academic year, and calls for a thorough review of our guidelines and procedures for deferments and exemptions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

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

[A release from the Office of the White House Press Secretary, May 13, 1969]

To the Congress of the United States:

For almost two million young men who reach the age of military service each year—and for their families—the draft is one of the most important facts of life. It is my conviction that the disruptive impact of the military draft on individual lives should be minimized as much as possible, consistent with the national security. For this reason I am today asking the Congress for authority to implement important draft reforms.

Ideally, of course, minimum interference means no draft at all. I continue to believe that under more stable world conditions and with an armed force that is more attractive to volunteers, that ideal can be realized in practice. To this end, I appointed, on March 27, 1969, an Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force. I asked that group to develop a comprehensive plan which will attract more volunteers to military service, utilize military manpower in a more efficient way, and eliminate conscription as soon as that is feasible. I look forward to receiving the report of the Commission this coming November.

Under present conditions, however, some kind of draft will be needed for the immediate future. As long as that is the case, we must do everything we can to limit the disruption caused by the system and to make it as fair as possible. For one's vision of the eventual does not excuse his inattention to the immediate. A man may plan to sell his house in another year, but during that year he will do what is necessary to make it livable.

Accordingly, I will ask the Congress to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, returning to the President the power which he had prior to June 30, 1967 to modify call-up procedures. I will describe below in some detail the new procedures which I will establish if Congress grants this authority. Essentially, I would make the following alterations:

1. Change from an oldest-first to a youngest-first order of call, so that a young man would become less vulnerable rather than more vulnerable to the draft as he grows older.
2. Reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability—and the uncertainty that accompanies it—from seven years to one year, so that a young man would normally enter that status during the time he was nineteen years old and leave it during the time he was twenty.
3. Select those who are actually drafted through a random system. A procedure of this sort would distribute the risk of call equally—by lot—among all who are vulnerable during a given year, rather than arbitrarily selecting those whose birthdays happen to fall at certain times of the year or the month.
4. Continue the undergraduate student deferment, with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability would come whenever the deferment expired.
5. Allow graduate students to complete, not just one term, but the full academic year during which they are first ordered for induction.
6. In addition, as a step toward a more consistent policy of deferments and exemp-

tions, I will ask the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review all guidelines, standards and procedures in this area and to report to me their findings and recommendations.

I believe these reforms are essential. I hope they can be implemented quickly.

Any system which selects only some from a pool of many will inevitably have some elements of inequity. As its name implies, choice is the very purpose of the Selective Service System. Such choices cannot be avoided so long as the supply of men exceeds military requirements. In these circumstances, however, the Government bears a moral obligation to spread the risk of induction equally among those who are eligible.

Moreover, a young man now begins his time of maximum vulnerability to the draft at age nineteen and leaves that status only when he is drafted or when he reaches his twenty-sixth birthday. Those who are not called up are nevertheless vulnerable to call for a seven year period. For those who are called, the average age of induction can vary greatly. A few years ago, when calls were low, the average age of involuntary induction was nearly twenty-four. More recently it has dropped to just about twenty. What all of this means for the average young man is a prolonged time of great uncertainty.

The present draft arrangements make it extremely difficult for most young people to plan intelligently as they make some of the most important decisions of their lives, decisions concerning education, career, marriage, and family. Present policies extend a period during which young people come to look on government processes as particularly arbitrary.

For all of these reasons, the American people are unhappy about our present draft mechanisms. Various elements of the basic reforms which I here suggest have been endorsed by recent studies of the Selective Service System, including that of the Marshall Commission of 1967, the Clark panel of that same year, and the reports of both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees. Reform of this sort is also sound from a military standpoint, since younger men are easier to train and have fewer family responsibilities.

My specific proposals, in greater detail, are as follows:

1. A "youngest-first" order of call. Under my proposal, the government would designate each year a "prime age group," a different pool of draft eligibles for each consecutive twelve-month period. (Since that period would not necessarily begin on January 1, it would be referred to as a "selective service year.") The prime age group for any given selective service year would contain those registrants who were nineteen years old when it began. Those who received deferments or exemptions would rejoin the prime age group at the time their deferment or exemption expired. During the first year that the new plan was in operation, the prime age group would include all eligible men from nineteen to twenty-six, not deferred or exempt, so that no one would escape vulnerability simply because of the transition.

2. Limited vulnerability. Each individual would experience maximum vulnerability to the draft only for the one selective service year in which he is in the prime age group. At the end of the twelve-month period—which would normally come sometime during his twentieth year—he would move on to progressively less vulnerable categories and an entirely new set of registrants would become the new prime age group. Under this system, a young man would receive an earlier and more decisive answer to his question "Where do I stand with the draft?" and he could plan his life accordingly.

3. A random selection system. Since more men are classified as available for service each year than are required to fill current or

anticipated draft calls, Selective Service Boards must have some way of knowing whom to call first, whom to call second, and whom not to call at all. There must be some fair method of determining the sequence of induction for those available for service in the prime age group.

In my judgment, a fair system is one which randomizes by lot the order of selection. Each person in the prime age group should have the same chance of appearing at the top of the draft list, at the bottom, or somewhere in the middle. I would therefore establish the following procedure:

At the beginning of the third month after Congress grants this authority, the first of a sequence of selective service years would begin. Prior to the start of each selective service year, the dates of the 365 days to follow would be placed in a sequence determined by a random method. Those who spend the following year in the pool would take their place in the draft sequence in the same order that their birthdays come up on this scrambled calendar. Those born on June 21st, for example, might be at the head of the list, followed by those born on January 12th, who in turn might be followed by those born on October 23rd. Each year, a new random order would be established for the next year's draft pool. In turn those who share the same birthday would be further distributed, this time by the first letter of their last names. But rather than systematically discriminating against those who come at the front of the alphabet, the alphabet would also be scrambled in a random manner.

Once a person's place in the sequence was determined, that assignment would never change. If he were granted a deferment or exemption at age nineteen or twenty, he would re-enter the prime age group at the time his deferment or exemption expires, taking the same place in the sequence that he was originally assigned.

While the random sequence of induction would be nationally established, it would be locally applied by each draft board to meet its local quota. In addition to distributing widely and evenly the risk of induction, the system would also aid many young men in assessing the likelihood of induction even before the classification procedure is completed. This would reduce uncertainty for the individual registrant and, particularly in times of low draft calls, simplify the task of the draft boards.

4. Undergraduate student deferments. I continue to believe in the wisdom of college deferments. Permitting the diligent student to complete his college education without interruption by the draft is a wise national investment. Under my proposal, a college student who chooses to take a student deferment would still receive his draft sequence number at the time he first enters the prime age group. But he would not be subject to induction until his deferment ended and he re-entered a period of maximum vulnerability.

5. Graduate student induction. I believe that the induction of men engaged in graduate study should be postponed until the end of the full academic year during which they are first called to the military service. I will ask the National Security Council to consider appropriate advice to the Director of the Selective Service to establish this policy. At present, graduate students are allowed to delay induction only to the end of a semester. This often means that they lose valuable time which has been invested in preparation for general examinations or other degree requirements. It can also jeopardize some of the financial arrangements which they made when they planned on a full year of schooling. Induction at the end of a full academic year will provide a less damaging interruption and will still be consistent with Congressional policy.

At the same time, however, the present policy against general graduate deferments should be continued, with exceptions only for students in medical and allied fields who are subject to a later special draft. We must prevent the pyramiding of student deferments—undergraduate and graduate—into a total exemption from military service. For this reason the postponement of induction should be possible only once for each graduate student.

6. A review of guidelines. The above measures will reduce the uncertainty of young men as to when and if they may be called for service. It is also important that we encourage a consistent administration of draft procedures by the more than 4,000 local boards around the country. I am therefore requesting the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to conduct a thorough review of our guidelines, standards and procedures for deferments and exemptions, and to report their findings to me by December 1, 1969. While the autonomy of local boards provides valuable flexibility and sensitivity, reasonable guidelines can help to limit geographic inequities and enhance the equity of the entire system. The 25,000 concerned citizens who serve their country so well on these local boards deserve the best possible framework for their decisions.

Ultimately we should end the draft. Except for brief periods during the Civil War and World War I, conscription was foreign to the American experience until the 1940's. Only in 1948 did a peacetime draft become a relatively permanent fact of life for this country. Now a full generation of Americans has grown up under a system of compulsory military service.

I am hopeful that we can soon restore the principle of no draft in peacetime. But until we do, let us be sure that the operation of the Selective Service System is as equitable and as reasonable as we can make it. By drafting the youngest first, by limiting the period of vulnerability, by randomizing the selection process, and by reviewing deferment policies, we can do much to achieve these important interim goals. We should do no less for the youth of our country.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 13, 1969.

"CRISIS OF RELEVANCE," ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, in an address delivered at the Kansas City Law Day banquet sponsored by the Kansas City Bar Association, the Lawyers Association of Kansas City, and the University of Missouri-Kansas City Law School, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) ignored the customary platitudes which so often mark such ceremonies.

Instead he raised some important questions concerning the law—how it is made and how it is administered. But he went beyond this, to address himself to a crisis of relevance—not only of the law to the great multitude of people—but to a crisis of relevance which extends to every aspect of American life.

Senator WILLIAMS has raised important questions which we, as legislators and representatives of the people, must face. I ask unanimous consent that this important speech be printed into the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF SENATOR HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., FOR LAW DAY AT UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI LAW SCHOOL AND KANSAS CITY, MO., BAR ASSOCIATION, THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1969

Today, across the land, people are paying tribute to the institution known as the Law Day—1969. But in other places and even here, now and in other times, May 1 is known as May Day.

Most writers believe that May Day's origin lies in the flower celebrations of ancient Rome. In England and in other European countries it has been celebrated for centuries by the gathering of flowers, primarily by children, but also by old and young alike, by people of high and low station. Merry-making was the theme of the day. Some of us may still remember the Maypole around which we gathered as school children; the floral baskets we made.

As with many other celebrations, the tradition-bound theme of exultant joy and merry-making had little relevance to the American and European working man in the late 19th century. In this country, in the 1880's, May Day became the vehicle for labor's demonstrations in behalf of an eight-hour day. May Day 1884 was the target date for a general strike, a strike out of which the Haymarket Riots in Chicago developed, with the attendant bombings, killing of seven policemen, and hanging of four of eight so-called "anarchists" after a trial which Governor Altgeld of Illinois subsequently held to be unfair.

In Europe it was also celebrated as a laborer's day. For a while it was converted into a political holiday by the Second Communist Internationale and more recently it has been used by the Soviet Union as an opportunity to display military might. I should note that neither Russia nor Czechoslovakia will parade their military hardware this year.

In a move prompted by the American Bar Association, John Kennedy, acting on a Congressional Resolution, proclaimed May 1, 1961 as Law Day. Lest we lose sight of the intended purpose of this day, let me quote briefly from President Kennedy's Proclamation:

"Law is the strongest link between man and freedom, and by strengthening the rule of law we strengthen freedom and justice in our own country and contribute by example to the goal of justice under law for all mankind. . . ."

"The objectives of Law Day, U.S.A., are to urge Americans to rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other and with other nations; to cultivate that respect for law which is vital in a Democratic society; and to foster a full understanding and appreciation of our liberties and of the legal and judicial institutions which protect them. . . ."

But as the merrymaking May Day of the 1880's had no relevance to America's working man, I greatly fear that Law Day and all it represents has lost relevance for the great multitude of people in 1969. In fact, I believe we have carelessly and thoughtlessly, through lack of resolve, entered into a crisis of relevance, not only in the law but in every aspect of American life.

If we open our eyes to what is there to be seen, not only what we want to see; if we open our ears to the crescendo of frustration, the cries of anguish, not only to the riotous sounds of violent rebellion; if we open our lips to taste the bitter dregs that make up the feast for 26 million Americans, not the tax free expense account luncheon martini; if we dip with our hands into the empty coffers of a migrant shack or a ghetto hovel, not into the unnumbered Swiss bank account; if we smell, with our nostrils, the stench of illness and disease which we cannot afford to cure, instead of the antiseptic odor of the biological germ warfare laboratory; if

only we would sense in its entirety, the unabated misery that abounds in our lands instead of the deceptively rarified, though not purified atmosphere of our Tower of Babel, we would begin to be aware that American institutions, of every nature, all around us, are tumbling before the challenge of relevance.

It is this challenge of relevance which is peculiarly fitting for the concern of lawyers. Trained in distinguishing between the relevant and irrelevant, we lawyers must know as Holmes has taught us, that the rules by which men should be governed must be determined by the "felt necessities of the time."

Our Government, its method and substance is losing relevance, for it fails, on too many occasions, to respond to the full sweep of our country's needs. We close down Job Corps Centers where it cost six thousand dollars a year to train an unemployable, to redirect the tension of youth from destructive street activity, to constructive work, to salvage what once had been considered a youngster lost to society; but we won't hesitate to spend \$7,000 a year to put and keep that man in prison if he is caught stealing or using narcotics to shelter himself from his world of misery the day after the Job Corps door is closed in his face. Can I put it any better than the youngster from New Jersey who told the Senate Poverty Subcommittee just last week—"You're not talking about saving \$100 million dollars. You're messing with people's lives—lives—1500 lives."

We quibble about states rights and about impact on local economy, we masticate food stamp versus food grant programs at a cow's rate before we accept the reality of hunger and malnutrition and resolve that at all cost, no American can be suffered to go to sleep hungry or be eroded by malnutrition. The Under Secretary of Agriculture offered no greater hope when he told a House committee last week:

"We have been and are engaged in an in-depth review of all the food assistance programs—their administration, operation and funding. We expect to come up with some answers within a short time."

I read with dismay the statement attributed only this past weekend to a senior White House official:

"The hunger problem is on the shelf. There may be malnutrition in America, but real hunger on a substantial scale—I don't believe it."

I said that I read this with dismay. But what of the hungering people who now are told that they had better make room on their empty shelves because we plan to put the hunger problem there. Is such a Government relevant?

We are told that our Government is required to expend billions of dollars on an anti-ballistic missile. One day it is because of Russia's increased nuclear capability, then it's only to defend against China's developing capability and propensity; first it's to protect our cities, then it's to protect only our missile sites because our cities cannot be protected. We are assured by the military that it will work, though it has never been tested. They've turned out wrong on so many occasions with tested materials and projects. Can we assume on the law of averages that they must be right this time? Do we really have a choice? I think we do. Just last week, reports filtered through the press that an ABM compromise was under study. The compromise, as reported, would have involved changing the designation from ABM sites to "applied research sites." Is this semantic gift-wrapping relevant to the explosive, judgment-day issue of life or death to humanity? I hold that it is not and that we, as attorneys, have a responsibility to society to insist on a Government which is relevant. Should we not insist that a nation that can muster all its

resources to win a war can do no less to win the peace.

The lack of relevance in our educational institution has led to nearly chaotic conditions on campuses in every part of this land. And in education the lack of relevance is double-edged; the system and its structure fails to respond to the needs of the student or to the needs of society into which he will emerge.

We send our youngsters to schools, from the youngest age, knowing full well that the schools will turn out carbon copies of us. And what are we, but carbon copies of the well-rounded educated homo-sapiens produced by seventeenth and eighteenth century liberalism. We have made strides in broadening the scope of education and the breed of man from which we selected our future educated class. But what do we draw from the well of twentieth century experience? Do we equip our youngsters with the ability to live with nuclear holocaust, a momentary possibility, or, even more important, do we prepare them to reverse the trend toward Armageddon that we have undertaken? Do we provide either the tools to combat and perhaps begin to eradicate the monumental social ills that plague us, let alone offer the opportunity to understand the ills and problematic cures? But more to the point, must we insist on blinding ourselves to the fact that our children have seen these problems and want to be part of an institution which deals with them? Are we too ashamed to admit that our children have seen what we have been too busy to let ourselves think about? We give our children deadly vehicles to play with at 15 and 16. We send them to war at 18 and 19. We finally have even started to consider letting them vote at the age of 18. But we turn a deaf ear to their plea to be heard on the campus. In fact, it is we who have turned them off. Once again, it is our responsibility as attorneys to promote a relevant educational institution. Mustn't we take to heart the admonition in Luke:

"Woe unto you, lawyers! For ye have taken away the key of knowledge; ye entered not in yourselves, and them that were entering in ye hindered."

And what of the professions? Is the practice of medicine or the medical institution relevant to our society? That depends on what society you mean. If by society you mean the financially comfortable American, then the medical arts to a greater or lesser degree are part of his equipment to survive in this world. If we mean the average American, we are talking about a man who cannot afford to need the medical specialist let alone hospitalization for any length of time. For a two-week hospital stay will cost the average American one tenth of his yearly income just for room and board. And what of the millions upon millions of Americans to whom the medical arts are as useful as black magic. Of what use is cancer research to the American infant who is subject to one of the highest infant mortality rates in the free world? Of what use is the medical tax deduction to a father who cannot afford to take his family to a doctor? Of what use is medicare and voluntary private health insurance to those who aren't aged or are underemployed or unemployed?

There are numerous other professions, as there are numerous other institutions such as industry, and communications, the relevance of which could be questioned. I will restrict myself to the Law.

However, before I do, a word is in order on the nature of the challenge of relevance. The challenge, at first manifested by disenchantment and distrust, has become one of disdain and disgust. This distrust, when quietly nurtured for generations, has ruptured into demonstrations, against the government, the university, industry recruitment; school lock-ins, lock-out, takeover and

destruction; rent strikes; campus and product boycotts; and, the most explosive and uncontrollable, riots in the streets.

I do not condone the violent manifestations of the challenge. However, one must recognize their cause if one is to root out the infection. One must know the grounds of the challenge if one is to make the institutions relevant.

And now there is the Law. I fear Dickens, through Mr. Bumble, spoke for too many generations and too many people when he said,

"The law is a ass; a idiot." Worse yet is that to too many of our citizenry, young and old, black and white, urban and rural, rich and poor, the law, to answer Mr. Justice Holmes' question, is merely what is at the end of the policeman's stick.

As lawyers we tend to think only of fact and opinion in terms of relevance. We don't question the relevance of the law or the legal institution. But the public we serve, or should be serving not only questions the institution. It is in the process of laying down the direct challenge.

What is the law? Is the law that "Brooding omnipresence in the sky," or, at the other extreme, is it merely what is at the end of the policeman's stick?

Are these descriptions of the law accurate? Need they be accurate? I think not. I hope not, for we, as members of this profession and as members of society cannot afford for them to be accurate.

The legal institution has as vital a role to play in responding to the felt needs of society as any of our institutions, perhaps even a more vital role. I say more vital because we can be the effective voice through which those felt needs gain expression. If we don't provide the effective voice, we will witness, on an even grander scale, the explosions of frustrated expression we've known these past years. We can, and we must, be the mouthpiece of those felt needs and each of us, as advocate or counsellor, teacher or student, lawmaker or judge, has a role to play and an obligation to be met. But initially, we must comprehend the two basic legal needs of the unrepresented part of our society.

First and foremost, they need to have their problems understood.

There are several aspects to this problem of understanding. There is, of course, the problem of language. There is also the problem of issue sensitivity. And then there is the need for patience and understanding.

Many of the unrepresented speak a dialect of English we find difficult to understand; whether it's soul talk, backwoods English, or campus slang. But we must make the effort to communicate. This applies primarily to the practitioners and judges among us. To the student, unless we permit him to represent indigents as is done in a few jurisdictions, the language problem is still theoretical. The lawmaker, unless his unrepresented constituency is also disenfranchised, learns very early to communicate in the language of the voters. The practitioners and judges must learn not to close their doors and ears to those of foreign tongue or of awkward speech. Remember, it cost Egypt ten plagues because Pharaoh turned a deaf ear to the strange tongue of Moses.

All of us must become attuned to the issues facing the unrepresented in our society. Their lives are not free from legal problems merely because they don't need wills drawn, or because they have no intricate real estate transactions to undertake; because they don't plan any corporate mergers, and have no multi-faceted securities problems. To the contrary, they need protection for their property while they are alive, for they have none to will to the next generation; they need protection from the immoral and sometimes illegal landlord who does not provide a habitable residence in accordance with the lease; they need guidance to establish

buyer's cooperatives to make their purchasing dollar stretch a little further; and they need, oh, how they need, protection against the ultra-usurious secured loans and credit so generously granted by the unscrupulous merchant. Yes, the unrepresented have their property problems, their merger problems, their securities problems; and countless others we are not even aware of.

Here the law schools can fulfill a greatly felt need. Room must be made in the curriculum, not for one elective in Law and Social Problems but for a full range of courses that explore the issues vital to our young, our poor, our discriminated against minorities. Some schools, and I think mostly prompted by the student body, have already taken the first steps in this direction. One school, for example, has recognized that labor law not only includes the law of industrial relations but also the minimum wage law. Some schools, like my Alma Mater, have begun to publish journals concerning law and social problems. But this is only a beginning.

Once the problems of the unrepresented are understood, we can begin to respond to their second felt need; we can begin to represent them.

We often think of representation for the unrepresented in terms of legal aid. To most of us that connotes criminal defense. But on this Law Day, U.S.A., let us recognize that the young, though they may not enter into contracts and may not vote, and the poor, though they too may not enter into many contracts and may not vote, for entirely different reasons, have the same broad range of representation needs as the rest of the society.

Of course, they need to be defended when accused of violating the law. I think we tend to sit back smugly comfortable knowing that most jurisdictions have established legal aid or public defender type programs. To the credit of some practitioners, they voluntarily participate in such programs. To the law schools and students go accolades for their participation in such programs. But how many of us have ever watched, not as an onlooker but as a critical analyst, the typical legal aid defense in operation. Have we noticed the unbelievably large number of criminal defendants represented in one day by the typical, harassed public defender. Can one man handle, in a responsible manner, fifteen to twenty pleas at one call of the criminal calendar. One even needs time to "cop a plea" effectively. Yet, they never are granted the luxury of time.

In this area of criminal defense, though we have a long way to go, we have at least taken first steps. What steps have we taken to respond to the other, more significant representation needs of the unrepresented society. They are, you know, frequently defendants in civil litigation. I say "you know." But why should you? They don't even know it until it's too late. How many hundreds of times each day, in courts across this land, are judgments confessed and liens foreclosed against the unrepresented. We can no longer sit back, shaking our heads with disapproval, while the unsuspecting, unsophisticated disadvantaged are dispossessed. And what of the would-be unrepresented plaintiff? They do have causes of action, unless we say no; unless the practitioner refuses to represent them in bringing suits against landlords or usurious creditors; unless the judge refuses to put aside the technical forms of pleading; unless the legislator refuses to legislate new causes of action if the judicial system fails to respond. Not to be unduly critical, I recognize that small claims statutes and courts do exist. One need not have a lawyer. But a price must be paid by the plaintiff in a small claims court, if he knows of its existence. He must be ready to accept rough justice. And he must be prepared to fight well-paid defense counsel. Surely we can improve our

judicial system to make the rights of the unrepresented enforceable. Surely we must, if the institution is to be relevant.

Perhaps I have belabored the judicial system. What has been said about it is equally true of administrative proceedings.

But what of the legislator and regulator? We have established, by constitution, by statute and by regulation, a larger than life process for the promulgation of law which theoretically must permit the public to express itself. In the legislature we announce hearings on bills. Interested persons are invited to request permission to be heard. But is the unrepresented society heard? Rarely, at the most, unless, as in the area of migratory labor, the hearings are held in the migrant camps or the migrant is adopted by a well-organized church group.

The Administrative rule-making process is even more elusive to the unrepresented. What does the Federal Register mean to him? And what of the rules and regulations which may be promulgated without the need for permitting oral or written comment?

The Administrative Conference of the United States recognized the significance of this problem last year. It called upon the Government to adopt some measure to open up the administrative rule-making process to the unrepresented. To my knowledge, no satisfactory solution has yet been proposed. The unrepresented themselves made that same demand last year during the Poor People's March in Washington. No response to their need has yet come forth.

I say to myself as a legislator and as a lawyer, that I must find a way to make the institution of the law respond to these needs. I say to you as lawyers, judges, teachers and students, that you must find the way to make the institution of the law relevant to the unrepresented. For, what right do we have to expect there to be order, if the law is not relevant to millions of Americans. Our unrepresented society believes, as Oliver Goldsmith said: "Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law."

Society has had enough experience to know that we cannot fiddle on so precarious a roof. This nation was founded by men whose primary goal was to establish a representative government relevant to these shores, and institutions responsive to the needs of the new world. I cannot help but wonder whether the Jeffersons and Franklins would soulfully sing:

"Is this the society we created
Is this the young country we made
We don't remember growing older
When did they?"

I refuse, Mr. Jefferson and Mr. Franklin, to believe that representative government has grown so old that it no longer can be representative. I refuse to acknowledge that responsive institutions arthritically can no longer respond. I firmly, resolutely believe, with Mr. Justice Holmes, that the life of the law; is experience and that "the rules by which men should" and may I add *must* "be governed," must be determined by "the felt necessities of the time." And it is the legal institution above all which must respond. For, it is before that institution, to paraphrase Mr. Justice Black in a 1942 address to the Missouri bar, that every "phase of the struggle of society for its own improvement," every "aspect of the clashing relations of men to one another" comes for settlement.

With the indulgence of the bar, I would like to quote the harberdasher from Independence. Though he talked of only those with whom we disagree, it is equally applicable to those to whom we and our institutions are not relevant.

"If we do not defend their rights, we endanger our own."

And Mr. Truman knew, at first hand, the power of the people.

Must we relive the May Day of 1884? Must we endure bloodshed, and despondency before we, like the Governor of Illinois, recognize that we have been unfair.

As lawyers, and as leaders of our society, on this Law Day, we must rededicate ourselves and all Americans to the ideals of equality and justice under law. I call upon us to foster a full understanding and appreciation of our liberties and of the legal and judicial institutions which protect them by making those institutions relevant; by making them responsive to the felt needs of our time; by making the protections of the law a reality for our unrepresented society. Only by doing this can we cultivate that respect for law which is vital to our democratic society.

THE MILITARY-INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX—ADDRESS BY SENATOR COOK

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, it is unnecessary to repeat here any of the warnings the late beloved President Eisenhower made in his final address in January 1961. Those prophetic words about the growing influence of the "military-industrial complex" are familiar to us all. On April 24, my esteemed colleague from Kentucky (Mr. Cook) presented a most timely and cogent speech on this subject. Many of the recommendations he made for restoring the balance of our national priorities deserve serious consideration. In a thorough and thoughtful way Senator Cook has made useful proposals how this problem should be faced by the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks before the annual banquet of the Amen Corner on April 24, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY SENATOR MARLOW W. COOK

There were many topics I could have made the subject of my speech tonight: the perils of being a freshman Senator, the first few months of our Republican Administration, or even a collection of mountain stories accumulated over two years of campaigning in Kentucky. But there are two major issues before the country which need the benefit of public discussion—what to do about hungry people and the subject about which I will be speaking tonight.

Attention has been focused in recent months on what many have felt for some time was becoming an all pervasive influence on American policy—both foreign and domestic. I am speaking, of course, of what President Eisenhower called the "military industrial complex". The death of the beloved General caused many of us to remember these words of warning issued to future generations of Americans. Surely no one understood the military mind and motivation as Eisenhower did.

Recently another military man of stature, General David Shoup, formerly Commandant of the Marine Corps, has issued similar warnings in an article appearing in the April issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. Last week my friend and colleague in the Senate, Barry Goldwater, in a speech on the floor, defended the military emphasis of our society as necessitated by what he called preserving the national security. Regardless of the point of view it can be said with certainty that the military industrial complex and what recently has become a microcosm of this larger issue—the ABM—is the paramount issue before the Congress and the country in 1969.

Since the death of President Eisenhower has focused attention on his most famous words, I think it is necessary to hear them again before we begin to examine the influence of the complex on our lives. In his final address to the nation January 17, 1961, the President said in commenting upon the defense structure which employed at that time 3.5 million persons:

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every state house, every office of the federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development, yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications, our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society.

"In the councils of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought by the military-industrial complex. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together."

Both friend and foe of the complex concede not only its existence but its origin. It is necessary to any understanding of the complex to begin with the period immediately subsequent to World War II and examine its beginnings, and its periods both of relative control and unbridled expansion. This kind of examination is mandatory if we are to understand Eisenhower's admonition and its meaning for the nation in 1969.

One thing World War II accomplished for almost all our people in terms of attitude about the world and the American role within the community of nations, was an abrupt end to widespread adherence to the concept of isolationism. The almost total lack of controversy over the formation of the United Nations and American participation in it contrasted greatly with the fate of the League of Nations after World War I. As Eric Goldman put it in his very excellent book, *The Crucial Decade*, in referring to American attitudes in 1946:

"For the first time during an American era of peace, it was next to impossible to discuss domestic problems coherently without having the points become entangled in foreign affairs."

The advent of a powerful Soviet Union and what we interpreted as a world-wide threat of Communist aggression denied to us the luxury of a return to the egocentric security of pre-war isolationism. On March 12, 1947, the Truman Doctrine was enunciated in a message to Congress:

"I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressures."

The term "Cold War" was coined by Bernard Baruch on April 16, 1947, in an address in Columbia, South Carolina. The Marshall Plan calling for \$17 billion to be spent over four years beginning in 1948 to bolster the economies of the non-communist countries of Western Europe was announced by the Secretary of State in a speech at Harvard on June 4, 1947. In July of the same year, Kennan first put forth the Administration's heretofore nameless policy of containment of the Communist world. The Greek uprising, the Berlin crisis and the Korean War further drew the battle lines—the cold war became an omnipresent reality. Since the battle lines were drawn and we had assigned ourselves the task of protecting the free world, a high degree of military preparedness was, of course,

required. It was in this atmosphere that the Defense Department and the civilian contractors which fed its endless appetites for new weapons, were nurtured to that degree of magnitude which many, including Eisenhower, felt was unhealthy for the nation.

One of my fellow Kentuckians, Fred Vinson, who later became Chief Justice, was appointed at the end of the War to be Director of the War Mobilization and Reconversion Agency, but it has become apparent that due to the continuation of an atmosphere of war, in a new "cold" version, reconversion never has occurred. No President since the beginning of the cold war has had much luck controlling the growth of the complex except Eisenhower. His final utterance warning us of its dangers was not his only effort to lessen the influence of the complex. The President said in 1958 that national survival rested on "security with solvency." To achieve the solvency to which he referred he said would take a major effort to combat the natural tendency of federal expenditures to rise, especially in the Defense Department. On April 25, 1958, when he was engaged in a battle with Congress over re-organizing the Defense Department he criticized the tendency to over-indulge in "sentimental attachments to outmoded military machines and concepts" and also the "noisy trumpeting about dazzling military schemes or untrustworthy programs."

Eisenhower realized that he was fighting a great many special interests including the Armed Services and their civilian suppliers. From the beginning when he cut the Air Force budget by \$5 billion in 1953, the Services carried their arguments to Congress and the press. On June 3, 1959, he said "obviously political and financial considerations" rather than "strict military needs" were attempting to prevail. On March 11, 1959, in warning against undue military influence, he said "Everybody with any sense knows that we are finally going to a garrison state" if they are allowed to succeed. At his final press conference on January 18, 1961, he discussed widespread advertising by missile manufacturers and called it "almost an insidious penetration of our own minds that the only thing this country is engaged in is weaponry and missiles."

Defense spending reached a high of \$50.4 billion during the Korean Conflict. Eisenhower had it down to \$40.7 billion in 1955 and in the last year of his Presidency it was \$45.7 billion. Defense spending during the Kennedy-Johnson years has almost doubled to approximately \$80 billion. What happened during the last eight years? The beginnings of the meteoric rise in defense appropriations amounting almost to a blank check for the Military probably can trace its beginnings to 1958 when Senator Kennedy first began his campaign for the Presidency. It was in that year that he coined the phrase "Missile Gap" and stated, "The deterrent ratio during 1960-64 will in all likelihood be weighted against us". To the contrary, states Dr. Ralph Lapp in his recent book, *The Weapons Culture*, U-2 flights over Russia indicated no evidence of deployment of a single ICBM. The political campaign continued and in 1959 the Advisory Council of the Democratic National Committee published a report calling for a "crash effort" to bridge the missile gap and urged \$4 billion more for that purpose. However, on February 7, 1961, after the campaign was over, the news broke that there was no missile gap. Nonetheless, the new Administration, keeping its campaign pledge, announced an added emphasis on our missile program and its first budget called for an increase of \$3.6 billion in military spending. Years later on September 18, 1967, Secretary McNamara in a moment of candor observed:

"In 1961, when I became Secretary of Defense, the Soviet Union possessed a very small operational arsenal of intercontinental missiles."

He proceeded to justify the Administration's decision to build more missiles, as a "conservative hedge", then added:

"Furthermore, the decision in itself—as justified as it was—in the end, could not possibly have left unaffected the Soviet Union's further nuclear plans. Clearly the Soviet build-up is in part a reaction to our own build-up since the beginning of this decade."

In all fairness, some not insignificant arms control measures were accomplished during the last eight years with the creation of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and the passage of the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty during the Kennedy Administration but the inescapable fact remains that military expenditures doubled during this period.

After eight years of the benefit of an Executive and Legislative *Carte Blanche*, the military-industrial complex, presents an imposing figure looming over the new Administration. Successfully answering the question, "What can be done to reduce it to a size consistent with a free society in a relatively peaceful era?" is the key to the success or failure of the new Administration and the determining factor dictating the structure of our society for decades to come.

That, Gentlemen, is a brief history of the development of the military-industrial complex. But before any solutions to the problem can be suggested, we must understand just what is meant by the term military-industrial complex. *Time Magazine* aptly described it in its April 11th issue:

"The complex is not a well-organized, centrally directed entity. It is a vast, amorphous conglomeration that goes far beyond the Pentagon and the large manufacturers of weapons. It includes Legislators who benefit politically from job-generating military activity in their constituencies, workers in defense plants, the unions to which they belong, university scientist and research organizations that receive Pentagon grants. It even extends to the stores where payrolls are spent, and the landlords, grocers, and car salesmen who cater to customers from military bases. Any important shift of Defense spending thus affects many interests and individuals. In Fiscal 1968 the Defense Department contracted for \$38.8 billion in goods and services, plus \$6.5 billion for research and development, amounting to 5.3% of the 1968 GNP. These funds went to many thousands of prime contractors and sub-contractors. According to a recent estimate, 21% of skilled blue-collar workers and 16% of professional employees are on payrolls that rely on military spending. Entire communities depend almost totally on a military installation, defense plants or both. . . ."

"The Defense Department spends almost \$4,000,000 a year on Congressional Liaison, employing about 340 people for the task. One of their functions is to keep in close touch with Members of Congress, providing such information as announcements of new contracts or construction in a particular Member's ballwicket. . . ."

"The big contractors find the Military an excellent source for . . . experts (on weapons systems). Senator Proxmire, one of the Pentagon's most persistent and effective critics, notes that 2,072 retired, high-ranking military officers are now on the payrolls of the 100 top defense contractors, a three-fold increase in the past ten years. While Proxmire does not charge any overt impropriety, he and others wonder whether an officer dealing with a particular company is going to drive a very hard bargain if he may go to work for it soon."

Now admittedly, our retired military officers have a perfect right to go to work for defense contractors. It is natural because they will continue to be dealing with matters about which they have acquired some expertise. And certainly private contractors should attempt to hire as many retired officers and acquire as many contracts as possible because they are in business to make

money. This is perfectly normal behavior in a free enterprise society. It is to be expected that the military establishment and the private contractor would work hand in hand. Each is doing what my teenage daughter would call "his own thing". The real criticism should be directed at the Congress and the Executive for giving the complex virtually a free hand. What President Eisenhower was seeking was a balanced society. We would not have achieved this goal if nearly half of our national budget went to welfare or health or any other area and the same must be said of defense. For a military person or defense contractor to classify something a matter of national security does not necessarily make it so. This is a political decision to be properly made by the elected representatives of the people, not by bureaucrats or generals or defense firms. The President and the Congress must reassert their prerogatives to set goals and determine national priorities to bring defense back to its proper role in American society. As Senator Fulbright put it:

"Priorities are reflected in the things we spend money on. Far from being a dry accounting of bookkeepers, a nation's budget is full of moral implications; it tells what a society cares about and what it does not care about; it tells what its values are."

I am optimistic that defense will once again be relegated to a proper role in our society. A number of forces are at work militating against the continuation of our current level of military appropriations. The military establishment, confident of its secure position, has pushed for a number of ill-advised and hard to justify projects such as the TFX, F-111, AMSA, SST and of most significance, the AEM. Our society is inherently a great balancer. When any one component becomes too powerful, the other parts turn on it and bring it into line. The attempts to get these projects funded, and the ill-conceived seemingly endless War in Vietnam have solidified opposition in Congress and made adversaries of some former friends, the most conspicuous of which are General David Shoup and Senator Stuart Symington.

Shoup explained the acquiescence of the public to our increasingly military ways by astutely pointing out that "to the 14.9 million Veterans of World War II, Korea added another 5.7 million five years later, and ever since, the large peacetime military establishment has been training and releasing draftees, enlistees and short-term reservists by the hundreds of thousands each year. In 1968, the total living Veterans of U.S. Military Service numbered over 23 million, or about 20% of the adult population."

This vast number of citizens instilled with, at least, some degree of military thinking and discipline plus the various Veterans groups and service associations not to mention an armed force of 3.4 million backed up by a reserve force of 1.1 million form a powerful lobby in favor of acquiescence to military viewpoints. Awareness of the way our society has become is the great first step toward combating militarism, let me read you a statement which should help to awaken many Americans:

"Soldiering loses appeal for some of the relatively few who experienced the blood, terror and filth of battle; for many, however, including far too many senior professional officers, war and combat are an exciting adventure, a competitive game and an escape from the dull routines of peacetime." This iconoclastic remark was not made by a long-haired campus radical of draft age, but the highly respected General Shoup, former Commandant of the Marine Corps and Medal of Honor winner.

Stuart Symington, the only man in Congress who sits on both the pro-military Armed Services Committee and the anti-

military Foreign Relations Committee, has undergone a remarkable metamorphosis. The former Air Force Secretary was once a full-fledged Congressional exponent of the military establishment. Now he speaks in terms of our bloated economy and points out that the average tax on income in 1955 was 27 percent and that now it is 34 per cent. He adds that in 1949, our country owned \$24.6 billion in gold, and owed \$7 billion; Now it has \$10.8 billion in gold and owes \$35 billion. A correspondent recently quoted him as echoing the remarks of a friend that too many officials in Washington "can hear the sound of the farthest drum before the cry of a single cry in the streets".

Senator Symington and General Shoup are just some of many former advocates who are now urging Americans to heed President Eisenhower's prophetic warning. Many decry the existence of the complex but doubt we can de-emphasize such a significant aspect of our national economy. To these people let me say first that those of us who seek to return the military establishment to its proper role know it must be maintained at the level necessary to meet the contingencies of an uncertain world. But some steps can be taken consistent with a true national security. Tom Wicker of the New York Times reports that in the view of non-Pentagon students of military spending, it is an oversimplification to classify the \$30 billion increase in defense spending since 1965 as attributable to the Vietnam War. In fact some believe the war may be costing as little as \$10 billion a year. Even if that figure is just nearly correct says Wicker, the Pentagon has managed an expansion of \$20 billion under the guise of financing the War. Therefore, we could take a great deal out of the defense budget without adversely affecting the current level of war expenditures. In solving the problem of how to make the cuts, several suggestions have been made, each of which I recommend and endorse tonight:

(1) A special joint committee of Congress whose sole function it would be to scrutinize the Defense Budget.

(2) A National Commission on the Defense Budget with a broad base bringing together major components of the private sector.

(3) Passage of the Bill to create a National Economic Conversion Commission, of which I am a Co-sponsor. This bill, if enacted, would create in the Executive Office of the President this Commission headed by the Secretary of Commerce and including the Secretaries of Defense, Agriculture, Interior, Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, Transportation, Housing and Urban Development, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Administrator of NASA and the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Its purpose would be to advance planning to encourage defense industries to convert to peacetime products with the least possible disruption to employment and community needs. Also it would require that all government defense contractors include provisions for conversion planning and employee retraining when submitting bids.

(4) Imposition of an arbitrary ceiling such as was imposed across the board last year by Congress before it approved the Administration's 10% surtax. Refusal to extend the surtax this year might be the appropriate leverage to bring about significant Defense reductions for the next Fiscal year.

Now is the time, this is the year, to begin to bring the military role in American life back within its proper sphere. Is missilery and the arms race which primarily feed the military industrial complex really inevitable today? I think the answer is no. Reconnaissance techniques with the use of electronic satellites are so improved both on the part of the Russians and ourselves that inspection, the prerequisite for meaningful arms limitation agreements, is now possible. Inspection, for the first time since someone

conceived of the possibility of halting arms build-ups is now a practical reality. But we do not contribute to a more stable world by giving the military establishment a blank check to indiscriminately deploy obsolete or ill-conceived missile systems and advise us to become involved in Asian land wars. Walter Lippmann says there is a neo-isolationist sentiment alive in the land today. While a return to the old concepts of isolationism would certainly not be good for the country, I believe a new isolationism or neo-isolationism if you will, resulting from a great reluctance to intervene militarily about the world, will be a great step forward for America. The neo-isolationism I see, is not economic or cultural but military. This new feeling is born of a frustration with excessive militarism whether it take the form of costly missile systems which increase international insecurity or ill-advised unilateral intervention in foreign countries which take the lives of thousands of young Americans.

Certainly, I would not deny that international competition exists between ourselves and the Soviets and Chinese, and for that matter, between the Soviets and the Chinese themselves, but this competition need not be conducted in a military manner. To those skeptics who say that war will always be with us, I must reply that the Nuclear Age has re-defined traditional notions of war and peace. Only a country run by maniacs would seek nuclear war and, in a very real sense, this will be a strong deterrent to future use of force to settle international conflicts. It is supreme irony, but the spectre of nuclear devastation has become the most convincing argument against major wars the world has ever known and the greatest impetus to international cooperation.

However, security abroad will come only after we achieve the "balanced society" at home which President Eisenhower called for. The difficulty of that task was best described in *The Federalist Papers*:

"In framing a government which is to be administered by men over men, the great difficulty lies in this; you must first enable the government to control the governed; and in the next place oblige it to control itself."

STOPPAGE OF FREE SCHOOL-LUNCH PROGRAMS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a news article published in last Wednesday's Atlanta Journal and shall read portions of the article:

The federal money which has been providing a free lunch each day to almost half of Washington County's schoolchildren will no longer be available as of 12:01 a.m. Thursday. . . .

The loss of the \$564,955.72 from the system's budget means free lunches and several programs for aiding handicapped children and training teachers will have to be discontinued next year. . . .

The system serves 5,177 children and 2,045 of these are being fed what local officials believe is the only balanced meal they receive each day under the free lunch program. . . .

Virtually all of the money goes to aid children of families who earn less than \$3,000, the federally set poverty line.

Although the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare granted an extension of the Thursday deadline until 12:01 a.m. Sunday in the Washington County school desegregation case, the facts that I have just recounted remain the same. Today they are a harsh reality, providing a vivid example of an agency of the Federal Government in pursuit of its unwarranted policy of taking badly needed funds away from poverty level children.

In February, I wrote Secretary Finch to ask that every consideration be given the Washington County case in order to preserve the system's school lunch program which was benefiting more than 2,000 needy children, and probably also giving them the only nourishing meal they got each day. In April, I received a reply from Leon E. Panetta, director of the Health, Education, and Welfare Office for Civil Rights, who agreed with me that cutting off these funds would result in great human suffering, especially for hungry children. Then he went on to infer, however that HEW was probably going to cut the money off anyway.

And this is what it has done.

I submit that this practice of depriving school lunch money in areas where there are heavy concentrations of poverty-stricken youngsters contributes not only to the malnourishment of the children immediately involved, but also to the overall poverty problem in such areas.

I say that it must be stopped.

Last week, before a hearing of the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs, Secretary Finch described this situation as "a vexatious dilemma." He acted as though he would like to remove himself from this dilemma. I can tell him how he can do it. Just stop taking away Education Act title I funds that are being utilized in lunch programs to feed needy schoolchildren.

The Secretary can do this very simply by adhering to the legislative history in both the letter and the spirit of the law under which he claims to be operating, title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

There is nothing in the law that authorizes the withholding of Federal school lunch funds in school desegregation noncompliance cases. In fact, the legislative history of the bill and subsequent pronouncements of Congress are to the contrary. During debate on the Civil Rights Act, we were all very much concerned about what was going to happen to school lunch programs under the enforcement of title VI. An amendment was offered to prohibit a cutoff of Federal aid to school lunch programs and we were assured by the floor managers of the bill that lunch programs would not be jeopardized by the law.

Senator Humphrey said he did not want to see school lunches cut off and that he would not support title VI if he thought it would have that result. The Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) has this to say, as appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1964:

Let me advise Senators that the failure of a district court to desegregate the schools will not jeopardize the school lunch program; it absolutely will not. Even if a community does not desegregate, that will not jeopardize the school lunch program—unless in that particular school the white children are fed but the black children are not fed; and I refer Senators to page 33 of the bill, which states very, very clearly: "which shall be consistent"—in other words, the orders and rules—"shall be consistent with the achievement of the objectives of the statute authorizing financial assistance."

We have a school lunch program, and its purpose is to feed, not to desegregate the schools; therefore, that would not be consistent. . . .

So we must remember that the shutting off of a grant must be consistent with the objectives to be achieved. A school lunch

program is for the purpose of feeding the schoolchildren. If the white children are fed but the black children are not fed, that is a violation of this law.

Insofar as I am able to determine, the school lunch fund cutoffs that have occurred so far do not involve the feeding of only white children, or only black children. These lunch programs have been feeding all the children who need it and who cannot afford even the small price of a school lunch and, it is ironical indeed that in most instances these programs have been feeding severely deprived black children who need their education and nourishing food the most.

Thus, on the basis of such assurance from proponents of the bill such as Senators Humphrey and PASTORE, the amendment to specifically protect school lunch programs from cutoffs was defeated.

It is the height of inconsistency to consider the fact that Department of Agriculture school lunch program assistance is immune from title VI cutoffs while school lunch money derived from title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—which was enacted for the exclusive benefit of underprivileged children—is terminated. During the last session of Congress, an attempt was made to rectify this inconsistency by providing in the Education Appropriation Act, Public Law 90-557, section 410:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds or commodities for school lunch programs or medical services may not be recommended for withholding by any official employed under appropriations contained herein in order to overcome racial imbalance.

It is my understanding that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare interprets the phrase "to overcome racial imbalance" as applicable only to school systems outside the South. This again is contrary to congressional determination. In the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, Public Law 90-247, it is clearly stated:

All such rules, regulations, guidelines, interpretations, or orders shall be uniformly applied and enforced throughout the fifty States.

This, then, is the way that Secretary Finch can relieve himself of the vexatious dilemma in which he finds himself. He can do so simply by adhering to the expressed intent of Congress and by going by the law. I hope that he will do so. Otherwise, I hope that Congress will see fit to act as soon as possible on my bill, S. 1472, to prohibit HEW from cutting off title I school lunch funds.

As for the Washington County situation, it is my understanding that the school lunch program there will be continued under the Agriculture Department's section 32 funds at least for the remainder of this school year, which is practically over. I am glad to know that the Department of Agriculture will step in to fill this area of human need that has been created by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

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 Atlanta Journal, May 7, 1969]
FUNDS CUT OFF FOR FREE LUNCH: HEW REJECTS SCHOOL PLAN PROPOSED BY WASHINGTON COUNTY

(By W. Eugene Smith)

SANDERSVILLE, GA.—The federal money which has been providing a free lunch each day to almost half of Washington County's schoolchildren will no longer be available as of 12:01 a.m. Thursday.

Washington County School Supt. W. B. Ouzts said Wednesday civil rights compliance officers in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in Washington told him by telephone that all federal aid to the system would end as of that time because a last-ditch desegregation plan submitted by the county could not be approved.

The plan, carried in person by Ouzts and school board Chairman C. V. Smith to Washington last Friday would have consolidated black and white elementary schools in Sandersville and Tennille and placed Washington County High (white) and T. J. Elder High (black) under one name and administration.

The loss of the \$564,955.72 from the system's budget means free lunches and several programs for aiding handicapped children and training teachers will have to be discontinued next year.

"We are going to feed these kids the rest of this year," Ouzts said, "but it will all have to be dropped next year."

The system serves 5,177 children and 2,045 of these are being fed what local officials believe is the only balanced meal they receive each day under the free lunch program.

Ouzts said Tuesday that many children are coming to school just for the lunches. "Our attendance levels have been running above 96 percent because of them," he said.

Virtually all of the money goes to aid children of families who earn less than \$3,000 the federally set poverty line.

Ouzts said some teachers will have to be released immediately and all the federally funded programs will cease as of the end of school on May 26.

Involved are 15 special teachers who have been aiding regular teachers with individual students and the staff of a remedial reading center directed by Mrs. Lydia B. Pool.

*** ready has closed a special school for mentally retarded children, and an experimental public kindergarten remains open only because parents are contributing to its support.

"One Negro woman gave me the only \$1 she had," Mrs. Pool related, "and said she would send more each month when her check came on the 13th." Some parents have contributed as much as \$16 per week for their children to stay in the school.

An in-service training program for teachers from Washington and nine surrounding counties also will be discontinued and 16 vocational education teachers whose salaries have been supplemented by federal money now face pay cuts of more than \$100 per month.

The federal funds have made up more than 20 per cent of the system's \$2.5 million budget.

Ouzts declared, however, that accreditation and the regular educational processes of the system will not be affected.

"Our people are determined to maintain quality schools," he said. "It's just the special programs which will suffer."

Word of the disapproval of the desegregation plan had come just hours before a Tuesday afternoon board meeting at which it was expected to be voted down anyway. Ouzts said federal officials did not say why the plan was turned down, and refused to grant his request for delaying the cutoff until May 20.

Asked what might have happened if the county board and HEW had gotten together on such a plan and it was implemented, the

superintendent replied, "There wouldn't be a white child left in the public school system.

"White people simply will not send their children to Negro schools," he added. "They would set up a private school for them."

Of the funds cutoff, he commented, "Looks like we're out of the federal money business. If they'll just leave us alone now, we'll be happy."

AIR SAFETY NEED STRESSED

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal took note on its front page this morning of a grave and perilous situation in our Nation's airways: A shocking lack of airport navigation aids in the face of mounting air traffic and recent fatal crashes. The foremost example of disaster cited by the Journal was that of Bradford, Pa., where two nearly identical crashes within 13 days claimed 31 lives. That twin tragedy has led me, and a good many men more expert in the field than I, to demand a sharp increase in the air safety capacity at our Nation's airports both large and small.

I have introduced a bill to establish a trust fund solely to provide the facilities and equipment which might have prevented seven out of eight recent airline approach crashes. As today's article states, "critics of airport facilities say there's ample reason to believe the lack or failure of modern navigational aids was largely to blame," for these recent crashes.

Mr. President, I hope that such articles as this one in the Wall Street Journal will encourage Congress to move to meet this need before more dramatic crashes take more lives and finally bring us to our senses. With that in mind, 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:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 13, 1969]

HAZARDOUS LANDINGS: LACK OF NAVIGATION AIDS MAKE MANY AIRPORTS DANGEROUS, EXPERTS SAY; CRITICS CITE RECENT CRASHES IN URGING A REASSESSMENT OF FAA SAFETY PRIORITIES; TWO DISASTERS AT BRADFORD

(By Thomas L. Ehrlich)

In the scramble to equip big-city airports to handle the explosive increase in air traffic, smaller commercial airports are getting short shrift. Many lack even basic navigational aids necessary for foul-weather operation—a situation that makes flying in and out of small airports not merely inconvenient but sometimes downright dangerous.

Such, at least, is the contention of a growing number of airline, airport and government officials who are pressing for a new look at the priorities of commercial airport safety. Though they acknowledge the need for the Federal Administration to add navigational facilities and manpower to untangle the air traffic jams at big airports, they argue that more help should also be given to long-neglected small airports.

Well over half of the 560 airports served by scheduled airlines in the U.S. fall into the under-equipped category, experts say. That means they lack such facilities as radar, control towers, up-to-date instrument landing systems and, in some cases, even such basics as adequate runway lights and markers.

LOW ON PRIORITY LIST

Complaints about the lack of such facilities are nothing new, to be sure. Aviation men have been complaining for years that

the lack of sophisticated equipment makes operations at small airports so uncertain in bad weather that passengers are constantly inconvenienced by flight cancellations, delays and diversions of flights to other airports. But because small airports account for less than 20% of U.S. passenger flights—and less than 5% of the passengers—FAA officials have argued that they rank low on the priority list.

But now the sensitive issue of safety has been added to the debate—after being dramatized tragically by two Allegheny Airlines crashes less than two weeks apart last winter near the same airport at Bradford, Pa. The crashes killed 31 persons. Both occurred at night in bad weather as the plane approached an airport that is typical of many small airports in its lack of advanced gear to guide planes down. Though the exact causes won't be known until Federal officials complete investigations of the crashes, one official confides that it wouldn't be "too far off" to blame Bradford's navigation system.

Moreover, in the past nine months six other commercial airliners also have crashed during airport approaches or landings—and in all but one instance either the airports lacked the most modern navigational aids or, in the case of some larger airports, the equipment wasn't functioning. Though the precise causes of all the crashes haven't yet been pinpointed, critics of airport facilities say there's ample reason to believe the lack or failure of modern navigational aids was largely to blame.

SEVERAL BILLS PENDING

To lessen the likelihood of more such crashes, critics urge that the FAA be given more money to spend on facilities and that a larger proportion be devoted to small airports. Several bills already have been introduced in Congress this year aimed at improving airport facilities and air traffic guidance. Democratic Sen. Warren Magnuson of Washington, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, has proposed setting up a trust fund to pay for both airport construction and improvement of navigation and control facilities. Republican Sen. Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania introduced a bill just last week that would set up a trust fund, financed by taxes on aircraft fuel, aimed solely at improving navigation and control equipment.

The key problem at most small airports is lack of an instrument landing system, or ILS, many experts believe. Developed in the 1940s, ILS is now standard at large airports but still absent at more than 300 smaller commercial airports in the U.S.

There are several components in a complete ILS, but the main element is a so-called glide slope mechanism that sends out a narrow radio beam slanting upward from the end of the runway. When a pilot approaches the runway in bad weather or in darkness, he "locks" onto the radio beam through instruments in his plane that show him visually where he is in relation to the proper flight path. Then he follows the beam down on a safe approach to the runway even in dense clouds.

At an altitude of 200 feet or so, the pilot resumes visual navigation, relying on high-intensity runway lights to show the way if weather is unusually bad.

TRICKY ALTIMETER READINGS

An older system, still in use at more than 340 airports, is known as the visual omnirange system, or VOR. It consists simply of a radio signal that is broadcast in all directions from an airport. The signal tells the pilot when he is getting close to the destination but gives him no guidance in approaching the runway. He must rely entirely on his altimeter and other instruments to bring him down safely to within view of the runway. Pilots complain that altimeter readings can sometimes be dangerously misleading,

particularly in areas heavily forested with tall trees, or in hilly country such as that surrounding Bradford, which has no ILS.

ILS, on the other hand, provides an approach that safely routes planes past mountains or other obstructions and, in effect, brings the craft down a path pointed at the end of the runway.

The FAA contends that safety is not affected by the presence or lack of ILS because the visibility requirements at non-ILS airports have the effect of closing them in dangerously bad weather. But several recent crashes occurred despite cloud ceilings and general visibility that were substantially above the required minimums.

At Bradford on Jan. 6, for instance, the cloud ceiling was 500 feet (the required minimum was 400 feet), and visibility was one and one-half miles (a half-mile over the minimum). Yet an Allegheny Airlines propjet crashed on a golf course five and one-half miles short of the runway. Thirteen days earlier, on Christmas Eve, an Allegheny propjet approaching in similar conditions had crashed three miles short of the runway on a frozen marsh.

At Lebanon, N.H., the night of last Oct. 25, the ceiling was 2,000 feet and visibility was 10 miles when a Northeast Airlines plane crashed into a ridge on nearby Moose Mountain, killing 32. The airport has no ILS, and it's believed that its VOR system was malfunctioning.

It's possible, of course, to tighten the requirements for cloud ceiling and visibility. But the result, particularly in winter, is often a sharp curtailment of service to small airports.

After the Bradford crashes, for instance, Allegheny Airlines raised the minimums at the 25 non-ILS airports it serves to 1,000 feet and three miles from 400 feet and one mile. The minimums later were reduced somewhat, but they still remain above those in effect before January. The result: Allegheny completed only 55% of its scheduled flights in and out of non-ILS airports in January, 82% in February and 94% in March. Forty-nine flights were canceled in one five-day period at Bradford.

At Lebanon, N.H., where Northeast Airlines similarly raised its minimums after the October crash, no flights landed or took off at all during one 10-day period. Half the airport's flights were canceled in December.

WITH HAT IN HAND

Though the FAA bears primary responsibility for equipping airports with ILS and other navigational equipment, some airport managers say the FAA's program is so slow that they may have to buy their own—at a cost of as much as \$200,000 per installation. "We may have to go out with our hat in our hands to ask for money to install equipment ourselves," says George Cricenti, manager of the Lebanon Airport. Such funds would have to come from the local communities served by the airport or from the state.

At least two airports already have installed their own ILS facilities. The airport at Appleton, Wis., installed one as part of the city's effort to attract new industry. The airport at Latrobe, Pa., reportedly got help from the wealthy Mellon family, which has extensive land holdings in the area, to install its ILS.

Most airports will have to wait for the FAA, however—and for some the wait may be many more years. The FAA has a long-range plan for 811 ILS installations during the next decade. But many of these will be additional installations at big, multi-runway airports that already have ILS.

AWAITING NEW FUNDS

Moreover, there's no guarantee the FAA will be able to afford the installations of ILS or many of the other navigation aids it has in its master plan. The FAA's proposed budget for fiscal 1970 asks \$134 million for

work on a computer-based, semiautomatic system for processing and displaying flight plan information at 20 air traffic control centers—but nothing at all for ILS installations. An additional \$116 million in equipment funds is suggested in the budget—part of which would go for ILS installations—but it's contingent upon some new source of revenue being provided by Congress. And at the moment the future of the pending bills in Congress—and of another expected soon from the Nixon Administration—is regarded as highly uncertain.

This year, the FAA will let contracts for 100 ILS installations to be paid for with "carryover funds" from previous budgets, a spokesman says. But, he adds, the cost will "clean out" those funds leaving nothing for future years.

Small airport managers have observed one encouraging development in recent weeks, however. In apparent response to criticism after the Bradford crashes, the FAA has hastily added 10 ILS installations to those already planned for this year—one at Bradford and nine at other small airports that previously had ranked low on the ILS priority list.

EXTINCTION OF ENDANGERED SPECIES—LETTER FROM PEGGY STEVENS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on May 14 and 15, the Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources, and the Environment, of which I am chairman, will hold hearings on the endangered species legislation.

In this connection, I wish to share with Senators a letter from Peggy Stevens of the fourth grade, Eagle Lake Elementary School, Edwardsburg, Mich. Accompanying Peggy's letter was a petition signed by 218 children and teachers, including, I understand, the mother of our distinguished colleague in the House, Representative JOHN BRADEMAS.

Peggy has some very original thoughts on the danger of extinction of alligators and crocodiles, and I commend her letter to all who are concerned with this problem.

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

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

EDWARDSBURG PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Edwardsburg, Mich.

DEAR SENATOR HART: At Eagle Lake School we are getting up a petition to save the alligators and crocodiles from extinction. Too few people realize the danger of these reptiles becoming extinct.

Our librarian, Mrs. Ducey, told us about this decrease of reptiles of this type. For instance in Africa one chief said he would rather lose a woman once in a while to an alligator or crocodile when she wades in to get water than buy expensive tin cans to scoop out the water with. This amounts to at least three women per month to an alligator or crocodile.

I thought up some pretty good rules, (I think) to help people, crocodiles, and alligators;

1. Forbid the sale of baby crocodiles and alligators, (they usually die and anyway they don't breed in captivity.)
2. Make it illegal to ship baby alligators or crocodiles across even the state line.
3. Make it a law to keep alligators and crocodiles from getting a taste of human blood, (they get very blood-thirsty once they get a bite of human flesh.)

About 20 kids from our school brought home baby alligators from Florida and every single one died! Please help stress the point, help all of us who signed the petition, save the alligators from extinction.

Thank you very much.

PEGGY STEVENS,
Mr. Zielinski, Room 9, Fourth Grade
Eagle Lake Elem.

PETITION

Pam Masten, Bev Rockenbaug, Betty Rockenbaug, Beth Gordon, Bryan Schuler, Joel Bors, Donny Duncan, Bob Daluga, Mrs. Joyce Knoebber, Margo Runkle, Tammy Hecremans, Jacquie Eaton, Laura Walters, Jeanna Weinberg, Sheila Ann Garl, Cherie June Garl, Julie Jaross, Gwen Fanderbush, Jerry Eaton, Wendie S., Frank S., Lisa Ratayski, Clint Hardy, Mrs. John Drucey, Alberta Shields, Louise Everest, Scott Baham, Cliff Williamson, Tom Stubbs, Kenneth Rowe, Bill Coleman, Miss Landis, Gayla, Nancy Teague, Brian Kauder, Peggy Swift, Joan Robinson, Karen Teague, Shirley Teeter, Barbara Brady, Charlene Wainscott, Bonnie Hese, Lori Johnson, Sherry Gould, Danny Elles, Michelle Beal, and Marjorie Neuberger.

Tom Knoebber, Andy Stevens, Jimmy Routson, Rex McKay, Andy Smith, Lance Severson, Frederick Nichols, Ilean Becraft, Shirlee Funderburk, Jennifer Kilburn, Antonia Frederick, Peggy Stevens, Tammy Bolin, Emily Hoover, Anne Allis, Lisa Allis, Lynne Nagy, Bobby Penrod, Pam Boepple, Greg Dick, Philip Van Vynckt, Scott O'Dell, Bill Gould, Karen R. Ronnebaum, Thaddeus Kraus, Jackie Stevenson, Gina Whiteaker, Laurie Jayne, Bob Mastin, Craig Overmeyer, Richard Capps, Margie Tolbert, Lynne Duckwall, Shelly Davis, Phil A. Roth, Dawn Beal, Georgia Reese, Tom Kujawski, Jane Vanderbosch, David Olmstead, and Cora Underwood.

Gaila, Mrs. John Greenlee, Mrs. L. D. Lane, Mrs. Max Masten, Jr., Mrs. Robert Reed, Mrs. Jon Anderson, Mrs. Jack H. Hardy, Esther Wilson, Marian Watson, Beatrice Brademas, Dean Balyeat, Heidi Richmond, Mary Ann, Greg Price, Matthew Walters, Shelley Greenlee Julia Bors, Rob Sisson, Scott Jaross, David Kaufman, David Medford, Patty Reed, John Greenlee, William Zielinski, Mike Miller, Scott O. Hammontrus, Jeff Diczoy, Alan Rockenlaw, Lenny Bloss, Robin Tisher, Patty Walters, Mrs. Gordon, Steven Mittan, Jerry Eaton, Bill Richmond, Kevin Dibble, Tim Davis, Billy Shields, James Ralph, and Mathew Bors.

Colleen Whiteaker, Richey Black, Kevin Turner, Eddie, Brenda Parsons, Penny Frakes, Jim Hakala, Norman Nichols, Dede Wilson, Cindy Vaereunyk, Denise Weinberg, Cindy Kittleson, Christina Cummins, Debbie Cater, Karen Stupps, Sheila Davis, Bryan Dibble, Dauna Cummins, Tracie James, Esther Boniface, Jon Lynn, Steve Nagy, Tim Wise, Robert Wait, Lou Ann W., Thelma Wise, Jim M., Julie Stacey, Jim M., Dirk Spico, Tim Littman, Todd B., Bill Gould, and Terri Huffman.

Sandy A. Stewart, Tom Littman, Victoria Parks, Raetta Romine, Kandy Braddock, Paula Whiteaker, Bruce Ronnebaum, Linda Strasser, Doug Medford, Kathy Bell, Judy Tevlin, Brian Graves, Randy Winderigler, Karen Van Syckle, John L., Anita Packelman, Mary Campbell, Marcia Cloud, Linda De Schepper, Carol Burema Carolyn Eckold, Lori Horne, Dawn Stevenson, Chris Hosler, Timmy Heramans, John Whited, Darlene Ward, Leonard Beal, Paul Coleman, Tom Leucas, Kathy Rea, James Matson, Cindy Rowe, Tammie Teeter, Susie Roberts, and C. R. Spice.

Lorinda Swinehart, Mary Yeakey, Julie Olmstead, Myrle Robinson, Charles Blass, Jon Stone, Jim Packelman, Jim Mitchell, Ralph McDonald, Francis Vanderbosch, Mary Jane Hardy, Jamice Anderson, Chip Beadie, David N. Modes, Bruce Watts, Jonathan Quick,

Robin Denney, Bobby Baucus, David Reed, and Linda Rodgers.

SDS BANNED FROM ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, last Sunday, the president of St. Bonaventure University, Olean, N.Y., announced that the Students for a Democratic Society have been banned from campus, charging that the radical organization was "anti-democratic, anti-American, and anti-Christian."

The president, the Very Reverend Reginald A. Redlon, made the announcement to 1,000 mothers and fathers who were attending St. Bonaventure's annual parents' weekend.

According to an article published in yesterday's New York Times, Father Redlon said:

The SDS is opposed to the ideals for which this university stands.

Mr. President, he is dead right about this. This is in the best tradition of St. Bonaventure University and institutions of its type, too many of which have ceased to have any reason for existence.

This is an educational tragedy. Great schools like St. Bonaventure have a philosophy of life that encompasses all of man's activities, a way of life that has to do with man's conduct, as well as with the development of his talents and skills, his behavior pattern as a decent human being.

Many of these institutions, which started out like the University of St. Bonaventure, have abandoned this philosophy, and do not have any philosophy of life, much less of education, today. As a consequence, they are lost, and it is my belief that they will not survive very long unless they find their way back soon.

So it is a mighty good thing to have the president of that great university reaffirm this philosophy of life.

I was privileged to deliver the commencement address there a few years ago, and I was honored to have an honorary degree conferred upon me. I am proud of it, and more so today.

What Father Redlon said ought to be read by all educators, but particularly by those who hold, or pretend to hold, or carry the ideas and ideals of Thomistic philosophy.

Mr. President, 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 New York Times, May 12, 1969]

SCHOOL BANS SDS AS ANTI-AMERICAN—ACTION BY PRESIDENT OF ST. BONAVENTURE UNIVERSITY ASSAILED

OLEAN, N.Y., May 11.—The president of St. Bonaventure University today banned the Students for a Democratic Society from campus, charging that the radical organization was "anti-democratic, anti-American and anti-Christian."

"The S.D.S. is opposed to the ideals for which this university stands," the president, the Very Rev. Reginald A. Redlon, said in announcing the ban to 1,000 mothers and fathers here for the Roman Catholic institution's annual parents' weekend.

The ban on the student organization,

which has been at the forefront of violent demonstrations on some other campuses, followed several weeks of more minor incidents here, including grumbling among the faculty and a brief student fast last month.

When Father Redlon announced the ban at the close of a special Mother's Day mass held in a gymnasium, the audience cheered. But disapproval came quickly from the dissident element that has increasingly disrupted the calm of this secluded 550-acre campus on the headwaters of the Allegheny River, 60 miles southeast of Buffalo.

TEACHER ASSAILS SCHOOL

"An atmosphere of repression has developed around Bonaventure, and this latest move is certainly typical of it. I've about given up hope for the place," said Lewis W. Roberts, an assistant professor of theology, who is leaving the 2,300-student Franciscan university at the end of this year out of "disgust."

A college spokesman said that the ban would simply mean denying the fledgling chapter of the S.D.S. the use of campus buildings, but that the several dozen students thought to be members would not be punished for their membership.

Father Redlon said that similar action would be taken against any group that opposed what the university stood for. He cited as an example the Ku Klux Klan, against which "this ban would likewise be leveled."

The conclusive proof that the S.D.S. was "opposed to all that our republic and our church and this institution stand for," the 47-year-old Father Redlon said, was some literature that students identified with the organization were passing out on campus last week.

A STUDENT'S OPINION

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, the forgotten American on the Nation's college campuses is the student who lives by the rules, who studies hard, respects authority, and is basically the all-American youth.

He will not be subpoenaed to appear before a congressional committee. He probably does not have long, shaggy hair, nor is he a confused leftist. He has not made the headlines of our major newspapers, and he has not appeared on national television while in the process of tearing down our great scholastic institutions. He probably comes from a hard-working middle-class family where values are still meaningful and has been taught all his life that anything worth having takes a great deal of hard work. He is a student who believes in progress and, in fact, is in the process of participating in it simply because he is in college. He is a young man or woman who understands that riots and destroying the institutions of America cannot solve problems such as poverty, war, discrimination. Like his elders and the vast majority of his peers, he is slow to anger and is very tolerant, but he can take only so much nonsense and abuse. He does not have the SDS as his spokesman, nor is he the captive of any particular ideology. He has been quiet, and through his silence he has been victimized since the first disturbances began at Berkeley several years ago. He has stood back and watched his beloved Harvard, Columbia, California, Cornell, Wisconsin, Howard, or City College of New York closed down and its property, its records, and its reputation damaged and tarnished. He will tolerate much more before he gets really

hot under the collar, but I think that that time is not too far off.

I recently received a letter from a young man at Harvard who has put into words the feelings of this vast group of young Americans. I am sure he speaks for them and to them, 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:

A STUDENT'S OPINION

(By J. C. Helms)

Is Harvard through? Could the present crisis ruin this university? Yes, it could.

The forceful seizure of a building will not ruin Harvard. The use of police will not ruin Harvard. A student strike will not ruin Harvard. But continued leniency on the part of the Administration and the faculty, alike, will ruin Harvard.

On April 9 several hundred students seized University Hall by force. The community was startled.

But how can it surprise us that such an incident occurs, when 2 years ago Robert McNamara was humiliated and subjected to mob coercion, and the University did next to nothing? How can it surprise us that such an incident occurs, when last year a mob of students held an interviewer from Dow Chemical Company prisoner for 7 hours, and the University did next to nothing? How long will this administration, backed up by faculty and students, continue to be so lenient, so permissive, so indulgent toward radical students guilty of criminal acts?

These radicals are not striking peacefully, they are not protesting peacefully, they did not occupy University Hall peacefully. They did it violently. They ejected 6 deans forcibly, one with such vigor that he knocked down 3 bystanders on his way out. They physically beat an undergraduate in University Hall because he was not in sympathy with their action: he was alone, and 5 of them held his arms and his hands while 2 others beat him. This was Wednesday afternoon, SDS, long before the police came, yet you can tell us that it was the police who first used violence?

You yell "scab" when we go to classes, you call us fascists when we support the police, you deface private property with your slogans and placards, you rifle the personal files of the Dean and publish his letters, you incite the mob to pelt President Pusey's house with rocks, and you wonder why we think our rights have been violated?

I think it's time somebody called nonsense, nonsense. I think it's time somebody called nuts, nuts. Isn't this the generation that wants to tell it like it is? Why, then, is everyone mincing words? The students who occupied University Hall are violent people, they do not belong here. Their wrongdoing is not just youthful restlessness, it is not just misdirected idealism; it is a crime, and those who committed this crime should be expelled immediately and never allowed to return.

Why, then, does the Faculty hesitate? The Administrative Board exists to handle discipline and it could have dealt with the present case 9 days ago. Is it because there are no students on that board? So what? Student participation in the punishment of colleagues is a serious issue and must be considered when reason has returned. But how can the Faculty think it wise to abandon, in the middle of a crisis, proven and equitable procedures and grasp at the untried compromise of an elected punishing committee of 10 professors and 5 students? Yet this is what they've done.

And so they add confusion to confusion. Or do they suppose that elections held on

one day's notice at a time of high emotion are going to select the best jury to pass judgment on the offenders? It is a travesty of justice, whatever the decision of this jury. But, in any case, that decision will most probably be lenient, for the watchwords of today are popularity and license, not rightness and order.

Or do you think we should be thankful to the students who have caused this mess? Do you think the mass-meetings and the television cameras and the bull-horns have made us better? It is loathsome to men of good sense to listen and listen and listen to people who talk about peace in Vietnam and make war here. It is loathsome to men of good sense to see these faceless mobs and committees and organizations all marching behind one banner, all wearing one ribbon, all chanting one song, all shouting one word: strike, strike, strike. Where are the individuals I hoped to find at Harvard, where are their individual thoughts, where are the careful distinctions, where are the subtle refinements? Nobody knows and nobody cares. Because all the fighters care about is victory, not truth.

And what is victory for SDS? They took a building. For weeks they told the Administration that they were going to take a building: all they were not sure about was, Why?

Now they know why, now they have their 8 Demands. O.K. In their present form these 8 demands are too extreme, but they are not without some merit. Nevertheless, whatever the demands of the SDS may be, there is still no justifying the use of force and violence. Not even a comparison with the Civil Rights movement can justify these tactics. It is true that good ends were attained in the Civil Rights movement by illegal means, but this achievement set a dangerous precedent, a very dangerous precedent, because such action opens wide the door to all sorts of selfish people, people who are only too willing to circumvent the law to attain their ends, ends which they invariably call good, but which are all too often bad.

Think it over, SDS. Just several days ago, one of your members told me in the Yard that if, by killing one, specific person, he could be guaranteed to end the war in Vietnam, he would kill that person. How about 2 persons, SDS? How about 10? How about Robert Kennedy, SDS, or Martin Luther King? Nobody likes the war in Vietnam, but how far will you go to achieve a goal, even if it's good?

And how far will the rest of us go in permitting a tiny minority to disrupt our lives and wreck our university? And how long will our faculty hesitate to expel these people? They hesitate because they are afraid, afraid that if the punishment is severe, there will be a serious student reaction. And they may be right: perhaps there will be.

So what?

It is time to call an end to playing politics with students. It is time to call an end to appeasement. It is time to call an end to making all decisions out of expediency. If there is one, large group in our society apart from organized religion that can and must still show the world that principles are preferable to politics, it is the teachers. Let businessmen and politicians be expedient, if they will, but let the spiritual leaders—and these are the teachers as well as the priests—let them proceed from principle, not politics.

And so I say: the violence of SDS, the use of police, the general student strike, will not ruin Harvard. But excessive indulgence toward things that are intolerable—this will ruin Harvard. We need change at Harvard—yes. We must free ourselves from outside control—yes. The students should play a more active role—yes. The University must have a greater concern for the community around it—yes.

But we need courage, too, as well as change, perception as well as compassion. If the Faculty fails to perceive the long-term effects of its decisions, if the Faculty loses its courage in the face of student disorder, if Harvard does not deal swiftly and severely with people who are bent on destroying American universities as a prelude to destroying all of American society, then Harvard is through.

DEATH OF FRANK GEORGE, NEZ PERCE INDIAN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on October 31, 1968, this country lost the services of a great American, Frank George. The death of this widely admired Nez Perce Indian, who devoted so much of his life for the benefit of others, leaves a void that will not be easily filled.

In recognition of his strong sense of public spirit, social involvement and personal unselfishness, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution drawn up in his memory by the sixth annual Idaho State Indian Conference be printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION IN MEMORIAM

Resolved, That this conference take note of the passing of Frank George on October 31, 1968 to close a remarkable career in the service of his fellow Indians. Born 56 years before of Nez Perce parents on the Colville Indian Reservation to which a remnant of Chief Joseph's warring people had been banished, Frank began his service in the Colville Indian Agency, Nespelem, Washington, which he left to engage in far-flung activities until he was nationally known among Indians. Successively he became Executive Secretary of the Colville Tribal Office, Secretary of the Affiliated Tribes of Northwest Indians, Recording Secretary and Later Executive Director of the National Congress of American Indians, and representative innumerable times of the Colville Confederated Tribes and of Indians generally on various missions. For example, in 1962 he was Chairman of the Nationalities Division of the Democratic Party at its convention in Los Angeles and was responsible for the Indian plank that went into the Democratic platform. Prior to that, with G. Mennen Williams and others, he was a guest of John F. Kennedy at Hiannasport, Massachusetts. Gifted with the ability to express himself well verbally or in writing, he was always effective in his espousal of Indian causes, in the news media, in the halls of Congress, before the Departments in Washington, DC., as precinct committeeman of the Democratic Party, as delegate to Democratic State Conventions, as delegate of the Colville Confederated Tribes, or as representative of Indian organizations. He was responsible more than any one else for stalling the enactment of bills for the termination of the Colville Indians. If these bills had ever become law, it would have adversely affected Indian titles and status on neighboring Indian reservations and would have set a bad precedent for Indians generally. Frank was blessed with a congenial personality and a cheery disposition. He was painstaking and persistent in his pursuits; above-board in his commitments; resourceful and thoroughly dependable—a standout man whom we admired, respected, and highly esteemed as a friend and associate. We dearly miss him and we cannot but assert that his era and ours are all better and brighter under the circumstances by reason of his dedication to our common problems in Indian affairs.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution be sent to his beloved wife, Mrs. Ann George, Box 151, Nespelem, Washington.

Attest:

OSWALD C. GEORGE.

LIBRARY MEMORIAL TO FORMER SENATOR CARLSON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, as most Senators know, Frank Carlson, a former Member of this great body, has a long and distinguished career of public service.

His record of service to his party, State, and Nation is indeed impressive. His activities in the area of humanitarianism are equally impressive.

Many great men have publicly acclaimed his deeds and honored his character. The people of his community who know him most intimately have announced their intention to establish a lasting monument to this great and kind man. The Topeka Daily Capital of May 12 contains an editorial outlining the plans of Concordia, Kans., citizens to build a library honoring their fellow townsman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Best Sort of Monument," be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Topeka (Kans.) Daily Capital, May 12, 1969]

BEST SORT OF MONUMENT

Concordia has taken appropriate action in deciding to build a library honoring the city's most illustrious citizen, Frank Carlson.

The 40 years he spent in public service, before his retirement in January, deserve recognition. Carlson is the only Kansan who has been a state legislator, congressman, governor and U.S. Senator. That he was elected and reelected to these offices without once suffering a defeat shows the admiration his constituents held for him.

Concordia's \$200,000 building will serve a dual purpose as the city's public library and a museum for Carlson's official papers and other memorabilia.

The affection Concordians hold for Carlson is reflected in the fact they have decided to meet a 1-mill levy for 10 years to finance half of the construction costs, with the other half coming from federal funds.

A nationwide campaign will be conducted to finance furnishing the memorial library. Because of the esteem Carlson is held by thousands of citizens, this fund should be easy to raise.

The coincidence of Concordia having outgrown its library at the time Carlson retired will result in a suitable memorial to him at the same time providing citizens with greatly expanded library facilities.

PATRIOTISM AWARDS TO BEAUMONT, TEX., STUDENTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, three high school students from Beaumont, Tex., were recognized May 6 at a national conference in Atlantic City, N.J., of Distributive Education Clubs of America for their efforts and achievements in a worthwhile project in behalf of patriotism in America.

The three youths are Kim Toomin, Calvin Williams, and Tom Combs, all students of Forest Park High School in Beaumont.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of a press release explaining the project, issued at the conference last week.

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

DISTRIBUTIVE EDUCATION CLUBS OF AMERICA, INC., NEWS RELEASE

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—The Pitch for Patriotism came from deep Texas all the way to Atlantic City, N.J. before the SRO crowd of 3500 enthusiastic DECA (Distributive Education Clubs of America) teenage members in attendance at the 23rd Annual National Leadership Conference this Tuesday morning.

Three youths, Kim Toomin, Calvin Williams and Tom Combs, representing Forest Park High School, Beaumont, Texas, along with their fellow chapter members, have been pushing patriotism in their community for the past several months with spectacular results. Forest Park DECA has distributed thousands of American decal flags to citizens amazed to find a nucleus of young people who recall memories of "Stars and Stripes Forever."

With an avowed purpose of "showing the other side of the coin," these three youths, a Negro, Jew and Anglo-Saxon, enthralled a representation of DECA's 100,000 students who practice civic-consciousness in communities in every state of the Union, Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia. The unique part of this program conducted by these students is the fact that they have not charged for the flags. Buying them through Reader's Digest (\$30 a thousand), these business-minded free enterprise-directed students have refused payment on the grounds that "we don't want to capitalize on patriotism, it's a duty of every American."

Appearing on the same platform with the Forest Park group was another DECA Chapter from Kingman, Arizona that last fall won the title of the best "Get Out The Vote" group in the United States. Kingman DECA, represented by Cathy Yukas, explained how her Chapter induced more than 80% of Kingman's registered voters to vote in the November 4 Presidential election. This figure exceeded by 20% the next-best voter turnout for this country.

The Atlantic City Conference is being attended by over 3,500 Distributive Education delegates from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

DECA is a national organization of 100,000 high school and post secondary students who are preparing for careers in marketing and distribution through a program of classroom and on-the-job training.

THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS' 50TH ANNIVERSARY YEAR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as 1970 approaches, the League of Women Voters is preparing nationally and in communities throughout the country for an especially productive year. The year 1970 marks the league's 50th anniversary.

The league as we know it today evolved from the National Woman Suffrage Association. To it can be attributed innumerable triumphs for the public interest during this half century since adoption of the 19th amendment. For while the league is strictly nonpartisan, in function and objective it is an organization deeply immersed in the decisionmaking process of this democracy. Affecting public policy, from the grassroots to the national level, is its chosen work and I am certain that most if not all of my colleagues can attest to its effectiveness.

I invite attention to the public recognition that has been accorded the league in anticipation of the 50th anniversary nationally, and more specifically within the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. I ask unanimous consent that the President's proclamation on the 50th anniversary of the League of Women Voters of the United States be printed in the RECORD, to be followed by the league's 50th anniversary campaign statement, "An Assignment From Society," and the list of the 50th anniversary campaign sponsors committee.

Also, I invite attention to editorials on the league's anniversary that were published recently in the Washington Post and the Evening Star and ask unanimous consent that they, also, be printed in the RECORD.

In the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, there are seven leagues with a total membership of 3,500 women. The efforts of these groups within the last year have been prodigious and varied, as is shown in the metropolitan area 50th anniversary campaign statement. I ask unanimous consent, finally, that that statement and the list of the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area campaign sponsors committee also be printed in the RECORD.

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

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES—A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

A half century ago—more than a year before the 19th Amendment was ratified—women from states where they already had the vote met to establish a League of Women Voters. Their purpose was to promote political responsibility through informed and active participation of citizens in government.

For fifty years the League of Women Voters has provided Americans in every state with information on candidates and issues and it has furnished a non-partisan platform from which all candidates may be seen and heard. These activities have strengthened government and have helped to sustain the public weal.

Whether it be concern for our urban malaise or desire for better international cooperation, whether it be conservation of our natural resources or the revitalization of our State and local governments, the League of Women Voters deserves the cooperation and encouragement of all Americans.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, call upon all our citizens to join with the League of Women Voters of the United States in the observance of its fiftieth anniversary in 1970.

I urge all businesses, industries, foundations, and civic organizations to give the full measure of their support to the League and its activities.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this seventeenth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-third.

RICHARD NIXON.

AN ASSIGNMENT FROM SOCIETY

Who knows what it will take to be a citizen—an effective citizen—in a continuously changing society? The challenges of the immediate future and the projected needs of the long-range view are staggering in their enormity, complexity, and intensity. Many

citizens today are feeling increasingly powerless to influence their own destinies, and as a result, are detaching themselves from citizen responsibility. Others, with rising expectations, are feeling more and more intensely that they must be given the full rights of citizenship now.

Viewing the next 50 years, the League of Women Voters not only accepts the challenge of an all-out attack on citizen bewilderment and frustration, but also is ready to involve more citizens as enlightened participants in government.

To commemorate its 50th Anniversary in 1970, the League of Women Voters and its 150,000 members actively seek "an assignment from society"—

To help resolve the growing problems of our cities; to increase the political effectiveness of the citizen in the ghetto and to remove the ghetto itself.

To make citizens of this country aware of our responsibilities for international cooperation and to share with citizens of other countries the processes and techniques for strengthening an open society.

To increase citizens' ability to work for the improved management of our water, land, and air resources in the interests of an attractive, healthy environment.

To direct itself to the task of revitalizing and strengthening state and local governments.

To expand its Voters Service in clarifying issues and supplying non-partisan information on candidates, in increasing the numbers registered and voting, and in encouraging active party participation.

FIFTY YEARS OF A GREAT IDEA

From the faith of the women's suffrage movement and the shock of the first world war came a great idea—that a non-partisan organization could provide political education and experience which would contribute to the growth of the citizen which would help assure the success of the democratic experiment called the United States of America. Thus the League of Women Voters, from its founding in 1920, has been destined to play a unique role in our complex society. It has converted the political conscience of 150,000 women in 50 states and more than 1200 communities into an effective non-partisan force for improved local, state, and national government.

The League has become a nationally recognized institution of reliable research and information. Among its credentials are 50 years of knowledge and experience gained from learning-by-doing, persistent searching for facts, and patient campaigning for solutions. The League's assets include the dogged, dedicated, resourceful character of its organization, the patience, energy, skills and talents of its members, and total commitment to the development of our human and natural resources through citizen decision and action.

Through its Voters Service activities, the League has reached millions of citizens with information on candidates and issues, and has provided a non-partisan platform from which all political contenders may be seen and heard. Governments, at every level, recognize the League's foresight in focusing public attention and bringing non-partisan pressure to bear on the critical issues of a changing society.

A CHALLENGE TO BE MET

In striking contrast to its public commitment of citizen service, the League's own methods of operation and finance have not kept pace with change. Under-financed and intent upon immediate program objectives, the League has given too little time to the long-range planning needed to maintain a healthy, growing organization.

In 1966 a special committee was appointed to take a good, hard look at the League as an organization, and the committee was not

satisfied with what it saw. The League had not capitalized on its nationwide character and assets. The League's financial resources—so proudly maintained through the diligent efforts of the members themselves—were no longer adequate to the challenge of the next 50 years. It is painfully obvious that at present the League lacks the means—in dollars and cents—to capitalize on its nationwide reputation or potential:

League members lack necessary tools and services;

State Leagues are squeezed between needs at the local and national levels;

National headquarters and the staff of resource and research experts have not grown in a decade;

Leaders at all levels are discharging their responsibilities only by taxing their physical endurance and by unrealistic financial sacrifice;

The League is hard pressed to serve those it has already reached; even more distressing, it has not reached all it could serve.

Standing still is not a viable choice for League members and certainly is an anathema to the spirit of the "great idea." The opportunity and necessity for service is compelling, for grappling with challenging situations is a League habit. Clearly, the League's 50th Anniversary is a time for vigorous expansion and development of its programs. But the program of service which the League envisions must be accompanied by financial resources adequate to the task. Over and above its customary revenues, the League of Women Voters will need from its constituency a development fund of \$11,000,000. And the League's real constituency is the public citizens, communities, other voluntary organizations, businesses, foundations—all with a vested interest in keeping democracy a vital and living process.

IMPLEMENTING THE ASSIGNMENT

The League's traditional operation assures the collection and clarification of facts concerning governmental issues, the observation and monitoring of government-in-action, the broad communication of its findings, and educational services leading to effective citizen participation in government.

It is these basic services which the League proposes to expand and enrich, to apply to the emerging problems of our society. The League must reach more of the population—especially the alienated and disadvantaged. The purpose of the League's expansion campaign is to make it possible for the League to work to its capacity on the interrelated problems of our society.

The implementation of the League's objectives can be accomplished by:

More effective and far-reaching Voters Service.

More educational activities and services for the community at large; more conferences for citizens; more publications in more languages geared to more socio-economic groups.

More professional resources for research and counsel.

More support for innovative community projects and services to attack our most urgent social and economic problems.

More efforts to enlist more women to join the League forces and add their time and energy to an organized effort for progress.

More training tools and activities to enrich member capability, knowledge and effectiveness in her community.

More League members involved in conference and committee work for the National program.

More and improved avenues of communication with the League members.

An expanded organization of professional and administrative staff at the local, state, and national levels to ensure that the League remains a vigorous organization abreast of national problems and issues.

More time and supporting services made available to elected officers and boards of director: to plan and direct programs.

Stronger program and administrative services in state League offices. The League is the only "grass roots" organization that gives persistent and continuous attention to this level of government.

More opportunities for interchange of ideas and experiences among local Leagues; more opportunities for leadership training to develop resources for state and national League leadership, and to enlarge the League's pool of trained manpower for community services.

To provide income that will be applied to meet future growth needs of the League at the national, state, and local levels.

A LOOK AT THE FUTURE

Today, as the League of Women Voters prepares to enter its next 50 years of service, both the League and the entire country face a new awareness of the importance of the individual citizen. If individual League members continue to believe that their stated purpose—the promotion of informed and active participation in government—is vital for all citizens, then the necessary foundation of support for the League's goals and activities over the next 50 years will be a reality. The 50th Anniversary of a Great Idea will, indeed, become a celebration.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES, 50TH ANNIVERSARY CAMPAIGN SPONSORS COMMITTEE

In 1970 the League of Women Voters of the United States will celebrate fifty years of service to the nation. As part of this celebration, the League has embarked on an \$11 million campaign to prepare for even more significant responsibilities in citizen participation in government in the decade ahead. The League is proud of those distinguished Americans listed below who endorse its past accomplishments and future plans through their membership on the Sponsoring Committee for the 50th Anniversary Celebration.

John W. Gardner, Chairman; Chairman, The Urban Coalition.

I. W. Abel, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; President, United Steelworkers of America.

Morris B. Abram, Waltham, Massachusetts; President, Brandeis University.

Vernon R. Alden, Athens, Ohio; Chairman of the Board, The Boston Company.

Clifford L. Alexander, Jr., Washington, D.C.; Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Elmer L. Andersen, St. Paul, Minnesota; Former Governor of Minnesota.

Eugenie Anderson, Red Wing, Minnesota; Former Ambassador to Denmark.

Joseph A. Belrne, Washington, D.C.; President, Communication Workers of America.

Daniel Bell, New York, New York; Professor of Sociology, Columbia University.

Barry Bingham, Louisville, Kentucky; Editor and Publisher, Courier-Journal and Louisville Times.

Eugene Carson Blake, New Canaan, Connecticut; General Secretary, World Council of Churches.

Sarah Gibson Blanding, Lakeville, Connecticut; President Emeritus, Vassar College.

Catherine Drinker Bowen, Haverford, Pennsylvania, Author.

Howard R. Bowen, Iowa City, Iowa; President, The University of Iowa.

Jerome S. Bruner, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Professor of Psychology, Harvard University.

Ralph J. Bunche, New York, New York; Under Sec. for Special Political Affairs, United Nations.

Mary Ingraham Bunting, Cambridge, Massachusetts; President, Radcliffe College.

Frederick H. Burkhardt, New York, New York; President, American Council of Learned Societies.

Erwin D. Canham, Boston, Massachusetts; Editor-in-Chief, Christian Science Monitor.

Lisle C. Carter, Ithaca, New York, Visiting Prof., Graduate School of Business and Public Adm., Cornell University.

Margaret Clapp, New York, New York; Former Pres., Wellesley College.

Harlan Cleveland, Brussels, Belgium; United States Permanent Representative to the North Atlantic Council.

Charles W. Cole, Amherst, Massachusetts; Former Pres., Amherst College.

James B. Conant, New York, New York; Former Pres., Harvard University.

Andrew W. Cordier, New York, New York; Acting Pres., Columbia University.

Norman Cousins, New York, New York; President and Editor, Saturday Review of Literature.

Mrs. Edison Dick, Lake Forest, Illinois; Former member, U.S. delegation to the United Nations.

Paul H. Douglas, Washington, D.C.; Chairman, National Commission on Urban Programs.

David Dubinsky, New York, New York; President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Thomas H. Eliot, St. Louis, Missouri; Chancellor, Washington University.

Edwin D. Etherington, Middletown, Connecticut; President, Wesleyan University.

Joseph L. Fisher, Washington, D.C.; President, Resources for the Future, Inc.

Arthur S. Flemming, St. Paul, Minnesota; President, Macalester College.

Mrs. George Gellhorn, St. Louis, Missouri; A founder of the League of Women Voters.

Murray Gell-Mann, Pasadena, California; Professor of Physics, California Institute of Technology.

Robert F. Goheen, Princeton, New Jersey; President, Princeton University.

Lincoln Gordon, Baltimore, Maryland; Pres., Johns Hopkins University.

Laurence M. Gould, Tucson, Arizona; Pres. Emeritus, Carleton College.

Frank Porter Graham, Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Former President, University of North Carolina.

Erwin N. Griswold, Washington, D.C.; United States Solicitor General.

John A. Hannah, East Lansing, Michigan; Administrator, Agency For International Development.

John D. Harper, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Chief Executive Officer, Aluminum Company of America.

Fred Harvey Harrington, Madison, Wisconsin; President, University of Wisconsin.

Patricia R. Harris, Washington, D.C.; Prof. of Law, Howard University.

Helen Hayes, Nyack, New York; Actress.

Andrew Heiskell, New York, New York; Chairman, Time, Inc.

Walter W. Heller, Minneapolis, Minnesota; Professor of Economics, University of Minnesota.

Pendleton Herring, New York, New York; President, Social Science Research Council.

Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, Notre Dame, Indiana; Pres., University of Notre Dame.

Charles J. Hitch, Berkeley, California; President, University of California.

Paul G. Hoffman, New York, New York; Administrator, UN Development Program.

M. Carl Holman, Washington, D.C.; Vice President for Program Development, Urban Coalition.

Mildred McAfee Horton, Randolph, New Hampshire; Former Pres., Wellesley College.

Judge Philip C. Jessup, The Hague, Holland; International Court of Justice.

John H. Johnson, Chicago, Illinois; Publisher, Ebony Magazine.

Joseph E. Johnson, New York, New York; President, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Edward M. Kennedy, Washington, D.C.; United States Senator.

Francis Keppel, New York, New York;

Chairman of the Board, General Learning Corporation.

James R. Killian, Jr., Cambridge, Massachusetts; Chm., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chicago, Illinois; Pres., Klutznick Enterprises.

Arthur Larson, Durham, North Carolina; Rule of Law Research Center, Duke University.

Mrs. Albert D. Lasker, New York, New York; Pres., Albert and Mary Lasker Foundation.

Mrs. Herbert H. Lehman, New York, New York; President, Lehman Foundation.

David E. Lillenthal, New York, New York; Chairman, Development and Resources Corporation.

Sol M. Linowitz, Washington, D.C.; U.S. Representative to the Organization of American States.

Ralph Lowell, Boston, Massachusetts; Trustee, Lowell Institute.

John J. McCloy, New York, New York; Former Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan Bank.

Ralph E. McGill, Atlanta, Georgia; Publisher, The Atlanta Constitution.

Stanley Marcus, Dallas, Texas; President, Neiman-Marcus.

Benjamin E. Mays, Atlanta, Georgia; President Emeritus, Morehouse College.

George Meany, Washington, D.C.; President, AFL-CIO.

Dr. Karl A. Menninger, Topeka, Kansas; Chm. of the Board of Trustees, Menninger Foundation.

George S. Moore, New York, New York; Chm., First National City Bank.

John W. Nason, Northfield, Minnesota; President, Carleton College.

Alfred C. Neal, New York, New York; President, Committee for Economic Development.

Maurine B. Neuberger, Washington, D.C.; Chm., Advisory Council on Status of Women.

Allan Nevins, San Marino, California; Author.

Frank Pace, Jr., New York, New York; Pres., International Executive Service Corps.

Rosemary Park, Los Angeles, California; Vice Chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles.

Charles H. Percy, Washington, D.C., United States Senator.

James A. Perkins, Ithaca, New York; President, Cornell University.

Jacob S. Potofsky, New York, New York; Pres., Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America.

Don K. Price, Jr., Cambridge, Massachusetts; Dean, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard Univ.

A. Phillip Randolph, New York, New York; International Pres., Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters.

Esther Raushenbush, Bronxville, New York; Pres. Sarah Lawrence College.

Father Paul G. Reinert, S.J., St. Louis, Missouri; President, St. Louis University.

Walter P. Reuther, Detroit, Michigan; President, United Automobile Workers of America.

Walter Orr Roberts, Boulder, Colorado; Pres. University Corporation for Atmospheric Research.

William M. Roth, Washington, D.C.; President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

James W. Rouse, Baltimore, Maryland; President, James W. Rouse and Co., Inc.

Rabbi Jacob P. Rudin, Great Neck, New York; President, Synagogue Council of America.

Bayard Rustin, New York, New York; Executive Director, A. Phillip Randolph Institute.

Terry Sanford, Raleigh, North Carolina; President, Urban America Inc.

Frederick Seitz, Washington, D.C.; President, National Academy of Science.

R. Sargent Shriver, Paris, France; Ambassador to France.

Mrs. Harper Sibley, Rochester, New York; Former Pres., Rochester Area Council of Churches.

Asa T. Spaulding, Durham, North Carolina; Former President, North Carolina Mutual Insurance Company.

J. E. Wallace Sterling, Stanford, California; Former Pres., Stanford University.

Robert G. Storey, Dallas, Texas; Former President, American Bar Association.

Julius A. Stratton, New York, New York; Chairman of the Board, The Ford Foundation.

Charles P. Taft, Cincinnati, Ohio; National Chairman, Fair Campaign Practices Committee.

Willard L. Thorp, Amherst, Massachusetts; Former Chairman, Development Assistance Committee, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.

Marietta P. Tree, New York, New York; Former U.S. Representative to the UN.

James Vorenberg, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Professor, Harvard Law School, Former member, President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice.

George Wald, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Professor of Biology, Harvard University.

James P. Warburg, New York, New York; Author.

Thomas J. Watson, Jr., Armonk, New York; Chairman, International Business Machines Corporation.

John H. Wheeler, Durham, North Carolina; President, Mechanics and Farmers Bank.

Jerome B. Wiesner, Cambridge, Massachusetts; Provost, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Roy Wilkins, New York, New York; Executive Director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Logan Wilson, Washington, D.C.; President, American Council on Education.

O. Meredith Wilson, Palo Alto, California; Director for Advanced Study of Behavioral Sciences.

Ellen Winston, Raleigh, North Carolina; Former Administrator, Social and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

W. Willard Wirtz, Washington, D.C.; Former Secretary of Labor.

Stephen J. Wright, New York, New York; Pres., United Negro College Fund.

Whitney M. Young, Jr., New York, New York; Executive Director, National Urban League.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 28, 1969]

FIFTY PRODUCTIVE YEARS

As a rule, the longevity of an organization is a notoriously unreliable basis for assessing its real worth. Once in a great while, however, a group comes along which grows progressively stronger year by year in its value and effectiveness. Such an organization is the League of Women Voters, which this week is marking the start of its fiftieth year of public service.

It has been a remarkable half-century. The premise of the league is that good government is a responsibility of the people, and the league's hallmark is a seemingly endless supply of reliable, nonpartisan information. In each election year, the focus is on factual analyses of candidates and issues. Between elections, the league's concern is with other elements of sound government. By now, local leagues are functioning in no less than 1,250 communities. The organization's strength is nowhere greater than here, in the seven locals of the Washington area.

No one should be surprised that the national league is observing its 50th anniversary not by looking backward, but by planning future expansions of service in voter education and information. These plans cannot be fulfilled, however, by voluntary effort

alone. From its members, individual and corporate gifts and community campaigns, therefore, the league, in its first national fund-raising drive, is seeking this year to raise \$11 million. It is a modest goal, deserving of support.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 28, 1969]

THE LEAGUE IS 50 YEARS YOUNG

In case anyone is unaware of it, this is The Year of the League—not the League of Nations or the League for Industrial Democracy but the League of Women Voters. In a rare display of candor on this particular subject, the ladies acknowledge that their League is now 50 years old. It came into being in late March, 1919 at the suggestion of Carrie Chapman Catt, the formidable campaigner for woman suffrage, with the double purpose of finishing the fight for the 19th Amendment to the Constitution and of making the new right of suffrage meaningful in the life of the Nation.

But the ladies of the League are not merely basking in the sunshine of a jubilee year. There is not the slightest indication that their organization is feeling its age. On the contrary, they are busying themselves in thousands of civic, educational, recreational, and political chores. The League's idea of celebrating seems to be to intensify its activities to bring about wider participation of women in public life and to broaden its impact on the processes of public policy-making.

With seven active Leagues in the Washington Metropolitan Area and branches in all 50 states, the LWV has become a powerful influence in American political life. We can think of no other organization that is more consistently and progressively identified with the public interest. In the last ten years the League has issued more than 3.5 million publications on national problems in addition to vast quantities of reports on state and local issues. More important than the quantity of its output has been the quality. For the hallmark of the League is that it studies a problem before taking a stand and that its conclusions avoid partisanship, ideologies and popular faddism.

Millions of what the League calls "woman hours" have been devoted to informing voters as to candidates and issues, to studying constitutional revision, fair apportionment, sound fiscal policies and legislative programs. The Leaguers are well known at city councils, school boards and planning bodies all over the country. At the moment they are devoting a great deal of energy to a drive against water pollution, to work for equality of opportunity in education, employment and housing and to a study of the country's defective electoral system.

It is strange that no single group of men organized for public service has succeeded in matching the objectivity, zeal and persistence of the League of Women Voters. Without doubt the League has become one of the most constructive forces in our system of participatory democracy. As it launches into its second half century, it is entitled to a hearty salute from the country in general and to a deep bow from those who supposed, in the dim years of the suffrage fight, that votes for women would lead to emotionalism and corruption in American politics.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., METRO AREA 50TH ANNIVERSARY CAMPAIGN (Alexandria, Arlington, District of Columbia, Fairfax, Falls Church, Montgomery County, and Prince Georges County)

The Seven Leagues of Women Voters of the Metropolitan Area with 3,500 members last year worked about 200,000 hours on nonpartisan efforts for the Washington metropolitan community to provide voters' service which:

Distributed 747,250 pieces of voters' service

¹ Deceased Feb. 3, 1969.

material, including candidates' questionnaires, biographies, ward maps, ballots, explanation of issues and voting guides.

Sponsored public meetings for citizens to question candidates.

Supplied registration and voting information for new citizens at naturalization ceremonies.

Answered thousands of telephone calls with facts for puzzled voters.

Provided absentee voter information locally, overseas and to armed forces.

To provide through study and action programs:

Observers at hearings on local, state and national issues.

Testimony on issues in support of League views resulting from League studies.

Workshops and public forums for citizen discussion on local and metro concerns such as rapid rail transit, bond issues, state constitutional reforms, crime, welfare, tax revenues, and national studies such as China Policy.

A sampling of the action shows:

Alexandria League members, present and past, hold 27 of 60 slots now filled by women in elective or appointive public positions.

Arlington League sponsored public briefing by citizens and transit experts preceding mass transit hearings, and drew wide attention with its China Policy workshop.

District of Columbia League members produced a massive school board candidates' questionnaire with answers from 64 candidates for the District's first elected school board.

Fairfax League members played a key role in registration drive which resulted more than 50% of eligible citizens entered on voting lists . . . a first for Fairfax.

Falls Church League members prepared initial study on need for a local high school gymnasium and need for local civic center . . . then supported successful bond issues for these.

Montgomery County League members conducted citizenship course for 1,500 Girl Scouts. These were "know your government" briefings with exams to show girls what they'd learned.

Prince Georges County League, with a membership of only 276 women, distributed 375,000 pieces of voter information of different kinds. The school board purchased 10,000 copies of P. G. League's "Know Your County" pamphlets.

Metropolitan Washington Council of the League did a broad study and report on low and middle income housing in metro area. It sponsored public workshops on regional co-operation. Will soon bring out booklet, "Know Your Region", a study and description of all local governments.

These few examples are typical of what your area Leagues have accomplished under the handicaps of grossly inadequate facilities and equipment . . .

A Seven League boost is needed now so we may provide:

More public workshops on issues important to the Washington area and its various communities.

More reference materials for school and public libraries.

More non-partisan voters' service publications to help more citizens to vote and to make informed choices when they do.

More voter education to encourage responsible participation in government—particularly among citizens in inner city and disadvantaged areas.

To do these things and more—and to give us time to expand our skills in service to all citizens—we need facilities such as new office equipment, adequate office help, more telephones and perhaps some offices for those Leagues now operated out of their presidents' homes.

Some distinguished friends of the League comment:

Mr. Andrew Parker, President of Woodward and Lothrop, is Chairman of Business and Industry Sponsors for the 50th Anniversary Campaign says, "I am very pleased at this opportunity to assist the League of Women Voters in its efforts to promote responsible citizenship."

The Hon. Mills E. Godwin, Governor of Virginia, writes (to the Alexandria League on occasion of League's work in Northern Virginia on public rally for bond issues) ". . . thanking you for the splendid job you did . . . to see that voters of your area understood the bond proposals."

The Hon. Gilbert Gude, Member of Congress, Maryland, in the Congressional Record of March 18, 1969: ". . . I have been impressed by the personal depth of understanding these ladies have evidenced. . . Their research is diligently pursued; their interests are broadly conceived and their participation is zealously lived."

Senator Wm. W. Proxmire, Chairman Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia on accepting a sponsorship for the 50th Anniversary Metro Campaign, "I have a high regard for the League of Women Voters."

Senator Charles MacC. Mathias of Maryland, on accepting a sponsorship, "I am honored to have been asked and I accept with pleasure."

An incomplete (as this is printed) list of other Business Sponsors in the Washington area includes Donald Bittinger, President, Washington Gas Light Co.; Austin Kiplinger, President, Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.; G. Dewey Arnold, Partner, Price, Waterhouse and Co.; Dr. John Menkart, President, Gillette Research Institute, Inc.; Sam Eig, Realtor, and O. L. Weir, President, Washington Board of Trade.

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS, WASHINGTON, D.C., METRO AREA 50TH ANNIVERSARY CAMPAIGN SPONSORS COMMITTEE

The League of Women Voters of the Washington Metropolitan Area are proud of the endorsement of the following distinguished citizens and grateful for their assistance.

CHAIRMAN, BUSINESS, AND INDUSTRY SPONSORS
Mr. Andrew Parker, President, Woodward & Lothrop.

SPONSORS

Rabbi A. Nathan Abramowitz, President, Washington Board of Rabbis.

The Honorable Dean Acheson, Former Secretary of State.

Mr. G. Dewey Arnold, Partner, Price Waterhouse & Company.

Mr. Frederick A. Babson, Chairman, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director, Downtown Progress.

Mr. Cleatus E. Barnett, President, Montgomery County Council.

Mr. Charles E. Beatley, Jr., Mayor, City of Alexandria, Virginia.

Mr. Donald S. Bittinger, President, Washington Gas Light Company.

Mr. David Carliner, President, Washington Home Rule Committee.

The Honorable William J. Driver, Administrator, United States Veterans' Administration.

Mr. Sam Eig, Realtor.

Dr. Frank Farner, President, Federal City College.

The Honorable Thomas W. Fletcher, Deputy Mayor, District of Columbia.

Dr. Isaac Franck, Executive Vice President, Jewish Community Council of Greater Washington.

Mr. Francis B. Francois, Vice Chairman, Prince George's County Board of Commissioners.

Mr. Aaron Goldman, President, The Macke Company.

Mr. Jackson Graham, General Manager,

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Mrs. Katharine Graham, Publisher, The Washington Post.

Mr. Leo E. Green, Mayor, City of Bowie, Maryland.

Mr. William Greenhalgh, Secretary, Montgomery County Council.

The Honorable Gilbert Gude, Representative 8th District, Maryland, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Theodore R. Hagans, Jr., President, District of Columbia Chamber of Commerce.

The Honorable Gilbert Hahn, Jr., Chairman, District of Columbia City Council.

Mr. Charles M. Halley, Mayor, City of Falls Church, Virginia.

Mr. Albert M. Hair, Jr., City Manager, Alexandria, Virginia.

Mr. George A. Hamill, Mayor, City of Fairfax, Virginia.

The Honorable Philip G. Hammer, Chairman, National Capital Planning Commission.

Dr. Royce Hanson, President, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

Dr. Milton Harris, Chairman, Board of Directors, American Chemical Society.

Mr. William Beasley Harris, Attorney.

Mrs. William Beasley Harris (The Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris), Professor, Howard University Law School.

The Honorable Royal Hart, Maryland State Senator.

The Honorable John W. Hechinger, President, Hechinger Building Materials.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. George A. Higgins, Director, Division for Urban Life, Department of Social Development, United States Catholic Conference.

The Honorable Lawrence J. Hogan, Representative 5th District, Maryland, U.S. House of Representatives.

The Honorable Charles A. Horsky, Chairman, Board of Higher Education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Bert W. Johnson, County Manager, Arlington County, Virginia.

Dr. Leonard Kaploff, Publisher, The Montgomery County Sentinel.

The Honorable Leon H. Keyserling, Consulting Economist and Attorney.

Mr. Austin Kiplinger, President, Kiplinger Washington Editors, Inc.

Mr. Hans A. Klagsbrunn.

Mr. Walter B. Lewis, President, Washington Planning & Housing Association, Inc.

Mr. Schuyler Lowe, Executive Officer and Comptroller, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

The Honorable Sherman J. Maisel, Member Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Mr. Frederick A. Marsteller, President, Washington Board of Realtors, Inc.

Senator Charles McC. Mathias, United States Senator, Maryland.

Mr. Walter F. McArdie, President, Metropolitan Washington Urban Coalition.

The Reverend Graydon McClellan, President, Council of Churches of Greater Washington.

Dr. John Menkart, President, Gillette Research Institute, Inc.

Mr. George M. Miller, Mayor, City of Takoma Park, Maryland.

Mr. Edward P. Morgan, Chief Correspondent, Public Broadcast Laboratory.

Mrs. Martha V. Pennino, Vice Chairman, Fairfax County Board of Supervisors.

The Honorable Stephen J. Pollak, Attorney.

Senator William W. Proxmire, Chairman, Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia, United States Senate.

Mrs. William P. Rogers.

The Honorable William L. Scott, Representative 10th District, Virginia, U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Atlee Shidler, Director of Educational Program, Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies.

The Honorable Carlton Sickles, Maryland Representative, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

Mr. Edgar L. Smith, Mayor, City of Greenbelt, Maryland.

Senator William B. Spong, Jr., United States Senator, Virginia.

Mr. Philip Stern, Author.

Mr. Elwood Street, Welfare Consultant, Ambassador Walter N. Tobriner, Ret.

Mr. Achilles M. Tuchan, Mayor, City of Rockville, Maryland.

The Honorable Sterling Tucker, Vice Chairman, District of Columbia City Council.

The Honorable J. C. Turner, President, Greater Washington Central Labor Council, AFL-CIO.

Senator Joseph D. Tydings, United States Senator, Maryland; Chairman, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. Frank E. Wall, Jr., Manager of Community Relations, IBM, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Charles L. Warren, Executive Director, Council of Churches of Greater Washington.

Dr. Bennetta B. Washington, Director, Women's Centers, Job Corps.

The Honorable Walter E. Washington, Mayor, District of Columbia.

Mr. Glenn Watts, Executive Vice President, Communications Workers of America.

Mr. Raymond D. Watts, Counsel, Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate.

Mr. O. L. Weir, President, Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade.

Dr. Elmer D. West, Executive Director, Consortium of Universities of Washington.

Mr. Martin R. West, Jr., Executive Vice President and Treasurer, Weaver Bros., Inc.

Mr. Thomas W. D. Wright, President, American Institute of Architects, Inc., Washington Metropolitan Chapter.

METRO CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Chairman, Mrs. Anthony Schwartz.
Community Campaign Co-Chairman: Mrs. Field Ogburn, Mrs. Arthur Yabroff.

Executive Committee: Mrs. John F. Lynch, Mrs. Herman Moeller, Mrs. Joseph Phillips, Mrs. Eric Wolf.

LOCAL LEAGUE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CHAIRMEN

Alexandria: Mrs. Brooke Schumm.
Arlington: Mrs. Benny L. Parker.
District of Columbia: Mrs. Betty Bower, Miss Josephine Thompson.
Fairfax: Mrs. Joseph Phillips.
Falls Church: Mrs. Owen Jones.
Montgomery: Mrs. Robert Levine.
Prince George's: Mrs. Milton Reeves.

WE MUST PROTECT THE PUBLIC INTEREST FROM THE FCC'S ERRATIC LICENSE RENEWAL PATTERN

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I wish to express my complete support for S. 2004, introduced by the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). The bill seeks to correct an erratic pattern of recent decisions by the Federal Communications Commission which has resulted in much consternation among our Nation's broadcasters—a pattern of decisions which do not serve the public interest.

A broadcaster is granted a license for a fixed period. Issuance is based upon a finding that the prospective licensee will operate in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," to use the words of the Communications Act.

Renewal of this license is likewise based upon a showing by the licensee that he has operated in the public inter-

est. In the past a showing of such station operation has entitled the broadcaster to license renewal for a new term. The confidence of renewal, upon a showing of serving the public interest, is important to the community and broadcasters who must make a very substantial investment if they are to provide the kind of service to which the public is entitled.

Apparently the FCC has now changed its policy regarding renewals. Recent far-reaching and potentially disruptive actions of the Commission indicate that the use of the word "renewal" is inappropriate. Now, it is intimated, it is not a "renewal" process, but an "issuance" process. This dramatic shift of policy was highlighted in a renewal proceeding involving a station in a major eastern market. Even though the existing licensee may have a good record, a new and unproven applicant may file for the license. Without involving myself in the merits of any particular case, I would like to comment briefly on the rationale of recent decisions and what it portends for the future, not only for broadcasters but for the healthy maintenance of a viable broadcasting system in the United States. We all know and recognize that the radio and television stations of the United States comprise the most advanced and far-reaching communications system in the world. No nation has achieved the competence, fairness, and completeness in news and public affairs. We all owe a debt to the many stations who responsibly fulfill their public interest obligations.

Prior to recent FCC decisions, station licensees assumed that prior record of service in the public interest would be of paramount importance in the license renewal process. Such an assumption apparently was incorrect. Now it appears, any newcomer may pit his "blue sky" promises against the performance of the existing licensee. Clearly, such a change is grossly unfair to the licensee who has adequately served his community. It is also unfair to the community to equate "mere promises" with "actual performance."

The proposed legislation seeks to correct this injustice by requiring that the FCC make a threshold determination with respect to the performance of the licensee. If the FCC finds that the licensee has been operating in the "public interest, convenience, and necessity," it should renew its license. If it finds that the licensee has not operated in the public interest, then opportunity will be offered to new applicants to apply for the facility which has been vacated.

I must emphasize that the bill does not seek to protect the unprincipled broadcaster in any way whatsoever—but it does recognize the importance of a long-term commitment and adequate investment to serve the public interest, and that is what the Communications Act of 1934 is all about. I heartily endorse the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island and urge the Commerce Committee to schedule immediate hearings so we can get the legislative ball rolling. Time is of the essence. For the RECORD,

the language of Senator PASTORE's bill is as follows:

A BILL TO AMEND THE COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934 TO ESTABLISH ORDERLY PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF APPLICATIONS FOR RENEWAL OF BROADCAST LICENSES

Section 309(a) shall be amended by adding the following after the final sentence thereof: "Notwithstanding any other provision of the Act, the Commission, in acting upon any application for renewal of a broadcast license filed under Section 308, may not consider the application of any other person for the facilities for which renewal is sought. If the Commission finds upon the record and representations of the licensee that the public interest, convenience and necessity has been and would be served thereby, it shall grant the renewal application. If the Commission determines after hearing that a grant of the application of a renewal applicant would not be in the public interest, convenience and necessity, it may deny such application, and applications for construction permits by other parties may then be accepted, pursuant to Section 308, for the broadcast service previously licensed to the renewal applicant whose renewal was denied."

ASSOCIATE JUSTICE ABE FORTAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a legitimate question of propriety has been raised concerning Associate Justice Abe Fortas: the question of whether it was proper for Mr. Fortas to accept a \$20,000 fee from the family foundation of Mr. Louis Wolfson while Mr. Fortas was a member of the Supreme Court. Justice Fortas did return the money after Mr. Wolfson was convicted for criminal violation of the Securities Act, but Mr. Fortas has not denied a charge that he kept the money for some 11 months.

Last year the Senate was asked to confirm the nomination of Mr. Fortas as Chief Justice of the United States. Many of us believed the appointment unwise. One of the many reasons for this belief was the existence of several other questions of propriety regarding Mr. Fortas.

When a motion to end debate on the nomination of Mr. Justice Fortas was presented in this body, the required two-thirds majority vote could not be mustered and the nomination could not be confirmed.

Mr. President, I was among those Senators who voted against cloture. I feared the several questions of propriety surrounding Mr. Justice Fortas then, and now those fears have been renewed by this most recent additional question of propriety.

A few days ago, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), the minority whip, called on the Supreme Court itself to conduct its own investigation to determine whether Mr. Justice Fortas committed an act of impropriety in accepting a fee from the Wolfson Foundation. In the alternative, Senator SCOTT suggested that the Court call on the last five presidents of the American Bar Association to conduct a similar inquiry.

I wish to associate myself with that suggestion. I think an inquiry either by the Court itself or by an eminent body selected by the Court would be both fair and proper.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, Soil Stewardship Week is being observed this week by soil conservation districts across America. These observances emphasize man's obligation to God as a steward of the soil, water, and other resources.

This year's theme, "Confront the Issues," underscores the responsibility of citizens in dealing with current issues involving stewardship of renewable natural resources. Some 3,000 soil conservation districts in America are sponsoring this special observance week for the 15th consecutive year. A specially illustrated booklet places emphasis on confronting the issues in today's complex world.

Soil Stewardship Week is a significant recognition of the faith-man-nature tie. I believe its importance will greatly increase as we continue to become an even more urban nation. People living on the land are reminded of the importance of soil every day they work the fields. Urban people will need forceful, formal reminders that their stake in good stewardship is just as vital.

Today, most of the conservation measures used by farmers and ranchers make economic sense to them. Many of them beautify the land. The average good farmer may not talk about treating his land well because he loves it as a gift from God, but he will act this way. Conservation with staying power must include an attitude in which a man has the desire to keep his land in good repair. Any true conservationist becomes a steward when he recognizes that nature, to man, is both a "natural resource" and a natural responsibility.

The present shows many future goals for soil stewards. The true steward, conscious of his responsibility to God for the care of the wealth of resources He has placed at our disposal, will welcome the additional goals as an opportunity. He will see in the goals a test of his initiative and resourcefulness—and a clear chance to demonstrate, in word and deed, his allegiance to God's will.

NEW JOURNALISM INSTITUTE

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the University of Arizona, in Tucson, has made what I consider to be a very significant announcement in the field of journalistic studies. Prof. Philip Mangelsdorf, head of the department of journalism, has announced the formation of the Arizona Journalism Institute to encourage excellence in Arizona journalism.

Because there are occasions when men in public office find themselves critical of our present news media, I think it is important that we recognize and applaud efforts—particularly those efforts that significantly involve the media themselves—to improve the quality of journalism.

I therefore ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a letter from Professor Mangelsdorf, in which he gives me information concerning the plans and goals of the Arizona Journalism Institute.

Just as I believe that our free press institutions are benefited in the free exchange of ideas within our society today—I even think the news media benefits from criticism now and then—I think that every effort to improve the quality and upgrade the standing of the journalistic profession should receive the proper recognition.

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

THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, Ariz.

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FANNIN: The Arizona Journalism Institute has been established by the University of Arizona Department of Journalism as a permanent center for study and conference among professional journalists within the state. It is located within the department's campus facilities in Tucson, Arizona.

Primary goal of the Arizona Journalism Institute is to encourage excellence in Arizona journalism through continuing education of the professional newsmen. A secondary objective is to foster greater dialogue within the profession.

Several approaches will be explored to accomplish these goals.

The Arizona Journalism Institute will publish a regular journal entitled "The Arizona Journalist," which will describe trends and attempt to evaluate performance within the profession. In addition, "The Arizona Journalist" will contain news of statewide interest taken from various professional and trade journals. It is to be circulated in the hope of reaching every career journalist in the state.

In addition to the journal, the Institute is forming plans for a series of seminars for working newsmen and editors. These seminars will survey techniques within the field of journalism and provide a forum for backgrounding of the newsmen in other fields.

The Community Journalism Workshop, in which the Department of Journalism sponsors a one-day training seminar for journalists from smaller newspapers, will be incorporated as an activity of the Institute. This is an example of the type of projects the Institute will develop, although the range of undertaking could reach from workshops and speakers to higher-level meetings of editors for the exchange of ideas.

Also under consideration are international exchanges with journalists and educators from Mexico and Latin America.

The Arizona Journalism Institute also has plans to publish reference material in conjunction with the seminar program.

The Institute must develop new techniques and, perhaps, discard some old ones to insure its success. Coordination between professionals and educators now exists in many professions, including medicine, law, engineering and science.

Director of the Institute is George Ridge, Jr., a member of the journalism faculty, Ridge, a University of Arizona law graduate who teaches Law and Ethics of the Press, was a reporter and editor for 15 years in Arizona and overseas.

A 16-member Board of Governors, representing the varied specialties of journalists throughout the state, will act as an advisory and consulting body for AJI. Members of the board include Bob Allison, Phoenix Gazette sports editor; Platt Cline, president of the Arizona Daily Sun, Flagstaff; Frances Gerhardt, assistant editor of the Arizona Record, Globe; Hugh Harelson, Arizona Republic news editor; Frank Johnson, Arizona Daily Star managing editor; Donovan Kramer, edi-

tor and publisher of the Casa Grande Dispatch; Clyde Lowery, Tucson Daily Citizen managing editor; Jonathan Marshall, publisher of the Scottsdale Daily Progress; Ed McDowell, Arizona Republic editorial writer; Walter Meek, Arizona Republic reporter; J. Edward Murray, Arizona Republic managing editor; Jones Osborn, editor and publisher of the Yuma Daily Sun; Lowell Parker, Phoenix Gazette managing editor; Barbara Sears, Arizona Daily Star city editor; Tony Tselentis, assistant managing editor of the Tucson Daily Citizen; and C. R. Waters, president of the Mohave County Miner.

Very sincerely,

PHILIP MANGELSDORF,
Head of the Department.

TRAIN DERAILMENTS INCREASE—ACTION NEEDED

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, an editorial published recently in the Palladium-Item of Richmond, Ind., reflects a growing concern in this country about railroad safety. The number of rail accidents has increased dramatically in recent years, and major wrecks have visited damage and destruction on many communities. Already this year major accidents have taken several lives and endangered hundreds more.

In the last 16 months, two dangerous accidents occurred within 50 miles of Richmond, Ind. Both required evacuation of townspeople and both resulted in major fires and explosions. It is natural that the Palladium-Item should exhibit a special concern in this matter—a concern that ought to be shared by more and more Americans who face the potential damage that derailments can inflict.

The editorial concludes:

It's quite clear that something must be done.

On May 20 and 21, the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation will begin hearings on rail safety legislation in the belief that something can be done.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "Train Derailments Increase," published in the May 5 issue of the Richmond, Ind., newspaper, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRAIN DERAILMENTS INCREASE

Increasing concern is being felt at national levels over the growing number of train derailments. It's a question of keen interest locally because this area has been the scene of two extremely dangerous ones in the past 16 months.

One which occurred a little over a week ago near East Germantown caused cars laden with chemicals to explode. Another took place a year ago last January at Dunreith. Property damage in each instance was high.

The most recent wreck has been blamed tentatively on a broken casting, a part of the undercarriage of a railroad car. It was not until a year later than an official report on the Dunreith pileup placed blame on a broken rail, but the cause still was listed as "probable."

That no lives were lost in either case is fortunate. But this fact does not take away from the extreme dangerousness of what happened, nor does it require much speculation as to how tragic the results easily could have been.

Sen. Vance Hartke, D-Ind., will use this latest wreck as a means to emphasize the

need for a federal railway safety act. Railroad accident investigations, federally, now come under the jurisdiction of the National Transportation Safety Board, set up by the new Department of Transportation.

Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) investigators now assigned to rail crashes have expressed surprise over the absence of what they call meaningful federal safety standards for railroads coupled with adequate procedures for "following up" accidents to determine their causes.

Joseph J. O'Connell, chairman of the National Transportation Safety Board, looks upon increasing train derailments as one of the country's "most serious" safety problems. There were 2,671 derailments in 1961. There were 5,487 in 1968, more than double those of seven years ago.

O'Connell has been quoted as feeling that the primary cause "lies in the field of maintenance" of railroad trackage and running stock.

A report on the Dunreith derailment was made public last Jan. 16. Just a little over a week later there was another derailment, this one at Laurel, Miss.

A wheel of a car carrying propane gas collapsed. Fourteen other cars, each also loaded with 30,000 pounds of the same gas, exploded. Two persons were killed; 33 hurt; 54 homes completely destroyed, 1,350 others damaged; two factories destroyed; six schools and five churches badly damaged.

Now the cause of that accident apparently has been found. It is being blamed on an irregularly machined component on the wheel which cracked under the stress.

Freight car pileups usually are costly only in the damage to what they contain, and to railroad property. But they become especially dangerous to entire communities when the cars are carrying flammable fuels or explosive, toxic chemicals.

Obviously it's a problem of which the railroads are aware. Admittedly a federal railway safety act won't automatically insure safety nor prevent all future accidents. But it may be able to set up guides and standards which, if followed, at least could reduce these accidents in number.

It's quite clear that something must be done.

SOCIAL CONSCIOUSNESS IN BUSINESS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, all too often we hear of the lack of social responsibility and social conscience of many of our Nation's larger businesses. Certainly some of this criticism is justified; however, more often than not we hear only one side of the story and are not made aware of the positive contributions business is making. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Business Tackles the Ghetto," written by Richard Martin, and published in the May-June issue of the American Way. This factual article recounts numerous examples of how many of our Nation's leading corporations and their executives have taken a vigorous role in training and in employing our black and hard-core unemployed citizens.

It is my hope that making this article known to Members of Congress will inspire others to undertake similar activities and encourage those now active in this area to continue with even bolder programs.

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

BUSINESS TACKLES THE GHETTO

(By Richard Martin)

Big business is taking a major and growing role in the struggle of black men for economic equality. Corporations are making strenuous efforts to provide jobs for ghetto dwellers by recruiting and training the hard-core unemployed. Corporate money and manpower is being mustered for imaginative new efforts to improve the education, housing and recreation facilities of Negro communities. Companies are setting up new plants and subsidiaries in ghetto areas and are providing capital technical assistance and encouragement to Negro-owned enterprises in slum areas. The effort is massive and it is showing results.

Some of the impetus for the growing involvement of big business in the ghetto is self-interest, of course. Executives are quick to admit that if the nation's big cities continue to deteriorate, corporate investments will deteriorate right along with them. Alternatively, companies view America's poor as a vast potential market.

But among government officials and executives of the nation's major corporations there's a growing conviction that American business should do much toward easing the urban crisis because it has the talent and will to do so.

George Champion, chairman of Chase Manhattan Bank in New York, explained the growing corporate involvement in a recent speech: "Isn't it time somebody stood up and said business should participate because it's the right thing to do—the humanitarian, the moral, the Christian-like thing to do?"

Alfonso J. Cervantes, the mayor of St. Louis, is even more emphatic. He maintains that corporate involvement in the ghetto offers the only solution to the urban and civil rights crises. He says: "Ultimately it must be private industry that figures out ways to integrate the disadvantaged—especially the Negro—into the economy and to dissolve the slum, or it will soon be necessary to despair not only of the slums, but of the total central city."

Many of the most notable company efforts are going into providing jobs for Negroes. The proportion of black workers and employees from other minority groups has risen sharply over the past two years and is still growing rapidly. Companies of all sizes are hiring and training Negroes to fill entry-level jobs. More significantly, many companies are also striving to keep Negroes they train on the job by providing opportunities for them to earn promotions and climb well above the bottom rung of the corporate ladder.

Although the Federal Government underwrites much of the cost of training the hard-core unemployed, companies say their efforts to find, hire, train and retain such employees require the expenditure of considerable time and energy and are a constant source of frustration to corporate personnel men.

"One difficulty in motivating jobless people is that many have had a past record of failure—in school, at work, in family life—and tend to expect failure in applying for jobs at a technically oriented company such as ours," says Monroe V. Dill, director of industrial relations at Eastman Kodak Company.

Even the most highly motivated of the unemployed require special attention and some preferential treatment from personnel men and supervisors. In dealing with the hard-core, "It's necessary not only to reach out to get them, but also to dip into their personal lives" to keep them on the job, says Frank McClure, personnel vice president at Radio Corporation of America. Mr. McClure says RCA personnel men often go to the homes of newly hired hard-core employees who don't show up for work.

An RCA plant personnel man on such a visit found that an eager, hard-working youth's record of absenteeism was caused by

an older, unemployed brother who kept stealing the young man's clothes. The problem was solved shortly afterwards when police jailed the older brother on other charges. One RCA man in New Jersey found that another worker was consistently late because he was spending more than an hour riding four different buses to get to work. The personnel man showed him where to catch a train that would take him to the plant in only 30 minutes.

Despite the obstacles, corporate efforts to hire and train the hard-core are making a dent in the problem. The National Alliance of Businessmen, now beginning the second year of its Job Opportunities program, had such success in its efforts to find and fill jobs last year that it has doubled its goals this year and is more than doubling the number of cities—to 125—involvement in the program. More important, 85,000 of the workers who have been hired were still on the job at the beginning of this year, a retention rate of 68%.

All companies provide one example of the way job and training are made available through the NAB program. Humble Oil and Refining Company, chief domestic subsidiary of Standard Oil Company, New Jersey, has set up a training course to teach unemployed family men the service station business in four weeks of hard study at the company's Clifton, New Jersey, service station center. Mobil Oil Corporation is conducting a program to train hard-core unemployed as service station attendants in five cities and has made two big Mobil stations in the Watts section of Los Angeles available to a community action group for job training programs. Shell Oil Company has projects in six cities designed to select, train and place the hard-core unemployed in meaningful jobs, and last summer reserved 20% of its nonprofessional summer jobs for disadvantaged youths.

To hire the unemployed, companies have drastically revised their employment criteria, eliminating aptitude tests and high school degree requirements and ignoring police records in many cases. A spokesman for Westinghouse Electric Company says: "What we're requiring of the hard-core is that they pass a physical examination and be able to read safety regulations and plant rules."

Some of the most successful efforts to employ the formerly unemployable are being made by Detroit's auto companies. Since the riots that razed blocks of Detroit in 1967, no industry in the nation has worked as hard to provide jobs. In the last eight months of 1968 alone, General Motors hired 21,700 jobless men in its plants throughout the country. Ford Motor Company hired 9,300 and Chrysler Corporation took on 5,800 in the same period.

To turn trainees into productive employees, auto men sometimes go to their homes to roust them out of bed or arrange for a babysitter. They take elaborate steps to tell each employee which bus to catch to get to the plant and show them how to make use of social agencies to get everything from eyeglasses to financial advice. Like other companies, the auto makers are also setting up programs to teach reading and arithmetic to those who need it, and they are beginning to offer courses in the plants leading to high school equivalency certificates.

"Our experience with employment of the hard-core unemployed shows a good percentage can be made into productive employees," says GM's chairman, James Roche. But he adds, "I wouldn't say we have more than scratched the surface."

Probably the most ambitious effort of all is being undertaken by the nation's largest private employer, the Bell System. Four of American Telephone & Telegraph Company's operating entities—New Jersey Bell Telephone Company, Western Electric Company, Bell Laboratories and the Long Lines depart-

ment—are combining their efforts to provide work for people from the central city areas of New Jersey where unemployment is high.

Western Electric has opened a factory in downtown Newark in a leased, three-story building that was formerly an automobile agency. The plant hires only persons who can't qualify for employment at other Western Electric plants. There is no pre-employment testing and normal educational requirements are waived. Only limited reading and writing ability is required. Medical standards have been relaxed. The company gives corrective safety glasses to employees who need them, and urges those with bad teeth to get them corrected.

The most significant aspect of Western Electric's program, however, is that it is designed to promote steady turnover in the Newark plant by preparing employees there to move into higher paying jobs. "Those who demonstrate ability to perform effectively in an industrial environment will be transferred to other company locations in Northern New Jersey," promises Paul A. Gorman, Western Electric president. "When this occurs, additional hard-core unemployed will be hired to take their places."

Big companies are making significant contributions to ghetto education. Consolidated Edison Company in New York hires high school students identified as potential dropouts for part-time jobs—with the stipulation that the youngsters stay in school and maintain passing grades. "Our primary objective with these kids is to give them a job so they'll have the money and the incentive to finish school," says a company spokesman.

In New York City, the Urban League and a handful of major corporations have set up 14 street academies to provide remedial instruction and counseling for ghetto school dropouts in an effort to get them back into the educational mainstream. "The objective is to pick up kids who may never have thought of going to college and prepare them for it," explains Paul Gibson, Jr., director of urban affairs at American Airlines.

American's street academy is scheduled to open this month. It will provide instruction and counseling for youngsters who otherwise might drop out of school. Between 7 p.m. and 9 p.m., after normal hours, American employees will staff the academy to provide special tutoring and counseling services for youngsters who have stayed in school and do wish to go on to college.

At American Airlines, even stewardesses are assisting the corporate effort. Among other projects, American is conducting personal grooming clinics, its American Youth Beauty Workshops, in cities throughout the country. The workshops, staffed by stewardesses, are to teach young ladies the good grooming methods necessary to find and hold jobs.

In Marion, Indiana, RCA hires regular public school teachers to teach classes at the plant after each work turn ends, enabling RCA employees who haven't finished high school to complete the requirements for their diplomas. In Harrison, New Jersey, RCA has sponsored after-hours machine shop classes in its plant for non-employees.

Ohio Bell Telephone Company offers ten-week Saturday courses in basic electricity for Cleveland high school seniors, paying them regular wages during the classes, and offering jobs after high school graduation to youngsters who qualify. Pacific Telephone Company in Sacramento, California, likewise is trying to encourage youngsters to make the most of their educational opportunities in high school by giving students, teachers and counselors firsthand looks at the company's operations. Thus, the youngsters will have a better idea of what their performance in school can mean in job opportunities after graduation.

Two Cincinnati high schools are trying out a new curriculum developed by GE to teach high school youngsters skills required of elec-

trical appliance repairmen. The students take courses in basic electricity, electronics, air conditioning and other subjects, and receive on-the-job training at GE appliance dealers' shops.

In Detroit, Michigan Bell Telephone Company and Chrysler Corporation each have adopted ghetto high schools. Northern High School, with 1,800 students, 98% of whom are Negroes, calls on Michigan Bell for manpower, technical and management skills and training facilities. A Michigan Bell employment manager conducts a twelve-week night course at the school to teach youngsters about job interviews, application forms, employment tests, grooming, deportment and other skills that will help them find and hold jobs after graduation. Michigan Bell also provides part-time jobs after school for about 20% of the school's senior class.

Chrysler's parental interest in Northwestern High School includes much of the same kind of help. In addition, Chrysler last year installed a modern, \$150,000 garage at Northwestern to train auto repairmen.

Aetna Life Insurance Company has adopted a high school in Hartford, Connecticut, as have Bell System Companies in Chicago and Milwaukee. Ford, GE, Avco and Procter & Gamble Company recently adopted the entire, 2,000-pupil school system of Lincoln Heights, Ohio, a mostly Negro suburb of Cincinnati.

Housing, too, is becoming a major focus of business involvement in the ghetto. In Camden, New Jersey, six companies, led by RCA, have set up a nonprofit group to provide low-cost homes for ghetto dwellers. Using a revolving fund of \$500,000, the group rebuilds empty houses and sells them to families whose income doesn't exceed \$4,400. By arranging local financing for the buyers, the organization has helped families move into reconditioned houses for as little as \$200 down and \$70 a month.

In a similar act of corporate citizenship, Warner & Swasey Company spent \$134,000 renovating a filthy, 40-year-old apartment building in the Hough area of Cleveland to produce thirteen three-bedroom apartments. The effort provided experience in rehabilitation to a Negro contractor who had had no previous involvement in such work and encouraged other businesses and organizations to make similar efforts.

B. F. Goodrich Company launched a program in Akron to provide a sizable, interest-free revolving fund to serve as seed money to help finance housing for low-income families. Harry B. Warner, president, says the company "examined various alternatives for broadening Goodrich's role in helping to make Akron a still better city. The need for improved conditions for many families in depressed areas" prompted this effort.

Companies also are making efforts to funnel capital into Negro-owned enterprises. Southern California Edison deposits its income-tax withholding funds, amounting to about \$50,000 a month, in the predominantly Negro Bank of Finance in Los Angeles. Safeway Stores, Inc. buys potatoes for some of its retail stores from a Louisiana cooperative made up of poor Negroes.

Western Electric buys products from Negro-owned and operated firms in Los Angeles and Chicago in "a deliberate effort to help nurture new businesses run by Negroes." In Boston, John Hancock Life Insurance company helped provide the initial financing to set up Unity National Bank, a multiracial bank in Roxbury.

American Airlines recently "asked employees to examine all of the company's local purchasing practices to look for ways in which we can buy more of our goods and services from Negro-owned or operated companies based in the cities in which we have facilities," says Mr. Gibson, the urban affairs director for the airline.

Many banks are liberalizing their loan requirements, especially for small businesses, to

give Negro businessmen a break. Chase Manhattan Bank representatives have made block-by-block visits to black-owned businesses in Harlem looking for loan prospects; Chase officers and staff members are giving advice and encouragement to developing Negro businesses.

In Chicago, Swift & Company has helped Negroes establish ice cream parlors. Safeway, in several cities, is helping to sustain Negro cooperative supermarkets. One of them, in San Francisco, was on the brink of financial disaster when Safeway stepped in and provided management consulting services for the token fee of \$1.

John Hancock is making available to black entrepreneurs a "skills bank" made up of lawyers, accountants, investment specialists and other experts who can provide their talents and services at little or no cost. Some Companies are encouraging local Community Fund officials to change their priorities in order to find new ways to better serve poor communities with money donated by businesses and employees.

"These are funds we as businessmen are raising and that our employees are contributing through payroll deductions," explains one corporate vice president. "We should see that they are judiciously distributed among those who need them the most."

There is no question that corporate efforts are making inroads into the deep-seated problems of the cities. But progress so far is too slight and too slow to satisfy many people. Robert H. Gudger, manager of personnel relations for American Airlines, complains: "The torrent of eloquence calling for action is equaled only by the flow of suggestions that committees be appointed, investigations be carried on and pilot projects started. These next-week warriors, willing to risk only a token force in the battle, miss the urgency of the war."

Corporate executives are spending a great deal of time working on civil rights and urban affairs. The National Alliance of Businessmen, business's own instrument for dealing with the crisis, draws on the talents of top management throughout the country. Other agencies, such as the Urban Coalition, an organization of business, civil rights, labor, religious and urban leaders, do likewise.

Urban affairs departments are being created in more companies, and lower level executives increasingly are encouraged to devote more of their time, both off and on the job, to work on local education, housing and small business projects.

At RCA, for example, Julius Haber, vice president of community relations, and San Convissar, manager of community relations, spend full time working on civil rights and urban problems. Much of their time is spent away from RCA's New York headquarters, encouraging executives and supervisors in outlying plants and offices to get out into Negro neighborhoods, read Negro newspapers and get to know black leaders.

The two executives spend much of their time talking to ghetto residents, Negro leaders and Negro newspaper editors in cities all over the country, keeping up to date. "At the same time we're keeping ourselves thoroughly informed, these people are often getting new insights, too," says Mr. Haber. "Sometimes it's a wrenching experience for these guys who have preconceived notions of white business attitudes."

The evidence is persuasive: American businessmen are tackling the ghetto, and they're doing it seriously and meaningfully.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON SELECTIVE SERVICE REFORM

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, President Nixon deserves the accolades of all of us for his forthright recognition of the

need for reform in our draft. This is a subject high in the minds of our young people; it deserves a place high on our agenda as well.

President Nixon has today sent to Congress a message of great significance—a message calling for basic reforms in the way we select young men for military service.

Most young people in the United States know that the draft we have today operates unfairly, unpredictably, and unevenly. They know that avoidance of the draft is not a difficult matter for those with the means—financial and intellectual—to seek out the loopholes. They know also that other young men do not have the means to avoid the draft, and that these young men may be fighting in the jungles of Southeast Asia, and dying there. The most persistent call for basic reforms in the draft comes from these young people themselves, and many educators have long pointed out the cynicism the present system and its resistance to change has engendered in the young people.

But most of those who have studied the draft in any depth, too, have recognized the need for drastic changes. The Burke Marshall Commission, particularly, prepared an eloquent call for reform in its 1967 report. The Senate passed in May of 1967 a bill extending the draft for 4 years which permitted the President to make most of the necessary reforms, but this farsighted bill did not survive the conference committee, and the extension bill which did pass the Congress in June of 1967 was harsh and restrictive, actually making matters worse than they were before Congress took up the extension bill.

President Nixon's proposals embody the reforms we most urgently need—moving to the youngest first, adopting random selection, reducing the period of exposure to the draft, insuring that educational deferments do not become de facto exemptions, and others. The proposals come warmly welcomed by those of us who have long urged these reforms. In February, I introduced an extensive bill making these reforms and others; a number of additional Senators and Representatives have done similarly. There is no reason whatever to delay approval of the President's recommendations, and perhaps to work other needed changes in the draft laws at the same time.

President Nixon, in his message, pointed out that we do not now know whether it is feasible to move toward an all-volunteer armed force. A part of the reason is—as I and others have pointed out—that we simply do not have enough information on the costs and implications of a professional army. Until we do, our wisest course is to move swiftly to make the draft fair, predictable, and even.

THE NUCLEAR WEAPONS RACE— ADDRESS BY SENATOR PERCY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, on April 17 the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) made an address at Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pa. His speech contained a pro-

posal that would help to bring a halt to the spiraling nuclear weapons race. Senator PERCY stated:

While there may well be valid scientific reasons against deployment of the present ABM system, there are also without doubt compelling strategic reasons for deferment.

What I believe is required in this still tense yet hopeful international season is a mutual freeze on the further deployment of strategic missiles, offensive and defensive, by the United States and the Soviet Union. A moratorium halting the arms race should be the first topic for discussion at the forthcoming talks on nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union.

At a time when both the world's superpowers have "sufficiency" in nuclear weapons and when new weapons are being developed by both countries, it is essential that a halt be agreed upon at the outset of talks. Unless we take this step, it is likely that weapons deployment during extended discussions would undermine the prospects for a meaningful agreement and make it exceedingly difficult in subsequent years to halt deployment of ABM and MIRVs on both sides.

I believe that Members of Congress and the public will find Senator PERCY's statement both timely and valuable. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SEARCH FOR PEACE AND THE ABM

(A speech by Senator CHARLES H. PERCY, Republican, of Illinois, delivered at Shippensburg State College, Shippensburg, Pa., Apr. 17, 1969)

We are engaged in a great debate on nuclear arms control the outcome of which could well determine whether millions of people are to live or to die. On the result rests, as well, the course this nation will chart in the next decade—is it to be a path toward destruction or detente.

The most vital foreign policy problem facing President Nixon and his Administration—aside from the need to conclude the war in Vietnam and to prevent one in the Middle East—is a need to reach an effective accord with the Soviet Union to limit the further spread of nuclear arms. Thus, the current discussion in the Senate and in the country over deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system must be viewed in the broader context of global arms control and the search for peace.

Great risks are involved in seeking to negotiate an arms limitation agreement with the Soviet Union. The difficulties inherent in and the necessity to verify compliance; the continuing problem of China; the large numbers of tactical short-range delivery systems on both sides; and the shifting international climate and political tensions all pose high challenges that must be overcome. Yet all the risks we will encounter in trying to forge an effective pact with the Russians must be weighed against the risks that the lack of such an agreement will impose on us in the ensuing decade.

There are hopeful signs as well as problems ahead on both sides of the barrier that divides us and the Soviet Union.

With their rapid buildup in strategic forces within the past few years the Russians are able to enter negotiations without conceding inferiority or exposing themselves to the possibility of being frozen in an inferior position.

On the American side, there is an acceptance by the President and his chief advisers of the concept of nuclear "sufficiency." Our leaders realize fully that beyond a certain point additional nuclear force cannot be converted into useful political pressure—al-

though the problem is that we are not all agreed on where that point should be set.

In my judgment, President Nixon has also accomplished a great deal in moving decisively away from an ABM system ostensibly geared to defend the cities against missile attack and capable of expansion, through the expenditure of untold billions of dollars into the full-scale illusion of a "thick" ABM to the extent that such a "thick" system is ever accepted as having achieved an effective screen against enemy missiles, it becomes an offensive weapon, since it releases our policy-makers from the restraints imposed by the Soviet second-strike counterforce capacity.

Moreover, the President has managed to move us away from the "thick" system without encountering any public outcry from the military and its partisans in Congress. For this he also deserves high credit and earnest praise.

Nevertheless, I vigorously oppose the deployment of the modified Safeguard ABM system at this time because I firmly believe that deployment may escalate the nuclear arms race; that it will not increase—and may actually decrease—our national security, and that it represents a long-term commitment in energy and tax dollars that could be far better spent in the urgent task of nation-building at home.

A wise scholar, once said: "Those who cannot learn from the mistakes of the past are forced to repeat them." Surely, then, we have something to learn from several previous efforts to deploy a defensive screen against Soviet striking power.

In the 1950s, the United States spent more than \$30 billion on bomber defenses, in two systems that our military experts later admitted were obsolete and totally inadequate even before they were completed. That was \$30 billion that might have been spent on better schools, on good housing, on adequate transportation and on the hundreds of other domestic tasks pressing urgently upon our society. Much of that expenditure now lies, frozen, useless and forgotten in the Arctic wasteland.

In the 1960s, the United States has spent another \$20 billion on ABM research and development. But the Pentagon has abandoned emerging defense systems when it became obvious that, years before they could possibly be deployed, the hardware and electronic controls had been rendered useless by new strides in Soviet offenses and penetration technology. All admit now that if we had deployed Nike-Zeus at an estimated cost of an additional \$20 to \$40 billion it would have been a waste of resources. Of course, I do not question the dedication of the military to their task. But they are not infallible in their judgment.

The Pentagon's defense budget requests have been risen from \$13.8 billion in 1950 to \$40.8 billion in 1960 to \$81 billion in the current fiscal year. And year after year, the Congress has granted these requests in full, and even increased them, often after only the most perfunctory debate on the Senate floor. According to the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, global expenditures for military purposes have reached levels unprecedented in recorded history—from \$132 billion in 1964 to \$201 billion in 1968.

Are we truly safe from harm as a people and as a planet through this great outpouring of wealth for weapons of death and destruction?

The essential fact of nuclear life in our times is that for a decade and a half the world's two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, have predicated their strategic moves upon a balance of power. This balance is based, in turn, upon the concept of mutual deterrence. Today, both we and the Russians possess "second-strike" capability; that is, if either side is attacked, even by surprise, it has the power to retaliate with sufficient force to inflict what sane men

would regard as unacceptable damage to the other side.

Both great powers have amassed in their arsenals a sufficient number of thermonuclear warheads and the means to deliver them to devastate the habitable world several times over. While the United States holds a numerical edge in the number of missiles, this is not the same as nuclear superiority.

Nuclear superiority is the ability of one power to inflict an initial strike on another of such terrible force that the other lacks the means to retaliate and inflict unacceptable damage on the aggressor. Neither the United States nor the Soviet Union possesses anywhere near such power today. Therefore, our deterrent, and, for that matter, the Soviet deterrent, will remain credible, even under the most pessimistic Pentagon estimates, until at least 1972.

Into this equation of mutual terror have now come new digits that a concerned citizenry is striving to analyze: the massive Soviet SS-9 missile that Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird repeatedly referred to in his recent testimony on Capitol Hill and that was displayed in a Moscow parade on November 7, 1967; the plan by the United States to install multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs) on our submarines and on our Minuteman missiles; and, finally, the plan to deploy the Safeguard ABM, which would be in partial operation by 1972 and fully operational at all 12 sites by 1975.

Because I speak as a public official and not as a nuclear scientist, it is not for me to prove conclusively that ABM cannot succeed in performing the mission that has been assigned to the system.

Suffice it for me to say that men of great repute in the world of science—including the chief scientific advisers to the last three Presidents and the immediate past Director of Defense Research and Engineering—feel that ABM from a scientific point of view, is a mistake.

Suffice it to add that all the Pentagon's estimates are associated with untested and unprecedented maintenance, electronic reliability and computer programming standards. Their estimates assume that the defense will work as planned in a nuclear environment that is, to put it mildly, unprecedented. Highly complicated computer programs, sensitive radars and missiles fitted with electronic equipment are supposed to shoot down hundreds of incoming missiles in a situation replete with radar-blinding fireballs, electronic-disrupting blast and X-ray effects and earth-shaking detonations.

The distinguished scientist, G. W. Rathjens, told a Senate subcommittee meeting on the ABM last month: "It would be surprising if such a design [the Safeguard-Sentinel] were optimal or even close to it considering that the interceptor missiles and radars were designed to protect very vulnerable cities rather than very invulnerable missile sites."

A near-miss on a missile-site target would not destroy the superhardened missile whereas a near-miss in an urban area would destroy the area nevertheless.

While there may well be valid scientific reasons against deployment of the present ABM system, there are also without doubt compelling strategic reasons for deferment.

What I believe is required in this still tense yet hopeful international season is a mutual freeze on the further deployment of strategic missiles, offensive and defensive, by the United States and the Soviet Union. A moratorium halting the arms race should be the first topic for discussion at the forthcoming talks on nuclear weapons with the Soviet Union.

At a time when both the world's superpowers have "sufficiency" in nuclear weapons and when new weapons are being developed by both countries, it is essential that a halt be agreed upon at the outset of talks. Unless we take this step, it is likely that weapons

deployment during extended discussions would undermine the prospects for a meaningful agreement and make it exceedingly difficult in subsequent years to halt deployment of ABM and MIRVs on both sides.

Such a freeze should be acceptable to the Defense Department. Secretary Laird has testified that our missiles on land and under the seas as well as our long-range bomber force present an overwhelming second-strike array. If a freeze—fully verifiable by both nations through satellite reconnaissance as well as other intelligence sources—is put into effect, the U.S. deterrent will remain credible into the foreseeable future.

Such a freeze should also be acceptable to the Department of State which is moving rapidly toward early missile talks with the Soviet Union. In recent Congressional testimony, Secretary of State William Rogers said: "If the Soviet Union, when we start these talks, indicates that they want to get out of the defensive missile business we can get out of it very quickly."

The stated reason for emplacing ABMs is to protect our Minuteman missiles and our bombers against the fear of a new generation of Soviet weapons. But if there is to be no new generation, then there is no reason for ABM. The time to stop, however, is now—before ABMs and MIRVs are emplaced by both nations.

A moratorium on further strategic arms deployment is simple in principle, verifiable in fact, and relatively easy to agree upon in comparison to the more complex questions of general arms limitations.

This is a reachable first step and we should strive for it without any further delay.

The time has come in the history of nations to halt this wasteful, fruitless spiral of weapons systems. Such escalation can only bring the United States and the Soviet Union to a new plateau of terror in the next decade. The cost will be hundreds of billions of dollars to each without any real net gain in the security of either.

The real question for the 1970s is whether the national interest of the United States demands that we try to protect our land missile force against the low-probability threat of nuclear war, even if the chance of effective protection or effective destruction of the counterforce is itself small over the long run.

The real question is at what cost and for how long we will continue to bemuse ourselves with low-probability nuclear threats to our national security in a world where others uniformly have less security than we do.

I believe the time has come for us as a people to learn to distinguish between a legitimate interest in insurance—which we already possess in our offensive arsenal—and an obsessive concern with an unachievable total security.

If you—if the American people—sense the true meaning of security in a nuclear world—and if the Russians see it as well—I am confident that together we can halt the arms race. It is urgent that we try, for soon it may be too late.

ADMINISTRATION CUTS IN FUNDS FOR EDUCATION

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, none of the recommendations for budget modifications which President Nixon submitted to Congress recently have drawn such universal opposition as has his proposal to reduce or eliminate programs of Federal assistance to education.

I am told that other Senators also are receiving a heavy volume of mail from students, parents, teachers, and administrators, telling of the tremendous benefits which have come about through Federal programs of assistance such as those to school libraries and counseling and

guidance services and programs designed to meet special equipment needs. They want such programs continued or expanded, in spite of the administration's recommendation that no money be appropriated for any of them.

President Nixon tells us that we should save \$71 million by eliminating all library book and equipment programs. In explanation it is said:

In the context of the total Federal program for education, special programs for books and equipment are considered low priority.

I find far more convincing the arguments of three Tulsa high school students. Jayme Jones wrote me that one-third of the books in her school library were purchased with funds allocated under title II, Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Her classmate, Mary Lou Bonaros adds:

Good books with up-to-date knowledge are needed to keep the youth of today as well educated as President Nixon says we are.

A third high school student, Robert Frohnapfel, summarizes my concern when he wrote:

Remember that, ultimately, money may be saved, but also, in the process, the students may be lost.

I am confident that Senators on committees reviewing authorizations and appropriations in the field of education will examine very carefully any recommendation which would eliminate or drastically reduce the funding for educational programs which are only now gaining the momentum needed to produce really significant results. In addition to the elementary and secondary education programs already mentioned, I would certainly include in this category programs of financial assistance to students attending institutions of higher education.

With the development of the college work-study program, the national defense loans program and the education opportunity grants program, many students, who otherwise could not do so, are able to find a way to gain an education beyond high school. Student aid officials at many Oklahoma colleges and universities are telling me that Federal funds allocated to them under these programs are scheduled to be cut from 35 to 50 percent. Unless Congress acts to raise the recommended funding of these programs, many young people will suffer.

Of course, the biggest single reduction recommended by the administration in an education program is a \$113 million cut in funding for school districts in federally impacted areas. The crisis faced by impact area schools is even more serious than this figure would suggest, since the Nixon budget allocates only \$187 million for such schools whereas an amount in excess of \$520 million will be needed during the coming fiscal year just to continue the program as it now exists.

Each year, those of us in this body who represent States with many heavily impacted school districts have had to fight the battle to see that adequate Federal assistance is appropriated. I am confident that we can do so again this year.

Mr. President, of the hundreds of letters I have received concerning the education budget submitted by the Nixon administration, I have selected several

May 13, 1969

which are representative of the thinking of Oklahomans on this subject. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

CARNEGIE, OKLA.,
May 2, 1869.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Capitol,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: According to many news releases President Nixon proposes cutting federal funds to education. We ask that you seriously consider what this would do to Oklahoma school children before you cast your vote in favor of the president's financial cut to education.

We feel we have made great strides in reducing class size, providing library materials, and providing a guidance program for Oklahoma boys and girls with the federal aid provided by Title III and V of NDEA and Title II of ESEA. Cutting or eliminating federal funds for these titles would set Oklahoma boys and girls back in education many years. We are sure you realize the state can't fund these programs as the federal government now does.

As you cast your votes, imagine your child in a classroom of fifty children, guided by a teacher who has no testing results or counselor to aid her in guiding the child in mental growth, and a very meager supply of library materials in which to enrich the child's learning.

Please consider Oklahoma boys and girls carefully! If education will not bring us to higher standards in this world, then what does the president propose that will? Welfare?

Sincerely yours,

BILLY AND MARIETTA PHILLIPS,
Public School Educators.

DUNCAN PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Duncan, Okla., May 2, 1869.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senator from Oklahoma,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I have noted with regret that President Nixon has recently recommended that the funding for three of our federal programs, NDEA Title III, NDEA Title V, and ESEA Title II, be dropped to zero for the coming year. These programs have contributed much to the advancement of our educational programs in Oklahoma, and we would certainly urge and encourage your consideration of their continuation in spite of the President's recommendations in these areas.

Sincerely,

BOB ATTERBURY,
Superintendent.

VELMA-ALMA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Velma, Okla., April 30, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: During the past several years tremendous progress has been made in education as a result of the Federal Government's involvement in education. Public schools are now providing a quality of education that is completely beyond the expectations we held only a decade ago. Much of the progress is a result of the educational emphasis provided by the United States Congress. Therefore, it is essential that Congress not begin to abandon education by failing to fund Title III, Title V, and Title II of N.D.E.A.

I urge you to use your vote and influence to maintain the funding of these programs.

Thank you for your time and attention.

Cordially yours,

JERRY MORRIS,
Principal.

CARNEGIE PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Carnegie, Okla., April 30, 1969.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: You well know the great needs of our youth in this area for every cultural help possible. With Indians numbering over one-third of our school enrollment we find that we need more and more books and audio-visual materials to interest them. Their record of use of all print materials is surprisingly high. You see the school provides their only opportunity to read a daily paper or a good magazine or books.

Here, all of the money provided by the Title II section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been used to carefully build up our collections. We have given special emphasis to selecting pertinent and interesting books. With the extension of the Act must come funding to implement such legislation. Please, remember our boys' and girls' needs and work for the appropriation which we so sorely need. We shall appreciate every effort on your part.

Sincerely,

LEAH H. LAW,
Librarian.

NOWATA, OKLA.,
April 30, 1969.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I write to you as a citizen, taxpayer, and parent of the state of Oklahoma. I know, as you do, that education is the key to growth and progress for our state and our nation.

The Administration's budget, presented to Congress on April 15, 1969, calls for zero funding of Title III of NDEA, Title V of NDEA, and Title II, ESEA. The elimination of funds from these three sources will vitally affect our schools in the areas of (1) Equipment and Supplies, (2) Guidance, Counseling, and Testing, and (3) Library resources.

Our Oklahoma Schools have used these funds to improve and enrich the quality of education in Oklahoma. In order to continue these programs, they must have these federal funds.

I urge your careful consideration of these three phases of the budget: Title III of NDEA, Title V of NDEA, and Title II, ESEA.

Thank you.

Yours truly,

Mrs. JIM E. PATTON.

CLAREMORE CITY SCHOOLS,
Claremore, Okla., April 29, 1969.

Senator FRED HARRIS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I am concerned about the proposed cuts of three of our Federal programs that the Administration recommended in the budget, April 15, 1969. These include Title III of NDEA, Title V of NDEA, and Title II of ESEA. The last two Titles will be completely eliminated because of lack of funds or appropriations under the budget proposal.

As you know, schools not only in Oklahoma, but all over the nation, have benefited greatly under these programs and we have come to depend upon them in planning our schools' programs for the future. I hope you will review these bills carefully and recognize the benefits they provide for our nation's children and will work toward restoring the appropriations and the funding of them in this session of Congress.

If there is any information or data I can provide you that would be helpful to you in reaching your decision, please advise.

Yours truly,

WALTER J. LEEPER,
Superintendent of Schools,
Claremore, Okla.

PORTER PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Porter, Okla., April 30, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I regret very much seeing any cut in funds for education. Surely there are other places where such cuts in funds would be less damaging.

Especially do I want to go on record as being very strongly opposed to any slowing up of our guidance and counseling program. A dollar spent for guidance and counseling services now will later save many dollars in institutional care. Please think this over. We cannot afford under any circumstances to hinder our guidance and counseling program.

Very truly yours,

FRANK BECK, JR.,
Principal.

WASHINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Washington, Okla., April 30, 1969.

HON. FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: President Nixon's proposed budget cuts in Title III, Title V and Title II will seriously affect our educational program. These Title programs have improved every phase of our school. Our students have, for the first time, received counseling because of Title V, our library is on a par with the better libraries in the state of Oklahoma because of Title II and our critical subjects are getting adequate equipment because of Title III. If there is anything that you can do about the proposed budget cuts in these areas I implore you to do so.

Sincerely,

VIRGIL R. WELLS.

BLAIR PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Blair, Okla., April 29, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: President Nixon's budget that was presented to the Congress on April 15th called for elimination of Titles III and V of NDEA and Title II of ESEA. Title III alone will cut more than one million dollars from the schools in Oklahoma. Title V will not provide any funds for Guidance, Counseling and Testing in our schools.

Title II of ESEA is the Library Resources bill. This particular bill is the one that I have the most interest and concern. This particular bill provides money for our library. Most schools do not have adequate libraries and this is the one way to supplement and provide better library materials.

I oppose the complete elimination of Titles III and V of NDEA and especially Title II of ESEA. I am not in accord with the Administration's budget to reduce Federal aid to education.

I will appreciate your assistance in securing monies to finance our present NDEA and ESEA programs rather than eliminate them.

Sincerely yours,

DELBERT HOLT,
Superintendent.

NOWATA, OKLA.,
April 29, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the past few years Federally financed aid to education has promoted the advance of many vital programs that have previously been non-existent. These programs without extensive federal control have done a great deal for the schools of Oklahoma in improvement of library, the addition of much equipment and supplies, furtherance of Guidance, Counseling and Testing, reduction of class size and many other benefits.

I urge your careful consideration of the administration's suggested budget recommendations of April 15, 1969, in regard to Title III and V of NDEA and Title II of ESEA. The recommendation is for no funding.

I feel these Federal programs are worthwhile and beneficial to the schools of our state and should be funded.

Yours truly,

CHESTER PRICE.

KONAWA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Konawa, Okla., April 29, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: Education in Oklahoma and especially in the Konawa School District has been raised and made more meaningful to our students with the help of federal assistance programs of Title I, Title II, Title III of NDEA, Title V of NDEA, Head Start, and other Federal Title Funds which have been available to the schools. We are happy for your support of this legislation of previous sessions of the National Congress and we urge you to continue this support during this session of Congress.

It seems that an effort is being made to stop the funding of three of these Federal Title Appropriations to the schools, I speak of: Title II ESEA, Title III of NDEA, and Title V of NDEA. If these are lost to our educational programs we will be forced to cut down on the purchase of equipment and supplies, Library books, and to slow down on the operation of Testing and Guidance work among our school students. The children of our state need these programs to continue the improvement of educational services.

The future of America lies in the development of the potential ability of her young people. We believe that the continued funding and operation of these Federal Title Programs are necessary if this improvement is to continue.

I urge you to support this legislation with your vote and to use the strength of your position as a leader in the U.S. Senate toward the continuance of these Title Programs. Thanks very much for your previous help toward the improvement of our educational problems and the elevation of education in general in our state and nation.

Yours very truly,

A. W. BARRETT,
Superintendent.

OKLAHOMA CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Oklahoma City, Okla., April 30, 1969.

SENATOR FRED R. HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: I am writing in regard to the present hearings on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Please do everything in your power to see that the various titles are fully funded. The amounts should be increased, not decreased or eliminated!

As a school librarian in Oklahoma City, I have seen the vast difference that federal funds can make. Our elementary schools now have centralized libraries (media centers) and in most cases have clerical assistants to staff them. The number of elementary librarians serving these schools has been increased although we do not have one librarian per building. The secondary libraries have added many books, much audio-visual equipment, and a great portion of the filmstrips, records, maps, tapes, kits, and other non-book media that they presently have through the use of federal funds.

This year I came to a newly integrated junior high school. We have worked toward establishing a media center to replace our previous "books only" library. The ESEA has made much of our progress possible; we still

have a very long way to go. Media and equipment are expensive. For example, a filmloop (8mm film in a cartridge) costs \$16.00 to \$23.00 while a projector costs \$108.00. To meet the new NEA-ALA standards for school libraries, we should have a basic collection of 500 filmloops and 34 projectors; we have 34 filmloops and two projectors. Without federal assistance, I doubt that we will even approach the national standards. How disheartening it must be to work in some of our smaller and poorer school systems in Oklahoma!

As an individual and a taxpayer, I would prefer that a great portion of my tax dollar go toward strengthening our schools. The ESEA has made much progress possible, and I hope that the act will be extended, and allocations increased to full amount allowed. Much help is needed to make our school libraries what our children need and deserve. An excellent example of what can and should be done is Kennedy Elementary School in Norman; I hope that you will visit it soon.

Yours truly,

Mrs. EDITH LaFORGE.

ADA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Ada, Okla., May 1, 1969.

HON. FRED HARRIS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HARRIS: All of us feel the economic pinch of inflation brought about by the war and excessive spending. We are all for economy in those areas in which we can intelligently forego expending public funds at this time.

Education is absolutely essential if we expect our economy to move ahead. We are more aware of the importance of education today than ever before. There are very few employment opportunities for an untrained person. A business that will survive and change with the times must have educated employees. I appeal to you on behalf of our community and area to use your strong influence to see that education continues to get adequate federal funds to supplement local and state funds.

Sincerely,

HUGH WARREN,
President, Ada Chamber of Commerce.

GUYMON PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Guymon, Okla., May 2, 1969.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I am very concerned about the proposal to cut Title III and V of NDEA and Title II of ESEA funds to public schools. These titles have been a very much needed incentive for schools and administrators in allotting funds to the programs which they fund. There has been much progress in these areas since these funds have become available which possibly could never have taken place had it not been for them.

People concerned with education are just beginning to realize how these vital areas, counseling and library materials, can enhance the entire school program. To withdraw these funds would certainly be a crippling blow to our schools.

With all the social problems we are now facing, it is imperative that we reach personally as many students as possible and seek to help them develop an awareness of and understanding for the society in which they live. Both of the areas which I have mentioned are ones in which a student is able to receive individual attention. I am sure you are already aware of this fact.

I would like very much to seek your aid in maintaining these important programs in educating our people to the need for these important programs in educating our people to the need for these programs. If there is any way in which I can serve in this capacity, I will be glad to do so. Thank you for your interest and concern.

Sincerely,

ELTON N. STEWART,
Counselor.

COMMENTS UPON THE SUPREME COURT DECISION SETTING THE BOUNDARY OF TEXAS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on May 5 of this year, the Supreme Court of the United States arbitrarily redrew the boundary of the State of Texas in regard to its offshore land, in direct contradiction of an earlier Supreme Court decision on this same matter. By its action, the Court denied to the State of Texas a considerable amount of offshore land that had been Texas' since she joined the Union in 1846.

I have previously introduced a measure into the Senate to correct this situation, S. 1619, which would set for all time the boundary of the State at that point where it existed in 1846 when Texas entered the Union. This action is necessary in order that lands belonging to Texas are returned to her and in order to make certain that in subsequent decisions the boundaries are not again changed. A "floating" boundary such as the one defined by the Supreme Court is an intolerable situation which must be corrected at the earliest possible time. The current situation in which the boundary changes every time there is an erosion has been rejected by both the Court and competent international tribunals time and time again; the most recent instance of this being when the United States finally agreed to return some land in the Chamazal area of El Paso, Tex., to Mexico; this land had accrued to Texas when the Rio Grande, which forms the border in that area, changed its course. Both nations have now realized that boundaries must be based upon something more than the whim of the weather. It is now time for us to reassert this doctrine in regard to the boundaries of the constituent States of these United States.

PROPOSED ACQUISITION OF B. F. GOODRICH BY NORTHWEST INDUSTRIES — COMPANY VERSUS CONGLOMERATE

Mr. SAXBE. Mr. President, I recently expressed deep concern over the steadily increasing number of mergers and acquisitions of solvent companies by conglomerate giants. As I previously stated, when studies showing the number of mergers and acquisitions are viewed in context with the number of corporations holding the manufacturing assets of this country, the conclusion is inescapable that this Nation is headed toward a situation where a relatively small number of corporations will hold the bulk of the country's manufacturing assets. This would certainly be an unhealthy economic situation.

The administration has taken steps to establish a new antitrust policy utilizing section 7 of the Clayton Act to test conglomerate takeovers on the basis of substantial lessening of competition. I commend both the administration and the Justice Department on their attack against the acquisition of the Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp. by Ling-Temco-Vought and the merger of International Telephone & Telegraph with Canteen Corp.

At this time, however, I would like to direct the attention of Senators to the proposed takeover of the B. F. Goodrich Co. by Northwest Industries. This pending transaction illustrates well what aggressive company management can do to stem the conglomerate tide that currently threatens our entire economy.

B. F. Goodrich, the Nation's fourth largest rubber producer, is headquartered in Akron, Ohio, and has a payroll of \$126 million in that State alone. The company has seven major plants and a research center in Ohio, as well as plants throughout the United States and abroad. In short, Goodrich is a strong company with great business longevity managed by competent individuals concerned about its products, employees, and stockholders as well as its business image and position in the community.

Northwest Industries, on the other hand, has been in existence just over a year. The conglomerate was formed in April of 1968 by combining two companies with business operations in railroads as well as steel, chemical, and underwear manufacturing. Since its formation the conglomerate's operating earnings have declined, and it recently announced operating losses for the first quarter of 1969. Northwest's fight for control of the Rock Island Railroad has been faltering. Its bid for Home Insurance and an attempted merger with Swift & Co., also failed. By and large, the management of Northwest is primarily interested in diversification for tax shelter purposes and could add little to the growth of Goodrich. Thus, the tangible result of Northwest's acquisition would be to add new product lines and increase the power and influence of the conglomerate.

While the proposed acquisition came as somewhat of a surprise to Goodrich, its management soon rose to meet the challenge. Goodrich purchased Gulf Oil's 50 percent interest in Goodrich-Gulf for 700,000 new Goodrich shares, thus putting as many shares as possible into friendly hands. A temporary injunction was initiated against Northwest alleging violations of Federal security laws. This temporary order was later denied. Goodrich acquired Motor Freight Corp., and filed a petition with the Interstate Commerce Commission, asserting that this merger required Northwest to get ICC approval of their proposed takeover. Goodrich then prevailed upon the anti-trust division of the Justice Department to ask Northwest to delay the proposed tender offer for Goodrich stock saying that the tentative acquisition would raise serious questions under section 7 of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act. The Department promptly complied with the company's request.

To date, Goodrich has been able to withstand the strain of lawsuits and stockholder pressure initiated by Northwest. The Goodrich management seems to have fought the attempted acquisition to a standstill.

It is encouraging to see a solid, reliable company withstand the predatory advance of a conglomerate. I applaud the efforts of the Goodrich directors and officers to keep the company from becoming

ing a small part of yet another complex conglomerate. Goodrich has utilized every avenue of self-help. They have projected their fight into the courts. I sincerely hope the administration and the Justice Department will take note of the efforts of the Goodrich management to keep the company intact and study further possible action under section 7 of the Clayton Act to prevent his impending acquisition by Northwest Industries.

THE PESTICIDE PERIL—VII

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks the pesticide industry has stated its defense for the use of DDT in Wisconsin during hearings before the Wisconsin State Department of Natural Resources. A petition to ban DDT is being advocated by various citizens groups including the Citizens Natural Resources Association of Wisconsin, the Izaak Walton League, and the Environmental Defense Fund.

In the defense testimony, as much information critical of the use of DDT and other persistent pesticides has been made public as the amount of data to support their continued use.

Last Thursday's Madison Capital Times reported the testimony of Dr. Paul E. Porter, an exchange scientist for the Shell Development Co. at the Woodstock Educational Research Laboratory in Sittingbourne, England. Dr. Porter confirmed the fact that DDT does not remain in the soil, but that it has a great deal of mobility and persistence which enables it to infiltrate the atmosphere, the waters, and the total environment.

Another defense witness, Dr. Harry W. Hays, director of the pesticides registration division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, admitted that the Government makes no effort to check industry claims before approving pesticides for use.

Also last week, the chairman of a six-member committee which studies DDT for the Swedish National Research Council, S. Goran Lofroth, testified that breast-fed babies ingest more than double the recommended maximum daily dose of DDT—a quantity which shows pharmacodynamic changes in laboratory animals. Sweden recently banned the use of DDT and related pesticides.

I ask unanimous consent that the article regarding Dr. Porter's testimony, published in the Madison Capital Times, and the article regarding Dr. Hays' testimony published in the Green Bay Press-Gazette, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Madison Capital Times,
May 8, 1969]

DDT DEFENDANT DELIGHTS PESTICIDE'S FOES WITH TESTIMONY ON RESIDUES

(By Whitney Gould)

He was a witness for the chemical industry in its defense of DDT, at the state Natural Resources Department's hearings on a petition to ban continued use of DDT in Wisconsin. But the petitioners found the testimony of Dr. Paul E. Porter today such a boost to their own case against the pesticide, that their attorney thanked him for

coming, and didn't even bother to cross-examine him.

Porter, now an exchange scientist for the Shell Development Company at the Woodstock Educational Research Laboratory in Sittingbourne, England, has studied pesticide residues for the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry.

He told the department, which today wound up its second week of hearings in the DDT "defense," of the methods by which DDT is broken down into other compounds in the air, in plants and in animals.

Sunlight and oxygen help to degrade DDT in the atmosphere into less toxic compounds, Porter said. Rain, evaporation and the metabolic processes within plants themselves break the pesticide down when applied to crops. The chemical leaves the soil at the rate of about 20 per cent a year, he said. And it tends to attach itself to plants and animals in the mud at the bottom of lakes and other bodies of water.

Degradation is fastest in the absence of oxygen, he noted, and oxygen is very low in such muddy bottoms.

(The world environment is full of oxygen, however, and it is this fact which disturbs anti-DDT scientists. They acknowledge that DDT is degraded, but not fast enough to prevent harm to fish and birds.)

In mammals, Porter noted, the pesticide is partly converted to DDE, "which is reversibly stored in the fat," and eventually excreted. In birds, the chemist noted, the pesticide is also stored in the fat, but "I don't know what is actually excreted."

Other testimony from Porter this morning focused on the possible confusion of DDT and its breakdown products, with "PCB's," or plasticizing agents, in pesticide residue analyses.

He noted that PCB's sometimes interfere with the detection of DDT and its breakdown products in analyses with a gas chromatograph (the instrument used to plot such residues). But the PCB's can be separated out under further analysis, Porter said.

"The techniques are time-consuming, and are rarely used by commercial labs," Porter said, "because that would make them non-competitive." As a result, most DDT and PCB detection tests made by commercial labs are probably in error, he said.

A chemist for one of those commercial labs, Francis B. Coon of the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation Institute, Inc., had insisted Wednesday that PCB's produced "peaks" on chromatograms similar to those of DDT and its relatives.

But under cross-examination by Victor J. Yannacone, attorney for the petitioners, Coon said he had not used a gas chromatograph for over a year, and in total, had done only about 100 of the 15,000 or so pesticide residue analyses made in the lab in the past few years. He also said he had not yet made further analyses to determine whether DDE residues detected in one fish had actually had PCB interference.

It is DDE which anti-DDT scientists have linked with upsets in the hormonal balance of several species of birds.

Yannacone pursued Coon's laboratory techniques doggedly, until he got from the chemist the admission that there was not enough PCB interference with his residue detections to warrant sending out a standard disclaimer to clients who had submitted samples for analysis.

Coon acknowledged that WARF Institute would be paid a fee for his appearance at the hearings, by the National Agricultural Chemicals Association, which is financing DDT's defense here. (A DDT-contaminated coho salmon submitted to WARF by the NACA was the source of Wednesday's debate over residue detections.)

Industry's ties with some elements in the scientific community are one of the issues in the Madison hearings. Shell Oil, employer

of today's witness, Porter, is one of the largest manufacturer's of DDT. And at the end of today's testimony, Yannacone, re-establishing that fact, told Porter, "On behalf of the petitioners . . . we'd like to thank you for coming."

Another spokesman for the petitioners said later that Porter was "a splendid witness, who confirmed our position regarding the physical and chemical properties of DDT, its metabolites, and PCB's."

The hearings recessed until 9 a.m. Monday in room 144B in the Hill Farmers State Office Building.

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette,
May 1, 1969]

NO CHECK ON PESTICIDES, OFFICIAL ADMITS

MADISON.—A federal official admitted Wednesday the government makes no effort to check industry claims before approving pesticides for use.

The admission came from Dr. Harry W. Hays, U.S. Agriculture Department pesticides registration division director, under cross-examination by attorney Victor J. Yannacone, representing conservationists who have petitioned for a ban on DDT in Wisconsin.

Hays was the second witness called by the chemical industry in opposition to a ban on DDT. The hearings before the State Natural Resources Department began last December, recessed in January and resumed Tuesday.

Hays, who had testified earlier he believed the chemical was not harmful, said registration of pesticides requires evaluation of the manufacturers' claims about the chemical's composition, effectiveness, dosage, persistence, migration, residues and other properties.

Yannacone also asked Hays if he was familiar with research done by scientists who had testified earlier in support of a DDT ban that the chemical was linked to reproductive failures in fish and birds.

"I haven't thoroughly reviewed all the data," Hays replied. He also said his division was not currently reviewing DDT.

EXPORT OPPORTUNITIES FOR AMERICAN BEEF PRODUCTS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 8, the distinguished Senator from Alabama (Mr. SPARKMAN) introduced S. 2079, a bill to establish an annual trade conference to discuss the possibilities and problems of expanding export opportunities for American beef products.

I am again privileged and pleased, Mr. President, to join with the distinguished Senator from Alabama as a cosponsor of this measure. When it is enacted, it will create numerous far-reaching benefits for the entire agricultural industry. As I was out of the city on Thursday, I would like to take this opportunity to comment briefly on the merits of Senator SPARKMAN's proposal.

Many serious problems confront our farming and ranching industry today. Even though this industry is vital to our very existence, it has not shared adequately in the prosperity and economic good fortune which has visited this country in recent years. It is time that the farmer and rancher have the opportunity to earn their fair share of the country's ever-increasing wealth. By meeting every year to discuss common problems, members of the beef industry can develop programs to enable them to improve their competitive position.

I believe that the beef industry has particular potential for growth and expansion. In recent years we have seen

these producers overcome a serious threat from beef imports. They not only survived, but they continued to experiment, to innovate, and to develop the highest quality meats and byproducts available in the world.

I also believe that there are tremendous possibilities for trade expansion in all sectors of this industry. Given adequate opportunity, the American producer can and will successfully compete in the international market. Statistics have shown us the favorable response to American meat products in such areas as Western Europe. With the increasing potential for trade growth, it is time that we take concrete action to assist the beef industry in developing its resources, in gaining appropriate access to the international markets, and in solving the many problems and difficulties inherent in such a venture. S. 2079 does this.

Expansion of our beef exports has obvious benefits for this Nation. First, increased trade opportunities can only improve the economic position of an industry. Second, increased international trade will also lead to increased domestic trade. Growing prosperity in the beef industry, for example, inevitably affects and benefits many of the related industries. Thirdly, we find here an excellent opportunity to better our balance-of-payments situation.

Mr. President, the Senator from Alabama has offered a bill which would provide an effective channel through which our beef industry can expand and develop in an orderly, advantageous manner. In light of the many benefits and advantages to be gained, I urge Senators to support S. 2079.

AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN CALL FOR AN END TO HUNGER IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, is the largest organization of food industry employees in the Nation and, perhaps, in the world. It is composed of 500,000 members organized in some 700 local unions throughout the United States and Canada. These men and women work in the production and processing of thousands of different foods.

The amalgamated has long realized its responsibility to consumers. It has been an initiator and leader in the fight for meat, poultry, fish, and other food inspection legislation and programs. It has also been active in social reform. It pioneered; for example, on farm labor reform.

Now the amalgamated is greatly involved in the fight against hunger and malnutrition. The executive board of the union has voted a powerful policy statement on this issue as a means of mobilizing its organization in the battle. I am delighted that we shall have the support of this important union.

I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement concerning hunger and malnutrition of the executive board of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen, AFL-CIO, be printed in the RECORD.

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

POLICY STATEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE BOARD OF THE AMALGAMATED MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN, AFL-CIO, CONCERNING THE FIGHT AGAINST HUNGER AND MALNUTRITION, APRIL 29, 1969

There is real hunger in our land of plenty. Recent studies indicate that some 10 million Americans are hungry or desperately malnourished.

Testimony before the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs shows that some children are physically and mentally retarded for life because of the absence of adequate and nourishing foods. Urban and rural school officials state that youngsters fall asleep at their desk and are aggressive and inattentive in class because of gnawing hunger. A survey by the U.S. Public Health Service estimates malnutrition to exist among 15 per cent of the population in some areas.

Remedy Available—The food necessary to overcome hunger and malnutrition is certainly available. U.S. producers are able to grow more than is necessary to feed every American adequately. In fact, they are subsidized to prevent them from growing as much as they can of many commodities. Our Union's members and food industry management can process an almost unlimited amount of wholesome and nourishing foods.

Hunger is probably the easiest of the poverty problems to solve. Its remedy involves no great and complex political, sociological or psychological problems, as do so many of the other anti-poverty efforts. Nor are the American people divided on what to do about hunger. There is tremendous public support for ending it—and ending it quickly.

Hunger can be wiped out in the United States if:

(1) Adequate funds are made available—especially by the federal government—to provide sharply expanded food programs, including the giving of free food stamps to the lowest income families.

(2) The administration by federal, state and local officials of the various existing food programs are reformed.

Progress Slow—Unfortunately, progress is slow in the fight to end hunger and success is not yet assured. The President has forced the hunger fight to take a back seat to the inflation battle. He has apparently shelved, at least for the time being, a proposal by his Department of Agriculture to increase sharply funds for the food stamp and school feeding programs. Instead, only a minor increase over President Johnson's budget estimate for food programs in fiscal year 1970 was proposed to Congress. Some conservatives in Congress also urge that the fight against hunger is too expensive, that it will increase the budget too much and that it will hold back the fight against inflation.

In addition, some Administration officials and some legislators refuse to admit that poverty-caused hunger truly exists. They attempt to blame existing malnutrition on the ignorance of diets and lack of desire to eat the proper foods.

Nonsense and Prejudice—The Amalgamated regards both of these contentions to be sheer nonsense and blind prejudices against poor people.

The Amalgamated believes the nation must afford the several billion dollars a year it will cost to wipe out hunger. What we cannot afford is to permit babies to go hungry in the midst of plenty or the brains and bodies of children to be stunted for lack of food while our national policies cut back agricultural production.

The Amalgamated also believes there is no question about the widespread existence of poverty-caused hunger in our nation. No one

can disregard the hearings of the Senate Select Committee, the surveys of individual legislators, the findings of nationally known and respected medical people and the tentative conclusions of the very detailed U.S. Public Health Service study.

Union Policy—The Amalgamated believes that action to end hunger is needed and it is needed now.

We recognize that the Amalgamated, as the largest and strongest organization of food industry workers in the United States, has a special responsibility in the fight against hunger. It is the policy of our Union to play a leading role in the effort to secure adequate resources and effective administration to banish hunger completely from our nation.

We shall accelerate our present legislative efforts. We shall work on behalf of bills to liberalize, reform and increase the scope of the food stamp program, such as the measure proposed by Sen. George McGovern (D., S.D.), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs. We shall support expansion of the school feeding programs and the removal of the ridiculous obstructions which now sharply limit its scope and effectiveness. We shall support efforts to use the direct food distribution program as a supplement to the other two programs.

In these activities, the Amalgamated is working and shall continue to work not only with other unions and civil welfare groups, but also with the managements of major food companies and food industry trade associations. There is a common enemy—hunger. Together, we shall defeat him quickly and permanently.

FAIR FEDERAL TAX PLAN

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution relating to a fair Federal tax plan, adopted by the county legislature of the county of Monroe, N.Y., on April 15, 1969.

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

RESOLUTION 119 OF 1969—FAIR FEDERAL TAX PLAN

Whereas, local taxpayers in this State and County have had to bear the burden of greatly increased taxes; and

Whereas, the taxpayers of this State will be paying an estimated \$23.3 billion as their share of the Federal Budget for 1969-70, estimated at \$195.3 billion; and

Whereas, the taxpayers of this State will have returned to them approximately \$1.5 billion, or approximately 5 cents on every dollar; and

Whereas, judicial concepts of fairness have mandated such requirements as "One man, one vote" and have required representation on that basis; and

Whereas, it is of equal fairness in principle that there be \$1.00 for 1 man and that New York State taxpayers receive a fair share of their Federal tax dollars on a basis of the population being cared for by this State and its political subdivisions;

Now, Therefore, Be it Resolved by the Legislature of the County of Monroe, as follows:

Section 1. That the Federal Administration be urged to apply a concept of fiscal fairness in the allocation of Federal tax return to this State and its political subdivisions, and that the program whereby New York State taxpayers get back only about 5c on every \$1.00 paid to the Federal Government be drastically reevaluated with a view of fiscal and economic fairness.

Sec. 2. That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Governor of this State, and to all our local State and Federal representatives.

CONTROVERSY OVER CALVERT CLIFFS

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in the past few months a proposal to construct a nuclear power plant at Calvert Cliffs on the west shore of Chesapeake Bay has raised considerable concern among the residents of Calvert County and others interested in environmental quality.

The proposal has brought forth for discussion basic issues of nuclear safety, thermal pollution, State responsibility, environmental planning and the like.

In a statement submitted to AEC hearings on the Calvert Cliffs plant, held in Prince Frederick, Md., I expressed the view that the Commission is not going to license an atomic reactor deemed unsafe. I also stated that thermal discharges of the cooling water cannot be permitted to endanger the ecology of the bay and that prudence requires consideration of the environmental impact of the facility prior to the approval of its site and design.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks and the editorial entitled "Nuclear Power and the Public Interest," published in the Washington Post of May 8, 1969, be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, SUBMITTED TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION HEARINGS ON THE PROPOSED CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATING FACILITY, PRINCE FREDERICK, CALVERT COUNTY, MD., MAY 12, 1969

The Baltimore Gas and Electric Company's planned nuclear power station at Calvert Cliffs will be a two unit, 1.6 million kilowatt facility. It will use 5,000 cubic feet of water per second for cooling purposes. This water will be returned to the Chesapeake Bay at a higher temperature than that withdrawn.

The Calvert Cliffs plant will be in full operation by 1974. It will then be the tenth largest power facility in the nation.

The need for this plant cannot be doubted. Our nation has almost insatiable appetite for electricity. Since World War II production of electricity has doubled every ten years. This trend is expected to continue. Our nation's growth depends on an ample power supply being readily available.

This is particularly true for the Baltimore area which in the next decade will experience considerable growth. The Calvert Cliffs plant is designed to serve this area.

Yet with progress comes problems. The discharge of the cooling water affects the ecology of the receiving waters. Scientists consider temperature the primary control of life and report that fish are especially sensitive to changes in the thermal environment. They and other forms of marine life are often unable to adjust to even the most limited changes in temperature.

"For this reason there is growing concern among ecologists about the heating of aquatic habitats by man's activities. In the U.S. it appears that the use of river, lake, and estuarine waters for industrial cooling purposes may become so extensive in future decades as to pose a considerable threat to fish and to aquatic life in general." So writes John R. Clark in the March, 1969 issue of the *Scientific American*.

Thermal pollution must thus be recognized as an important problem, one which may block our achieving a quality environment.

By 1980, the electric power industry will use one-fifth of the total fresh water runoff of the U.S. for purposes of cooling. The scope of this potentially dangerous thermal discharge is therefore large.

The Chesapeake Bay is an invaluable natural resource of Maryland. Its quality cannot be tampered with. The AEC, the business community, and the state and local agencies involved must recognize the great importance of the Bay to the people of our state.

Thermal pollution simply must not be permitted to abuse its water quality.

The proposed facility at Calvert Cliffs will be nuclear powered. Atomic energy has been shown to be a safe and efficient source of future potential energy.

The Atomic Energy Commission proceeds with extreme caution when licensing atomic reactors. It is of course proper that they do so. I am confident that the Commission will exercise considerable and great care with the Calvert Cliffs reactor and that, upon their final approval, the facility will pose no danger of a nuclear nature to the area.

The responsibility of the AEC, however, extends only to issues of national security and health and safety. It has no jurisdiction over concerns of environmental quality. A January 13, 1969 ruling of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit affirmed a lower court decision that the AEC did not err in refusing to consider the possibility of thermal pollution from a nuclear power facility. The Court held that the Commission simply did not have the necessary jurisdiction to involve itself in such an area.

This is a serious gap in the legislative authority of the AEC. I respectfully urge the Commission, on its own, to seek redress before the Congress. Thermal pollution is too serious a threat to permit an inactive position on the part of the AEC. Additionally, I urge the Commission to upgrade its informal, advisory contacts with the Department of Interior in order to insure maximum use of available expertise within that Department.

For my own part I am cosponsoring legislation, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, which in part directs itself to this problem of thermal discharges by requiring certification, consistent with established water quality standards, of permits required for water withdrawals affected with a federal interest.

As a regulated public utility the Baltimore Gas and Electric Company has the responsibility to meet the present and future power needs of well over a million Marylanders. In general the company has served the people well. Their desire to build a plant at Calvert Cliff reflects their awareness of future power demands in the Baltimore area.

The company has often expressed their willingness to preserve and protect the Chesapeake Bay. I have no doubt of their sincerity and am aware of steps taken by Baltimore Gas and Electric to transform this willingness to action. One particular step that is significant is the extensive consultations that have taken place between the company and concerned state officials. These have resulted in design alterations which lessen the impact of plant operations on the cooling and receiving waters. Such action can only be applauded and recognized as an absolute necessity in the future.

There are, however, two disturbing aspects to this project. The first is the absence of public research on the environmental impact of the Calvert Cliffs facility. The state and the Atomic Energy Commission should not have to rely on company sponsored studies, with or without access to their data. They should be provided with the capacity to conduct independent studies of their own. My second concern involves the simultaneous nature of the research undertaken and actual construction at Calvert Cliffs. The latter suggests that the site is an accomplished fact and that no evidence brought forward by any research will alter it. Additionally, as the Washington Post suggests in a May 8 editorial, this lessens the importance of these hearings and lends credence to those who

argue that local interests are in fact being overlooked.

An additional problem raised by the construction of new electric power generating stations is the routing of power lines. It is a problem here, as the B.G. & E. lines must go northwest to the Baltimore area, and elsewhere. Present technology does not permit such high voltage lines to be placed underground.

The industry as a whole must recognize that it has an obligation to minimize the environmental impact of these lines, and that this will cost considerable money. Power lines no longer can simply be strung in a straight path, representing the shortest distance between two points. Concern for aesthetics and history must be programmed into the routing. We do not need another Antietam affair. The industry must recognize that the additional expense incurred must be borne as a regular cost of doing business. The public interest does not ask the industry to do this. It demands it, and expects that it will be done.

In concluding, I would like to state that I believe that the proposed nuclear power plant at Calvert Cliffs is needed if Maryland's future electric demands are to be met. Equally necessary, however, is the responsibility of all of us to preserve and protect the Chesapeake Bay. The threat to the Bay from thermal pollution is a real one. To argue that all the nuclear facilities now in existence would raise the temperature of the Bay only one or two degrees is misleading. Thermal discharges are like some poisons: In small dosages they can be lethal. The overall temperature at the Bay may be only slightly affected but a specific portion, the receiving waters, may be severely damaged. I do not think we can be too careful.

We need electric power; we need environmental protection as well.

It is imperative that the appropriate state agencies act now to institute objective, State-sponsored scientific studies of each area of the Bay and its tributaries proposed to be used as a site for a power generating station during the next 20 years. We should determine long before construction plans are finalized whether the site selected by the power company is desirable from a conservation point of view. The study should determine further which areas of the Bay are best suited to absorb thermal discharges without injury to the ecology of the estuary.

[From the Washington Post, May 8, 1969]

NUCLEAR POWER AND THE PUBLIC INTEREST

The storm that has blown up in Southern Maryland over the proposal to locate a nuclear power plant on the Calvert Cliffs at Lusby, Calvert County, is typical of many that will be brewing in the months and years ahead. People who live in the area are worried about the possibility of radiation and heat pollution in the Chesapeake Bay. Others are deeply concerned about the clutter of towers and wires that will be necessary for the transmission of 1,600,000 kilowatts of power to Baltimore. And many others whose lives will not be immediately affected see in this project an unwarranted assault on our natural environment.

As Hal Willard noted in an illuminating discussion of the problem in our Panorama Section on Thursday, 11 nuclear power plants are already under construction or in operation along the Atlantic Coast. Every one has been controversial, and the controversy is certain to mount as additional plants of this kind are planned and constructed. The outcome may cast a long shadow over the future.

It is not a question of whether or not the power companies are planning wisely. Calvert Cliffs, for example, was selected by the Baltimore Gas and Electric Co. from about 50 potential sites. Possibly it is the best location for a nuclear power plant that can be found

in the area. It is also clear that elaborate precautions will be taken to make the plant safe and to minimize its impact on wildlife in the area, especially the fish in the Chesapeake Bay. Yet some vital changes in the environment will be unavoidable, and the results of these changes cannot now be fully known.

There is not much comfort in the assurance of one company official that if studies now being undertaken show that "the plant will have significant effects on the Bay then we will have to try to do something about it." When the plant is built and in operation, it will be too late to turn back. Some responsible body ought to be determining before the die is cast, whether the risk is tolerable and if so where the plant can be best located in the public interest.

It is interesting to note that the first public hearing on this project will be held by the Atomic Energy Commission on May 12, although excavation for the plant has been completed and the company has spent millions of dollars for right-of-way, equipment and so forth. The hearing will have the appearance of a mere ratification proceeding for a fait accompli. The company must also obtain a certificate of convenience and necessity from the Maryland Public Service Commission, but this too will seem to be a mere formality. Fortunately, the Maryland regulations will require site approval before construction of another such project can begin, but that does not change the unpalatable facts in the present situation.

The least the country can ask, in venturing into a new field of this kind which may vitally affect the environment, is that a competent and disinterested public body take a careful look at all the available facts before the leap is taken. The location of such plants ought to be a major issue before a Council on Environmental Quality, such as Senator Jackson has proposed. The hope for cheaper nuclear power must be weighed against long-range risks to all forms of life, and no private enterprise is competent to make such determinations by itself.

CRISIS ON THE CAMPUS

MR. TOWER. Mr. President, there is a need to call the attention of every Senator to the crisis on our Nation's campuses. Every day we are assaulted by news of disturbances of varying magnitude on campuses across the country. This is beyond doubt a matter of grave concern to us all because of its implications for the future of higher education and consequently for the future of our Republic.

Many words have been spent in recent months in the analysis of the causes of campus upheaval. The blame has been placed variously on U.S. involvement in Vietnam, on the urban crisis, the generation gap, establishment hypocrisy, racial friction, the inability of a segment of students to meet the academic standards of their universities, television, world communism, atheism, Weltschmerz, or whatever other traditional hobgoblin the particular commentator might favor.

The problem might be more fundamentally expressed in terms of an observation that Aldous Huxley made. He observed that two-thirds of our human miseries spring from human stupidity and human malice, and that all too often misplaced idealism and dogmatic zeal were used to justify them. The true reasons for stupidity and malice, he argued, were "intellectual sins."

We sin by attributing concrete significance to meaningless pseudo-knowledge; we sin

in being too lazy to think in terms of multiple causation and indulging instead in oversimplification, over-generalization and over-abstractness; and we sin by cherishing the false but agreeable notion that conceptual knowledge, and, above all, pseudo knowledge are the same as understanding.

The young are particularly susceptible to these sins, steeped as they are in conceptual knowledge, acquired in the midst of the learning process, for they have not yet undergone the maturing process which is prerequisite to true understanding.

But whatever the root causes of campus disorders, the issues which have been fought out—the proximate causes of strife—have been relatively frivolous. Students have demanded seats on the university boards of trustees, a voice in the hiring and firing of professors, a hand in curriculum development and generally the assumption of roles traditionally reserved for professional educators and administrators. Yet this has been the positive side of student unrest. I would not suggest that college faculties and administrators turn a deaf ear to the serious proposals of students. But when those proposals are framed as demands, when the attempt is made to force the assent to those demands through violence and threats of violence, the proposals, whatever their merit, are lost, and the only issue becomes the violent means of expression the students have chosen. It has been frequently said that the rebellious students are trying to tell us something. If this is so, I strongly suggest that they return to the classroom and emerge again only after they have acquired the intellectual wherewithal to express themselves in a manner more generally understood.

The rhetoric of the campus revolution with its vocabulary of bywords and catch phrases serves as an obstacle to true communication between student factions and college officials and exacerbates the rage of the general public. College administrators find themselves inundated by a plethora of "nonnegotiable demands" for "meaningful" curriculums injected with social "relevance." There is a faction of students and some faculty members as well who would have the university become the instrument of social activism. But the university has always been in the advance guard of social change as well as the chief keeper and perpetuator of traditional ideas and values. It has been a place for the free exchange of ideas, for a continuing dialog with the past and a reach for the future. And yet, now, there is a faction that would reduce this subtle mechanism to a deadweight, a bludgeon. How seriously can we take this rhetoric? Whatever value one may place on the vocabulary of student militancy, it is agonizingly clear that the actions—destruction, arson, the forcible occupation of classrooms, administrative offices, laboratories, and other buildings—are the negation of reason and are hostile to any imaginable concept of a university.

One effect of insurgency on the Nation's campuses has been the introduction in Congress and in many State legislatures of measures which would pro-

vide for the fine and imprisonment of those found guilty of disrupting the orderly course of business in our colleges and universities. I sincerely hope that such measures will not prove necessary. The direct interference of government in academia would establish an atmosphere with connotations almost as disastrous to the conduct of intellectual pursuits as the rebellion which it seeks to quell. Existing statutes covering arson, trespassing, and so forth are sufficient if college and university administrators are willing to proceed with the requisite firmness of purpose to bring the order without which the basic problems at issue cannot be addressed. Administrative officials, if necessary with the assistance of local law-enforcement officials, have the experience, the ability, and the familiarity with the problems to deal most effectively with campus chaos. In the final analysis the responsibility is theirs.

ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1969—PERSONNEL TRAINING

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, when I introduced for myself, for the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), and 43 other Senators from both parties, the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1969—S. 1997—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's required report on the administration of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 was not available for inclusion along with my remarks. In discussing manpower needs in relation to alcoholism, the report states:

One of the most urgent needs in relation to coping more effectively with alcoholism is the overcoming of the acute shortage of trained personnel.

I ask unanimous consent that appendix F, the text of the report relating to manpower needs in relation to alcoholism be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Although we have made great strides forward and come to recognize alcoholism as a health problem, we have far to go to meet the sociomedical challenge in the treatment of alcoholism. As a health problem, alcoholism is confronted with the acute shortage of health manpower common to all areas of health care. The report reaffirms the urgent need for qualified personnel to provide treatment in the field of alcoholism—the Nation's fourth most serious health problem, and I consider it an endorsement of the proposed legislation. I believe the report makes quite clear that the Alcoholic Rehabilitation Act should be implemented by an intensified program of manpower and staff training, including not only the recruiting and training of new personnel, but also the improvement of the skills of persons already in the field of alcoholism health care—a specific purpose of the Alcoholism Care and Control Act through a provision which establishes fellowship grants to overcome the critical shortage of trained people in alcoholism and alcohol-related problems.

There being no objection, the appen-

dix was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPENDIX F—MANPOWER NEEDS IN RELATION TO ALCOHOLISM*

Recent years have seen an increasing awareness of both the magnitude of alcoholism and the neglect of this major problem area. There now is a realization of the immense impact of drinking problems on the health and well-being of millions of Americans and their families. Recent years also have been marked by a substantial change in public and professional attitudes towards alcoholism. Finally, strenuous efforts are underway in many parts of the country to find humane and more satisfactory ways of dealing with chronic alcoholics than the present "revolving door" system.

One of the most urgent needs in relation to coping more effectively with alcoholism is the overcoming of the acute shortage of trained personnel. This shortage has persisted because of the belief that alcoholism was not an illness and the myth that alcoholics could not be helped. Manpower needs can be divided into three principal areas: (1) the training of professional workers in fields such as medicine, nursing, social work, etc., (2) the training of nonprofessional and semi-professional alcoholism counselors, and (3) the training of a small number of specialists in areas such as research, administration and teaching.

The bulk of training of personnel in relation to alcoholism should be provided by the professional schools. Most assistance for alcoholics will need to be given by personnel from the basic health and other helping professions. Information on the treatment and medical management of alcoholism should be included at several levels of medical training—classroom instruction, clerkship, internship, and residency training programs. This learning should occur in settings which do not perpetuate the attitudes of revulsion and therapeutic pessimism towards alcoholics than now characterize the educational experience of virtually all medical students. Psychiatric training should not be restricted to the provision of detoxification care in emergency services and should include supervised psychotherapeutic work with alcoholics and their families. Social work training should include both classroom work and practical field experience with clients who are problem drinkers. This can be either in a general, social, or psychiatric agency that provides assistance to these patients, or in a specialized alcoholism treatment facility.

Programs of continuing education, extension education, and postgraduate training in the fields of medicine, psychology, social work, nursing, corrections, and psychiatry should include appropriate attention to alcoholism. There also is a need for inclusion of material on alcoholism in the training of clergymen and police officials. Currently, very few teachers are qualified to be effective in relation to preventive alcohol education.

The training of mental health personnel such as psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and psychiatric nurses is particularly important because community mental health centers are increasingly serving as key resources for the treatment of alcoholics and their families. By 1975, over 2,000 such centers will be in operation throughout the country.

While there is a major shortage of qualified personnel to provide treatment to alcoholics, there is also a severe shortage of other workers in areas such as education, community

*Prepared by the National Center for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholism, National Institute of Mental Health, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

organization, and consultation. Such persons, functioning, for example as consultants, coordinators and "catalysts", would be familiar with many aspects of alcoholism and also with general trends in the fields of health and social welfare. Their educational background should include work in psychology and sociology, and in addition, they should have special training and experience in such areas as community organization and group dynamics.

The better utilization of semi- and non-professional workers is all the more urgent because of the continuing shortage of trained personnel in all the helping professions. There has been a tradition of using non-professional personnel, particularly recovered alcoholics, in many facilities. These workers can function most effectively if they have had some previous training. Such training should include: (1) orientation to professional approaches to alcoholism, (2) knowledge about different agencies and their functions, (3) supervised field experience, (4) emphasis on the importance of assessing each patient's needs, and (5) recognition of the potentialities and limitations of nonprofessional workers.

During an interim period—say five to ten years—substantial assistance will have to be provided to medical schools, schools of nursing, schools of social work and other training institutions to help them overcome this long standing neglect of alcoholism. Hopefully, at the end of such a period, training in relation to this major medical-social problem, will be an integral part of the training of all health and other "helping" professional personnel.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the May 1969 issue of Reader's Digest contains an article entitled "We Could Have Won in Vietnam Long Ago," written by Adm. U.S. Grant Sharp, U.S. Navy, retired. As commander in chief of the Pacific from June 30, 1964, to July 31, 1968, Admiral Sharp had charge of the largest American military command in the world. His principal activities obviously were oriented toward the war in Vietnam. I commend this article to the attention of the Senate as it underscores the basic reasons why the United States is losing in Vietnam. As Admiral Sharp stated:

Vietnam is a classic example of how not to fight a war.

I believe Admiral Sharp's statement is a well-reasoned account of the drastic mistakes the United States has made in pursuing this conflict, and 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:

SPRINGBOARD FOR DISCUSSION: WE COULD HAVE WON IN VIETNAM LONG AGO

(By Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp, U.S. Navy, retired)

(NOTE.—As Commander in Chief Pacific from June 30, 1964, to July 31, 1968, Adm. U. S. Grant Sharp had charge of the largest American military command in the world, covering an area extending from the West Coast of the United States to the Indian Ocean. During this period he personally directed the air war against North Vietnam. Though most of his 41-year career in the Navy was spent on surface ships—he was decorated for gallantry under enemy fire as the skipper of a destroyer in World War II—Sharp has long been a strong advocate of air

power. Now 63 years old, he lives in San Diego, Calif.)

During the four years I was deeply involved in the direction of the war in Vietnam, I faithfully carried out the orders of my superiors. Now that I am retired, I feel obliged to speak out, to warn the American people against the folly of conducting a major war on a piecemeal basis.

There is no need for the United States to be bogged down as it is in a seemingly endless struggle in Vietnam. We could have won the war long ago—perhaps by the end of 1967. We could have achieved victory with relative ease, and without using nuclear weapons or invading North Vietnam. All that we had to do to win was to use our existing air power—properly.

We had tremendous air power within easy striking range of North Vietnam—on aircraft carriers in the Gulf of Tonkin and at bases in Thailand and south Vietnam. Yet never in the entire course of the war have we used our air power to its full advantage. This tragic failure to do so is, in my opinion, perhaps the most serious error we have made in all of American military history. It has resulted in needless casualties. It has added billions of dollars to the cost of the war, and each month that passes causes our worldwide prestige to sink lower and lower.

For this failure, Robert S. McNamara, former Secretary of Defense, must take a large share of responsibility.

DEAD WRONG

I strongly support our American concept of civilian control of the military; it is one of the vital bulwarks of our system of government, and I would oppose any effort to change it. At the same time I believe wisdom dictates that the civilian authority should consider carefully the advice of his professional military advisers. In his handling of the air war, however, Secretary McNamara arbitrarily and consistently discarded the advice of his military advisers. His insistence that we pursue the campaign on a gradualistic basis gave the enemy plenty of time to cope with our every move. He was, I submit, dead wrong.

The primary purpose of the air campaign against North Vietnam should have been to disrupt the enemy's economy and thus destroy his ability to wage war. We could easily have done this. Instead, primary emphasis was put on seeking to cut down on the infiltration of men and matériel from North to South Vietnam. Now, you can slow infiltration with air power, and we did just that—but you can never stop it. To concentrate on infiltration and to refrain from hitting primary targets—as we were required to do—emasculated our war effort.

We were and are in this war for just one purpose—to convince the leaders of North Vietnam that they should cease their aggression, get out of South Vietnam and leave their neighbors alone. We said long ago that we would stop the bombing and withdraw our troops when their aggression ceased. Until North Vietnam does stop its aggression, I believe we should use the force necessary to win the war as rapidly as possible.

What my colleagues in the field and I wanted to do was to bring the economy of North Vietnam to a halt. That is one of the major functions of air power in warfare. Some argue that North Vietnam has an agrarian economy and that air power is thus less effective than it would be against an industrialized nation. North Vietnam's is an agrarian economy, but it functions around the hubs of Hanoi and Haiphong, and we could have brought that economy to a grinding halt. This would have deprived the enemy of his ability to support his forces in the south—and thus brought the war to a quick end.

Instead, what did we do? To take just one example: there are several railroad yards in

the Hanoi area which are vitally important to the enemy's war effort. We should have hit them fast and hard, but we were never allowed at them. We were permitted to go in and peck at some less important yards on the fringes of the city. And then we were pulled off. This happened time and time again. We would get authority to go to Hanoi; the communists and their sympathizers would then push the propaganda buttons, and there would be a worldwide outcry. Washington would get nervous, and we would be pulled back.

Neither I nor my military colleagues ever favored hitting targets that would result in the deaths of large numbers of civilians. Indeed, we went to great lengths to avoid killing civilians, even though this often created extra risks for our pilots. Our air campaign was the most precise ever fought. It is worth noting that the communists observed no such restrictions; they have repeatedly lobbed rockets blindly into Saigon and other population centers. From 1957 through 1968, the communists killed more than 27,000 South Vietnamese civilians and kidnaped more than 52,000 others, most of whom have never been heard from again. There is no precise information on the number of civilians who may have been killed in our air raids over North Vietnam, but the North Vietnamese frequently published reports indicating the number of civilian casualties resulting from individual attacks. An analysis of these reports during a 7½-month period at the height of our air campaign in 1967 indicates that fewer than 400 civilians were killed.

When I was Commander in Chief Pacific, I submitted repeated requests to my superiors for permission to bomb additional military targets in order to make the air war really effective. I made these requests about once every two weeks. I have been given to understand that the Joint Chiefs of Staff supported my position 100 percent. But most of my requests were denied when they reached the office of the Secretary of Defense.

When McNamara visited Saigon in July 1967, he was briefed by Gen. William C. Westmoreland, the commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, by Lt. Gen. William W. Momyer, commander of the Seventh Air Force, and by me. I emphasized what I thought ought to be done about the air war against the north. On several occasions I also talked with President Johnson about the problem. I thought he was receptive to the arguments of our military leadership, but the Secretary of Defense seems always to have prevailed.

It may well be that our civilian leadership believed that to use our military tools properly, to eliminate the enemy's ability to make war would have been to risk a nuclear confrontation with the Soviet Union. Personally, I believe the risk was minimal; in any case, a nation which is not willing to take calculated risks to achieve its objectives should never go to war in the first place. Further, I believe that once a political decision is made to commit American troops to battle, we are morally obligated to use our military power in such a way as to end the fighting as quickly as possible.

POWER ON A LEASH

Our first chance to win the war quickly came in February 1965, when we started bombing the north. At once, we should have launched a sustained, maximum-effort attack on all of the enemy's war-supporting industries, transportation facilities, military complexes, petroleum-storage depots. At that time, the enemy had no Soviet surface-to-air missile (SAM) sites installed, and his anti-aircraft capability was practically nil. He could not have opposed us in any significant way, and we could have quickly broken North Vietnam's resistance.

If we had launched a maximum-effort air campaign—coupled with heavy pressure on the enemy's troops in South Vietnam—it would not have been long before he would

have been forced to ask for negotiations. And it is important to note that these negotiations would have been conducted on terms favorable to us—instead of, as it turned out, our having to coax him to the negotiating table, more or less on his terms. It's also possible that under this extreme pressure the enemy's aggression in the south might just have faded away. Either way, it would have been a victory for us.

But what happened? From the start, our air power was kept on a tight leash. At first, when we sent even a reconnaissance plane over the north, Washington would tell us what route and altitude to fly. We started our operations close to the Demilitarized Zone and worked gradually northward about 30 miles at a time, always under Washington's close control. It was obvious to anybody plotting the course of events that the enemy could expect us eventually to move on up to the heartland of the country. Thus, the vital military elements of surprise and maximum impact were lost.

We also lost valuable time. Our policy of gradualism enabled North Vietnam to mount the most formidable air-defense system that has ever been used in combat history. The North Vietnamese began building SAM sites in 1965, and during that year were able to fire only 125 missiles. Eventually, the North Vietnamese had about 40 SAM battalions, and during 1967 they fired nearly 3,500 missiles at our aircraft. The result is that we have lost nearly 1000 planes over North Vietnam. Many of the pilots were killed or captured. Not only did we suffer this needless loss of men and aircraft, but the North Vietnamese were given time to disperse their factories and military installations. This made it all the more difficult to go after them later, and hence prolonged the war.

HAVEN IN HAIPHONG

Of all the things we should have done but did not do, the most important was to neutralize the port of Haiphong. During 1967, some 80 percent of North Vietnam's imports came in by sea, mostly through Haiphong. This included arms, ammunition, oil, trucks, generators, machinery, spare parts, steel and cement—all vital to the war. We should have blocked the approaches to the harbor with mines laid by aircraft. Closing an enemy harbor is customary and logical in warfare. This was the simplest and most effective measure we could have taken.

All along, our military leaders recommended that the port be neutralized. The recommendation was always vetoed. It was claimed that closing Haiphong would not affect the enemy's capability of waging the war in South Vietnam—that North Vietnam could sustain the war at the same level by means of rail, road and coastal shipments from China. But a reasonable evaluation of our intelligence convinced us that it was next to impossible to move that amount of matériel over North Vietnam's exceedingly limited transportation network. In my opinion, closing Haiphong would have shortened the war by many months.

Along with mining the approaches to the harbor, we should have destroyed the enemy's stockpiles of matériel on the docks at Haiphong and in the centers of the cities of Haiphong and Hanoi. The stockpiles were easy targets there—but the Defense Department ruled that we had to wait until the enemy moved this matériel away from the cities and scattered it for 300 to 400 miles along the trails into South Vietnam. Then it was extremely difficult to find, and much of it, including vast amounts of ammunition, reached South Vietnam, where it was used to kill American and other Allied soldiers.

LOST TARGET

Much earlier in the conflict, we should have gone after North Vietnam's most important bridge, the Paul Doumer span in Hanoi, which handles all rail traffic between

Hanoi and Red China and Hanoi and Hanoi. We hit a lot of minor bridges in North Vietnam before we finally were allowed to go after the Doumer. Even then, we were allowed to hit it only for limited periods of time. Then it would be taken off the list, and the North Vietnamese were given time to build it up again! Whenever we struck anywhere close to Hanoi, people in Washington would complain that we were causing too much disruption in the city—which was exactly what we were trying to do.

We were never permitted to hit the docks along the Red River in Hanoi. We should have kept the Hanoi power station out of commission. We hit it several times. Inexplicably, after each strike it was taken off the target list, and the enemy would put it back into commission. Eventually, we were prohibited from making any more attacks on it—and this was long before the Johnson Administration ended all bombing of the north.

We also should have hit the Hanoi waterworks, which was next door to the power station, but we were never allowed to do it. We hit the railroad yard close to the town of Hongai once; then we were pulled off that. This is another thing that is hard to understand: we were allowed to do something, then two months later it would be off limits—and it stayed off limits for the rest of the air war.

PRIVILEGED SANCTUARY

But even with the restrictions, the air campaign was effective as far as it went. By early 1967, we had destroyed or disrupted about 50 percent of North Vietnam's war-supporting industry. The North Vietnamese were hurting far more than most people realized. We had intelligence reports that their morale was suffering. Their whole effort was weakened by the fact that they had to have more than 500,000 people working to rebuild their transportation network—plus 125,000 to man their anti-aircraft defenses. Thus, despite all the restrictions, we really had the enemy on the ropes by late 1967. If we had hit his war-making resources harder all along, he would have been knocked out by then. In my judgment, the war would have been over.

Once North Vietnam gave up, the Vietcong in the south would have had no choice but to follow suit. The Vietcong are directed and supplied by Hanoi. Vietcong combat units are now two-thirds North Vietnamese; they cannot fight without North Vietnamese regular forces in close proximity, and could not have continued on their own.

If there is no progress in the negotiations with the communists in Paris, and if the communists continue to wage their aggression in South Vietnam at either present or increased intensity, then we should resume the air war. If they are going to continue to fight, I don't think they should be granted the luxury of being able to conduct their aggressions from a privileged sanctuary. We should resume the air war, moreover, on an all-out basis and not in piecemeal fashion. We should finish the whole Vietnam war quickly.

Vietnam is a classic example of how not to fight a war. The "gradual" approach requires the expenditure of much more of one's manpower, resources and prestige than is necessary. Our prestige is by no means as high now as it would have been if we had gone in, cleaned the thing up and made our exit.

If we had fought World War II as we have fought the Vietnam war, we would still be fighting it—if we hadn't lost it.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR W. LEE O'DANIEL

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I learned with deep regret of the recent death of

a former Member of this body who also served as Governor of the State of Texas, W. Lee O'Daniel.

Known to most Texans as "Pappy," Mr. O'Daniel was elected Governor in 1938, and in 1941 won a special election to become a Member of this body. He was reelected to a full 6-year term in his own right and then retired, choosing not to run for reelection in 1948. In this body, he held the seat I hold today—the seat once held by Lyndon B. Johnson.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), yesterday described the colorful campaigning and colorful history of "Pappy" O'Daniel.

I only wish to say that with him goes an endearing and charming part of Texas political history.

HOW TO IMPROVE MEDICAL CARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the March 24, 1969, issue of U.S. News & World Report contains an interview with Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association.

We are becoming increasingly aware that the problems of the accessibility and cost of health care in America are becoming increasingly acute. Comprehensive medical care is difficult to obtain, even for Americans who have adequate incomes, while for the poor who live in isolated squalor in rural shacks or urban slums the problems are compounded. In one sense the issue is one of giving every American the financial means to "purchase" comprehensive medical care. But beyond that we must recognize that, for too long, we have ignored the problems of delivering health services, and our system of health care is poorly organized to respond to ever-increasing need and demand.

To all of these points Mr. McNerney speaks with great force and eloquence. He is one of the most creative and bold thinkers in the field of health care, and his position as president of the national Blue Cross Association gives him a uniquely qualified position from which to comment on the inadequacies of our health system. I commend this interview to the attention of the Senate. I hope that Congress can make progress in developing a program of comprehensive prepaid health coverage, and I look forward to joining with Mr. McNerney and others in that effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the interview with Mr. McNerney be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOW TO IMPROVE MEDICAL CARE—INTERVIEW WITH THE HEAD OF THE BLUE CROSS ASSOCIATION

(NOTE.—Crowded hospitals . . . bigger bills . . . long delays in seeing a doctor . . . millions of Americans neglected—at a time when the nation spends 50 billion dollars a year on health. Is U.S. medicine itself sick? And if so, is the cure to be found in still more spending? Or in better organization of a confusing array of services?)

(To discover what's really wrong and how to improve the quality of medical care, members of the staff of "U.S. News & World Report" talked with an authority on the subject—Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association. This exclusive inter-

view was held in the magazine's conference room.)

Q. Mr. McNerney, what would you like to tell President Nixon about this nation's health needs?

A. I would stress the fact that many of our current health problems on a national or local level cannot be solved without changes in our current pattern of delivering services. It is not enough to raise more money through taxes or voluntary prepayment. We must find better ways to translate knowledge into service.

In 1968, over 50 billion dollars was spent on health, and the increase over previous years was accounted for significantly by price rises. This situation cannot continue.

Reorganization must involve the Federal Government itself, which now has more than 80 agencies focused, in one manner or another, on health. Lacking internal co-ordination, the Government falls short of its full potential in setting objectives, establishing priorities and exploiting fully the assets of the private sector. With a tight budget coming up, this latter point takes on high importance. A public advisory committee working with the HEW [Health, Education and Welfare] Secretary's office would be helpful.

With better delivery systems, all of us would be in a sounder position to attack the problem of adequate financing although the two are always interrelated.

In this regard, an improved Medicaid program is badly needed. Also every effort must be made to encourage management and labor in employed groups to put high priority on health benefits.

Hard on the heels of greater productivity and access to health services for the public come related problems of education and manpower and environmental health.

Grants and loans are needed to meet manpower demands, but they should be given with strings attached. For example, medical and allied studies should focus on administrative as well as clinical medicine, and experiments in various methods of rendering care should be stipulated.

Q. You seem to see a trend toward more state medicine in the U.S.—

A. If by "state medicine" you mean medical care provided by or financed by the Government—yes, I do see more ahead. But I'm one of those who feel quite strongly that we in this country are going to stay with a pluralistic system of providing and financing medical care—a system involving both Government and private operations.

There are hard reasons for this. There is a distinct danger of underfinancing when one source of funds is involved. We have a complex set of values in the United States: In one breath we want care for all, and less costs; we want greater independence and self-expression for the professional, and more co-ordination.

Added to this is the fact that we are a country of neighborhoods, as well as States or a nation. The safest way to assure innovation and progress, if not support, is to provide at least a minimal amount of selection.

Private institutions such as Blue Cross which reflect local as well as regional and national preferences—experienced in negotiating between providers and consumers, constantly experimenting with new forms—make a natural ally with the Government, whose resources are indispensable and whose tendency toward uniformity needs to be counterbalanced.

Q. What is the basic problem—the availability of health care, or its cost?

A. Costs are certainly a major problem, but the greater problem is providing better access to health care for all our citizens, rich and poor alike, by correcting the deficiencies that exist in our delivery system. In the process, we must solve the human as well as the economic problems.

I think the new Administration is going to have to face some difficult decisions regarding the allocations of money.

What we've got to keep in mind is that expenditures for medical care itself, although essential, are not the only factors determining the health of people. A family's purchasing power, diet, housing, and family solidarity can be major determinants of health.

So those of us in the health field would applaud any measure to improve family income or living conditions. Adequate family incomes—with growing discretionary spending by the family—would do a great deal to improve the nation's health.

Q. Besides the patients who pay the bills, is anyone concerned about the rapid rise in medical costs?

A. I am concerned. Industry is concerned. Labor is concerned. And government is concerned. It is a national problem.

Q. How fast are medical costs actually rising?

A. In the hospital field, during the 1950s and the early 1960s, costs rose at an average rate of about 7 per cent a year. But in the last three years—1966, 1967 and 1968—the rise of hospital costs has approached 15 per cent a year.

Payments to physicians have also accelerated in recent years. During the 1950s and early 1960s, doctor costs rose at an average rate of 3 per cent a year. In the last two or three years, the rise approximated 6 per cent a year.

Q. Would you describe this as a "runaway" rise?

A. No. I think that overstates the case. If you look at the U.S. economy as a whole, you would find that the costs of many service institutions with high labor content have exceeded significantly the average as represented by the consumer price index.

For example, over the past 15 years the costs of education have gone up approximately the same as health costs. Our expenditures for education were 11.9 billion dollars in 1950 and 43.5 billion dollars in 1966. During the same period, our health expenditures rose from 12.1 billion dollars to 45 billion dollars.

I want to make it emphatically clear that I do think the extent of the rise in health costs calls for moderating measures, but I don't think we have seen a "runaway" situation—especially when one reflects on the fact that the scope and quality of medical services have been growing along with their cost.

We get more and better medical care today than we did 15 years ago. The revolutionary advances in medical science have necessitated costly equipment and manpower. As a result, in the case of many once-critical ailments, your odds of survival are infinitely greater.

WHERE HEALTH SUFFERS

Q. Are many Americans going without medical care because costs are so high?

A. Too many are. There is significance in American mortality and morbidity rates as compared with those in other countries. There are 15 countries with a lower infant-mortality rate than the U.S. And our country ranks something like twentieth in the world longevity.

With particular reference to the death rate among children, it's pretty clear that we have a problem. The infant-mortality rate among the poor in this country is about twice that of the well-to-do. The death rate among the black poor is likely to be three times the national average.

When one looks behind these figures—and others—and sees that the poor get much less prenatal and postnatal care, worse nutrition, worse housing, and less preventive and rehabilitative care than the average citizen, then one has to suspect strongly that costs are a major problem to certain seg-

ments of our population. Fifty per cent of the poor are not immunized against common childhood ailments. Sixty-four per cent do not see a dentist. And 45 per cent of the female poor who have babies do not get prenatal care.

Q. Is the answer increased spending?

A. I think the problem is less how much we are spending on health care, and more how we are spending this money.

In other words, while we are doing some things well—such as through our expenditures on research, education and treatment of certain acute illnesses—there are some things we are not doing well. For example, preventive care—needed to keep people from getting sick, whether through personal-health services or environmental services such as air and stream purification—is inadequate. And the productivity, or efficiency, of some aspects of our health-care system is too low.

Q. Why is medical efficiency so low?

A. The major productivity problem is that while we as a nation have changed significantly, both in terms of living conditions and in terms of medical science, we are still, in too many sections, using the health-care apparatus that we had in the 1930s and 1940s.

Today we are more urbanized, and the pressures of urban living are different from those of a rural economy—resulting in different demand and delivery problems. Medical science has vastly proliferated the numbers and variety of health services that need to be provided. To meet these and other changes, we need a reorganization of our health services.

Q. How would you change the system?

A. In broad terms, we need to bring all major health services together on what might be termed "health campuses." Further, the various services involved must be more closely co-ordinated—for example, doctors' offices, hospitals, extended-care facilities, public-health programs and home-care programs. Also, the physician must become better integrated in the total range of services.

Today, agencies and services are so fragmented it is difficult for the patient to know how to enter and then use the system intelligently. And, obviously, co-ordination problems arise which have cost implications.

In some depressed areas, where ability to travel is limited or knowledge of health services is minimal, there is often a lack of services—compounding the matter of fragmentation.

Q. Should these health centers be developed with government funds, or private money?

A. It will take both. It will take government help to build expensive hospital beds—or, better still, to modernize those beds. It will take significant government help to build or modernize some of the allied facilities and those for education and research. The help will be in the form of grants and loans.

On the other hand, a fair amount of private funds, primarily through prepayment and insurance, can be involved in paying for the services that are provided in these facilities and for assuming some of the capital expenditures that will be required.

To keep these costs as low as possible, however, meaningful control and incentive mechanisms must be applied. For example, planning of physical facilities must be done carefully to avoid costly duplication and needless overspending. There should be some effective system of areawide planning to fit health facilities to the needs of the community.

NEEDED: BROADER INSURANCE

Q. Are changes needed in health insurance?

A. We are going to have to provide more

comprehensive health care by having prepayment and insurance pay for a broader range of benefits.

At present, prepayment and insurance pay for only one-third of the medical-care dollar. This should be increased to 85 or 90 per cent as soon as possible, for the cost of even one large health-care item—such as drugs or a hospital stay—can handicap a family severely.

The scope of benefits widely available should be extended very quickly to include such out-of-hospital costs as dental care, prescribed drugs, home care, and particularly preventive care, so that nobody is left in grave danger as far as financing his family's medical care is concerned.

The broadening of benefits would also serve to help reduce the use of our most expensive service—that is, the hospital.

For example, preadmission testing, now in effect in 22 Blue-Cross plan areas, makes it possible for a patient to get his X-ray and lab tests in the outpatient department of the hospital several days or weeks before he's admitted, without spending needless time in a hospital bed.

Potential savings from this kind of testing in one State have been estimated as high as 7.5 million dollars. For convalescing patients, home care, now in effect in 17 Blue Cross plans, costs as little as \$10 a day—a fraction of the cost of a hospital stay.

Q. Would you expand federal, or private insurance?

A. The broadening must be done in both sectors—public and private.

In the private sector, labor and management must recognize that as high a priority must be placed on comprehensive health benefits as on such things as more take-home pay, reduced workweeks, longer vacations and other fringe benefits. Not only do broad benefits have incentive value, but the payoff of a healthy working population with minimal medical indigency and dependence on tax sources is potentially great.

In the automotive industry, for example, we already find that such things as outpatient psychiatric care, treatment in nursing homes and other extended-care facilities, and prescription drugs are now part of their standard health-insurance contracts. This is an encouraging trend.

In the public sector, the Government should help provide benefits for those who cannot afford them. It will become less and less defensible for the Government to ignore the needs of the poor.

HOW TO HELP THE POOR

Q. How would you reach those poor people? Would you simply extend the Government's system of medicare to include people of all ages, instead of just the elderly?

A. It would be well to leave medicare focused primarily on the aged, as it is now. In addition, the totally and permanently disabled could be brought into medicare regardless of age—as well as State retirees.

To make medical care more available to the poor who are outside any of the above categories, we should strengthen considerably our medicaid program. Several points come to mind:

The Federal Government could increase its aid to the States under the medicaid program from the present 55 to 83 percent up to 70 to 90 per cent, if necessary. A major problem to date has been the inability of States to provide adequate matching funds. State tax resources are considerably less than federal, and increasingly the problem of the poor is becoming a national—as opposed to a local—problem.

I would do away with the current undignified and needlessly complicated system of need determination, which is too subjective and too subject to inequitable interpretation by states and localities. Instead, let a person declare his home on a short form to the Internal Revenue Service.

Presumably, all welfare-cash beneficiaries would not be working and would receive 100 per cent help. For those who work, if their income is below a certain figure—they would get something less than 100 per cent help. Persons in lower income categories might get 50 per cent, others 25 per cent, and those above a certain income level would get no help at all.

But these income levels should be re-examined periodically, over all. Federal guidelines should be promulgated as a condition of participation in federal aid—for example, who should be eligible, what evaluative data are to be kept, and the actuarial value of minimum benefits.

Also, the Federal Government should require that the income limits be relatively uniform among the States—taking into account the different costs of living in different areas.

This would be a simpler, more flexible system. If the nation's economy should improve, that could be taken into account. It would reduce demands on already burdened local tax revenues needed for many social purposes like education. It would avoid the regressive aspects of a uniform payroll tax.

Further, the States participating in this plan could purchase their medical care through private carriers which would be responsible for performance under clearly stipulated conditions.

Q. Do you believe in compulsory, tax-paid health insurance for everybody?

A. The States should have some elbow room to work out their own plans. If a State wanted to, it could use a plan like Governor Rockefeller's in New York—which in its original form involved a payroll tax shared jointly by the employer and employee in support of a minimum-benefit package for the working population, and the use of private carriers to administer the benefits. Those on welfare rolls would still need direct government assistance.

Q. Do you have any estimate of what such a program would cost—in taxpayers' money?

A. No, I don't. It has been estimated that it would cost about \$250 a year per person to render comprehensive health services under today's health system. The cost of either program would depend, in the last analysis, upon what benefits were included, who was included, and so on.

Q. Speaking of costs, what has caused this sudden jump in hospital and doctor costs?

A. On the hospital side, it is important to note that labor costs account for about 70 per cent of the average hospital's budget.

For a long time, wages paid hospital employees were far below the wage standards in most industries for workers of comparable skills. But in recent years, nurses and other hospital employees have begun demanding wages comparable to those paid other workers. In some places, hospital employees have gone on strike; in other places, they have made strong demands. All this, plus the fact that hospital employees were placed under the federal minimum-wage law in 1966, have caused labor costs to accelerate.

So a large amount of the recent rise in hospital costs represents hospital labor catching up on wages.

WHY COSTS WILL GO HIGHER

Q. Have hospital workers now caught up, or is this rapid rise to go on in the future?

A. I would say that the pay of the average hospital employee is still behind that for comparable skills in the community. Therefore, we can look for two or three years more of an exceptional rise. Then it should start to moderate.

Other factors in rising hospital costs include expensive new equipment, new services and the public's rising demand for these services, as well as expensive laboratory tests.

There can also be no doubt that overuse is a factor that is contributing to high hospital bills. In the absence of broad benefits

and well co-ordinated allied services, the hospital can become the site of care which can be rendered more economically elsewhere.

Q. How about doctors? Are they making fortunes, as many people believe?

A. The average doctor nets perhaps something like \$33,000 a year, according to recent figures. Of course, there are some doctors who make considerably more than that. But I don't think the average income of doctors is too high, considering the cost and long years of their education and their relatively short productive working lives. Whether the doctor is able to be fully productive in today's system is another matter.

Q. A recent report covering the greater metropolitan area of Washington said that in a 10-year period the number of hospital beds in this area had increased by 25 per cent, but the number of hospital employees had increased in the same period by 75 per cent. This indicates a decrease in productivity per man. Why is this?

A. It's directly relatable to the fact that medical science is getting much more complicated. If you were to examine the number of procedures that are performed in a hospital, the variety of drugs that are administered, the types of operations that are performed, you would find that the equipment and technical processes of the medical profession expanded significantly in the last 10 years.

Q. Doesn't all this new equipment help to reduce labor costs in treating illness?

A. On the contrary, much of the new equipment actually requires more people. For example, the complicated equipment used in open-heart surgery might require the services of from 10 to 15 people during the course of an operation.

Similarly, a cobalt-radiation unit used in the treatment of cancer, and kidney-dialysis machines have created a new need for manpower where none existed before. As a result, the average hospital today requires 2.5 employees per patient, compared with an average of 1.5 twenty years ago.

Furthermore, much of the new equipment is additive; too rarely does it substitute for a significant number of the simpler procedures preceding it. Automation, for example, of laboratory tests, or monitoring life's vital functions, holds promise, but we are only at the initial demonstration stage of this development.

BENEFITS TO THE ECONOMY

Q. You have also said that certain segments of the population are not getting the care that they should. Do you foresee a big increase in the number of people getting medical care or in the extent of medical care that they get?

A. Yes—and it should be recognized that this care is viewed as a right rather than a privilege. Health care for everyone must be regarded as a necessary and vital element of our society.

Apart from the moral issues involved, good health makes good economic sense, as I suggested earlier. It has been estimated, for example, that 10 per cent of the nation's income growth over the past 50 years has been due to the declining death rate, resulting in a larger labor force.

It is also estimated that every dollar spent on research into arthritis or rheumatism gives us a potential return of \$39 by keeping a person out of bed and having him at work as a taxpayer rather than a drag on our economy. Similar examples could be cited for other debilitating diseases.

It is foolish to pay to keep a lot of sick, unproductive people on welfare when, by the judicious expenditure of little or no more money, we can keep these same people on their feet as working and contributing members of society.

In essence, there is reason to increase the percentage of our gross national product

spent on health care, because this in turn may increase even more the size of our gross national product—assuming a reasonably productive delivery-of-care system.

Q. You have suggested how reorganization of our medical system can bring better care. But how would it stem the rise in medical costs—or would it?

A. First of all, I think that costs in the health field, like those in the education field, are always going to go beyond the rise in prices generally—the consumer-price-index rise—for the foreseeable future, essentially because medical services involve so much labor.

In medicine, there is minimum opportunity to substitute machines for men. So what we are talking about is a moderation of a cost rise, rather than actually bringing it down completely into line with other cost rises.

But I believe that if we do more program-and-facility planning, and if we reimburse medical institutions on an incentive basis instead of simply paying their charges or costs uncritically, we can then begin to moderate the medical-cost rise. In an essentially uncompetitive economy, both are necessary as well as promising.

WAYS TO PARE EXPENSES

Q. What do you mean by paying on an "incentive basis"? How would such a payment system work?

A. Well, let's take the hospital, for example. At present a lot of hospital care is paid for on a daily-charge or cost basis. The amount a hospital charges or states as cost is paid—or considered a bad debt. This system does too little to encourage efficiency.

Now, the Blue Cross and some other prepayment plans, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare are experimenting with other methods of paying hospitals.

One idea being considered is to negotiate contracts with hospitals and pay each a rate based on an agreed-on budget or target. Another approach is to pay a hospital on the basis of the average cost of all similar hospitals in their area. If a hospital can keep its costs below this average, it would get to keep some of the difference—while, if its costs exceeded the average, it would be penalized some of the difference.

It is assumed that hospitals could reduce costs through the greater application of industrial-engineering techniques, use of more shared services with other hospitals, better corporate planning, and stronger over-all administration.

What must be kept in mind is the temptation to lower costs through compromises with quality. To guard against this, measures of effectiveness are needed as reference points. Some are coming.

In Southern California, under CASH—Commission for Administrative Services in Hospitals, a program we helped sponsor—90 hospitals are finding many new ways to improve services to the point where they expect to save a total of from 12 million to 16 million dollars annually. Following CASH suggestions, some hospitals now show a more than 20 per cent improvement in the utilization of nursing personnel, based on carefully formulated work standards and intensive in-service education.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL IDENTITY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the 10th of May is a traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people and marks the anniversary of three important events in the history of Rumania. Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, was proclaimed Prince of Rumania on May 10, 1866. Eleven years later, Rumania declared her independence from the Otto-

man Empire and decided the issue on the battlefields south of the Danube, where, in alliance with the Russian czarist army, the Rumanian forces defeated the Turks. Then, in 1881, on the 10th of May, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania. With a sense of national pride, Rumanians have long cherished this day of triple significance in their history. But, the oppressive alien regime that now holds sway over Rumania will not countenance the free celebration by the people of their traditional national holiday. Instead, May 9, the anniversary of Soviet victory, is an official occasion for celebration. But it is an empty occasion for the Rumanian people who in the depth of their being held fast to their national identity and look for the day when they may once again be free to guide the destiny of their country.

BIOGRAPHY OF THE ABM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago I spoke at some length in the Chamber regarding the waste and dangers implicit in the President's decision to deploy the so-called antiballistic missile.

The New York Times magazine of May 4, 1969, contains a fascinating article written by Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, the noted nuclear physicist, who, among a great number of prominent physicists, believes the deployment of antiballistic missiles is a grave national mistake.

Dr. Lapp's article, entitled "A Biography of the ABM," traces the history of this project from the earliest days of the development of antiaircraft rockets. I commend Dr. Lapp's historical review of this dubious defense hardware to the reading of every citizen concerned with our national defense. 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:

FROM NIKE TO SAFEGUARD: A BIOGRAPHY OF THE ABM

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

Four U.S. Presidents have been confronted with decisions on deploying antiballistic-missile systems. Four species—Nike-Zeus, Nike-X, Sentinel and Safeguard—all replete with heroic names and confusing acronyms, have puzzled Presidents and laymen alike.

President Eisenhower's hand was forced during his last year in office when Congress approved funds for producing Nike-Zeus, but he stubbornly—and wisely, in the light of subsequent developments—refused to spend the money after his science advisers told him that neither the Zeus missile nor its radar system could cope with a serious attack.

President Kennedy took the advice of his defense chief, Robert S. McNamara, and turned back demands to deploy ABM defenses even though the "military-industrial complex" applied pressure and politicians on Capitol Hill produced frightening "evidence" of Soviet nuclear strength. Again, the hardware—the missiles, radar and computers—did not measure up to White House advisers' standards.

President Johnson, on the other hand, did not take the advice of McNamara, who had prepared scores of computer print-outs showing that an ABM defense promised no security whatever because a Soviet reaction to it could easily cancel any advantage it might provide. McNamara was forced to back down, however, and, as one Pentagon expert told

me, "for the first time went against the numbers" by announcing in September, 1967, plans for a "thin" ABM defense against the threat of nuclear missiles hurled from Red China. Congress went along on the plan, which became known as the Sentinel system.

President Nixon asked his Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird, and Laird's deputy, David Packard, to take a new look at Sentinel, which had run into spirited opposition. On March 14, Nixon announced his Safeguard program, an ABM system designed primarily to protect missiles, not people. This change, made to end city-dwellers' opposition to Sentinel, has opened up a searching inquiry into U.S. nuclear policy.

Safeguard is being bitterly contested in the Senate and a close vote is expected in June, when the Defense Department authorization bill comes up for approval. Senator J. W. Fulbright's Foreign Relations Committee has taken the bit in its teeth and, through Senator Albert Gore's subcommittee, examined the ABM issue in nationally televised hearings. What is on trial in this mounting debate is more than the fate of a missile system. As Senator Mike Mansfield expressed it: "I see no safety for this nation in bristling and burnished missiles whether they stand tall around deteriorating cities or rise in the empty fields of an impoverished rural society." It is, in brief, a matter of national priorities—of attending to urgent domestic needs so long neglected because of the dominance of military spending.

The ABM issue is neither singular nor simple. It has become highly technical and complex, complicated by shifting defense justifications and increasingly polarized on the Nixon-Kennedy political axis. Thus the national debate will sorely test the ability of a democracy to grapple with technomilitary matters heavily underlaid with political intrigue. Given this prospect, it is appropriate to view the ABM problem in perspective—to examine it piece by piece as it has evolved over the years.

American research on ballistic defense began with Army Ordnance Contract No. W30-069-ORD-3182, placed with Western Electric's Bell Telephone Laboratories on Feb. 8, 1945. This agreement underwrote "investigations, research experiments, design, development and engineering work required to produce a suitable antiaircraft missile." It marked the birth of the Nike missile, which over the years graduated from defense against bombers to interception of intercontinental ballistic-missile warheads.

Western Electric, the manufacturing arm of A.T.&T., has remained for a quarter-century the prime contractor of the Army's antimissile program. Through the latter half of the nineteen-forties, Nike development cost about \$3-million a year as the first Army fledgling, dubbed Nike-Ajax, tried out its stubby fins. In November, 1951, Nike-Ajax soared into the clear air over the White Sands Proving Grounds in New Mexico and knocked down a drone aircraft.

The 21-foot Nike-Ajax, boosted by a solid-fueled first stage and a liquid-fueled upper stage, attained a speed of 2,000 miles an hour, a range of 25 miles and a ceiling of 10 to 12 miles. This performance was impressive enough to warrant its deployment around U.S. cities and air bases as a bomber defense. But it mounted a warhead of ordinary high explosives and the Army decided to push on to a second-generation Nike, one that would "go nuclear" and have greater range and speed.

A nuclear-tipped Nike-Hercules, standing 41 feet high, emerged as an operational missile in 1958, after five years of development. The Hercules, with a range of 75 miles and a speed of 2,200 miles an hour, replaced the Ajax in some 80 antiaircraft batteries around the country. A total of 3,000 Hercules missiles came off the production line to protect American cities against bomber attacks.

While Hercules was incubating, a missile

specifically designed for use against other missiles—ICBM—was under study. The Army initiated in 1955 a Bell Telephone Labs study of ABM, the first true antimissile missile. No one can trace the origin of this term, though the antimissile idea probably occurred to the British when the first V-2 crashed on London in September, 1944. The Army's antimissile project was undertaken against a background of two technological breakthroughs. One was the U.S. development of the H-bomb, with a matching Soviet achievement only a pace behind; the other was the mounting evidence that the intercontinental ballistic missile was just below the horizon. (The ICBM was initially called IBM in the Pentagon, but the International Business Machines Corporation strongly objected to the purloining of its initials.)

On August 26, 1957, Tass, the Soviet press agency, reported the successful test of a "very-long-range ballistic missile," the TR-3, and within six weeks Sputnik I dramatized Soviet rocket prowess. The Air Force's development program for the first American ICBM, the Atlas, a 100-foot liquid-fueled rocket, was nearing fruition. The first successful test came in November, 1958. The Army, meantime, was quick to capitalize on the potential Soviet threat. On Oct. 28, 1957, Gen. Maxwell Taylor fired the first Army gun to promote ABM. "We can see no reason why the country cannot have an antimissile defense for a price that is within reach," he said, adding: "I am sure many of you have heard the statement that the dollar requirements for this kind of defense are astronomical and that the whole concept is beyond consideration. I can assure you that the studies I have seen lead me to a different conclusion."

Taylor knew the problems the Army's ABM faced. There was a widespread belief that the ICBM was unstoppable—that no defense was possible. There was apprehension about the cost of the ABM proposal, and there was competition from the Air Force, which had been the big spender in air defense.

The Army was confident that it could successfully intercept and destroy an "adversary" warhead on the test range and thus win the argument over whether an ICBM could be stopped. It was not deeply concerned either about the cost problem. Since the Pentagon had already spent \$25-billion on postwar air defense, the Army was not inclined to think that similar expenditures for missile defense were out of the question.

The Air Force was a stickler matter. While the Army was giving Western Electric the go-ahead to develop Nike-Zeus, the third-generation missile in the series, the Air Force had deployed rocket-launched ramjets, called Bomarc, around the United States and Canada and was developing an antimissile called Wizard as a competitor to Nike-Zeus. Eisenhower's Secretary of Defense, Neil McElroy, stepped into the battle in January, 1958, dividing responsibility for ballistic-missile defense between the contestants but giving the Army a clear priority in the ABM program. McElroy followed up his decision by creating the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA). Its main mission turned out to be Project Defender, a \$100-million-a-year program concerned with all phases of ballistic-missile defense.

Though the Army had other cards—Werner Von Braun's intermediate-range Jupiter program, for instance—the 50-foot Nike-Zeus antimissile missile became its trump card in the battle for a share of the U.S. missile program. Launched with a powerful 450,000 pounds of thrust, the three-stage, solid-fuel Zeus soon began to take a sizable portion of the Army research budget. Zeus expenditures were \$12-million in fiscal 1957, quadrupled the next year and in fiscal 1959 soared to \$210-million. Although the missile was still two years from flight-testing, the Army tried to use a power play: in 1960 it asked for \$400-million to begin production. Secretary McElroy batted back the request,

but Congress stuffed the money into the budget anyway. McElroy held his ground and refused to spend it. He summoned White House science advisers to the Pentagon and balanced their analyses of ABM effectiveness against the Army's claims and studies by other scientists.

The Army failed in its big push to go into production on an ABM, but it won a consolation prize—increased research and development funds.

The Nike-Zeus program, as it stood in 1959, had two huge deficiencies. Its Zeus Acquisition Radar, or ZAR, could not distinguish between a real and a decoy warhead, and it could not cope with a large number of attacking missiles. Essentially, these fatal flaws grew from the fact that the "eye" of the radar system rotated and could therefore take only a periodic peek at incoming objects rather than fixing them with a steady stare. The short look severely limited the amount of information the system could gather about an approaching target. It meant that the Zeus, with its impressive missile punch, was a near-blind giant; it couldn't hit what it couldn't see.

President Kennedy felt pressure for the ABM almost from the day he took office, but his nimble Defense Secretary, Robert McNamara, was more than a match for the Army-industrial-political phalanx. Again, ABM went back into the research-and-development oven, but this time the heat was turned up. Nike-Zeus, a missile almost as big as the six-story-high Minuteman ICBM itself, was about to overcome its growing pains. The Thiokol Chemical Corporation had licked the problems of casting a huge solid propellant. Douglas Aircraft mated the three stages together, and an assembly of individual radars was concocted to provide sharper vision for the system. Late in 1961 the Nike-Zeus achieved its first test-firing. Then in the spring of 1962 all three stages worked perfectly and on July 19 Zeus was readied to intercept the nose-cone of an ICBM.

An Atlas launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., streaked westward toward a target 5,000 miles down range. Poised in an underground cell on Kwajalein Island, in the Marshall chain southwest of Hawaii, was a Nike-Zeus on alert. Could a bullet hit a bullet in the inky darkness of space? Here was a crucial experiment. A set of elaborate radars picked up reflected signals from the oncoming Atlas, fed data to computers and determined the intercept point. A separate radar was given this vital information and took over; a computer commanded the Zeus to launch. With a mighty roar it zoomed upward, burning out and discarding its first stage, then shucking off the second stage after consuming its propellant. High above the Pacific, the last stage of the Zeus arced toward its target, guided by the sensitive radar on the ground. The Zeus scored a hit. Had it been the real thing, a nuclear explosion would have "killed" the hostile warhead.

Some skeptics remained unconvinced, calling the demonstration a "turkey shoot," a controlled experiment rather than a combat test; they said that in a real attack the Zeus crew would not know when or from what direction the attacking missile would come. But it was a landmark for the Army anti-missile effort and the over-all program was accelerated.

The Kwajalein missile intercept came hard on the heels of a high-altitude test of a two-megaton warhead. The blast took place about 200 miles above Johnston Island, a small chunk of real estate southwest of Hawaii. It was a spectacular sight that lit up the night skies over much of the Pacific, allowing an enterprising photographer on Oahu to catch Diamond Head bathed in light from the explosion 800 miles away. A nuclear explosion in the vacuum of space is a strange event. It takes place in one-ten-millionth

of a second—a silent flicker of radiation. Yet in this infinitesimal moment energy equal to two million tons of TNT is released. Almost none of it, strange to say, is emitted as visible light. Most of it flashes out as an immense burst of X-rays—rather weak X-rays, at that—less powerful than those used by a dentist photographing a patient's teeth, but of such vast quantity that their impact energy can destroy an ICBM warhead in space.

The Army's ABM program, guided from on high by advice from the Research Projects Agency, was once again reshuffled. There emerged a new program, code-named Nike-X, aimed at protecting all of the United States against nuclear attack from the Soviet Union. Nike-Zeus remained the space killer, but new radars were added and—most important—a brand-new missile, the Sprint, was born. Still, the White House gave no indication that it would fund an ABM program.

Nike-X's strategy was to meet incoming missiles with a one-two punch. Nike-Zeus would supply the long-range jab, 100 miles or so above the earth's surface. Sprint would be the short-range, solid punch aimed at objects that had dropped into the earth's atmosphere. Here the retarding effect of the atmosphere would, so to speak, sort out the real and decoy warheads because the real ones, which are heavier, would sink faster. (It is not practical to include heavier decoys in a missile's payload because the extra weight robs the missile's real warhead of its explosive power.)

In March, 1963, Martin Marietta was awarded the contract to develop Sprint. Components were tested that year and the new ABM, which could jet itself to a mile-high altitude in a few seconds, was tested in 1965 and lived up to its designers' expectations. Equipped with a warhead only a tenth as powerful as the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima, the 27-foot Sprint is the backbone of the Army's hopes for fending off a massive nuclear attack. To date, the Army has tested about 30 Sprints, and it remains confident that the conical missile will perform as specified.

Meanwhile, Nike-Zeus was undergoing a metamorphosis designed to extend its range. This was vital if the Nike-X system was to be economically feasible. If the range were not increased, a large number of expensive missile farms and radars would have to be spread out over the nation. Cost was all important; a cost-minded Secretary McNamara told a Congressional committee:

"It is worth noting that had we produced and deployed the [obsolete] Nike-Zeus system proposed by the Army in 1959 at an estimated cost of \$13-billion to \$14-billion, most of it would have had to be torn out and replaced, almost before it became operational, by the new missiles and radars of the Nike-X system."

In 1966 the Joint Chiefs of Staff decided that Nike-X was ready to deploy. McNamara disagreed, saying that the deployment would only provoke the Russians into a similar move that would nullify the effectiveness of Nike-X. Nonetheless, Congress came to the aid of the Army by appropriating funds to begin production of the Nike-X hardware. At this point the Army got a big assist from the Soviet Union. Although legislators and generals had been asserting for some time that the Russians were about to deploy their own ABM system, the first part of the sixties passed with no convincing evidence of Soviet deployment. To be sure, Premier Nikita Khrushchev boasted to American newspaper editors in the summer of 1962 that his nation had antimissile missiles that "could hit a fly in outer space," but it was not until Nov. 7, 1964, that any solid proof of an ABM appeared. It came in the form of a 65-foot, cigar-shaped metal container trundled across Moscow's Red Square by a long tractor-trailer

combination. This marked the debut of Balosh, the missile's NATO code-name, and within two years U.S. spy satellites discovered that these Nike-Zeus-type defensive missiles were being deployed around Moscow.

Until the deployment of the Galosh missiles, McNamara had adamantly held the line against recommending a Nike-X deployment. He knew that it would cost at \$20-billion—and possibly two or three times that amount—to build an ABM defensive shield to protect against a determined Soviet attack. The dollar outlay was by itself not critical, but McNamara was certain that Nike-X would provoke the Soviet Union into another round in the arms race and that when this was run the United States would be no better off, possibly worse off, than before the building of the Nike-X defense.

Although the intelligence report on the Galosh deployment was top secret and available to only a very few high-level Government officials, McNamara knew that it would be leaked to the press before 1966 was out. He therefore decided to take matters into his own hands and release the news before it could be leaked by others, creating the impression that he had been withholding information. On Nov. 10 the Defense Secretary held a news conference at Johnson City, Tex., and disclosed that an ABM ring was being built around Moscow.

McNamara was aware that arms advocates in industry, in Congress and in the Pentagon would press for some response to the Soviet move. He also knew that the U.S. nuclear strike force more than measured up to the Galosh ring around Moscow and that programmed additions to strategic strength in the seventies would multiply U.S. power to an awesome degree. Though one can understand the Russian defensive mentality—a heritage imposed by Napoleon and Hitler—there can be no question that the Soviet initiative stepped up the arms race.

At this point we must depart from a consideration of purely defensive forces and examine the power of the strategic offense and, in particular, the potential of multiple warheads. Long before there was any real evidence that the Soviet Union was making headway in ABM development, the U.S. set out on a course that now sorely complicates attempts to reach agreement on arms limitations. The complication is summed up by another of the acronyms that plague the postwar period—MIRV. This stands for Multiple, Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicle. Translated from Pentagon gobbledegook, it means packaging more than one nuclear warhead in an ICBM nosecone and equipping each warhead so that it can be dispatched to a separate target. Although MIRV broke into public print shortly after McNamara's disclosure of the Soviet Galosh ring, it had been under development for many years. This is evident from an exchange in July, 1968, between Senator Mansfield and Dr. John Foster, the Pentagon's research chief.

MANSFIELD. "Is it not true that the U.S. response to the discovery that the Soviets had made an initial deployment of an ABM system around Moscow and possibly elsewhere was to develop the MIRV system for Minuteman and Polaris?"

FOSTER. "Not entirely. The MIRV concept was originally generated to increase our targeting capability rather than to penetrate ABM defenses. In 1961-62 planning for targeting the Minuteman force, it was found that the total number of aim points exceeded the number of Minuteman missiles. By splitting up the payload of a single missile [deleted] each [deleted] could be programmed [deleted] allowing us to cover these targets with [deleted] fewer missiles. [Deleted] MIRV was originally born to implement the payload split-up [deleted]. It was found that the previously generated MIRV concept could equally well be used against ABM [deleted]."

While it is interesting to speculate on why the 800 Minuteman scheduled at the time were inadequate for hitting the chosen "aim points," we are primarily concerned with U.S. retaliation, not with a U.S. strike at Soviet missile sites. In a subsequent question, Senator Mansfield asked if the U.S. strategic power might add up to "a capability to throw 10,000 warheads at an aggressor" by 1973. Foster replied that this was possible. (One strategic program in 1969 calls for the deployment of 11,000 nuclear warheads by the mid-seventies.)

While this colloquy, buried deep in the fine print of 2,528 pages of a green-jacketed record of appropriations hearings, may seem technical and obscured by the deleted remarks, it penetrates to the core of the current debate over President Nixon's Safeguard system, which had its beginnings in 1967 as McNamara pondered a response to the Soviet Galosh deployment.

Pressure built up early in 1967 for the U.S. to counter Galosh by deploying the Nike-X system. The Congressional Cold Warriors, twice denied an ABM victory, scented success and pressed for immediate action on Nike-X. The Joint Chiefs of Staff came up with a unanimous decision to deploy Nike-X on a two-step plan: (1) a \$9.9-billion program to provide 25 cities with ABM defense; and (2) a \$19.4-billion program to extend this defense to 25 more cities and add more Sprints to thicken the defenses of the largest 25 cities.

Senator Richard B. Russell, the venerable former chairman of the Armed Services Committee, backed this program, saying that the first step would save 80 million Americans and the second step would extend this protection to a total of 90 million citizens. "It seems to me that the objective in defense should be to prepare to save all that you can," he argued, "even if you are unable to save everything and everyone." Russell pointed out that his committee had initiated the action in 1966 to add production funds for Nike-X and that these had not been used because of McNamara's doubts about the system. He said they could now be applied to getting Nike-X started.

The heat was turned on McNamara in the spring of 1967. His annual statement on the nation's defense posture had neatly incised the issue that year. He agreed that Nike-X could save 80 million or 90 million lives—although it might cost, according to his calculations, \$40-billion to do so—but he made two observations that cast Senator Russell's people-saving optimism in a different light.

First, the defense chief made the point that 80 million lives might be saved, but 30 million Americans would inevitably die in a missile attack. Second, 30 million is a rock-bottom estimate based on the assumption that the Russians would do nothing to respond to the U.S. deployment of a massive ABM system like Nike-X.

"It is a virtual certainty," the Defense Secretary emphasized, "that the Soviets will act to maintain their deterrent, which casts grave doubts on the deploying of the Nike-X system for the protection of our cities against the heavy, sophisticated missile attack that they could launch in the nineteen-seventies."

That, in essence, is what the great debate over ABM systems is all about.

The controversy then took a new turn. The Republican National Committee issued a 55-page pamphlet titled "Is LBJ Right?" The question had to do with President Johnson's foot-dragging on deploying the Nike-X. Now the issue was cast in partisan terms—at a time when the President was still running for re-election. One commentator observed that Nike-X was now aimed at Republican, not Soviet, missiles.

So the ABM battle was at last joined; sometime during the late summer of 1967 McNamara had to surrender to the massive pressure to respond in kind to the Soviet

Galosh venture. On Sept. 18, he announced a plan to begin the deployment of what became known as the Sentinel system. It was an incredible speech that was replete with defense heresy and nuclear brimstone:

"... technology has now circumscribed us all with a conceivable horizon of horror that could dwarf any catastrophe that has befallen man in his more than a million years on earth... Our current numerical superiority over the Soviet Union in reliable accurate and effective warheads is both greater than we had originally planned and, in fact, more than we require... In the end, the root of man's security does not lie in his weaponry."

Perhaps the most astonishing thing about Sentinel was that it was keyed—and no one seems quite sure how this happened—to an irrational nuclear ICBM attack from Red China. But when the military authorization came before the Senate, there was little doubt that the Senators were thinking of something else. As Senator Russell said in an interview in *Atlanta Magazine*:

"It's a base for a system throughout the whole nation. I didn't deceive anybody. When we brought it up they tried to dress it up as being designed to protect us from China. But I stated very frankly on the floor of the Senate that I consider it the foundation of a complete antimissile system that would save at least 80 million Americans against any atomic attack, however drastic."

The Sentinel debate raged for months in the Senate, but the deciding vote was cast by Moscow. The invasion of Czechoslovakia eliminated any doubt about approval for the ABM system. But at least McNamara managed to trim back the Nike-X deployment into a half-price Sentinel system. This \$5.5-billion program featured a nationwide system of about 14 sites for the Spartan missile (the new, extended-range Nike-Zeus) designed to provide "thin" continental umbrella protection. Across the top tier states would be five installations equipped with Spartans and perimeter Acquisition Radars (PAR's) as well as Sprint missiles and Missile Site Radars (MSR's). PAR scans the northern skies out to a distance of 1,500 miles, alerts the Spartan interceptors and relays its data to MSR, which in turn directs the missiles to a "kill point" in space. Sprints, the short-range missiles, are added to protect the all-critical radars; if the radars were hit by an attacking warhead, the system would be sightless and ineffective.

Scientists attacked the Sentinel system as a futile effort, arguing that Spartan could easily be outwitted by a clever foe using a combination of deceptive techniques—such things as radar-reflecting balloons, decoy warheads, bundles of fine metallic slivers so reflective that the radar would be blacked out, or even fragments of the rocket's final stage. But as long as the Red Chinese threat was associated with the Sentinel, arguments against it were futile.

The five northern-tier Sentinel posts included Seattle; Great Falls, Mont.; Grand Forks, N.D.; Detroit, and Boston. Presumably the Montana and North Dakota bases, in addition to filling gaps in the radar chain across the nation, were to provide the 350 Minuteman ICBM's in those areas with a thin ABM defense. The rest of the Sentinel sites were to be Spartan-MSR bases scattered across the country so that their areas of effectiveness formed an overlapping pattern covering the whole nation.

Sentinel ran into trouble when the Army started to select sites in such big cities as Seattle, Chicago and Boston. The citizens of suburban Chicago took exception to a plan to put a Spartan base near Libertyville, Ill. Congressman Sidney R. Yates protested the selection, saying that the site could be located at Bong Air Force Base, 125 miles to the north in Wisconsin. The Spartan's cover-

age area extended into Canada, so there was no compelling reason to choose Chicago as a site—unless, as some people suspected, the Army planned eventually to install a short-range Sprint defense as part of a "thick" system to protect Chicago. Citizens wished to have less monstrous neighbors than the Spartan. Lieut. Gen. Alfred Starbird, West Point-trained and a man schooled in nuclear technology through years of service at the Atomic Energy Commission's Washington office, had been named Sentinel systems manager and he rushed to the rescue. "There cannot be an accidental nuclear explosion," asserted General Starbird, a member of the 1936 U.S. Olympic team, and he gave his personal assurance that there would be no such accident.

The Army's run-in with distressed citizens in Chicago was repeated in other cities, especially in Boston, where Senator Edward Kennedy got into the act. By this time Richard Nixon had been elected and attention had focused on Kennedy as his opponent in 1972. Therefore the Sentinel encountered one more complication—that it would become a political bone chewed over by Nixon and Kennedy.

As a Presidential candidate in 1968, Nixon took a hard line on nuclear issues and backed an ABM program. In a late October radio broadcast, he warned that U.S. defenses were close to the "peril point" and came out strongly for "clear-cut military superiority over the Soviet Union." As President, Nixon took note of the rising urban opposition to Sentinel and ordered a complete review of the ABM issue. For two months Defense Secretary Laird and Deputy Secretary Packard, a multimillionaire West Coast electronics executive, studied the problem, while construction work on the city sites was halted.

Nixon abandoned the Johnson Administration's \$5.5-billion Sentinel system and on March 14 introduced a new Safeguard system, designed primarily to protect the 350 Minuteman ICBM silos in Montana and North Dakota. Although billed as a "sharply cut-back" program, it called for the expenditure of \$7-billion in a phased effort. Phase I involves \$2.1-billion for installing two PAR radars and two MSR radars, along with Spartans and Sprints, to protect the Minuteman fields at the Malstrom and Grand Forks Air Force Bases. Phase II of Safeguard may extend the protection to 650 more Minutemen at bases in South Dakota, Missouri and Wyoming. When Nixon unveiled Phase I, public reaction seemed favorable. According to the Safeguard timetable, no bases would be located in cities; this defused the urban opposition, but Senator George McGovern, the South Dakota Democrat and an outspoken ABM critic, said in an interview:

"U.S. defense policy on ballistic-missile defense is about as confused as anything can get. No weapons system in recent history has pursued such a random course of changing objectives and shifting justifications."

The confusion had not reached its maximum, however. It remained for Secretary Laird and his deputy to widen the credibility gap. To justify the abrupt shift from a people-saving Sentinel to a missile-saving Safeguard, the new boss at the Pentagon spoke of the "first-strike" threat posed by the continuing deployment by the Russians of a heavy-weight missile, the SS-9. A first strike is defined as a blitz attack designed to devastate an opponent's ability to mount an effective response, or second strike.

The Soviet Union, Laird disclosed, had deployed more than 200 SS-9's, and intelligence estimates projected a total force of 500 such ICBM's by 1976. "As we look over the development in the current deployment of the SS-9," Laird said, "it leads me to the conclusion that with their big warhead, and the testing that is going forward in the Soviet Union, this weapon can only be aimed at the destroying

of our retaliatory force." Nixon's defense chief described the SS-9 as a first-strike weapon and concluded: "There is no question about that . . ." but this served only to raise more questions.

Actually, Laird's contention would not hold water. The Minuteman force deployed in hardened underground silos numbers 1,000, and any Soviet first strike would have to knock out a very high percentage if the return fire were not to produce clearly "unacceptable" damage in the Soviet Union. Furthermore, as Senate critics were quick to point out, our own missiles were being equipped with multiple warheads and the total firepower in the future would add up to 10,000 or 11,000 warheads. These would be distributed among continentally-based ICBM's and B-52 bombers, intermediate-range missiles in Europe, bomber craft based in Europe or on board aircraft carriers, and submarines. No aggressor, the critics argued, could hope to get away with a blitz attack against such a diversified deterrent.

Of course, no one knew just what Soviet decision-makers would regard as "unacceptable damage," but one of McNamara's last official acts had been to spell out the megastatistics of nuclear destruction. He disclosed that a U.S. retaliatory strike at Soviet targets, using the Minuteman's one-megaton warheads and assuming them to be well-aimed, would produce the following damage:

Number of warheads	Soviet fatalities		Industrial destruction percent of capacity
	Millions	Percent	
100.....	37	15	59
200.....	52	21	72
400.....	74	30	76
800.....	96	39	77
1200.....	109	44	77
1600.....	116	47	77

This neat but ghastly summary, supplied by the Pentagon's computers, explains the grim mathematics of deterrence. Only if the Russians could confine a U.S. retaliatory strike to fewer than 200 warheads could they hope to preserve more than 28 per cent of their productive capacity and, obviously, their present society. Considered against the Pentagon's plan to have 11,000 warheads deployed in a few years, this seems an impossible assignment: Laird's own estimate is that Moscow will have only 500 SS-9's by 1976. The experience of American experts, who consider the Russians to be their equals, has indicated that only 80 per cent of the missiles fired ever launch properly (the others fail to fire, explode or otherwise malfunction). That means that only 400 Soviet missiles could actually pose a threat to the United States. Once more using American performance as a guide, one can estimate that only 80 per cent of the 400-320 missiles—would land within a mile of their targets. And the concrete silo of the Minuteman, with its 70-ton lid, is designed to withstand the blast of a 25-megaton SS-9 1.1 miles away. After a Soviet first strike, therefore, about 680 Minutemen would remain operable. Allowing for the average failures on blastoff, more than 540 Minutemen would destroy their objectives in the Soviet Union on the second strike. (Since their targets are cities rather than underground silos, their effectiveness is insured at distances much greater than 1.1 miles.) The toll would be a third of the Russian population and more than three-fourths of the industrial capacity.

But Secretary Laird, after 60 days in the Pentagon, saw a more fearsome threat in the SS-9's potential for the use of multiple warheads. His deputy, David Packard, told the Foreign Relations Committee's task force under Senator Gore that the SS-9 was being adapted to mount three warheads, and on April 21 Secretary of State William P. Rogers

announced that the Russians had conducted in the Pacific long-range tests of an SS-9 with multiple warheads.

At first glance it might seem that the 1,500 warheads produced by mounting three on each of the 500 SS-9's would be sufficient to destroy our 1,000 Minutemen, but this Simple Simon arithmetic will not hold up when the problem is put to careful analysis, for accuracy becomes a critical matter.

The total destructive power of the SS-9 is reduced with multiple warheads because of the extra weight of packaging. While it can carry a single 25-megaton weapon, if three warheads are used they must be limited to four megatons each. The Minuteman silo can withstand a four-megaton blast five-eighths of a mile away. Once more, 20 per cent of the SS-9's would never get off the ground. And—again according to the American experience—20 per cent of the warheads launched would be lost through MIRV malfunctions. That means that only 960 of the original 1,500 warheads would pose a threat to the United States. But it's much more difficult to hit a target with a radius of five-eighths of a mile than one with a 1.1-mile radius; only 25 to 50 per cent of the 960-240 to 480 warheads—would make it. This would leave about 500 to 750 operable Minutemen. Allowing for predictable losses on blast-off, 400 to 600 Minutemen would hit their Soviet targets on the American second strike, killing a third of the population and destroying three-fourths of the productive capacity.

Secretary Laird, in a further attempt to buttress his case for the Safeguard, said on April 25 that the Soviet Union could have a two-to-one edge over the United States in long-range missiles by 1975. He failed to note, however, the fundamental differences between the first strike, in which the targets are hardened missile silos, and the second strike, which is aimed at cities and production centers. Laird's statement also ignored the potential capability of the U.S. strategic strike force to mount 10,000 warheads by the mid-seventies.

Senator GORE's examination of the need to defend Minuteman sites opened up the whole concept of "nuclear sufficiency," which Nixon had highlighted in his first news conference. Senators who previously took it for granted that the Armed Services Committee knew what it was doing began to ask questions that struck at the heart of nuclear deterrence.

Senator Stuart Symington of Missouri, a former Secretary of the Air Force, raised the issue of U.S. policy in the event that radar revealed a massive first strike aimed at Minuteman bases. Would the Minutemen be fired before Soviet warheads began digging into the U.S. soil? If so, Soviet missiles would be hitting empty holes. (As Senator Fulbright pointed out, empty holes may be our most powerful deterrent weapon.) Pentagon spokesmen were confused in their replies to the launch-on-warning issue and, again, more questions were raised than answered.

Though the Armed Services Committee was, until recently, reluctant to hear experts who differed with the Pentagon, Senator Gore's group called paired witnesses to argue for and against the ABM proposal. Some scientists who opposed the latest system could not be faulted on grounds of competence or familiarity with the technology. Some, like Dr. Herbert York, had held high defense posts and could argue technical points on a thoroughly informed basis. Since the hearings got live, nationwide television coverage, they raised public doubts about the necessity for and the adequacy of the Safeguard system.

The Pentagon's case for Safeguard appeared to suffer from hasty preparation. But even the best-prepared case would have run into trouble for the simple reason that the American people were weary by the war in Vietnam, dismayed and disturbed by the

North Korean capture of the intelligence ship Pueblo and resentful of the continued diversion of dollars from the domestic front to defense. President Eisenhower's warning as he left office that the "military-industrial complex" was growing too powerful assumed new meaning. Senator William Proxmire, for example, turned up a new study of the role of retired officers in the defense industry. The Wisconsin Democrat disclosed that the top six defense contractors for the ABM system (McDonnell Douglas, General Electric, Hughes Aircraft, Martin Marietta, Raytheon and Sperry Rand) employed 400 retired officers at or above the rank of Army colonel and Navy captain. Senator Proxmire made no attempt to disguise his concern about this influence. "The problem of defense spending is out of control," he said in a Senate speech. "The system is top-heavy. The 'military-industrial complex' now writes its own ticket."

It seemed that each day's news disclosed another instance in which costs outran estimates for weapons systems. The mammoth C-5A supercargo carrier, built by Lockheed in Senator Russell's home state, Georgia, was initially priced at \$15-million; by this spring the cost had nearly tripled. To cost was added technological complexity, illustrated by the F-111, built by General Dynamics in Texas. The military establishment was shaken by a growing lack of public confidence, and the displeasure was bound to be greatest over the most complex and potentially the most costly of all weapons systems—ABM.

When the U.S. deploys an ABM defense, the Russians must assume—as the U.S. did after the Galosh deployment—that it will be effective. Further, they must assume that the defenses will be thickened around the largest U.S. cities. This is simply another way of saying that the Soviet Union must assume that the Safeguard system will expand into a full-blown Nike-X system. Such an expansion would jeopardize the deterrent capacity of the Soviet second-strike force and compel an increase in Soviet missile deployment just as Galosh brought a response from Washington. Thus the arms race gathers momentum.

President Nixon has recognized the danger of this situation and he has ordered that the Safeguard program be divided into phases that will be preceded by periodic reviews. Many thoughtful analysts doubt, however, that an ABM system, once begun, can easily be stopped. They point out that Phase I of Safeguard, a \$2-billion program to protect a third of the Minuteman force to a limited degree, can easily triple in cost if full protection is sought. It can triple again—to \$18-billion—if the protection is to be extended to all Minutemen. They believe that in substance the \$2-billion first phase is really a pilot operation to see if the system will work. If it does, they contend, it will be expanded to all ICBM sites and ultimately to protect major U.S. cities as well. Inexorably, these analysts say, once this "technological Maginot Line" is started, it will expand until it stretches from border to border, defining the ramparts of Fortress America.

In this 24th year of the Atomic Age, the United States faces a truly momentous decision—whether to seek, through a system of international control, a way out of the nuclear dilemma or to continue toward what President Eisenhower called "the hopeless finality of a belief that two atomic colossi are doomed . . . to eye each other indefinitely across a trembling world."

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE RALPH W. YARBOROUGH ON "THE HEALTH CRISIS IN AMERICA TODAY"

MR. KENNEDY. Mr. President, last Thursday Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH delivered a highly significant

speech entitled "The Health Crisis in America Today." Speaking at ceremonies for the 20th anniversary of the Albert Lasker Medical Journal Awards, Senator YARBOROUGH discussed why the field of health care and services presents perhaps our biggest domestic problem at the present time.

He noted, for example, that 15 other countries have lower infant mortality rates than ours. Twenty countries have higher life expectancy rates for males than we do, and 11 countries have higher rates for females. While the health industry is one of our biggest—with over \$53 billion spent by the American public last year on medical care and treatment—the Nation has not yet dedicated itself to sound health care as a national goal.

Senator YARBOROUGH recognized the urgent need to move ahead to meet our seniors' health needs. Among priorities he stressed were: A significant increase in our Federal support of medical research; programs to meet overwhelming shortages of health manpower; and vast improvement in delivering health care to those who need it the most. He discussed many of the other shortcomings and needs and challenges in the field of health care, and he pointed the way to action by Congress.

Mr. President, Senator YARBOROUGH has served for 11 years on the Subcommittee on Health. He is presently the chairman not only of that subcommittee, but of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. He has devoted much of his work in the Senate to critical issues concerning health. In his recent speech, he reaffirmed an ambitious, foresighted, and absolutely necessary program for meeting the needs of the present and of the future.

I think that his speech will be of great interest and value to my colleagues here in the Senate and to anyone interested in health care. I ask unanimous consent that Senator YARBOROUGH's speech, "The Health Crisis in America Today," appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE HEALTH CRISIS IN AMERICA

(Speech by Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, chairman, Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, 20th anniversary Albert Lasker Medical Journal Awards Luncheon, Thursday, May 8, 1969, St. Regis Hotel, New York City)

Mrs. Lasker, Dr. Rusk, Distinguished Guests: Since it is my understanding that the communications industry is heavily represented in this audience, you will appreciate an experience I had on a television station just a few weeks ago.

I had a very sharp interviewer who asked me why, with my life-long interest in education represented in the sponsorship and passage of a number of major bills in the Congress in the last eleven years, I chose the chairmanship of the Health Subcommittee when the Education Subcommittee was open to me. I didn't regard the query as unfriendly—but I think I know the kind of question he would have put to me if we were not on the air. It would have gone something like this:

"Senator, are you out of your mind? Over a period of 12 years in the Senate you have been identified as a major spokesman for education, and you have also headed a Sen-

ate Subcommittee on Labor. What makes you think you can do anything about health? Besides, Senator Lister Hill headed the Health Subcommittee for 14 years; anyone who follows the act of that great statesman for health faces an impossible challenge."

I replied that over the past decade the Congress has done a remarkable job in helping to improve the educational system in our country. Not everything has been solved, but I do believe that we lead the world in providing educational opportunities for our children. In my opinion we have the best educational system in the world, with 7.6 million students in college—3.8 per cent of our total population.

I also told the reporter that I was not exactly a babe in the woods in the field of health legislation. For the past eleven years I had served on the Health Subcommittee under Lister Hill, most of the time as ranking Majority member; I pointed out that daily contact was bound to rub off and told him that I took the Health Subcommittee because America lagged behind many modern nations in health.

And the major reason I appear here in New York before you today as chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee, is that I want to tackle what I believe to be the biggest domestic problem in this country today.

We are the richest nation in the world—we supposedly have the highest level of medical competence—yet we trail most major nations in a number of key indices of health. For example, we are sixteenth among the countries of the world in infant mortality rates. In other words, 15 other countries, including France, England, West Germany, Japan, the Scandinavian countries and so on, have lower infant mortality rates than ours, compared with only seven countries with lower rates 15 years ago. In terms of life expectancy, 20 countries have higher life expectancy rates for males than we do, and 11 countries have higher rates for females.

Infant mortality and life expectancy rates don't tell the whole story. For instance, the American male is a bad insurance risk. The 1966 Demographic Yearbook of the United Nations points out that more American males will die between the ages of 40 and 50 than in all 17 countries listed, except for the Soviet Union. In this age category, we have the highest incidence of death from heart disease of every major country reporting to the United Nations.

And yet we are told—and we know—that the medical care and treatment, or health industry, has become big business in this country. Last year the American people, through public taxation and private payments, spent 53 billion dollars to fuel this industry out of a GNP of 900 billion dollars. The American health service industry, one of the fastest growing in the nation, employs more than 3,500,000 persons, exclusive of another million engaged in the manufacture and distribution of drugs. The health industry is currently exceeded in employment only by agriculture and construction. A recent projection by the United States Public Health Service indicates that, in the early 1970's, health services will be the nation's largest consumer of manpower. In America we have a concept of a health industry, not health care. The nation has not yet accepted a concept of health care for our people; the question of illness is treated as a business for profit.

As chairman of the Senate Health Subcommittee, I intend to dig deeply into all of the ramifications implicit in the foregoing statistics, and to conduct full-scale hearings this year and next year to find out how we can make good health a major national goal of this democracy.

I am not speaking in generalities. For example, why can't we set, as a short range goal, an average life-span of 75 years. In 1900, the life expectancy of the average American was 49 years; the remarkable in-

crease in longevity over the past half century has been primarily due to the medical research conquest of the infectious diseases and the rapid application of these findings to large masses of our people—vaccinations against Polio, Measles, Smallpox, Diphtheria, etc.; drugs against Tuberculosis; antibiotics against Pneumonia and other respiratory infections.

We must develop the same sense of urgency with regard to the chronic long-term killers and cripples.

We cannot achieve even this limited objective without a significant increase in our support of medical research. Over the past three years, Federal budgets for medical research have shown little or no dollar increases, and the revised budget for the National Institutes of Health submitted by the new Administration on April 15th is the worst I have seen in my 12 years in the Senate. It cuts NIH appropriations approximately fifty million dollars under the hold-the-line budget submitted by President Johnson in January of this year. In recent years, sitting alongside of Lister Hill, I have listened to some of the most distinguished medical authorities in the country testify that a standstill research budget means a cut of ten to fifteen percent in research activity because of the rising cost of equipment and personnel. Each year since 1966, the number of new research projects supported by the National Institutes of Health has declined appreciably; with the new slashes projected by the Nixon Administration, our great universities and our medical schools will be forced to curtail budgets and release significant numbers of faculty members, at a time of catastrophic shortages in medical personnel in the nation.

How do we justify this? Do we have the answers to heart disease, which kills one million Americans every year? The Administration must think we do, because it has cut the budget for the National Heart Institute six million dollars under last year's inadequate figure. Can we make any progress when the proposed budget for the National Heart Institute for fiscal year 1970 is four million dollars under the amount appropriated for that Institute three years ago? Dr. Michael DeBakey, that magnificent surgeon who honors Texas and the entire nation by his tremendous dedication, has visited with me several times this year; he has informed me that his colleagues in the field of cardiology all around the country are demoralized by these recent budget cuts.

Do we have the answer to cancer, which kills one American man, woman or child every two minutes? We know we don't, and yet the budget proposed for the National Cancer Institute for the coming year is approximately five million dollars less than the amount appropriated for the Institute last year. My good friend, Dr. R. Lee Clark, Medical Director of the M. D. Anderson Hospital in Houston, has stated publicly that most major forms of cancer could be conquered by the year 1976—the 200th anniversary of the founding of this great Republic—if we would but make it a national goal. Dr. Clark recently told a finance committee of the Texas Legislature:

"Doctors are close to a cure for cancer—as close as scientists were to development of atomic energy in 1939."

Less than a decade ago, we set a national goal of getting a man on the moon. We appropriated billions of dollars and we had magnificent administrators such as Jim Webb, the long-time head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, determined to achieve this goal. Many people on this planet of ours will cheer when the first man lands on the moon, but how many millions would cheer and how much more it would mean to mankind if America discovered a cure for cancer, which has cursed the family of man since the beginning of

time and takes two million lives in all parts of the world each year.

Our Committee also intends to look deeply into the critical shortages in the field of health manpower.

The shortage of doctors in this country is a national scandal. In this country today, there is a joke that it is easier to rob a bank than to find a doctor—and some even try to rob a bank to pay the doctor if they find him. Each year, this great and affluent nation imports 2,000 doctors from foreign countries to make up for the demanding deficiencies in our health education system. Today, over 20 percent of the interns, and over 30 percent of the residents, in our hospitals and medical schools are products of foreign medical schools. In some of the mental hospitals in this country, 75 percent of the medical staff is made up of foreign doctors.

What is the reason for this? Is it because our young men and women don't want to become doctors? In my own State of Texas, a very tough medical examining board last year found 1,300 young men and women eminently qualified to enter medical school. However 900 of these were turned away because of the limited capacity of the four medical schools in Texas, and only 400 were admitted.

Where will some of these rejected students go? Well, the University of Guadalajara, south of the border in Mexico, admitted 1,500 medical students in its first year class last September, including 600 American students. It is obvious that they won't get the same quality of training which could be obtained here, but most of them will graduate, they will come back to the United States, and we will welcome them eagerly because we cannot staff our 7,000 hospitals with American trained doctors.

Yet we fumble along because we do not have a national goal. It may seem incredible, but we have never stated how many doctors we really need. By way of contrast, the Soviet Union has 600,000 doctors—twice the number we have—and its new goal is 700,000 doctors by 1975. The Soviet Union exports 2,000 doctors to the under-developed countries of the world each year, while we import 2,000 for under-developed America each year.

Without prejudging the case, it is obvious to me, after listening to testimony before the Health Subcommittee over the past five years on the scarcity of doctors, that we need at least 200 medical schools in this country, whereas we are now staggering slowly toward a limited goal of 100 medical schools. Time does not permit a listing of comparable shortages of nurses, dentists, laboratory technicians and allied health personnel.

Finally, in our scheduled Senate hearings we intend to give major attention to our failure to deliver health care to those who need it most. This country needs to adopt health care as a national goal. Our present system is merely one of medical treatment.

Despite three decades of effort by our commercial insurance companies and Blue Cross-Blue Shield, thirty million Americans still have no health insurance at all. In their publicity, the insurance spokesmen make much of the fact that four-fifths of the population has health insurance of one description or another, but they do not point out that two-thirds of the costs of personal health care in America are still uninsured.

"What we have, in fact, is a disorganized, disjointed, antiquated, obsolete, non-system of health care," Walter Reuther told the American Public Health Association just a few months ago.

Last year the Blue Cross Association, concerned with mounting public criticism of the inadequacies of health insurance commissioned the pollster Lou Harris to do an in-depth sampling of the American people to either validate or refute these criticisms.

The Harris survey was the most complete of its kind ever conducted in this country, including home interviews with more than one thousand people in all parts of the land.

The results of the Harris survey, as published last December by the Blue Cross Association, can only be described as shocking. Most of the respondents to the inquiry, whether poor or affluent, felt themselves isolated from good medical care. A majority reported they would not know where to turn in the event of a serious illness in the family. From all of the accumulated evidence, the Harris survey concluded:

"Now in the affluent 60's . . . it can truthfully be said that over one-third of this nation feels ill-cared for in its medical needs."

In the public sampling, more than half of the American people gave health a higher priority than having a good job and, among poverty groups, 72 percent of poor whites and 59 percent of poor blacks rated good health over a job or money.

Large segments of our population exhibit the deepest anxieties and frustrations when asked about the accessibility of good health care. Two-thirds of the general public feel that you can't get a doctor in an emergency; 40 percent of the general public, and two-thirds of the poor, worry that they will be unable to pay a doctor if they can locate one, and more than half of the general public and two-thirds of the poor told interviewers that they were terrified of a serious illness which would disable the breadwinner and wipe out all family savings.

The section on health care of the poor should be read, and re-read, by every member of this audience.

"The health of the poor in the United States is a national disaster," says Dr. Jack Geiger, Professor of Preventive Medicine at Tufts University School of Medicine. Dr. Geiger runs an OEO Health Center in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, where the local pharmacy dispenses food as prescription medicine at Dr. Geiger's insistence.

According to a recent report of the National Center for Health Statistics, which sampled the incidence of illness among 45 million Americans at or below the poverty line, these people had four times as many heart conditions as those in the highest income groups; six times as much mental and nervous trouble; six times as many cases of high blood pressure, and so on.

Along with my colleagues in the Senate, I fought the long battle for Medicare, and I regard the 1965 law as the first Congressional step in bringing medical care within the reach of all of our people. However, because of deductible, co-insurance, limitation of benefits, and non-coverage of drugs outside the hospital, even Medicare pays only 40 percent of the total medical bills of the average elderly person.

I won't spend much time on Medicaid. Theoretically, it is supposed to cover the medically indigent of all ages who are not necessarily on welfare, but whose low incomes make it impossible for them to afford the soaring costs of medical care. In actual practice, it has been converted into another aspect of welfare medicine. As a matter of fact, in most states today it is only covering people on welfare and, in quite a few areas, is doing it less adequately than the former categorical medical assistance programs. Furthermore, as a result of a 1967 Congressional limitation, which I strongly opposed, medical indigence is now defined as 33 percent above a state's average welfare payment.

All of these facts were available to the new Administration, but instead of beefing up this ailing invalid it has chosen to propose a fantastic cut of more than 500 million dollars in the Federal matching contribution to the Medicaid program. I am informed by the administrators of the program that this meat axe slash will fall hardest upon those who have no lobby and cannot speak

for themselves—the mentally ill in our 300 state mental hospitals.

I don't have to tell you here in New York what a disaster Medicaid is. As a result of the 1967 Congressional limitation, more than one million people were removed from the Medicaid rolls, and I understand that further cuts exacted by the current New York Legislature will force additional hundreds of thousands off the Medicaid rolls in this one state alone.

Let me give you one statistic that brings the point home—of 45 million people at or below the poverty line, only about 7½ million received Medicaid assistance in 1968.

Granting that health is important to all of our elderly citizens, is it not even more urgent to bring the boon of decent health care to millions of young mothers and children excluded from the present system?

If we can afford a war in Vietnam that is costing us 36 billion dollars a year, then we can surely afford some sort of national health insurance for all of our people. Good health is not a luxury—it is as basic as food, clothing and shelter, and it should be guaranteed to every American through a national program of health insurance.

In a recent interview, after discussing some of these views, a highly respected Congressional correspondent asked me why we hadn't been able to glamorize health care in the way, for example, the space program had been dramatized and sold to the American people. Why weren't more Congressmen interested in the health of the American people, he asked.

I answered him quite frankly. There are no big, fat hundred million dollars involved in contract after contract for health programs—like the Defense Department hands out; nothing like the contracts in the hundreds of millions for space launchers or missiles. This program is only about people; we have got to stir people up to demand it.

This is where you people in the communications field come in. We in the Congress need some real crusading journalism to help us to arouse public opinion on this issue.

There is a tremendous amount of sympathetic material in this yearning of the American people for good health for themselves and for their loved ones. There are case histories in the Lou Harris survey which wrench your heart, yet this report has received very little publicity. For example, Willie Jefferson, a Negro sharecropper in Columbia, Mississippi, interviewed about the state of health as he sees it, shook his head sadly and concluded:

"People just didn't used to be sick as much as they are today. They died when they got sick, and didn't live sick." From the Director of the Santa Clara California Migrant Clinic:

"More money is spent conserving migratory birds than on the health of migratory workers."

I intend, as long as I am a member of the Senate and as long as I remain on this good earth, to fight for the day when good health care for all Americans will be a major national goal. I cannot do it alone, nor can the Congress do it alone. We will not succeed until the American people support us, demand that we allocate money to health as we are now allocating it to space and to the arms race. You in this audience who are skilled in the art of communication can be the bridge for that kind of understanding.

I beseech your help.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

DRAFT REFORMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 91-116)

The PRESIDENT OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

For almost two million young men who reach the age of military service each year—and for their families—the draft is one of the most important facts of life. It is my conviction that the disruptive impact of the military draft on individual lives should be minimized as much as possible, consistent with the national security. For this reason I am today asking the Congress for authority to implement important draft reforms.

Ideally, of course, minimum interference means no draft at all. I continue to believe that under more stable world conditions and with an armed force that is more attractive to volunteers, that ideal can be realized in practice. To this end, I appointed, on March 27, 1969, an Advisory Commission on an All-Volunteer Armed Force. I asked that group to develop a comprehensive plan which will attract more volunteers to military service, utilize military manpower in a more efficient way, and eliminate conscription as soon as that is feasible. I look forward to receiving the report of the Commission this coming November.

Under present conditions, however, some kind of draft will be needed for the immediate future. As long as that is the case, we must do everything we can to limit the disruption caused by the system and to make it as fair as possible. For one's vision of the eventual does not excuse his inattention to the immediate. A man may plan to sell his house in another year, but during that year he will do what is necessary to make it livable.

Accordingly, I will ask the Congress to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, returning to the President the power which he had prior to June 30, 1967, to modify call-up procedures. I will describe below in some detail the new procedures which I will establish if Congress grants this authority. Essentially, I would make the following alterations:

1. Change from an oldest-first to a youngest-first order of call, so that a young man would become less vulnerable rather than more vulnerable to the draft as he grows older.

2. Reduce the period of prime draft vulnerability—and the uncertainty that accompanies it—from seven years to one year, so that a young man would normally enter that status during the time he was nineteen years old and leave it during the time he was twenty.

3. Select those who are actually drafted through a random system. A procedure of this sort would distribute the risk of call equally—by lot—among all who are vulnerable during a given year, rather than arbitrarily selecting those whose birthdays happen to fall at certain times of the year or the month.

4. Continue the undergraduate student deferment, with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability

would come whenever the deferment expired.

5. Allow graduate students to complete, not just one term, but the full academic year during which they are first ordered for induction.

6. In addition, as a step toward a more consistent policy of deferments and exemptions, I will ask the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to review all guidelines, standards and procedures in this area and to report to me their findings and recommendations.

I believe these reforms are essential. I hope they can be implemented quickly.

Any system which selects only some from a pool of many will inevitably have some elements of inequity. As its name implies, choice is the very purpose of the Selective Service System. Such choices cannot be avoided so long as the supply of men exceeds military requirements. In these circumstances, however, the Government bears a moral obligation to spread the risk of induction equally among those who are eligible.

Moreover, a young man now begins his time of maximum vulnerability to the draft at age nineteen and leaves that status only when he is drafted or when he reaches his twenty-sixth birthday. Those who are *not* called up are nevertheless vulnerable to call for a seven-year period. For those who *are* called, the average age of induction can vary greatly. A few years ago, when calls were low, the average age of involuntary induction was nearly twenty-four. More recently it has dropped to just about twenty. What all of this means for the average young man is a prolonged time of great uncertainty.

The present draft arrangements make it extremely difficult for most young people to plan intelligently as they make some of the most important decisions of their lives, decisions concerning education, career, marriage, and family. Present policies extend a period during which young people come to look on government processes as particularly arbitrary.

For all of these reasons, the American people are unhappy about our present draft mechanisms. Various elements of the basic reforms which I here suggest have been endorsed by recent studies of the Selective Service System, including that of the Marshall Commission of 1967, the Clark panel of that same year, and the reports of both the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees. Reform of this sort is also sound from a military standpoint, since younger men are easier to train and have fewer family responsibilities.

My specific proposals, in greater detail, are as follows:

1. A "*youngest-first*" order of call. Under my proposal, the Government would designate each year a "prime age group," a different pool of draft eligibles for each consecutive twelve-month period. (Since that period would not necessarily begin on January 1, it would be referred to as a "selective service year.") The prime age group for any given selective service year would contain those registrants who were nineteen years old when

it began. Those who received deferments or exemptions would rejoin the prime age group at the time their deferment or exemption expired. During the first year that the new plan was in operation, the prime age group would include *all* eligible men from nineteen to twenty-six, not deferred or exempt, so that no one would escape vulnerability simply because of the transition.

2. *Limited vulnerability.* Each individual would experience maximum vulnerability to the draft only for the one selective service year in which he is in the prime age group. At the end of the twelve-month period—which would normally come sometime during his twentieth year—he would move on to progressively less vulnerable categories and an entirely new set of registrants would become the new prime age group. Under this system, a young man would receive an earlier and more decisive answer to his question, "Where do I stand with the draft?" and he could plan his life accordingly.

3. A *random selection system.* Since more men are classified as available for service each year than are required to fill current or anticipated draft calls, Selective Service Boards must have some way of knowing whom to call first, whom to call second, and whom not to call at all. There must be some fair method of determining the sequence of induction for those available for service in the prime age group.

In my judgment, a fair system is one which randomizes by lot the order of selection. Each person in the prime age group should have the same chance of appearing at the top of the draft list, at the bottom, or somewhere in the middle. I would therefore establish the following procedure:

At the beginning of the third month after Congress grants this authority, the first of a sequence of selective service years would begin. Prior to the start of each selective service year, the dates of the 365 days to follow would be placed in a sequence determined by a random method. Those who spend the following year in the pool would take their place in the draft sequence in the same order that their birthdays come up on this scrambled calendar. Those born on June 21st, for example, might be at the head of the list, followed by those born on January 12th, who in turn might be followed by those born on October 23rd. Each year, a new random order would be established for the next year's draft pool. In turn those who share the same birthday would be further distributed, this time by the first letter of their last names. But rather than systematically discriminating against those who come at the front of the alphabet, the alphabet would also be scrambled in a random manner.

Once a person's place in the sequence was determined, that assignment would never change. If he were granted a deferment or exemption at age nineteen or twenty, he would re-enter the prime age group at the time his deferment or exemption expires, taking the same place in the sequence that he was originally assigned.

While the random sequence of induction would be nationally established, it would be locally applied by each draft board to meet its local quota. In addition to distributing widely and evenly the risk of induction, the system would also aid many young men in assessing the likelihood of induction even before the classification procedure is completed. This would reduce uncertainty for the individual registrant and, particularly in times of low draft calls, simplify the task of the draft boards.

4. *Undergraduate student deferments.* I continue to believe in the wisdom of college deferments. Permitting the diligent student to complete his college education without interruption by the draft is a wise national investment. Under my proposal, a college student who chooses to take a student deferment would still receive his draft sequence number at the time he first enters the prime age group. But he would not be subject to induction until his deferment ended and he reentered a period of maximum vulnerability.

5. *Graduate Student Induction.* I believe that the induction of men engaged in graduate study should be postponed until the end of the full academic year during which they are first called to military service. I will ask the National Security Council to consider appropriate advice to the Director of the Selective Service to establish this policy. At present, graduate students are allowed to delay induction only to the end of a semester. This often means that they lose valuable time which has been invested in preparation for general examinations or other degree requirements. It can also jeopardize some of the financial arrangements which they made when they planned on a full year of schooling. Induction at the end of a full academic year will provide a less damaging interruption and will still be consistent with Congressional policy.

At the same time, however, the present policy against general graduate deferments should be continued, with exceptions only for students in medical and allied fields who are subject to a later special draft. We must prevent the pyramiding of student deferments—undergraduate and graduate—into a total exemption from military service. For this reason the postponement of induction should be possible only once for each graduate student.

6. *A review of guidelines.* The above measures will reduce the uncertainty of young men as to when and if they may be called for service. It is also important that we encourage a consistent administration of draft procedures by the more than 4,000 local boards around the country. I am therefore requesting the National Security Council and the Director of Selective Service to conduct a thorough review of our guidelines, standards and procedures for deferments and exemptions, and to report their findings to me by December 1, 1969. While the autonomy of local boards provides valuable flexibility and sensitivity, reasonable guidelines can help to limit geographic inequities and enhance the equity of the entire System. The 25,000 concerned citizens who serve their coun-

try so well on these local boards deserve the best possible framework for their decisions.

Ultimately we should end the draft. Except for brief periods during the Civil War and World War I, conscription was foreign to the American experience until the 1940's. Only in 1948 did a peacetime draft become a relatively permanent fact of life for this country. Now a full generation of Americans has grown up under a system of compulsory military service.

I am hopeful that we can soon restore the principle of no draft in peacetime. But until we do, let us be sure that the operation of the Selective Service System is as equitable and as reasonable as we can make it. By drafting the youngest first, by limiting the period of vulnerability, by randomizing the selection process, and by reviewing deferment policies, we can do much to achieve these important interim goals. We should do no less for the youth of our country.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 13, 1969.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The PRESIDING OFFICER 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.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report listing certain information on contracts negotiated for the period July 1, 1968, through December 31, 1968 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

A letter from the Director of Selective Service, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 in order to provide for a more equitable system of selecting persons for induction into the Armed Forces under such act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting copies of the following Commission publications: "Gas Supplies of Interstate Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1967"; and "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1967" (with accompanying publications); to the Committee on Commerce.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO ESTABLISH A COMMISSION ON GOVERNMENT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PROPOSED DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE ACT

A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

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

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A memorial of the House of Representatives, State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 21

"A memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to amend the Agricultural Marketing Act to make funds more readily available to New Mexico farmers to organize agricultural marketing associations

"Whereas, since 1959 economic growth and activity in New Mexico has lagged behind the growth in the national economy; the rate of unemployment in New Mexico has been above the national average; total income received by residents of New Mexico has increased less than the national average; and

"Whereas, in 1967 New Mexico ranked forty-first in per capita income in the United States with a per capita income of only two thousand four hundred sixty-two dollars (\$2,462); and

"Whereas, New Mexico's economy is based to a large extent on agriculture; and

"Whereas, it is essential to the economic survival of the individual farmer that he be able to effectively market his products; and

"Whereas, agricultural marketing cooperatives are a means by which the individual farmer can effectively market his products; agricultural marketing cooperatives place the agricultural industry and the individual farmer on a basis of economic equality with other industries; agricultural marketing cooperatives minimize speculation and reduce the use of ineffective and wasteful methods of product distribution; agricultural marketing cooperatives maintain stable, advantageous domestic markets and prevent undue and excessive depressions in agricultural prices by controlling the production and distribution of agricultural products; and

"Whereas, New Mexico farmers, particularly orchard farmers, lose millions of dollars each year because they do not have an effective means to market their products; and

"Whereas, the organization of agricultural marketing cooperatives in New Mexico will stabilize and increase farm incomes and stimulate New Mexico's economy; and

"Whereas, farmers in New Mexico do not have sufficient economic resources to finance the organization of agricultural marketing cooperatives and must rely on the federal government for financial assistance; and

"Whereas, the farm credit administration cannot, under the Agricultural Marketing Act, loan agricultural marketing cooperatives amounts in excess of sixty percent of the appraised value of the security for the loan; and

"Whereas, New Mexico farmers who would benefit most by organizing agricultural marketing cooperatives cannot finance forty percent of the construction or acquisition of facilities as required by federal law;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico that the Congress of the United States is requested to study and make necessary changes in the Agricultural Marketing Act to assist and encourage New Mexico farmers to organize and finance agricultural marketing cooperatives; and

"Be it further resolved that the Congress of the United States is specifically requested to assist New Mexico farmers organize and finance agricultural marketing cooperatives by amending the Agricultural Marketing Act to remove the limitation on the amount the farm credit administration may loan for the construction or acquisition of facilities by agricultural marketing cooperatives and to limit the rate of interest on federal loans under the Agricultural Marketing Act to four percent a year; and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, to the United States Department of Agriculture, to the leadership of the Congress of the United States and to the members of the New Mexico delegation to the Congress of the United States.

"DAVID L. NORVELL,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION 14

"Memorializing Congress and the U.S. department of agriculture to rescind the ban on the use of lean pork in venison sausage

"Whereas, one of Wisconsin's most significant industries is based on its great deer herd which provides enjoyment and employment for thousands of persons; and

"Whereas, a substantial part of this industry is the production of some 4 million pounds of venison sausage each year; and

"Whereas, venison sausage sometimes involves the use of one-third lean pork, of which 600 tons is used for this purpose annually; and

"Whereas, the U.S. department of agriculture has approved regulations to become effective in 1969 which will allow only fat to be added to venison in venison sausage; and

"Whereas, this regulation will seriously affect the quality of venison sausage to the detriment of this fine Wisconsin industry; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the Wisconsin legislature urges the U.S. department of agriculture to rescind the regulation prohibiting lean pork in venison sausage; and, be it further

"Resolved, That the Wisconsin legislature urges Congress to enact legislation which will overturn the regulation of the U.S. department of agriculture which will prohibit the use of lean pork in venison sausage if the department fails to rescind it; and, be it further

"Resolved, That duly attested copies of this resolution be transmitted to the secretary of the U.S. department of agriculture, the secretary of the senate of the United States, the chief clerk of the house of representatives and the members of Wisconsin's congressional delegation.

"HAROLD V. FROELICH,

Speaker of the Assembly,

"WILMER H. STRUEBING,

Assembly Chief Clerk,

"WILLIAM P. NUGENT,

Senate Chief Clerk."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24

"A joint memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to increase the income tax exemptions for individuals and their dependents to one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each such individual and requesting the support of the New Mexico delegation to any legislation proposing such an increased exemption

"Whereas, the family is the center of our American way of life and its children are the country's greatest resource; and

"Whereas, the greatly increased cost of living has fallen most heavily on families with children or other dependents; and

"Whereas, it is to the benefit of the country to foster family life and provide minimum standards for sustenance and healthful living; and

"Whereas, the present six hundred dollar (\$600) exemption for dependents is not a realistic amount for the proper support of a dependent in relation to the greatly inflated prices of these times;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the congress of the United States be requested to increase the income tax exemption for taxpayers and their dependents from six hundred (\$600) to one thousand dollars (\$1,000) each; and

"Be it further resolved that the New Mexico congressional delegation be urged to support any proposed legislation designed to increase the personal exemption and the exemption for dependents to one thousand dollars (\$1,000); and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be transmitted to the president of the United States senate, to the speaker of the United States house of representatives and to each member of the New Mexico congressional delegation.

"DAVID L. NORVELL,

Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,

Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"E. LEE FRANCIS,

President, Senate.

"JUANITA PINO,

Chief Clerk, Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Iowa; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 13

"Senate concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States and making application to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to allow the people of each state greater freedom of choice in the apportionment of their state legislature and local governing bodies

"Whereas, the people of each state should have greater freedom of choice in the apportionment of their state legislature and local governing bodies; now therefore,

"Be it resolved by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring, of the sixty-third General Assembly of Iowa, That this legislature respectfully requests and makes application to the Congress of the United States to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States or, in the alternative, to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The people of a state may apportion one house of a bicameral legislature using population, geography, and political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as they deem appropriate or giving reasonable weight to the same factors in apportioning a unicameral legislature, if in either case such plan of apportionment has been submitted to a vote of the people in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution and has been approved by a majority of those voting on that issue. When a plan of apportionment based on factors of population, geography, and political subdivisions is submitted to a vote of the people under this section there shall also be submitted, at the same election, an alternative plan of apportionment based upon substantial equality of population in both houses of the bicameral legislature."

"SEC. 2. Any plan of apportionment which has been approved under this article shall be resubmitted to a vote of the people, or another plan may be submitted under the provisions of section one, at the November general election held two years following each year in which there is commenced any enumeration provided for in section two of Article 1, and upon approval by a majority of those voting thereon, such plan of apportionment shall continue in effect until changed in accordance with law and with the provisions of this Constitution.

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this Constitution shall prevent a state from apportioning membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units using population, geography, and political subdivisions as factors, giving each factor such weight as the state deems appropriate."

"Be it further resolved, That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to submit said amendment in such manner that it shall be valid as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years of its submission to the states by the Congress, provided that each such legislature shall be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section two of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

"Be it further resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution shall be valid as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several states within seven years of its submission to the states by the Congress, provided that each such legislature shall be apportioned on the basis of substantial equality of population in accordance with the most recent enumeration provided for in section two of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

"Be it further resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each member of the Congress from this state.

"ROGER W. JEPSEN,

President of the Senate.

"WILLIAM H. HARBOR,

Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"CARROLL A. LANE,

Secretary of the Senate."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 10

"A joint memorial relating to Federal funding of public welfare expenditures

"Whereas, the United States congress has enacted legislation over the years requiring mandatory financial participation by the states in welfare programs, and

"Whereas, these welfare programs have been expanded by congressional action and supreme court decision until the welfare programs in many states are becoming an intolerable financial burden for these states, and

"Whereas, it is extremely unlikely that the federal government will diminish, or rescind, the presently inaugurated programs, and

"Whereas, it is increasingly apparent that a state, such as New Mexico with its low per capita income, will soon reach a point where no money can be raised, and

"Whereas, the State of New Mexico does not endorse the present welfare system, but urges the federal government to implement programs with incentives;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico that the United States congress be requested to withdraw the requirement that the states

must participate with state funds in the various welfare programs, and

"Be it further resolved that the United States congress is requested to allow state control of welfare programs and to provide for one hundred percent federal funding of all welfare programs, and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be sent to the president pro tempore of the United States senate, to the speaker of the United States house of representatives and the New Mexico congressional delegation.

"DAVID L. NORVELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"E. LEE FRANCIS,
President, Senate.

"JUANITA PINO,
Chief Clerk, Senate."

A memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 24

"A memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to allow a State plan of education to consider Federal aid to school districts under Public Law 874 as a payment in lieu of local taxes for the support of education, and to consider such Federal aid as a local resource in ascertaining the ability of a local educational agency to provide a minimum education program.

"Whereas, federal payments to local school districts which educate the children of certain federal employees will be unable to be used in computing state support for local school districts under the provisions of Public Law 874; and

"Whereas, in New Mexico this requirement will force a further dilution of funds available to local school districts by forcing an equal financing of each district regardless of needs; and

"Whereas, distribution of state finances on an equal basis, without regard to actual need, will deprive many poorer districts of funds which will go to provide non-essential programs to the richer districts with Public Law 874 funds; and

"Whereas, the forced frivolous use of state funds for non-essential programs in certain school districts will deprive other districts of needed financing for minimal educational program;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico that the congress of the United States be respectfully memorialized to amend Public Law 874 so as to allow federal aid under Public Law 874 to be considered as payments in lieu of local taxes for educational support, and to allow such federal aid to be considered as a local resource in ascertaining the ability of a local educational agency to provide a minimum educational program; and

"Be it further resolved, that copies of this memorial be sent to the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the members of the New Mexico delegation to the congress of the United States.

"DAVID L. NORVELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL

"A joint memorial requesting the United States Congress to enact legislation regarding the 1970 Census

"Whereas, it is a basic concept of American democracy that the people have an inherent, inalienable right to lead their lives in privacy; and

"Whereas, the need of the federal govern-

ment to conduct a census of its people and to thereby gather information that is essential and necessary for all governmental units in the country is readily understood and accepted; and

"Whereas, this essential and necessary information consists solely of the following answers to a census questionnaire:

"A. name and address;

"B. relationship to the head of the household;

"C. sex;

"D. date of birth;

"E. race or color;

"F. marital status; and

"G. visitor in home at the time of census; and

"Whereas, further questions regarding a person's living habits and possessions are an unnecessary and unwarranted invasion of the privacy of that person;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the legislature of the State of New Mexico that the congress of the United States be requested to enact legislation to direct the bureau of the census to limit the 1970 census of the population to those questions described here as being essential and necessary; and

"Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be sent to the president pro tempore of the United States senate, the speaker of the United States house of representatives and to each member of the New Mexico congressional delegation.

"DAVID L. NORVELL,
Speaker, House of Representatives.

"ALBERT ROMERO,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"E. LEE FRANCIS,
President, Senate.

"JUANITA PINO,
Chief Clerk, Senate."

REPORT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL SYSTEM"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 91-170)

Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, pursuant to Senate Resolution 239, 90th Congress, second session, submitted a report entitled "The Federal Judicial System," which was ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Victor Cardosi, of New Hampshire, to be U.S. marshal for the district of New Hampshire.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 19 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps and ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

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

The nominations, ordered placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. Louis B. Robertshaw, U.S. Marine Corps, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Lt. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, for appointment to the grade of general while so serving;

Maj. Gen. Julian Johnson Ewell, U.S. Army, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Lt. Gen. Marshall Sylvester Carter, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Vice Adm. Ray C. Needham, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list;

Brig. Gen. Oscar Elliott Ursin, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, and sundry other Medical Corps officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Col. David Edward Thomas, Medical Corps, U.S. Army, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Lt. Gen. John Joseph Davis, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I also report favorably 918 appointments in the Army in the grade of colonel and below; 4,451 promotions in the Navy in the grade of captain and below; 144 appointments in the Marine Corps in grade of captain and below; and 1,096 appointments in the Air Force in grade of captain and below. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Joseph P. Madden, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer;

Anthony J. Gieber, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Kenneth W. Robey, and sundry other scholarship students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Felton Page, and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Jeffrey W. Oster, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Marine Corps;

Joseph Rohrich, Jr., for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of colonel, from the temporary disability retired list;

Orley B. Caudill, for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade of lieutenant colonel, from the temporary disability retired list;

James D. Stone, and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Darrell J. Ahrens, and sundry other Air Force officers, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Robert M. Barrett, Jr., and sundry other distinguished graduates of the Air Force Officer Training School, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

Albert A. Acrl, and sundry other staff non-commissioned officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps;

Earl A. Blevins, and sundry other Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps officers, for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Dennis A. McConaghy (Navy enlisted scientific education program), for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Robert Barber, Jr., and sundry other warrant officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps;

John L. Croston, and sundry other staff noncommissioned officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps;

James A. Neserschmidt, and Juan C. Noqueira (Platoon Leaders Class), for permanent appointment in the Marine Corps;

Lynn "W" Adams, and sundry other officers, for permanent promotion in the Navy;

James R. Abbott, and sundry other cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

John M. Andrews, and sundry other cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment in the Regular Air Force;

O. Glenn Goodhand, for reappointment in the active list of the Regular Army, from the temporary disability retired list, in the rank of colonel;

George S. Harrington, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer;

Roger M. Pezzelle, and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Richard B. Alexander, and sundry other scholarship students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Riley T. Griffin, and Jack H. Thrasher, cadets, graduating class of 1969, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Lloyd M. Abbott, Jr., and sundry other distinguished military students, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States.

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. RIBICOFF:

S. 2145. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Mouett* in the coastwise trade; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 2146. A bill to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural poverty areas in order to stimulate the rate of economic growth and employment in those areas, and to provide the residents thereof with greater access to consumer, business, and mortgage credit at reasonable rates; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

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

By Mr. EAGLETON:

S. 2147. A bill to consider children living in federally assisted public housing as federally connected children for purposes of educational assistance to federally impacted areas; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. SPONG:

S. 2148. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 2149. A bill for the relief of Alexander Kalnoki Bedo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON (by request):

S. 2150. A bill to repeal section 372-1 of title 25, United States Code, relating to the appointment of hearing examiners for Indian probate work, to provide tenure and status for hearing examiners performing such work, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MONTOLA):

S. 2151. A bill to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to establish a southwestern human development program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 2152. A bill to amend the National School Lunch Act with regard to surplus dairy products and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

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

By Mr. FONG:

S. 2153. A bill for the relief of Benigno Domlao Jacinto;

S. 2154. A bill for the relief of Radegundis J. Aagsalud; and

S. 2155. A bill for the relief of Ching Cheung Kwong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HART:

S. 2156. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 2157. A bill to amend section 5(a) of the Clayton Act with respect to the evidentiary effect of judgments and decrees entered in proceedings instituted by the United States under the antitrust laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 2158. A bill to permit positions primarily concerned with the behavioral and social sciences to be classified at GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, without numerical limitation; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 2159. A bill for the relief of Cheung Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTOLA:

S. 2160. A bill to provide for highway construction in economic development regions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

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

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BELLMON):

S. 2161. A bill to aid the United States postal establishment in providing for the accumulation, analysis, and dissemination of reliable and meaningful financial, statistical, and accounting information in regard to all third class mail matter, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

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

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. HART, and Mr. INOUE):

S. 2162. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to provide for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting any hazardous substance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

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

By Mr. PROUTY:

S. 2163. A bill to establish, in the House of

Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 2164. A bill to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

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

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S.J. Res. 110. A joint resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2146—INTRODUCTION OF THE COMMUNITY CREDIT EXPANSION ACT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I am introducing a community credit expansion bill to get more private funds moving into our troubled inner cities and depressed rural communities. The bill seeks to increase the availability of consumer credit, mortgage credit, and business credit in urban and rural poverty areas. The bill also attempts to expand the opportunities for business ownership by the residents of these areas. This would be accomplished, first, by establishing a new kind of private financial institution to specialize in investments in poverty areas; second, by amending the various banking laws to remove restrictions on such investments by existing financial institutions; and, third, by providing Federal guarantees to encourage the flow of private credit into poverty areas.

The bill is long and complex, with 12 titles, and there may be objections to some of its many provisions by certain groups. While I believe the basic thrust of the legislation is sound, I am not necessarily wedded to each and every detail in the bill and I would be glad to consider reasonable modifications.

In that connection, I plan to send copies of the bill to various interested groups to obtain their comments and recommendations prior to formal committee hearings. Following this review, I would expect that we would incorporate as many recommended changes as possible in a revised bill for consideration by the Banking and Currency Committee. Thus, the bill being introduced is an interim proposal to serve as the basis for discussion by interested parties.

Private financial institutions are now supplying nearly \$70 billion in new capital each year and have total assets of more than \$900 billion. These resources far exceed the amount of Federal funds likely to be available for urban problems. The collective day-to-day decisions of private financial institutions determine which communities grow and which communities decline. If we can redirect and rechannel the flow of private credit into urban ghettos and depressed rural areas, we can have a substantial impact on the economic and social problems arising

from these areas and without adding to the Federal budget.

In order to develop a discussion of these ideas, last October my Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Banking and Currency Committee held 1 week of hearings on Financial Institutions and the Urban Crisis. We were interested in finding out what private financial institutions were doing and could do to channel more private investment into urban poverty areas. Some of the questions focused on by the hearings include the following:

First. What are financial institutions doing now to help alleviate the problems of our cities?

Second. What is the proper role of Government and private financial institutions in meeting urban problems? Are new types of governmental or quasi-governmental agencies needed, or can private institutions do the job?

Third. What are the existing constraints which impede the flow of credit into the ghetto?

Fourth. To what extent do existing regulations, examination procedures and laws restrict the flow of credit into ghetto areas? Can these restrictions be eliminated or modified?

Fifth. To what extent would broader investment powers of financial institutions result in additional flows of credit into the ghetto?

Sixth. Have Federal chartering policies made it difficult to establish Negro-owned financial institutions in ghetto areas?

Seventh. Have examination practices been overly critical of investments in ghetto areas?

Eighth. What kinds of governmental inducements would stimulate financial institutions to channel more capital into the ghetto?

Ninth. To what extent are governmental subsidies needed and to what extent are self-liquidating, guarantee type approaches adequate?

Tenth. What would be the effect of legislation requiring financial institutions to allocate a certain percentage of their resources to inner city areas or to investments which benefit residents of ghetto areas?

Eleventh. To what extent are new kinds of financial institutions called for to specialize in investments in the ghetto? Can such institutions be operated as subsidiaries of existing institutions?

THE CREDIT GAP

As a result of these hearings and other evidence, it has become clear that a credit gap exists in our poverty areas. This gap has three dimensions.

First. Consumer credit: A number of recent investigations have pinpointed the lack of consumer credit in the Nation's inner cities. Ghetto residents are frequently denied credit at the more reputable downtown stores and are forced into credit purchases from ghetto merchants, frequently at exorbitant prices.

A recent study of retail credit practices in the District of Columbia showed prices in the ghetto stores were 60 percent higher than the prices in middle class stores. The Kerner Commission listed exploitation by ghetto merchants

as one of the principal causes of riots and urban unrest.

While creditors hesitate to extend credit to ghetto residents because of the higher risk involved, it is also true that many residents of the ghetto are excellent credit risks. Rather than discriminate against an entire class of neighborhood, creditors need to be more selective and make credit available to those inner city residents who can pay it back.

Second. Mortgage credit: While the 1968 Housing Act made great strides in expanding our programs for low- and moderate-income housing, the success of the program depends upon the supply of mortgage credit. The recent reports of both the Douglas and Kaiser Commissions have cautioned that the unavailability of mortgage credit can block the achievement of our housing goals. To the extent we have periodic episodes of tight money such as we had in 1966, housing starts will be severely curtailed and low- and moderate-income housing will be curtailed the most. Just as Negroes are the first fired during a recession, low-income housing is the first to suffer during a credit shortage. We must develop new institutional arrangements to free our low- and moderate-income housing programs from the ups and downs of the mortgage market.

There has also been ample evidence that many investors "red line" entire neighborhoods in the inner city and refuse to make mortgage loans in those areas or to the residents thereof regardless of the credit worthiness of the individual borrower. This makes it extremely difficult for ghetto residents to obtain mortgage credit. One consequence has been the development of the notorious "speculator system" recently exposed by the Washington Post. Under this system, predatory speculators obtain homes at low prices and resell to ghetto residents at exorbitantly high prices.

Third. Business credit: A number of recent phrases—"black capitalism," "compensatory capitalism," "minority enterprise," and "a piece of the action"—all serve to dramatize the need for business ownership in poverty areas. The former Administrator of the Small Business Administration, Howard Samuels, has launched a new program called "Project Own" to stimulate minority business ownership. According to his figures, less than 3 percent of the Nation's 5 million business establishments are under nonwhite ownership.

But new businesses require credit and the supply of private credit for minority enterprise has not always been forthcoming. A number of commercial banks have recognized their responsibilities in this field and have started special loan programs for ghetto businesses. However, the uncertainties have been great, and because of institutional rigidities, progress has been slow and difficult.

Another difficulty in stimulating business ownership in poverty areas is the lack of equity capital. Commercial banks, which have been the traditional source of credit for small businesses, are forbidden by law to engage in equity financing. This makes it exceedingly diffi-

cult for new business establishments to get started in the ghetto.

THE ROLE OF CREDIT

In surveying the financial problems of urban and rural poverty areas, one must be careful to avoid a tendency to overgeneralize or oversimplify. It is possible to err in two directions:

On the one hand, we should not be misled into thinking that private financial institutions can solve all our difficulties. The unavailability of credit is merely one aspect of an extremely complicated problem. Our urban problems will not magically disappear by increasing the supply of credit. Nor can we force feed credit into the ghetto if there is a lack of genuine investment opportunities or management potential.

On the other hand, neither should we become victims of an extreme dispersal theory which holds that all investment in the ghetto is economically unviable and that the ghetto should be disbursed into suburbia. According to this view, any attempt to channel funds into inner-city areas is labelled as "gilding the ghetto" which will inevitably lead to economic failure.

There is no doubt that in the long run we must work toward the dissolution of the ghetto on moral as well as economic grounds. But in the short run we must deal with the problems at hand and in this context some increase in private investment is warranted.

To the extent that lack of credit in poverty areas is due to the lack of investment opportunities, Federal guarantees and other devices will not be particularly successful without massive subsidies. But to the extent the lack of credit is due to a misperception of risk or uncertainty by the financial community, Federal guarantees can be effective in stimulating additional private investment.

There is ample evidence that many investors "red line" entire neighborhoods and refuse credit to residents of those neighborhoods regardless of the credit worthiness of the individual borrower. In time, the practice of red lining becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. The flight of capital induces neighborhood decline, which in turn increases investment risk which results in the flight of still more capital.

We need to break this vicious cycle and rechannel credit and investment back into the inner city and our depressed rural communities. While no single investor can afford to undertake the risk, a program of Federal guarantees can encourage a greater flow of private investment. To the extent the added investment begins to rebuild the community by providing jobs and decent housing, and by making it a better place in which to live, the risk which deterred the original investor will gradually be reduced.

With this background in mind and as a result of the evidence and suggestions presented during the hearings of my subcommittee, I have drafted a bill called the Community Credit Expansion Act to encourage the greater availability of credit in urban and rural poverty areas. I would like to outline briefly for

the Senate the main provisions of this bill.

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF POLICY

Title I of the bill declares it a matter of national policy to increase the flow of consumer, business, and mortgage credit to benefit the residents of urban and rural poverty areas and to expand the opportunities for business ownership by the residents of such areas.

TITLE II—ELIGIBLE AREAS

Areas eligible for assistance would be designated by the Secretary of Commerce. These areas would include:

First, Redevelopment areas designated by the Economic Development Administration—EDA—under the Public Works and Economic Development Act with a population of less than 250,000. Such areas are designated on the basis of high unemployment or low median family income and must encompass an entire county or "labor market area"—as defined by the Secretary of Labor—or an entire municipality over 250,000 in population or an Indian reservation. Under these criteria, it is not possible to designate a portion of a municipality as an eligible area. Approximately 828 areas have been designated eligible by EDA, most of which are in rural areas.

Second, Urban poverty areas within metropolitan areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce. Such areas must have a population of at least 25,000. The factors to be considered by the Secretary of Commerce in designating such areas are the rate of unemployment, median family income, educational level, housing conditions, and welfare incidence. Upon designation, such areas would also become eligible areas under the EDA Act.

While recent attention has focused on urban poverty areas, we must not forget that rural poverty is closely related to our urban problems. The lack of adequate economic opportunities in our rural areas has caused a vast migration of rural residents into our already overcrowded central cities. By advancing the rate of economic development in rural poverty areas, we can retard the rate of urban migration and alleviate some of the pressure on our overcrowded central cities.

TITLE III—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

This title establishes a new kind of financial institution chartered and supervised by the Comptroller of the Currency called national development banks. The banks would be privately owned, either by their stockholders or by existing banks operating such National development banks as subsidiaries. The banks would be ordinary profitmaking, private institutions, although the Comptroller of the Currency would be able to limit their dividends to rates consistent with the banking industry as a whole. At least one-third of the Bank's directors must reside in eligible areas.

National development banks would have all of the standard powers for carrying on the business of banking now possessed by national banks under the National Banking Act. However, national development banks would be required to allocate at least 80 percent of all their loans and investments for the

benefit of the residents of eligible urban and rural poverty areas. The kind of loans and investments which would meet the 80-percent test are as follows:

First, consumer loans to the residents of eligible areas;

Second, mortgage loans on property within eligible areas;

Third, single family mortgage loans on residences outside eligible areas if the buyer is from an eligible area and the mortgage does not exceed the limits established under section 235 of the National Housing Act for low and moderate income housing;

Fourth, multifamily mortgage loans on apartment projects outside eligible areas provided at least 50 percent of the tenants during the first two years are from eligible areas and the mortgage does not exceed the limits established under 221(d)(3)(ii) of the National Housing Act for moderate income housing;

Fifth, business loans to residents of eligible areas;

Sixth, business loans to corporations in which at least 50 percent of the stock is owned by the residents of eligible areas;

Seventh, business loans to firms which employ at least 50 persons of whom at least three-fourths are residents of eligible areas;

Eighth, loans to nonprofit or limited dividend organizations whose principal purpose is to serve the residents of eligible areas;

Ninth, equity investments in business enterprises which are at least 50 percent owned by the residents of eligible areas.

The investments financed by a bank would not necessarily have to be in the poverty area as long as they benefited poverty area residents. For example, mortgage credit extended by a national development bank would not be confined to housing in the ghetto. Those who live in the ghetto should be helped to find housing wherever they wish to live including locations outside the ghetto. Likewise, ghetto residents could obtain business loans from national development banks for business establishments operated outside the ghetto. We cannot foster "black entrepreneurship" if we limit its operations solely to the ghetto.

SPECIAL AUTHORITIES OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

In return for concentrating 80 percent of their loanable funds for the benefit of poverty areas, national development banks would be given a number of special authorities and a favorable access to funds. The special authorities would include the following provisions:

Liberalized entry provisions: In order to obtain Federal deposit insurance, a prospective national development bank would have to meet the standard criteria imposed on other banks, namely, that it has the requisite capital, that it has adequate management, and that it has a reasonable chance of success. But such a bank would not have to prove that the "convenience and needs" of the community requires a new bank. This restriction has often made it difficult for new banks to obtain charters, particularly in those communities where existing banks are not providing adequate service.

Lower reserve requirements: The Federal Reserve Act requires member banks to maintain cash reserves at Federal Reserve District banks. Since these reserves do not earn interest, bank earnings are reduced. National development banks would be permitted to maintain reserves against demand deposits at a rate 4 percentage points below the rate established for country banks. At the present time, the rate for country banks with demand deposits under \$5 million is 12½ percent. In addition, reserves required against time deposits would be at one-half of the rate established for other banks, which at the present time is 30 percent on ordinary savings deposits.

The lower reserves requirements will permit national development banks to have a greater percentage of their assets invested in interest earning obligations. This in turn will enable such banks to make risk loans in eligible areas on more reasonable terms. Moreover, the safety of deposits would not be jeopardized by lower reserve requirements since the funds so released could be invested in short-term Treasury bills or similarly safe liquid instruments. It is expected that the ordinary examination procedures of the Comptroller's office will ensure that national development banks maintain adequate reserves of liquid investments.

Equity investments: National development banks would be permitted to put up to 10 percent of their funds in equity investments in businesses which are at least 50 percent owned by eligible area residents. The shortage of equity capital is one of the most critical problems in establishing or expanding ghetto-owned businesses, hence this provision will permit national development banks to fill a pressing need.

Ample precedent can be found for this approach in the Edge Act which enables U.S. banks to operate foreign subsidiaries engaging in equity financing. There is no good reason why the same approach cannot be applied on home soil where the needs are at least as great as has been recently suggested by Governor Brimmer of the Federal Reserve Board.

The authority to make equity investments with a potentially higher yield should also enhance the flexibility of a national development bank to extend regular credit on more reasonable terms.

Management services: National development banks are given the authority to provide management counseling, technical assistance, bookkeeping, computer, and other services for the benefit of eligible area residents. This will enable such banks to function as true development banks by working with the community to help establish and expand new businesses.

The role of a development bank is not passive but active. A good development bank will not passively await the submission of loan requests. Instead, it will work with businessmen or potential businessmen in the area to launch new business ventures. In short, much of the demand for development bank credit will be inspired by the development bank itself. In addition, it will supply the coun-

selling and other business services needed to make these new ventures a success.

Guarantees: National development banks would be given the authority to guarantee loans and extend letters of credit on behalf of eligible area residents. A fee would be accepted for the guarantee and reserves would be established to cover losses. Loan guarantees permit a national development bank to obtain outside credit for eligible area residents when its own funds are not sufficient to meet all demands. The Comptroller of the Currency would issue regulations setting forth reasonable limitations on the extent of such guarantees and on the amount of reserves required.

Real estate loans: National development banks would be given more liberal authority for making real estate loans compared to existing authority now accorded national banks. These more liberal authorities include the following:

First. The maximum loan-to-value ratio on 5-year nonamortized loans would be increased from 50 percent to 66½ percent;

Second. The maximum loan-to-value ratio on conventional mortgage loans would be increased from 80 percent to 90 percent and the maximum term would be increased from 25 to 35 years;

Third. The maximum term for construction loans would be increased from 3 to 5 years.

Fourth. Second mortgage financing would be authorized provided the combined first and second mortgage did not exceed the applicable loan-to-value ratios;

Fifth. Investments in mortgages guaranteed or insured by a Federal agency would be exempt from limitations on the total amount of mortgage loans and from the applicable loan-to-value ratio and maximum maturity;

Sixth. Guaranteed debentures of 5 or more years maturity issued by national development banks could be counted as capital in computing the ceiling on the total amount of mortgage loans outstanding.

SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

Mr. President, in order to increase the amount of funds available to national development banks for their lending activities, the legislation would enact a number of provisions giving such banks a favorable access to funds. These include the following:

Lower discount rate: National development banks could borrow from Federal Reserve banks at a rate 1 percentage point below the rate established for other banks. The Federal Reserve could, of course, offset such borrowing through general open market operations in order to maintain the same aggregate level of bank reserves. Thus, the lower rate accorded national development banks would in no way impede the execution of monetary policy. At the same time, the 1 percentage point differential should give such banks access to low costing credit and thus enable them to extend credit to poverty areas on more reasonable terms.

Federal Reserve credit: The Federal Reserve would be directed to discount to

the maximum extent feasible federally guaranteed loans made by national development banks without regard to maturity and not to exceed 25 percent of the total amount of Federal Reserve credit supplied in any 1 year.

The Federal Reserve System has supplied an average of \$4 billion of credit a year to the banking system over the last 5 years, hence if this provision is fully implemented, national development banks could receive \$1 billion a year of new funds through the Federal Reserve System. Such advances would, of course, be offset by fewer open market Government security purchases in order to maintain the same aggregate monetary effect. As in the case of lower discount rates, monetary policy would not be adversely affected.

Guaranteed debentures: National development banks could issue federally guaranteed debentures in amounts up to five times their capital. Such debentures could be issued directly to a national development financing corporation—established under title IV—which in turn could raise funds by issuing consolidated debentures, thereby achieving economies of scale in the flotation of securities. Through this device, national development banks should be able to tap the money and capital markets for funds at favorable rates. The Federal Government would collect premiums for the guarantees which would be used for the payment of any losses so as to administer the program on a self-liquidating basis.

Treasury deposits: The Secretary of the Treasury would be directed to maintain Treasury deposits—tax and loan accounts—at national development banks in an amount equal to 10 percent of all other demand deposits at such banks. In addition, the Treasury could draw down deposits at national development banks only after it had drawn down its deposits at the national development banks. Treasury deposits comprise only 2 to 3 percent of the demand deposits at the average bank, thus by maintaining Treasury deposits at 10 percent, national development banks are given a substantial additional source of funds at zero interest costs.

State and local deposits: Deposits of State and local funds in national development banks would be provided with unlimited FDIC deposit insurance provided the public depositor agreed to draw down such deposits only after all other bank deposits had been fully drawn down. Most State laws require public deposits to be either fully insured by the FDIC or to be collateralized with Treasury obligations. By providing unlimited deposit insurance plus the "first-in, last-out" withdrawal procedure, national development banks are given a source of highly stable funds which can be used for community purposes. Total State and local deposits average \$31 billion, hence a reallocation of even a small portion of these funds to national development banks can have a sizable impact.

Deposit rate differentials: The Federal financial supervisory agencies would be directed to maintain appropriate differ-

entials in the maximum rates payable on time deposits by commercial banks, savings and loan associations and national development banks in order to assure an adequate flow of savings deposits to national development banks. Given a rate advantage on savings deposits, national development banks would be able to compete effectively for funds with established financial institutions.

FORMATION OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

Under the terms of the bill, national development banks could be owned and operated by new individuals or they could be started as subsidiaries of existing banks. However, in all cases at least one-third of the Bank's directors would have to be residents of eligible areas.

Because of the general shortage of capital and managerial resources, existing banks will be the logical organizers for many of the new national development banks. But new banks organized by community residents could also be established. Moreover, subsidiary banks could in time be sold to community residents. In addition, the resident employees of subsidiary development banks could start their own bank once having obtained the requisite managerial expertise.

The concept of creating specialized financial institutions has ample precedent in the history of American financial legislation. Congress has established an elaborate agricultural credit system designed to make credit more available to farmers. Within the system, a number of specialized financial institutions have been established including Federal land banks and Federal land bank associations for providing long-term mortgage credit; Federal intermediate credit banks and production credit associations for providing short and medium-term operating loans; and banks for cooperatives for providing credit to farmer-owned purchasing or marketing cooperatives. Over \$9 billion in credit is currently outstanding to farmers through this system.

Congress also recognized the need for more consumer credit when it passed the Federal Credit Union Act in 1933. As a result of this legislation, over 12,000 federally chartered credit unions have been chartered with assets of \$6.6 billion and a total membership of more than 12 million people.

Likewise, Congress provided deposit insurance, borrowing facilities and Federal charters for savings and loan associations in order to promote homeownership. Under the impetus of Federal legislation enacted in the 1930's, the savings and loan industry has grown from a mere \$5 billion in deposits in 1933 to over \$130 billion today. The percentage of families owning their own homes increased from 43 percent in 1940 to nearly 64 percent in 1967.

The Small Business Investment Act represents the latest effort to establish a specialized financial institution for supplying equity capital to small business.

Just as Congress has created new financial institutions to meet the problems of other periods, so it needs to create specialized institutions to meet the problems of the 1970's. In the past new insti-

tutions have specialized in a particular kind of credit—that is, consumer credit, mortgage credit, or business credit. By way of contrast, national development banks would be completely diversified in the kind of credit they could provide and would specialize instead in a particular geographic area where credit needs are unique and urgent.

Thus, the establishment of specialized financial institutions is not a radical or unprecedented innovation but rather a continuation of the approaches contained in previous financial legislation.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCING CORPORATION

This title establishes a private corporation chartered under the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act to act as a borrowing agent for national development banks chartered under title III. The corporation would purchase federally guaranteed debentures issued by national development banks and reissue consolidated debentures fully collateralized by individual national development bank debentures. The ultimate borrowing cost to the national development banks would be governed by the rate on the corporation's consolidated debentures and because of economies of scale, should be less than if each national development bank were to sell its debentures directly to the market.

The corporation would be a strictly private organization, wholly owned by the national development banks which in turn would be required to purchase stock in the corporation in an amount equal to between 1 to 2 percent of each debenture sold to the corporation.

The initial board of directors would be appointed by the President, but subsequent directors would be elected at periodic intervals by the national development banks. The initial expenses of the corporation for the first 3 years would be paid by the Comptroller of the Currency, not to exceed \$1 million. The corporation's dividends would be limited to 6 percent and not more than \$1 billion stock could be outstanding.

In addition to acting as a borrowing agent for national development banks, the corporation would also be empowered to extend technical assistance to such banks.

TITLE V—INCENTIVES TO EXISTING BANKS

Mr. President, in addition to providing for the establishment of national development banks, the act would also provide incentives for existing banks to allocate more of their loans and investments toward the benefit of eligible area residents. There may be a number of communities in which the establishment of a national development bank is not possible for one reason or another. In such cases, incentives to existing banks would provide a source of new credit for eligible poverty areas. Even in communities which do establish a national development bank, a credit shortage in the eligible poverty area is likely to persist. Thus, the added incentives given to existing banks can help to stimulate additional credit flows to supplement the funds provided by the National Development Bank. The following changes in banking law are effected:

Equity investments: National banks would be permitted to make equity investments in development corporations serving eligible areas and in business concerns at least 50 percent owned by eligible area residents. Such investments could not exceed 2 percent of the bank's total loans and investments. This provision would provide a potential reservoir of more than \$4 billion for equity investments in the ghetto and in depressed rural areas.

Guarantees: National banks would be given authority to guarantee loans extended by other lenders to eligible area residents. In this way, a local bank lacking loanable funds of its own would be able to tap funds outside the community for credit worthy investments in the ghetto. It would be one way in which local banks could mobilize the substantial financial resources of large institutional investors such as life insurance companies and pension funds to help meet the credit needs of the ghetto.

Mortgage loans: National banks could be given the same liberalized mortgage lending authority available to national development banks, provided the loan was for the benefit of eligible area residents. These liberalizations include increasing the maximum loan-to-value ratio on conventional mortgages from 80 percent to 90 percent and increasing the maximum maturity from 25 to 35 years.

Lower reserve requirements: Banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System would have their reserve requirements reduced up to a maximum of 4 percentage points to the extent that they increased the percentage of their loans and investments benefiting eligible areas. Such loans and investments would be defined by the 80 percent test required of national development banks under title III.

A reduction in reserve requirements offers a powerful incentive for a bank to increase its poverty area loans since such reserves do not earn interest. To illustrate how this provision would work, let us assume a bank had \$1 billion in demand deposits, and \$1 billion in total loans and investments of which \$1 million was in poverty area loans on June 30, 1969. Let us further assume that demand deposits and total loans and investments grow to \$1.1 billion by June 30, 1970 and that poverty area loans grow to \$2.1 million.

If the bank had continued to allocate only 1 percent of its funds to poverty areas as it had in 1969, it would only have had \$1.1 million in poverty area loans instead of the \$2.1 million actually made by 1970. Thus, the bank has increased its relative allocation to poverty areas by \$1 million.

In recognition of this increase, the Federal Reserve Board might decrease the bank's required reserves against demand deposits from 17.5 percent to 17.45 percent. This would have the effect of reducing deposits at the Federal Reserve by \$500,000. The bank could invest these funds in Treasury bills at a 6-percent return. The effective yield obtained by the extra \$1 million in ghetto loans would be increased by the extra interest earned through the reduction in reserve requirements. In the example given, the effective

yield on an additional ghetto loan would be raised by 3 percentage points, thus giving the bank a strong incentive to increase the total volume of such loans.

Any increase in bank reserves through this provision could be offset by Federal Reserve open market operations in order to maintain the same aggregate monetary effect.

TITLE VI—SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

This title amends existing law affecting savings and loan associations to encourage more investments for the benefit of eligible areas.

Consumer loans: Federally chartered savings and loan associations are permitted to make consumer loans to the residents of eligible areas. The rates on such loans would be limited to 1 percent per month, or 12 percent per year, their maturities to 5 years, and their aggregate volume to 15 percent of total assets.

Long term advances: A second window would be established at the Federal home loan banks for the purpose of making long term advances to member associations provided the proceeds are used to make mortgage loans meeting the criteria established for national development banks under title III. The home loan banks would raise such funds in the usual manner through the issuance of consolidated debentures. Existing advances from the home loan banks are generally short-term and are limited to meeting temporary liquidity problems. However, the amendment contemplates using the home loan bank system as a vehicle for raising permanent capital for investing in low- and moderate-income housing.

Advances under this title would also be exempt from the following restrictions placed on existing advances:

First, advances would cover 100 percent of a conventional mortgage securing an advance, whereas existing law is limited to 65 percent;

Second, maturities on conventional mortgages offered to secure advances could run to 45 years instead of 30 years as under existing law; and

Third, such advances would not be limited to 12 times the amount of home loan bank stock owned by the association.

TITLE VII—FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

This title amends the Federal Credit Union Act to increase the amount of consumer credit supplies to residents of eligible areas.

Guarantees on loans to low-income credit unions: Existing law prohibits federally chartered credit unions from borrowing more than 50 percent of their savings shares. This limitation could be waived by the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions for credit unions which predominately serve the residents of eligible areas. In addition, the Director could guarantee loans extended by other lenders to such credit unions. This provision is expected to facilitate the movement of funds from relatively affluent credit unions with surplus funds to credit unions serving low-income groups where loan demand far exceeds savings capital. At the present time, credit unions have more than \$2 billion in idle funds not on loan to members.

The Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions would charge a premium for the guarantee in order to establish a reserve for losses. Treasury borrowing authority would back up such reserves if necessary.

Guarantees on member credit: Even though Federal guarantees on loans to low-income credit unions will increase their loanable funds, it is expected that loan demand will still exceed available funds in many cases. In order to increase the leverage of credit unions serving the residents of eligible areas, such credit unions are empowered to guarantee credit extended to their members by other creditors such as retail merchants. This will enable the members of such credit unions to bypass the high cost ghetto merchant and obtain items on credit from legitimate merchants at lower prices without tying up the limited funds of the credit union.

The credit union would collect a premium for its guarantee which would go into a loss reserve. The credit union could also purchase reinsurance from the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions in order to protect itself against heavy loss. The Bureau would collect a premium for its reinsurance and would have Treasury borrowing authority in the event such premiums were insufficient to repay losses.

TITLE VIII—CONSUMER CREDIT GUARANTEES

In order to increase consumer credit availability to residents of eligible areas who are not members of credit unions, a separate guarantee program is authorized under the administration of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. The Secretary would be empowered to guarantee up to 80 percent of consumer credit loans extended by banks and other creditors to the residents of eligible areas not to exceed the rate of interest established by the Secretary. The Secretary would also be authorized to utilize a blanket guarantee approach in which HUD would automatically back each loan extended by an approved lender with an 80-percent guarantee without governmental review. HUD and the GAO would, however, periodically review the entire activities of creditors under the guarantee program to insure that proper procedures were being followed. This technique is similar to Export-Import Bank guarantees which have proven workable and which reduce redtape to a minimum.

The Secretary would collect premiums for such guarantees for deposit in a loss reserve. Treasury borrowing authority is provided in the event losses exceed reserves.

TITLE IX—EDA LOAN AND LEASE GUARANTEES

This title amends the Public Works and Economic Development Act to provide the Economic Development Administration with authority to guarantee loans and leases entered into by business firms locating in areas which provide jobs for eligible area residents. Although EDA has a direct lending program to assist businesses to expand in such areas, it has never received adequate funding. The guarantee authority should permit the agency to have far greater leverage with a minimum Federal outlay.

The guarantees provided under this title can be for land acquisition, facility construction or rehabilitation, machinery and equipment purchase, and the provision of working capital.

Loan guarantees could not exceed 90 percent of project cost and would be limited to 30 years.

Lease guarantees would be limited to 30 years and could not exceed 90 percent of the remaining unpaid rental payments. It is expected the lease guarantee program would be particularly attractive to private shopping center or industrial park developers who could first obtain a lease guarantee from EDA and use such guarantee as collateral to secure private financing.

EDA would collect a premium for its guarantees to build up a loss reserve and would have available Treasury borrowing authority to cover any losses in excess of reserves.

TITLE X—SMALL BUSINESS LOAN GUARANTEES

This title streamlines the existing SBA loan guarantee program for loans to residents of eligible areas. SBA would be empowered to use a blanket guarantee approach whereby it would automatically provide 90 percent guarantees for all loans made by approved lenders without further processing by SBA. SBA would establish the general criteria to be followed by lenders and would periodically review each lender's operations to ensure conformance to established procedures. This technique is expected to reduce redtape and increase lender participation.

In addition, SBA would establish a separate fund to collect premiums and pay losses pursuant to such guarantees. The fund would be backed up by Treasury borrowing authority in the event the reserves in the fund were inadequate to cover losses. This procedure avoids the need to use appropriated funds to build up reserves. Under current SBA procedures, each loan guarantee must be backed by appropriated funds equal to 10 percent of the guarantee. Thus, scarce appropriated funds are diverted from more essential uses—such as direct loans—and the ability to guarantee private loans is made subject to the availability of appropriated funds. These difficulties would be overcome through the use of a Treasury backup.

TITLE XI—GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY FINANCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

This title establishes a 25-member joint Government-Industry Financial Planning Council to be appointed by the President. Not more than five members could be employees of the Federal Government.

The purpose of the Council would be to periodically review the credit needs of eligible areas, to recommend reasonable investment goals to the business and financial community, and to serve as an information clearing house on the financial and credit problems of eligible areas. The Council would also report annually to the President and Congress including its recommended legislative and administrative actions needed to achieve the purposes of this act.

It is expected that this council would establish workable poverty area investment programs similar to the \$1 billion

ghetto investment program announced by the life insurance industry in 1967. With the participation of the entire financial community, this kind of effort could be multiplied many fold.

TITLE XII—SUPERVISION OF, AND REPORTS CONCERNING, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

This title broadens the existing concepts of financial institution supervision which has heretofore been predominately concerned with deposit safety. In addition to deposit safety, the Federal financial supervisory agencies would also be required to review the adequacy of a financial institution's community service and particularly service to eligible areas. All too often, banks which desire to increase their ghetto loans are criticized by the bank examiners for assuming too much risk. Thus, this section is intended to strike a better balance between safety and community service in the bank examination process.

Each agency would also provide annual statistics to Congress on the volume and type of credit extended to eligible areas by the financial institutions under their supervision.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that a copy of the bill and its summary be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2146) to encourage the flow of credit to urban and rural poverty areas in order to stimulate the rate of economic growth and employment in those areas, and to provide the residents thereof with greater access to consumer, business, and mortgage credit at reasonable rates, introduced by Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2146

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 "Community Credit Expansion Act".

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF POLICY FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

SEC. 101. (a) The Congress finds that there are acute shortages of business, consumer, and mortgage credit at reasonable rates in urban and rural poverty areas of the United States. Such shortages limit the economic development of such areas, create unemployment and underemployment with the social ills connected therewith and produce distortions in the national economy.

(b) It is the purpose of this Act—

- (1) to increase the flow of credit to urban and rural poverty areas;
- (2) to accelerate economic growth and employment opportunities in such areas;
- (3) to provide increased access to consumer, business, and mortgage credit on behalf of the residents of such areas;
- (4) to expand the opportunities for business ownership by the residents of such areas; and
- (5) to provide for the establishment of new financial institutions, and encourage existing financial institutions, to increase the flow of credit to such areas.

TITLE II—ELIGIBLE AREAS
DESIGNATION OF AREAS

SEC. 201. (a) Section 401(a) of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3161 (a)) is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(2) by adding after paragraph (5) a new paragraph as follows:

"(6) those additional areas which are identifiable sections within standard metropolitan statistical areas in which the Secretary determines that there is a high incidence of poverty. In making such determination the Secretary shall consider the extent to which the area is characterized by a low median family income, a high rate of unemployment among all males or among males between the ages of fourteen and twenty-five, a low level of education, a relatively high percentage of substandard housing, and a relatively high percentage of persons receiving public welfare."

(b) Section 401(b)(3) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3161(b)(3)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(A)" after "except that"; and

(2) by striking out "; and" and inserting the following: ", and (B) areas designated under subsection 401(a)(6), shall have a population of not less than twenty-five thousand persons; and".

(c) Section 401(b)(4) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 3161(b)(4)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and (a)(4)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", (a)(4), and (a)(6)"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "Any area designated under subsection (a)(6) may combine more than one section of a larger urban area, if such sections are contiguous or are separated only by the central business district of a larger urban area."

DEFINITION

SEC. 202. As used in this Act, the term "eligible area" means any area which is a redevelopment area under section 401 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 and except for areas designated under section 401(a)(6) for such Act, has a population of less than two hundred and fifty thousand persons.

TITLE III—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

CHAPTER 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION BY THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

SEC. 301. (a) The Comptroller of the Currency (hereinafter referred to as the "Comptroller") shall prescribe regulations to carry out the provisions and purposes of this title.

(b) The Comptroller shall exercise supervision over national development banks, chartered under chapter 2 of this title, and shall conduct at least one annual examination of each such bank to determine the lawfulness and safety of its operations, and the extent to which the bank is providing the type of service for which it was established in furtherance of the purposes of this Act. If any such bank fails to implement corrective procedures indicated by any such examination and supervision within a reasonable time after notice to it by the Comptroller, the Comptroller may assess such fine (not to exceed \$1,000 for each day of non-compliance) against such bank as he may deem appropriate.

(c) Regulations prescribed by the Comptroller under this section may include requirements with respect to the maintenance by national development banks, chartered under chapter 2 of this title, of such special liability reserves as may be necessary or appropriate to limit the funds available to any such bank from which dividends are payable with a view to preventing a substantially higher part of the net earnings of such bank

from being paid out in the form of dividends than is the general practice of other banking institutions.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 302. Within sixty days following the close of each fiscal year, the Comptroller shall transmit to the President and the Congress a report describing his activities under this title for such year, including such statistical material as may be appropriate on the operations of national development banks. The Comptroller may, in furtherance of this section, require such reports and statistical data from each national development bank established under this title as he may deem appropriate.

CHAPTER 2—CHARTERING OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

ORGANIZATION OF BANKS

SEC. 310. (a) A national development bank may be formed by any number of natural persons, not less in any case than five. They shall cause to be executed on its behalf articles of association which shall state that the bank is formed for the purpose of carrying on the business of banking in one or more eligible areas with powers conferred by this chapter. The articles may also contain other provisions, not inconsistent with law, which the bank may see fit to adopt for the regulation of its business and the conduct of its affairs. The articles shall be signed by the persons uniting to form the bank and a copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Comptroller to be filed and preserved in his office.

(b) Except as otherwise specifically provided by law or by its articles of association, the articles of association of a national development bank may be amended with respect to any lawful matter, and any action requiring the approval of the stockholders of such bank may be had by the approving vote of the holders of a majority of the voting shares of the stock of the bank obtained at a meeting of the stockholders called and held pursuant to notice given by mail at least ten days prior to the meeting or pursuant to a waiver of notice given by all stockholders entitled to receive notice of the meeting. A certified copy of every amendment to the articles of association adopted by the shareholders of a national development bank shall be forwarded to the Comptroller, to be filed and preserved in his office.

ORGANIZATION CERTIFICATE

SEC. 311. (a) The persons desiring to form a national development bank shall prepare an organization certificate, which shall specifically state—

(1) the name assumed by the bank, which name shall include the words "national development bank" and be subject to the approval of the Comptroller;

(2) the place where its operations are to be carried on, designating the eligible area or areas to be served by the bank;

(3) the amount of capital stock of each class and the number of shares into which the same is to be divided;

(4) the names and places of residence of the shareholders and the number of shares subscribed for by each of them; and

(5) the fact that the certificate is made under the provisions of this chapter.

(b) The organization certificate shall be acknowledged before a judge of some court of record, or notary public, and shall be, together with the acknowledgment thereof, authenticated by the seal of such court or notary and transmitted to the Comptroller, who shall record and carefully preserve the same in his office.

CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 312. No national development bank shall be organized with less capital than \$100,000. *Provided*, That this amount may be reduced to not less than \$50,000 if the Comptroller determines that such reduction is necessary to establish a national development bank for the benefit of the eligible area.

AUTHORIZATION TO COMMENCE BANKING BUSINESS

SEC. 313. (a) Whenever a certificate is transmitted to the Comptroller as provided in this chapter, and the national development bank transmitting the same notifies the Comptroller that all of its capital stock has been duly paid in, and that the bank has complied with all the provisions of this chapter required to be complied with before the bank shall be authorized to commence the business of banking, the Comptroller shall examine into the condition of the bank, ascertain especially whether all of the capital of the bank has been paid in, the name and place of residence of each of its directors, and generally whether the bank has complied with all the provisions of this chapter required to entitle it to engage in the business of banking; and shall cause to be made and attested by the oaths of a majority of the directors, and by the president or cashier of the bank, a statement of all the facts necessary to enable the Comptroller to determine whether the bank is lawfully entitled to commence the business of banking.

(b) If, upon a careful examination of the facts so reported, and of any other facts which may come to the knowledge of the Comptroller, whether by means of a special commission appointed by him for the purpose of inquiring into the condition of such association, or otherwise, it appears that such association is lawfully entitled to commence the business of banking, the Comptroller shall give to such association a certificate, under his hand and official seal, that such association has complied with all the provisions required to be complied with before commencing the business of banking, and that such association is authorized to commence such business. But the Comptroller may withhold from an association his certificate authorizing the commencement of business, whenever he has reason to suppose that the shareholders have formed the same for any other than the legitimate objects contemplated by this chapter.

(c) Upon the issuance by the Comptroller of a certificate under this section, the national development bank shall become a body corporate with all of the rights and powers and subject to all the limitations and duties prescribed by this chapter.

(d) A national development bank shall cause the certificate issued under this section to be published in some newspaper printed in the city or county where the bank is located, for at least thirty days next after the issuing thereof; or, if no newspaper is published in that city or county, then in the newspaper published nearest thereto.

PLACE OF BUSINESS

SEC. 314. The business of each national development bank, and any branch established by it with the approval of the Comptroller, shall be located within an eligible area; except that any such bank may be located outside an eligible area if it provides substantial services to at least two or more eligible areas.

CAPITAL STOCK

SEC. 315. (a) The capital stock of each national development bank shall be divided into shares having a par value of \$10 each, and shall be issued only at par to the original organizers, to residents of an eligible area served by the bank and to any national or State banking association.

(b) Any national development bank may issue preferred stock of one or more classes subject to the approval of the Comptroller.

(c) The stock of each national development bank shall be represented by certificates bearing the name and location of the bank, the name of the holder of record of the stock represented thereby, and the number of shares which the certificate represents. Such stock may be transferred on the books of the bank in such manner as may be prescribed in the bylaws or articles of associa-

tion. Every person or organization becoming a shareholder by transfer shall, in proportion to his shares, succeed to all rights and liabilities of the prior holder of the shares. No change shall be made in the articles of association by which the rights, remedies, or securities of the existing creditors of the bank shall be impaired.

CAPITAL IMPAIRMENT; NO ASSESSMENTS ON STOCKHOLDERS

SEC. 316. (a) If any part of the capital of a national development bank consists of preferred stock, the determination of whether or not the capital of the bank is impaired and the amount of impairment shall be based upon the par value of its stock even though the amount which the holders of preferred stock shall be entitled to receive in the event of retirement or liquidation shall be in excess of the par value of the preferred stock.

(b) The holders of stock in a national development bank, the subscription price of which has been fully paid, shall not be held individually liable as holders for any debts, contracts, or engagements of such bank and shall not be liable for any assessments to restore impairments in the capital of such bank.

WITHDRAWAL OF CAPITAL

SEC. 317. No national development bank shall, during the time it shall continue its banking operations, withdraw or permit to be withdrawn, in the form of dividends or otherwise, any portion of its capital.

INCREASE OR REDUCTION OF CAPITAL

SEC. 318. (a) Any national development bank may, with the approval of the Comptroller, and by a vote of shareholders owning two-thirds of the stock of the bank, increase its capital stock to any sum approved by the Comptroller, but no increase in capital shall be valid until the whole amount of the increase is paid in and notice thereof has been transmitted to the Comptroller and his certificate obtained specifying the amount of increase in capital stock and his approval thereof, and that it has been duly paid in as part of the capital of the bank.

(b) Any national development bank may, by the vote of shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, reduce its capital to any sum not below the amount required by this chapter; but no such reduction shall be made until the amount of the proposed reduction has been reported to the Comptroller, and the reduction has been approved by the Comptroller. No shareholder shall be entitled to any distribution of cash or other assets by reason of any reduction of the common capital of any such bank unless the distribution has been approved by the Comptroller and by the affirmative vote of shareholders owning at least two-thirds of the stock of the bank.

STOCKHOLDERS LIST

SEC. 319. Each national development bank shall at all times have a full and accurate list of the names and addresses of all shareholders and the number of shares in the bank held by each. Such list shall be available during business hours for inspection by all shareholders, creditors, and State officials authorized to assess taxes, and a copy shall be furnished to the Comptroller upon his request.

DIRECTORS

SEC. 320. (a) The affairs of each national development bank shall be managed by not less than nine or more than fifteen directors who shall be elected by the shareholders at a meeting to be held at any time before the bank is authorized by the Comptroller to commence the business of banking, and afterward at the regular annual meeting of the shareholders as specified in the bylaws. At least one-third of the directors so elected shall be residents of the eligible area or areas to be served by such bank. Directors shall hold office for one year or until their

successors are elected and have qualified. If any such bank violates this section and continues such violation after thirty days' notice from the Comptroller, the Comptroller may appoint a receiver or conservator therefor.

(b) Each director of a national development bank shall, during his whole term of service, be a citizen of the United States and own not less than ten shares of the capital stock of the bank purchasable at par from the bank.

(c) Each director of a national development bank shall be responsible for the honest administration of its affairs in accordance with the provisions of this Act and shall be subject to such other specific duties and liabilities as the Comptroller may by regulation prescribe.

(d) Any vacancy in the board of directors of a national development bank shall be filled by appointment by the remaining directors, and any director so appointed shall hold his office until the unexpired term to which he was appointed has been completed.

(e) The president of a national development bank shall be a member of the board of directors of the bank.

REMOVAL OF DIRECTOR OR OFFICER

SEC. 321. Whenever, in the opinion of the Comptroller, and director or officer of a national development bank shall have continued to violate any law relating to the bank, or shall have failed to carry out the purpose of this Act, or shall have continued unsafe or unsound practices in conducting the business of the bank after having been warned by the Comptroller to discontinue violations of law or unsafe or unsound practices, the Comptroller may cause notice to be served upon the director or officer to appear before him to show cause why he should not be removed from office. A copy of the order shall be sent to each director of the bank affected by registered mail. If, after granting the accused director or officer a reasonable opportunity to be heard, the comptroller finds that he has continued to violate any law relating to the bank, or has continued unsafe or unsound practices in conducting the business of the bank, after having been warned by the Comptroller to discontinue violation of law, or unsafe or unsound practices, the Comptroller in his discretion may order that the director or officer be removed from office. A copy of such order shall be served upon the director or officer. A copy of such order shall also be served upon the bank of which he is a director or officer, whereupon the director or officer shall cease to be a director or officer of the bank: *Provided*, That the order and the findings of fact upon which it is based shall not be made public or disclosed to anyone except the director or officer involved and the directors of the bank involved, otherwise than in connection with proceedings for a violation of this section. Any director or officer removed from office as herein provided who thereafter participates in any manner in the management of the bank shall be fined not more than \$5,000, or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, in the discretion of the court.

GENERAL POWERS OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

SEC. 322. Upon issuance by the Comptroller to a national development bank of an organization certificate the bank shall have power—

- (1) to adopt and use a corporate seal;
- (2) to have succession from the date of its organization until such time as it be dissolved by the act of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock, or until its franchise becomes forfeited by reason of violation of law, or until terminated by either a general or a special Act of Congress, or until its affairs be placed in the hands of a receiver and finally terminated by him;

(3) to make contracts;

(4) to sue and be sued, complain and defend, in any court of law and equity, as fully as natural persons;

(5) to elect or appoint directors, and by its board of directors to appoint a president, vice president, cashier, and other officers, define their duties, require bonds of them and fix the penalty thereof, dismiss such officers or any of them at pleasure, and appoint others to fill their places;

(6) to prescribe, by its board of directors, bylaws not inconsistent with law, regulating the manner in which its stock shall be transferred, its directors elected or appointed, its officers appointed, its property transferred, its general business conducted, and the privileges granted to it by law exercised and enjoyed;

(7) to exercise by its board of directors or duly authorized officers or agents, subject to law, all such incidental powers as shall be necessary to carry on the business of banking; by discounting and negotiating promissory notes, drafts, bills of exchange, and other evidences of debt, including the incurring of secondary liability in connection therewith; by receiving demand and time deposits; and by loaning money and extending credit subject to the provisions of this chapter;

(8) to purchase for its own account investment securities under such limitations and restrictions as the Comptroller may by regulation prescribe; but in no event shall the total amount of the investment securities of any one obligor or maker, held by the bank for its own account, exceed at any time 10 per centum of its capital stock actually paid in and unimpaired and 10 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund, except that this limitation shall not apply to investments in direct obligations of, or obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States;

(9) to purchase, hold, and convey real estate for the following purposes and for no other—

(A) as shall be necessary for its accommodation in the transaction of its business;

(B) as shall be mortgaged to it in good faith by way of security for debts previously contracted;

(C) as shall be conveyed to it in satisfaction of debts previously contracted in the course of its dealings; and

(D) as it shall purchase at sales under judgments, decrees, or mortgages held by the bank or shall purchase to secure debts due to it; but no national development bank shall hold the possession of any real estate under mortgage, or the title and possession of any real estate purchased to secure any debts due to it, for a longer period than five years.

LIMITATION ON LENDING POWERS OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

SEC. 323. At least 80 per centum of the total amount of loans and investments made by a national development bank shall be for the benefit of eligible areas. For the purpose of applying this limitation, the following types of loans shall be considered for the benefit of eligible areas:

(1) Unsecured loans with maturities not exceeding five years to individuals who at the time such loans are made are residents of eligible areas for provident or productive purposes.

(2) Loans to finance the acquisition, construction, modernization, repair, or rehabilitation of real property situated in an eligible area and upon the security of mortgages secured by such property.

(3) Loans upon the security of—
(A) mortgages secured by single-family residential property situated outside an eligible area and involving principal obligations not in excess of the limits applicable to mortgages insured under section 235(1) of

the National House Act, if (i) the mortgagor under any such mortgage is a resident of such an area at the time of the execution of the mortgage and had been such a resident for a period of not less than one year immediately preceding the execution of such mortgage, and (ii) the property covered by such mortgage is not sold to a person who is a nonresident of such an area for a period of at least two years after the execution of such mortgage; and

(B) mortgages secured by multifamily residential property situated outside an eligible area and involving principal obligations per family units not in excess of the limits specified in section 221(d)(3)(ii) of the National Housing Act: *Provided*, That not less than 50 per centum of the residents of such property during a period of at least two years after the execution of the mortgage are persons who were residents of an eligible area at the time they became occupants of such property.

(4) Loans to any business enterprise which—

(A) is a sole proprietorship or partnership wholly owned by a resident or residents of an eligible area;

(B) is a corporation in which at least 50 per centum of the outstanding stock having voting rights is held, at the time the loan is made, by residents of eligible areas; or

(C) is a business concern which does not qualify under (A) or (B), but which (i) employs on a full-time basis not less than fifty persons and at least three-fourths of whom are residents of eligible areas, or (ii) enters into an agreement (as a condition to the granting of the loan) to meet the employment requirements specified in clause (i) not later than one year after the execution of the loan agreement.

(5) Loans to nonprofit or limited dividend organizations whose principal purpose is to provide assistance or services to residents of eligible areas.

(6) Equity investments meeting the requirements under section 343.

LENDING LIMITS

SEC. 324. The total obligations to any national development bank of any person, copartnership, association, or corporation shall at no time exceed 20 per centum of the amount of the capital stock of the national development bank actually paid in and unimpaired and 20 per centum of its unimpaired surplus fund. The term "obligations", as used herein, means the direct liability of the maker or acceptor of paper discounted with or sold to the bank and the liability of the endorser, drawer, or guarantor who obtains a loan from or discounts paper with or sells paper under his guaranty to the bank, and includes, in the case of obligations of a copartnership or association, the obligations of the several members thereof, and, in the case of obligations of a corporation, all obligations of all subsidiaries thereof in which such corporation owns or controls a majority interest. Such limitation of 20 per centum shall be subject to the same exceptions as are applicable to national banks under section 84 of title 12 of the United States Code.

VENUE OF SUITS AGAINST NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

SEC. 325. Suits, actions, and proceedings against any national development bank may be had in any circuit, district, or territorial court of the United States held within the district in which the bank may be established or in any State, county, or municipal court in the county or city in which the bank is located having jurisdiction in similar cases.

VIOLATIONS OF LAW; FORFEITURE

SEC. 326. If the directors of any national development bank shall knowingly violate, or knowingly permit any of the officers, agents, or servants of the bank to violate any of the provisions of this chapter, all the rights,

privileges, and franchises of the bank shall be thereby forfeited. Such violation shall, however, be determined and adjudged by a proper court of the United States, in a suit brought for that purpose by the Comptroller in his own name, before the bank shall be declared dissolved. In cases of any such violation, every director who participated in or assented to the same shall be held liable in his personal and individual capacity for all damages which the bank, its shareholders, or any other person, shall have sustained in consequences of such violation.

INSOLVENCY, RECEIVERSHIP, AND LIQUIDATION

SEC. 327. (a) Whenever any national development bank is dissolved and its rights, privileges, and franchises declared forfeited as prescribed in this chapter; or whenever any creditor of such bank shall have obtained a judgment against it in any court of record and made application accompanied by a certificate from the clerk of the court, stating that the judgment has been rendered and has remained unpaid for the space of thirty days, or whenever the Comptroller shall become satisfied of the insolvency of such bank, he may, after due examination of its affairs in either case, appoint a receiver who shall proceed to terminate the affairs of such bank. The receiver so appointed shall exercise the powers and be subject to the restrictions of receivers of national banks; and the Comptroller shall have the same powers and duties in connection with the administration of the receivership as he has in reference to the receivership of national banks.

(b) Shareholders' agents for shareholders of national development banks may be appointed in the same manner, have the same general powers and duties, and be subject to the same restrictions as shareholders' agents of a national bank.

(c) Any national development bank may, with the approval of the Comptroller, go into liquidation and be closed by the vote of its shareholders owning two-thirds of its stock. Whenever a vote is taken to go into liquidation it shall be the duty of the board of directors to cause notice of this fact to be certified under the seal of the bank by its president or cashier to the Comptroller and publication thereof to be made for a period of two months in a newspaper published in the city or town in which the bank is located, or if no newspaper is there published, in the newspaper published nearest thereto, that the bank is terminating its affairs and notifying the creditors to present their claims against the bank for payment. All such claims shall be presented to and approved by a liquidating agent to be appointed by the board of directors of the bank, with the approval of the Comptroller, and the affairs of the bank shall be liquidated by such agent and under the supervision of the Comptroller.

APPLICATIONS OF OTHER FEDERAL BANKING LAWS

SEC. 328. Except as otherwise provided in this title, provisions of law applicable to national banking associations shall be applicable to national development banks chartered under this chapter.

CHAPTER 3—SPECIAL AUTHORITIES OF NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

ENTRY PROVISIONS

SEC. 340. Section 6 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1816) is amended by inserting after the word "management", the following: "and except in the case of national development banks to be chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act."

LOWER RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 341. Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(4) Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions, the reserve ratio for national development banks (established under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act),

regardless of location, shall be at a rate of 4 percentage points below that established under paragraph (2) for demand deposits and one-half of the rate established under paragraph (3) for deposits other than demand deposits."

EQUITY INVESTMENTS

SEC. 342. A national development bank shall have power, subject to rules and regulations of the Comptroller, to provide equity capital to business enterprises in which at least 50 per centum of the voting power and beneficial interest is owned by residents of eligible areas: *Provided*, That the total amount of investments made under this section by any such bank shall not exceed 10 per centum of the total outstanding principal amount of loans and investments made by it under section 322.

MANAGEMENT SERVICES

SEC. 343. A national development bank shall have power, subject to rules and regulations of the Comptroller, to provide management counseling, technical assistance, bookkeeping, computer, and other services to persons and organizations to which the bank is authorized to extend credit under section 323 and to make reasonable charges therefor.

LOAN GUARANTEES

SEC. 344. A national development bank shall have power, subject to such limitations as the Comptroller may by regulation prescribe, to extend letters of credit to residents of eligible areas and to guarantee loans made to such residents, to charge fees therefor, and to establish appropriate reserve to cover losses arising in connection therewith.

REAL ESTATE LOANS

SEC. 345. A national development bank shall have the power, subject to the rules and regulations of the Comptroller, to make any loans secured by liens upon real estate which a national banking association may make pursuant to the provisions of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) subject, however, to the same limitations on the aggregate sum of such loans as are contained in said section 24 (except that for the purposes of making computation of such aggregate limitation, there shall be included within the capital and surplus as said terms are used in said section 24, an amount equal to 100 per centum of the outstanding bonds, debentures, notes, or other capital obligations, maturing not earlier than five years, which are issued by the bank pursuant to section 362(a) of this Act), and, in addition thereto, to make loans secured by liens upon real estate as follows:

(1) loans upon improved or unimproved real estate not exceeding 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ per centum of the appraised value of such real estate for a term no longer than five years;

(2) loans upon improved real estate not exceeding 90 per centum of the appraised value of such real estate for a term no longer than thirty-five years if the loan is secured by an amortized mortgage, deed of trust, or other such instrument under the terms of which the installment payments are sufficient to amortize the entire principal of the loan within a period of not more than thirty-five years; and

(3) loans made to finance the construction of industrial, commercial, residential, or farm buildings, not exceeding the full appraised value of such real estate where there is a valid and binding agreement entered into by a financially responsible lender to advance the full amount of the bank's loan upon completion of the buildings (or not exceeding 80 per centum of such appraised value where there is no such binding agreement) for a term no longer than five years, which loans may be combined with loans under paragraph (B) above, for a combined total term not to exceed thirty-five years.

Any loan made pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3), above may be secured by a lien which is not a first lien upon the real estate

provided that the amount of such loan when added to the amount of the unpaid principal balance of all loans secured by prior liens upon such real estate shall not exceed the respective percentages of the appraised value of such real estate set forth in said paragraphs. The aggregate sum of loans made pursuant to paragraphs (1) and (2), above, shall be added to the aggregate sum of loans made pursuant to the first paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371) in applying the limitation on the aggregate sum of loans set forth therein. The aggregate sum of loans made pursuant to paragraph (3), above, shall be added to the aggregate sum of loans made pursuant to the third paragraph of section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371), in applying the limitation on the aggregate sum of loans set forth therein. (In making the computation of aggregate loan limits as required by this paragraph, there shall be included within the capital and surplus, as said terms are used in section 24, an amount equal to 100 per centum of the outstanding bonds, debentures, notes, or other capital obligations, maturing not earlier than five years, which are issued by the bank pursuant to section 362(a) of this Act.) None of the limitations set forth in this section, or in section 24 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 371), including the limitations on the aggregate sum of loans, shall apply to any loan which is insured or guaranteed by any agency of the Federal Government to the extent of the amount so guaranteed or insured by any such guarantee or insurance.

CHAPTER 4—SOURCES OF FUNDS FOR NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

LOWER DISCOUNT RATES

SEC. 360. (a) The second sentence of the eighth paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 347) is amended by inserting before the period the following: "Provided, That the rates applicable to advances made to national development banks, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, shall be one percentage point below that established for all other member banks."

(b) Section 14(d) of such Act (12 U.S.C. 357) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The rates of discount applicable to paper presented by national development banks, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, shall be one percentage point below that established for all other member banks under this section."

FEDERAL RESERVE CREDIT

SEC. 361. Section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Upon the endorsement of national development banks chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, the Federal Reserve banks shall to the maximum extent feasible discount notes held by national development banks to secure loans meeting the requirements of section 323 of such Act and guaranteed or insured by the United States, or any agency thereof, without regard to the maturity thereof, in amounts not to exceed 25 per centum of the total Federal Reserve bank credit created in any one year."

ISSUANCE OF BONDS, DEBENTURES, NOTES, AND OTHER CAPITAL OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 362. (a) Each national development bank shall have power, subject to the limitations and requirements of this chapter and to rules and regulations prescribed by the Comptroller, to issue bonds, debentures, notes, and other capital obligations, but no such obligation shall be issued by any bank for a term in excess of twenty years. The aggregate amount of capital obligations authorized to be issued under this section shall at no time exceed an amount equal to five

times the unimpaired capital and surplus of the bank issuing such obligations.

(b) If at any time a national development bank is unable to pay when due, out of its accumulated reserves, capital, surplus, or other available funds, the principal of or any interest on a capital obligation issued under subsection (a), or if at any time the Comptroller appoints a receiver of or for a national development bank, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon appropriate certification by the Comptroller, shall pay to the holder of the obligation from the assets of the guaranty fund, established under subsection (e) of this section, the amount of principal and interest due and unpaid on the obligation. The Comptroller, by regulation, shall make reasonable provision for the filing of proofs of claim under this subsection and if in any case he is not satisfied as to the validity of any claim, he may require the final determination thereof by a court of competent jurisdiction. Upon payment of any claim, the Secretary of the Treasury shall succeed to all the rights of the holder of the capital obligation so paid to the extent of the payment.

(c) Each national development bank shall pay into the guaranty fund, as a guaranty fee, such percentage of the face value of all obligations issued and sold by it under subsection (a), or such other fixed amount, as is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) In order that each national development bank may have available forms of capital obligations for issuance under this section, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prepare forms suitable for that purpose and hold the same subject to the request of any such bank accompanied by written approval from the Comptroller. Engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, and other material needed for these purposes shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury may charge any national development bank requesting forms a reasonable fee related to the cost incurred in the preparation, custody, and delivery of capital obligation forms.

(e) (1) There is hereby established in the Treasury a national development bank debenture guarantee fund to be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. The fund shall be used only for the purpose of the guarantee program authorized by this section, including the payment of administrative expenses. All fees paid in connection with such program shall be credited to the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of or guaranteed by, the United States.

(2) Upon the establishment of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund the sum of \$1,000,000 and for that purpose he may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfer to the fund. Sums so transferred shall be repaid from time to time, at a rate of interest to be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, from fees credited to the fund.

(3) In the event that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to meet obligations of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund such sums as may be necessary to fulfill such obligations. The Secretary may use, for the purpose of making any such transfer, the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfers to the fund. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to repay such transfers. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from time to time, at a rate determined by the Secretary, from fees credited to the fund.

TREASURY TAX AND LOAN ACCOUNTS

SEC. 363. Section 8 of the Act of September 24, 1917, as amended (31 U.S.C. 771), is amended—

(1) by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 8." and (2) by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) In the exercise of the authority conferred by subsection (a) and section 6302(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, the Secretary of the Treasury shall—

"(1) designate national development banks, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, as special depositaries of public money;

"(2) subject to the fiscal requirements of the Government, and not to exceed in the aggregate the sum of \$1,000,000,000, maintain in a Treasury tax and loan account in each such bank an average balance which is not less in any calendar quarter than 10 per centum of the average balance during the preceding calendar quarter of all demand deposits held by such bank in accounts other than such Treasury tax and loan account; and

"(3) cause the withdrawal of deposits held in Treasury tax and loan accounts in special depositaries other than national development banks to be made prior to calling for the withdrawal of deposits in such accounts held in national development banks."

STATE AND LOCAL DEPOSITS

SEC. 364. (a) All national development banks shall be depositaries of public money, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and may be employed as financial agents of the Government. Such banks may also receive deposits of State and local funds.

(b) Section 3(m) of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813(m)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(m)"; (2) by striking out "The term" and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as provided in paragraph (2), the term"; and (3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) The term 'insured deposit' means the net amount due any State or local government for deposits in an insured national development bank, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, if there is in effect a binding agreement (as determined by the Corporation) between the depositor and the Corporation under which the depositor has agreed, in consideration of the additional insurance coverage authorized by this paragraph to withdraw any such insured deposit only after all other deposits credited to such depositor in banks other than national development banks have been withdrawn. Any such agreement may be terminated by the depositor only upon the expiration of one year after written notice of intent to terminate has been given to the Corporation in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Corporation."

DEPOSIT RATE DIFFERENTIALS

SEC. 365. Section 1 of Public Law 89-597, approved September 21, 1966 (80 Stat. 823), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "In the exercise of such powers the foregoing officers and agencies shall maintain appropriate differentials between the rates of interest payable by national development banks, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, and by other banks and financial institutions with a view to insuring an adequate supply of funds to national development banks in furtherance of the purposes of the Community Credit Expansion Act."

CHAPTER 5—TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS

NATIONAL BANK ACT

SEC. 380. (a) Paragraph "Seventh" of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other

provision of this paragraph, the association may purchase for its own account shares of stock issued by a national development bank chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act, and may deal in, underwrite, and purchase for its own account debentures and other debt obligations issued by any such bank."

FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Sec. 381. (a) The first sentence of paragraph 8 of section 4 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 301) (par. (3)) is amended—

(1) by striking out "and" after "credit conditions,"; and

(2) by inserting before the period the following: ", and the provision of adequate credit to eligible areas (as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act)".

SECURITIES ACTS

Sec. 382. (a) Section 3 of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended (15 U.S.C. 77c), is amended by adding at the end of subsection (a) (2) the following: "or any security issued by a national development bank, chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act";

(b) Clause 1 of section 12(1) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, as amended (15 U.S.C. 78l(1)), is amended by inserting after "national banks" the following: ", national development banks (chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act)".

TITLE IV—NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT FINANCING CORPORATION

CREATION OF CORPORATION

Sec. 401. There is hereby authorized to be created a private corporation, to be known as the "National Development Financing Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The Corporation shall not be an agency or establishment of the United States Government, but shall be subject to the provisions of this title and, to the extent consistent with this title, to the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act (D.C. Code sec. 29-901 et seq.).

PROCESS OF ORGANIZATION

Sec. 402. (a) The President shall appoint incorporators of the Corporation, one of whom shall be designated by the President to serve as chairman.

(b) The incorporators shall take whatever actions are necessary or appropriate to establish the Corporation, including the filing of articles of incorporation as approved by the President.

CAPITAL STOCK

Sec. 403. The Corporation shall have power to issue capital stock in series and amounts approved by the board of directors of the Corporation, but in no case shall more than \$1,000,000,000 of such stock be outstanding at any one time. Such stock may be sold or transferred to any person or organization (other than the United States), subject to the approval of the Corporation, and shall be issued at its fair book value not exceeding par as determined by the bank. The Corporation may pay dividends of not to exceed 6 per centum per annum on such stock, but such dividends shall not be cumulative. Each person or organization holding one or more shares of such stock shall be entitled to one vote for each share held.

PURCHASE OF STOCK BY NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

Sec. 404. Each national development bank, chartered under title III of this Act, shall purchase stock of the Corporation in an amount equal to not more than 2 per centum or less than 1 per centum of the sums borrowed from the Corporation by such bank, as determined by the Corporation.

INITIAL EXPENSES

Sec. 405. In order to facilitate the initial operations of the Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to pay

initial organizing and operating expenses for a period of three years from the date of enactment of this Act. For the purpose of making such payments the Comptroller is authorized to use not to exceed \$1,000,000 of the funds held in the Comptroller's equity account.

CONSOLIDATED BONDS AND DEBENTURES

Sec. 406. The Corporation is authorized to—

(1) issue consolidated bonds or debentures backed by collateral at least equal in value to the amount of bonds or debentures outstanding and which shall consist of the bonds or other debt obligations of national development banks issued pursuant to section 325 of this Act, and approved by the Comptroller of the Currency for this purpose.

(2) invest funds not needed in its financing operations in such property and obligations as it may determine; and

(3) buy and sell securities it has issued or in which it has invested.

EARNINGS

Sec. 407. At the end of each fiscal year, the Corporation shall determine the amount of its net earnings after paying or providing for all operating expenses (including reasonable valuation reserves and losses in excess of any such applicable reserves) and shall apply such earnings as follows:

(1) To the restoration of the amount of the impairment, if any, of capital stock, as determined by its board of directors.

(2) Fifty per centum of any remaining earnings shall be used to create and maintain a surplus account.

(3) Reasonable contingency reserves may be established.

(4) Dividends on stock may be declared at a rate not in excess of 6 per centum of the par value of such stocks.

DIRECTORS

Sec. 408. (a) The Corporation shall have a board of directors consisting of nine individuals who are citizens of the United States, of whom one shall be elected annually by the board to serve as chairman. The initial members of the board shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The terms of directors so appointed shall expire, as designated by the President at the time of appointment, three at the end of two years, three at the end of three years, and three at the end of four years after such date; and any director so appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed, shall be appointed for the remainder of such term. Members of the board who are otherwise compensated by the United States for full-time service shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their full-time service. Other appointed members of the board shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 per day for each day engaged in the performance of their duties as directors. All appointed directors shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law.

(b) Upon the expiration of the term of office of any appointed director of the Corporation, the vacancy shall be filled in the manner prescribed in section 409.

MEETINGS AND SHAREHOLDERS LIST

Sec. 409. Not more than ninety nor less than sixty days prior to the expiration of the terms of appointed directors specified under section 408(a), the board of directors of the Corporation shall cause to be published a current statement of the stockownership of the Corporation, showing the amount and value of shares held by each stockholder, setting forth his name and address. The board shall then call a stockholders meeting to be held at the principal office of the Corporation not more than thirty nor less than twenty days prior to the expiration of the term of

the directors to be replaced, and shall, by registered mail, notify all such stockholders of same, and of the number of votes they are entitled to cast. Any stockholder shall be entitled to propose nominees for election as director prior to and at such stockholders meeting, and proxy voting shall, with proper verification, be permitted. A nominee for director must receive a majority of all votes cast at such meeting to be elected. The board shall have the power to make such rules as may be reasonable and necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

OFFICERS

Sec. 410. The board of directors of the Corporation shall appoint a president of the Corporation and such other officers and employees as it deems necessary to carry out the functions of the Corporation. The president shall be an ex officio member of the board of directors and may participate in meetings of the board, except that he shall have no vote except in case of an equal division. No officer of the Corporation shall receive any salary, other than a pension, from any source other than the Corporation during the period of his employment by the Corporation.

OPERATIONS AND POWERS

Sec. 411. (a) The Corporation is authorized to discount for, or purchase from, any national development bank, organized under title III of this Act, with its endorsement, any note, draft, or other such obligation presented by such bank, and to make loans and advances to any such bank from the proceeds of consolidated bonds or debentures issued by it under section 406(a).

(b) The Corporation is authorized to provide technical assistance to any national development bank in the carrying out of its financial operations.

(c) To carry out its operations, the Corporation shall have such additional powers as are conferred upon a stock corporation by the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act.

TAX EXEMPTION

Sec. 412. The Corporation, its property, its franchise, capital, reserve, surplus, security holdings, and other funds and its income shall be exempt from all taxation now or hereafter imposed by the United States or by any State or local taxing authority; except that (1) any real property and any tangible personal property of the bank shall be subject to Federal, State, and local taxation to the same extent according to its value as other such property is taxed, and (2) any and all obligations issued by the Corporation shall be subjected both as to principal and interest to Federal, State, and local taxation to the same extent as the obligations of private corporations are taxed.

OBLIGATIONS AS LAWFUL INVESTMENTS, ACCEPTANCE AS SECURITY

Sec. 413. All obligations issued by the Corporation shall be lawful investments and may be accepted as security for all fiduciary, trust, and public funds, the investment or deposit of which shall be under authority or control of the United States or of any officer or officers thereof. All stock and obligations issued by the Corporation pursuant to this Act shall be deemed to be exempt securities within the meaning of laws administered by the Securities and Exchange Commission, to the same extent as securities which are direct obligations of or obligations guaranteed as to principal or interest by the United States.

ANNUAL REPORT

Sec. 414. The Corporation shall, not later than January 20 of each year, transmit to the President and the Congress an annual report of its operations and activities.

AMENDMENTS TO OTHER ACTS

Sec. 415. (a) The sixth sentence of the seventh paragraph of section 5136 of the

Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 24), is amended by inserting "or obligations of the National Development Finance Corporation," immediately after "or obligations, participations, or other instruments of or issued by the Federal National Mortgage Association or the Government National Mortgage Association."

(b) Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (12 U.S.C. 84), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) Obligations of the National Development Finance Corporation shall not be subject to any limitation based upon such capital and surplus."

(c) The first paragraph of section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U.S.C. 1464 (c)), is amended by inserting "or in obligations of the National Development Finance Corporation," in the second proviso immediately after "any political subdivision thereof;"

(d) Paragraph (2) of section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (12 U.S.C. 355), is amended by inserting ", or any obligation of the National Development Finance Corporation" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

TITLE V—INCENTIVES TO EXISTING BANKS

EQUITY INVESTMENTS

SEC. 501. Paragraph "seventh" of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Notwithstanding any other provision of this paragraph, the association may (1) purchase for its own account shares of stock issued by any development corporation (meeting criteria established by the Comptroller which serves one or more eligible areas, as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act, or by any business concern in which at least 50 per centum of the outstanding stock having voting rights is held by residents of such areas, and (2) make investments in any business concern in which the other joint owners are residents of such areas; except that the total amount of purchases or other investments made and outstanding by the association under the authority of this sentence shall not exceed at any time 2 per centum of the total outstanding principal amount of all other loans and investments made by it."

GUARANTEES

SEC. 502. Section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"Ninth. To guarantee, or to associate with other national banking associations under a pooling or other arrangement (conforming to criteria prescribed by the Comptroller) to guarantee, the payment of principal and interest on loans and advances of credit made for the benefit of eligible areas, and, for the purposes of this paragraph, loans and advances of credit meeting the requirements of section 323 of the Community Credit Expansion Act shall be considered to be for the benefit of eligible areas. Guarantees under this paragraph shall be made on such terms and conditions and subject to such requirements with respect to reserves to cover losses as the Comptroller shall by regulation require."

REAL ESTATE LOANS

SEC. 503. Any national banking association may make any loan which a national development bank may make pursuant to paragraphs (1), (2), or (3) of section 345 of this Act subject to the limitations on said loans set forth in said section provided that such loan, if made by a national development bank, would be considered as a loan for the benefit of an eligible area as defined in paragraph (2) of section 323 of this Act.

RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 504. Section 19(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 461(b)) is amended by

adding after paragraph 4 (added by section 354(d) of this Act) a new paragraph as follows:

"(5) Under regulations to be prescribed by the Board, the reserve ratios established under paragraphs (1) and (2) shall be reduced by not more than 4 percentage points, and the reserve ratio established under paragraph (3) shall be reduced by not more than 2 percentage points, in the case of any member bank (other than a national development bank the reserve ratios for which are established under paragraph (4)) carrying out a program (in accordance with criteria established by the Board) to increase the percentage of loans and investments made by it for the benefit of eligible areas beyond such percentages which existed as of June 30, 1969. For the purpose of this paragraph, loans meeting the requirements of section 323 of the Community Credit Expansion Act, and investments in national development banks, shall be considered to be for the benefit of eligible areas. Within the limitations hereinabove prescribed, the precise percentage points by which such reserve ratios shall be reduced in the case of any member bank shall be determined on a sliding scale, under regulations of the Board, designed to provide the maximum benefit under this paragraph to those banks which demonstrate the greatest relative increase in such loans and investments."

TITLE VI—FEDERAL SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

CONSUMER LOANS

SEC. 601. Section 5(c) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by adding immediately before the last paragraph the following:

"Without regard to any other provision of this subsection, but subject to such limitations and conditions as the board may by regulation prescribe, any such association may make unsecured loans with maturities not exceeding five years to residents of eligible areas, as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act, for provident or productive purposes at rates of interest not exceeding 1 per centum per month on unpaid balances, inclusive of all charges incident to the making of the loan. The aggregate amount of loans made by any such association under this paragraph which are outstanding at any one time shall not exceed 15 per centum of the assets of such association."

LONG-TERM ADVANCES BY FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANKS TO MEMBER ASSOCIATIONS

SEC. 602. (a) The Federal Home Loan Bank Act is amended by adding after section 10b. a new section as follows:

"Sec. 10c. Each Federal home loan bank is authorized to make long-term advances (not to exceed twenty-five years) to its members or to national development banks chartered under title III of the Community Credit Expansion Act upon the security of—

"(1) mortgages secured by property situated in an eligible area (as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act);

"(2) mortgages secured by single-family residential property situated outside an eligible area and involving principal obligations not in excess of the limits applicable to mortgages insured under section 235(1) of the National Housing Act, if (A) the mortgagor under any such mortgage is a resident of such area at the time of the execution of the mortgage and had been such a resident for a period of not less than one year immediately preceding the execution of such mortgage, and (B) the property covered by such mortgage is not sold to a person who is a nonresident of such an area for a period of at least two years after the execution of such mortgage; and

"(3) mortgages secured by multifamily residential property situated outside an eligible area and involving principal obliga-

tions per family units not in excess of the limits specified in section 221(d)(3)(ii) of the National Housing Act: *Provided*, That not less than 50 per centum of the residents of such property during a period of at least two years after the execution of the mortgage are persons who were residents of an eligible area at the time they became occupants of such property.

No such advance shall be in an amount in excess of the unpaid principal of the mortgage loan. The provisions of subsections (b), (c), and (d) of section 10 shall be applicable to advances made under this section; except that (A) any such mortgage loan may have more than thirty years (but not more than forty-five years) to run to maturity, and (B) advances made under this section shall not be considered for purposes of applying the limitations set forth in the second sentence of such subsection (c)."

(b) Section 11 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1431) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" in subsection (b);

(2) by striking out "section 10(a)" in the last sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 10(a) and 10c."; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) Each Federal Home Loan Bank shall establish a Low Income Housing Fund for the purpose of making advances to its members under section 10c in order to aid in achieving the purposes of the Community Credit Expansion Act. Such fund shall be managed under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board in furtherance of the purposes of such Act, and the proceeds from the sale of debentures issued under this subsection shall be made available to any such bank, as needed, for the purpose of establishing and maintaining such fund"

TITLE VII—FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

POWERS OF FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

SEC. 701. (a) Section 8(10) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1757(10)) is amended by inserting after "Provided, That," the following: "the foregoing limitation may be waived, under rules and regulations prescribed by the Director in the case of any Federal credit union the members of which are predominantly residents of eligible areas, as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act: *Provided further, That*."

(b) Section 8 of such Act (12 U.S.C. 1757) is amended by adding after paragraph (5) the following new paragraph:

"(5A) in the case of any Federal credit union the members of which are predominantly residents of an eligible area (as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act), and subject to such limitations as the Director may by rules and regulations prescribe, to guarantee persons, firms, or organizations regularly engaged in extending credit in the form of loans or in connection with the sale of property or services against losses which they may sustain as a result of advances of credit made by them to the members of any such Federal credit union, and to charge such fees for any such guarantee and to establish such reserves to cover losses arising in connection therewith as the Director shall by regulation prescribe;"

GUARANTEE OF LOANS; INSURANCE AGAINST LOSSES ON LINES OF CREDIT EXTENDED BY CERTAIN FEDERAL CREDIT UNIONS

SEC. 702. (a) Section 21(f) of the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C. 1766(f)) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(3) (A) To assist Federal credit unions the members of which are predominantly residents of eligible areas, as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act, the Director is authorized, in ac-

cordance with rules and regulations prescribed by him, to guarantee loans made to any such credit union, and to establish reasonable fees or charges for guarantees granted hereunder.

"(B) The Director is further authorized, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by him, to offer to any Federal credit union insurance against losses which it may sustain in connection with the guarantee program authorized by paragraph 5(A) of section 8 of this Act, and to charge reasonable premiums or fees for insurance granted hereunder.

"(C) (1) All funds obtained by the Director in connection with the guarantee or insurance programs authorized under subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall be deposited in a revolving fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. The fund shall be used only for the purposes of such programs including the payment of administrative expenses. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations (including but not limited to funds held in reserve for losses) shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(II) Upon the establishment of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund the sum of \$1,000,000, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfer to the fund. The Director shall, whenever feasible, having regard to the current operation of the fund, repay, from time to time, sums so transferred. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(III) In the event that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to meet obligations arising under subparagraph (A) or (B), the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon request by the Director, transfer to the fund such sums as may be necessary to fulfill such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may use, for the purpose of making any such transfer, the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfers to the fund. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Director such sums as may be necessary to repay such transfers. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury."

TITLE VIII—CONSUMER CREDIT GUARANTEES

AUTHORITY TO GUARANTEE

Sec. 801. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to guarantee creditors, which the Secretary finds to be qualified by experience and facilities and approves as eligible for guarantees under this section, against losses which they may sustain as a result of loans and extensions of credit made to persons of low income residing in eligible areas, subject to the following limitations:

(1) Any such loan or extension of credit must be for personal, family, or household purposes.

(2) The rate of interest charged on any such loan or extension of credit shall not exceed the ceilings established by the Secretary to facilitate the purposes of this Act.

(3) The prices charged for goods or services sold on credit guaranteed under this title must generally conform to prices avail-

able to persons who are not residents of eligible areas.

(4) The person to whom credit is extended under this section does not qualify for credit under the customary credit standards maintained by the creditor at the time the credit was extended or at the time of the enactment of this Act.

(5) There shall be reasonable assurance of repayment, in accordance with such criteria as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe having due regard for the purpose of this Act, with respect to any such loan or extension of credit.

(6) The amount of any claim for loss on any such loan or extension of credit paid by the Secretary under this title to any creditor shall not exceed 80 per centum of such loss.

(b) Guarantees issued under this section shall, insofar as practicable, apply to all loans or extensions of credit, meeting the requirements of this section and regulations prescribed thereunder made after the date of enactment of this Act by approved creditors without requiring the approval of the Secretary of each such loan or extension of credit.

(c) The Secretary shall make such reasonable charges for or in connection with guarantees under this section as he determines to be appropriate. Such charges shall be fixed with a view to obtaining income which will be sufficient, having due regard for the purposes of this Act, for a self-supporting program.

FINANCING

Sec. 802. (a) All funds obtained by the Secretary in connection with the guarantee program authorized by this title shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be known as the consumer credit guarantee fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund") which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. The fund shall be used only for the purposes of the program authorized by this title, including the payment of administrative expenses. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations (including but not limited to funds held in reserve for losses) shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

(b) Upon the establishment of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund the sum of \$1,000,000, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfer to the fund. The Secretary shall whenever feasible, having regard to the current operation of the fund, repay from time to time sums so transferred. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

(c) In the event that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to meet obligations arising under guarantees issued under this title, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon request by the Secretary, transfer to the fund such sums as may be necessary to fulfill such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may use, for the purpose of making any such transfer, the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfers to the fund. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to repay such transfers. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

AUDIT BY GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE

Sec. 803. Insofar as they relate to loans or extensions of credit guaranteed under this title, the financial transactions of creditors approved for guarantees under this title may be audited by the General Accounting Office under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, records, reports, files, and other papers belonging to such creditors pertaining to such financial transactions and necessary to facilitate the audit.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 804. In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this title, the Secretary shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in subsections (c), (d), (g), and (h) of section 2 of the National Housing Act, and any reference in such subsections to insurance granted by the Secretary shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to refer to guarantees granted by the Secretary.

TITLE IX—COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL LOAN AND LEASE GUARANTEES

AMENDMENT TO TITLE II OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Sec. 901. Title II of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3141-3143) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sections:

"COMMERCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL LOAN AND LEASE GUARANTEES

"Sec. 204. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to guarantee the payment of loans or other evidence of indebtedness or lease rentals in order to assist in financing any project located within a redevelopment area or outside such area if the project is primarily for the benefit of such an area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings; and (2) to guarantee loans or other evidence of indebtedness for working capital made to private borrowers by private lenders in connection with projects assisted under clause (1), upon application of the lender or lessee and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe: *Provided, however,* That no such working capital loan guarantee shall at anytime exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan.

"(b) Guarantee assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

"(1) Such guarantees shall not be made to assist establishments relocating from one area to another or to assist subcontractors whose purpose is to divest, or whose economic success is dependent upon divesting, other contractors or subcontractors of contracts theretofore customarily performed by them: *Provided, however,* That such limitation shall not be construed to prohibit guarantee assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment of the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operation of the existing business entity in the

area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

"(2) The project for which guarantee assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within a redevelopment area.

"(3) No guarantee shall be made hereunder unless the funds required for such project are not available without such guarantee from private lenders on terms which in the opinion of the Secretary will permit the accomplishment of the project.

"(4) No loan, lease, or working capital loan shall be guaranteed unless it is determined that there is reasonable assurance that the obligations guarantee will be met.

"(5) No guarantee under this section shall be made for a period exceeding thirty years.

"(6) The Secretary may make such charges for or in connection with guarantees as he may deem appropriate.

"(7) No lease guarantee under this section shall exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the remaining unpaid rental payments for the terms of the guarantee.

"(8) No loan guarantee under this section shall at any time exceed the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan.

"(9) No loan for a principal sum in excess of 90 per centum of the actual cost of a project, as determined by the Secretary shall be guaranteed or secured by a lease guarantee under this section.

"(10) No such guarantees shall be made unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which guarantee assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided*, That nothing in this Act shall authorize guarantee assistance for any project prohibited by the laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located, nor prevent the Secretary from requiring such periodic revisions of previously approved overall economic development programs as he may deem appropriate.

"(c) All loan, lease, or working capital loan guarantees issued under this section shall be considered contingent liabilities backed by the full faith and credit of the United States.

"GUARANTEE FUND

"Sec. 205. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 203, all funds obtained by the Secretary in connection with the loan and lease guarantee program authorized under section 204 shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be known as the commercial or industrial guarantee fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. The fund shall be used only for the purposes of the program authorized under section 204, including the payment of administrative expenses. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations (including but not limited to funds held in reserve for losses) shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(b) Upon the establishment of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund the sum of \$2,000,000, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfer to the fund. The Secretary shall from time to time repay such transfer to the Secretary of the Treasury to the extent feasible under the current operations

of the fund. Interest on funds so transferred shall be paid by the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(c) In the event that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to pay upon demand any sum due under the loan and lease guarantees issued pursuant to section 204, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon notification by the Secretary, transfer to the fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, sufficient funds to make the necessary payments. The Secretary of the Treasury may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfers to the fund. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Commerce such sums as may be necessary to repay such transfers. Interest on funds so transferred shall be paid by the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury."

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Sec. 902. (a) Section 701 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3211) is amended by inserting in paragraph (4) after "loans", the first place it appears, "or guarantees"; and by inserting in such paragraph after "loans", the second place it appears, ", guarantees".

(b) Section 701 (5) of such Act is amended by inserting after "maturity" the words "or term"; by inserting after "loan", the first place it appears, "or guarantee"; by inserting after "loan", the second place it appears, ", guarantee," and by inserting after "loan", the third place it appears, ", guaranteed obligation".

(c) Section 701 (6) of such Act is amended by inserting after "loans" the words "or guarantees".

(d) Section 701 (7) of such Act is amended by inserting after "loans", each place it appears, "or guarantees".

(e) Section 701 (8) of such Act is amended by inserting "204", after "202".

(f) Section 701 (9) of such Act is amended by inserting after "loans" the words "or guarantees".

TITLE X—SMALL BUSINESS LOAN GUARANTEES

AMENDMENT TO SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Sec. 1001. Section 7 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(g) (1) The Administration is also empowered to guarantee banks and other lending institutions, which the Administration finds to be qualified by experience and facilities and approves as eligible for loan guarantees, against losses which they may sustain as a result of loans and advances of credit, and purchases of obligations representing loans and advances of credit, subject to the following limitations:

"(A) Any such loan or advance of credit must be one which the Administration is empowered to make, or purchase a participation in, under subsection (a).

"(B) The purpose of any such loan or advance of credit must be to assist, in conformity with criteria specified in regulations prescribed by the Administration, in the development or operation of small business enterprise in eligible areas (as defined in section 202 of the Community Credit Expansion Act) by the residents thereof.

"(C) No such loan or advance of credit shall be eligible for guarantee under this subsection unless there is reasonable assurance of repayment in accordance with such criteria as the Administration shall by regulation prescribe having due regard for the purpose set forth in section 1 of the Community Credit Expansion Act.

"(D) The amount of any claim for loss on any such loan or advance of credit paid by the Administration under this subsection to

any bank or other lending institution shall not exceed 90 per centum of such loss.

"(2) Guarantees issued under this subsection shall, insofar as practicable, apply to all loans or advances of credit, meeting the requirements of this subsection, and regulations prescribed thereunder, made after the date of enactment of the Community Credit Expansion Act, by approved banks or other lending institutions without requiring the approval of the Administration of each such loan or advance of credit.

"(3) The Administration shall make such charges for or in connection with guarantees under this subsection as he determines are appropriate having due regard for the purposes sought to be achieved by this subsection.

"(4) (A) All funds obtained by the Administration in connection with the guarantee program authorized under this subsection shall be deposited in a revolving fund to be known as the small business loan guarantee fund (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States. The fund shall be used only for the purposes of the program authorized by this subsection, including the payment of administrative expenses. Moneys in the fund not needed for current operations (including but not limited to funds held in reserve for losses) shall be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States to the credit of the fund or invested in bonds or other obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

"(B) Upon the establishment of the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the fund the sum of \$2,000,000, and for that purpose the Secretary of the Treasury may use as a public debt transaction the proceeds from the sale of securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfer to the fund. The Administration shall whenever feasible, having regard to the current operation of the fund, repay from time to time sums so transferred. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"(C) In the event that there are insufficient moneys in the fund to meet obligations arising under guarantees issued under this subsection, the Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon request by the Administration, transfer to the fund such sums as may be necessary to fulfill such obligations. The Secretary of the Treasury may use, for the purpose of making any such transfer, the proceeds from the sale of any securities issued under the Second Liberty Bond Act, and the purposes for which such securities may be issued under such Act are extended to include such transfers to the fund. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Administration such sums as may be necessary to repay such transfers. Interest on sums so transferred shall be paid from the fund at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury."

TITLE XI—GOVERNMENT-INDUSTRY FINANCIAL PLANNING COUNCIL

ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL

Sec. 1101. (a) There is hereby established a Government-Industry Financial Planning Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council").

(b) The Council shall consist of twenty-five members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Not more than five persons nominated for appointment as members of the Council shall be officers or employees of the Federal Government. All other persons so nominated shall be from private life and shall be selected for their qualifications in financial, consumer, and business affairs.

(c) The term of office of each member of the Council shall be four years, except that (1) the terms of the members first appointed

shall expire, as designated by the President, five at the end of one year, five at the end of two years, five at the end of three years, and ten at the end of four years; and (2) any member appointed to fill a vacancy shall serve for the remainder of the term for which his predecessor was appointed.

(d) Members of the Council who are appointed from the Government shall not receive additional compensation by reason of their service on the Council. Other members of the Council shall receive compensation at the rate of \$100 for each day engaged in the business of the Council. All members of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) The President shall call the first meeting of the Council and designate an Acting Chairman. The Council shall, from time to time thereafter, select one of the members from private life to serve as Chairman of the Council.

(f) The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman, but not less often than once every six months.

FUNCTIONS

SEC. 1102. (a) The Council shall—

(1) determine the needs of eligible areas for additional sources of credit in furtherance of the purposes of this Act;

(2) recommend reasonable investment goals to the various segments of the business and financial community in meeting the credit needs of eligible areas;

(3) review annually the extent to which private capital is being invested in the redevelopment of eligible areas and the extent to which credit is flowing into such areas; and

(4) serve as a clearinghouse for information on the availability of private financing and credit in redeveloping eligible areas and meeting the credit needs of its residents.

(b) The Council shall submit an annual report, and such interim reports as it deems advisable, to the President and the Congress with respect to the administration of its functions under this section, and setting forth such recommendations for administrative and legislative actions as it determines to be desirable in furtherance of the purposes of this Act.

GENERAL AUTHORITY

SEC. 1103. The Council may—

(1) appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates; except that the salary of any person so employed shall not exceed the maximum salary established by the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) obtain the services of experts and consultants from private life in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(3) receive money and other property donated by private nongovernmental sources, without condition or restriction other than it be used for the purposes of the Council; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of any such property in carrying out its functions; and

(4) make other expenditures necessary to carry out its functions.

APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 1104. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title are hereby authorized to be appropriated. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

TITLE XII—SUPERVISION OF, AND REPORTS CONCERNING, FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

DEFINITION

SEC. 1201. As used in this title the term "Federal supervisory agency" means—

(1) the Comptroller of the Currency with respect to national banks and district banks;

(2) the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System with respect to Federal Reserve banks and State banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System;

(3) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation with respect to State banks which are not members of the Federal Reserve System but the deposits of which are insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation;

(4) the Federal Home Loan Bank Board with respect to Federal savings and loan associations, and institutions the accounts of which are insured by the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation; and

(5) the Director of the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions with respect to Federal credit unions.

ADEQUACY OF FINANCIAL SERVICE TO ELIGIBLE AREAS

SEC. 1202. (a) Each Federal supervisory agency shall, in the exercise of its examination or other supervisory functions with respect to the financial institutions indicated in section 801, determine the extent to which each such institution is providing adequate service to the community, with particular reference to any community which is an eligible area.

(b) Each such agency shall report annually to the Congress and to the Government-Industry Financial Planning Council established under title XI of this Act concerning the extent to which institutions under its supervision, located geographically so as to be able to provide financial assistance to persons and projects in eligible areas, are making loans or investments in such areas, together with such recommendations as such agency may deem appropriate.

The summary, presented by Mr. PROXMIRE, is as follows:

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE COMMUNITY CREDIT EXPANSION ACT

Title I. Purpose.—The purpose is to increase the flow of private consumer, mortgage and business credit to urban and rural areas.

Title II. Eligible Areas.—Urban and rural poverty areas would be designated by the Secretary of Commerce on the basis of income, employment, educational levels, housing conditions and welfare incidence.

Title III. National Development Banks.—Establishes a new system of privately owned and operated financial institutions called National Development Banks chartered by the Federal Government. Such banks would have powers similar to national banks, but would be required to invest 80% of their funds to benefit poverty areas. In return, they would receive more flexible authorities including lower reserve requirements and a more favorable access to funds including the right to issue guaranteed debentures. Such banks could be owned by individuals or operated as subsidiaries of existing banks.

Title IV. National Development Financing Corporation.—Establishes a private corporation to act as a borrowing agent for National Development Banks by purchasing their debentures and reissuing consolidated debentures.

Title V. Incentives to existing banks.—Provides incentives for other banks to invest in poverty areas by authorizing equity investments and banks guarantee authority, by liberalizing terms on mortgage loans, and by reducing reserve requirements.

Title VI. Savings and Loan Associations.—Authorizes Federal Savings and Loan As-

sociations to make consumer loans in poverty areas and authorizes the Home Loan Bank System to provide long term loans to member associations on the condition the funds be used to make mortgage loans benefiting poverty areas.

Title VII. Federal Credit Unions.—Establishes a new program for guaranteeing loans to credit unions serving poverty areas. Authorizes such credit unions to guarantee credit extended to their members, backed by Federal reinsurance.

Title VIII. Consumer Credit Guarantees.—Authorizes a new consumer-credit guarantee program under the administration of the Department of Housing and Urban Development for credit extended to residents of poverty areas.

Title IX. EDA guarantees.—Authorizes the Economic Development Administration to extend loan and lease guarantees to aid firms creating new jobs for the residents of poverty areas.

Title X. SBA guarantees.—Streamlines the SBA business loan guarantee program by authorizing blanket guarantee procedures to cut processing time and by removing the requirement to use appropriated funds to build reserves.

Title XI. Financial Planning Council. Authorizes a government-industry financial planning council to review credit needs of poverty areas and recommend private investment targets.

Title XII. Bank Supervision.—Broadens bank examination procedures to take into account service to poverty areas. Requires periodic reports to Congress on the extent of private investment in poverty areas.

S. 2147—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE IMPACTED AREAS ACT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the present administration has decreed that the 1960's conclude in an era of consolidation and coordination.

It is important however, that consolidation and coordination mean tuning up, not toning down—that we expand our domestic programs where necessary as well as contracting them where warranted. And in education especially, we must surely do more as well as doing it better.

A century ago, Horace Mann called education "the great equalizer of the conditions of men—the balance wheel of social machinery."

This balance wheel is inoperative for a great many poor Americans today.

To continue to tolerate a situation in rural and urban slum areas where 40 to 60 percent of sixth graders perform at second grade level, where 30 percent do not finish high school, is to insure that the cycle of poverty, futility, nonproductivity, and waste which afflicts too many Americans today will be with us indefinitely.

And our opportunity to interrupt the cycle of poverty may soon disappear.

Everywhere in our society, rapid changes are taking place. Science and technology are being utilized by agriculture, industry, business, the armed services, and the health services as never before—putting new and profoundly different demands on the U.S. labor force.

As we move ever more rapidly into the technological age, with its concomitant demands for better education and constant adjustment to rapid change, we

may irrevocably forfeit the last opportunity to deal with poverty.

A noted educator, writing of disadvantaged children in a Brookings Institute study published in Agenda for the Nation, stated:

Lack of education is not a new phenomenon, but it is much more serious now than a few decades ago and is not likely to be balanced by other kinds of opportunities for learning, for employment, and for enhanced personal satisfaction. For most of these children and youth, education is the only means available for advancement, and they don't get it.

It is time to see that America's children do get the education they need, and especially those who need it most.

The Constitution of the United States

grants Congress the power to legislate and to appropriate. In so doing, it places upon us a large share of the responsibility to set national priorities and channel national resources toward national goals.

I urge that the 91st Congress make education first among these, and pledge the full faith and credit of the American people to guarantee a full and excellent education to every American child.

And toward this end I wish to introduce a bill on behalf of myself and 20 colleagues to include federally financed public housing in the definition of impacted areas eligible to receive Federal education assistance.

The U.S. Housing Act of 1937 was among the earliest and most enlightened

strategies in America's continuing war on poverty. Since its passage, over 698,000 housing units for poor people have been constructed, and an additional 238,000 units are now planned or under construction. They are located in over 3,000 communities in all 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Over 75 percent of the units are located in cities over 25,000, and over 50 percent in the 46 largest cities in the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that a State by State summary of Federal housing be printed in the RECORD at this time.

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

STATE SUMMARY OF HAA-AIDED PUBLIC HOUSING PROGRAM OPERATED BY LOCAL HOUSING AUTHORITIES AS OF DEC. 31, 1967

State	Number of local authorities	Number of housing units, by status					Number of projects by status				
		Total	Under reservation	In preconstruction	Construction	Under management ¹	Total	In preconstruction	Under construction	Under management	
Alabama.....	134	35,816	1,998	3,875	2,072	27,871	394	37	18	339	
Arizona.....	20	4,585	590	596	348	3,051	62	14	11	37	
Arkansas.....	89	9,996	548	1,629	1,120	6,699	157	33	13	111	
California.....	50	37,680	1,876	4,256	266	31,282	247	14	5	228	
Colorado.....	14	4,774	58	266	140	4,310	36	6	2	27	
Connecticut.....	25	16,198	1,847	1,417	501	12,433	92	16	5	72	
Delaware.....	3	2,265	266	381	122	1,496	12	1	2	6	
Florida.....	60	27,843	2,386	4,847	441	20,169	211	7	7	176	
Georgia.....	193	47,000	6,164	3,470	1,290	36,076	614	37	15	568	
Idaho.....	6	389	30	40	60	259	3	3	1	1	
Illinois.....	76	66,044	4,193	8,405	2,866	50,580	382	43	33	309	
Indiana.....	26	14,225	1,375	4,215	1,910	6,725	87	29	12	47	
Iowa.....	15	965	160	281	446	78	14	3	9	6	
Kansas.....	23	4,095	625	1,960	467	1,043	30	20	4	2	
Kentucky.....	101	20,124	1,792	2,259	1,999	14,074	193	33	21	139	
Louisiana.....	75	27,119	4,427	3,132	871	18,689	188	29	11	146	
Maine.....	6	1,171	293	175	307	396	10	2	2	6	
Maryland.....	14	16,983	1,801	2,639	342	12,201	60	10	4	46	
Massachusetts.....	36	32,765	4,218	5,171	1,305	22,071	145	28	10	107	
Michigan.....	72	23,835	5,651	3,443	1,742	12,999	120	32	22	66	
Minnesota.....	32	14,091	1,060	5,047	1,280	6,704	87	25	14	48	
Mississippi.....	38	7,209	576	468	67	6,098	120	7	2	111	
Missouri.....	53	17,171	980	2,793	1,571	11,827	74	23	10	41	
Montana.....	13	1,437	205	100	165	967	32	5	9	18	
Nebraska.....	75	7,689	1,532	1,532	279	4,346	81	8	10	63	
Nevada.....	10	1,925	20	315	185	1,405	20	3	3	14	
New Hampshire.....	11	3,035	591	854	-----	1,590	25	8	-----	17	
New Jersey.....	62	46,117	3,177	4,040	3,482	35,418	224	24	14	186	
New Mexico.....	27	2,644	420	1,013	164	1,047	46	18	3	25	
New York.....	62	108,450	8,424	14,775	6,329	78,922	252	68	17	167	
North Carolina.....	63	23,731	3,592	3,410	748	15,981	173	32	4	132	
North Dakota.....	8	766	170	-----	180	416	15	-----	4	11	
Ohio.....	23	37,923	2,723	6,677	1,667	26,856	142	30	12	100	
Oklahoma.....	73	9,126	3,918	4,042	276	890	66	57	6	3	
Oregon.....	9	4,232	290	1,282	142	2,618	38	5	3	30	
Pennsylvania.....	52	68,521	7,326	12,724	2,067	46,404	323	67	25	231	
Rhode Island.....	21	9,050	887	960	608	6,595	44	8	5	31	
South Carolina.....	16	9,505	1,121	1,353	286	6,745	111	7	2	102	
South Dakota.....	5	716	50	70	168	428	17	2	5	10	
Tennessee.....	74	31,597	3,316	2,838	907	24,536	281	34	12	235	
Texas.....	281	46,844	3,745	4,265	1,474	37,360	517	58	30	429	
Utah.....	1	30	-----	-----	30	30	2	-----	-----	2	
Vermont.....	6	752	427	87	60	178	6	1	1	4	
Virginia.....	17	16,099	839	1,434	219	13,607	67	4	3	60	
Washington.....	22	11,454	741	2,637	387	7,689	88	30	8	50	
West Virginia.....	23	4,608	1,060	645	330	2,573	34	7	4	23	
Wisconsin.....	33	6,866	426	610	1,614	4,216	56	10	20	26	
Wyoming.....	1	40	-----	-----	20	20	3	-----	-----	1	
District of Columbia.....	1	12,709	460	1,708	485	10,056	51	9	4	38	
Alaska.....	2	729	10	99	103	517	19	6	2	11	
Hawaii.....	1	4,410	329	816	151	3,114	31	7	1	23	
Puerto Rico.....	1	40,176	1,254	4,008	4,616	30,298	163	20	19	124	
Virgin Islands.....	1	2,422	64	866	198	1,294	14	5	2	7	
Guam.....	1	250	-----	-----	-----	-----	1	1	-----	-----	
Total.....	2,156	946,196	90,031	134,175	48,843	673,147	6,290	1,008	468	4,815	

¹ Includes completed units under construction.

² Includes 42 projects (6,017 units) ACC approved not yet executed.

Note. Excludes 1 PWA project (80 units) directly operated.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, federally built public housing has been a boon to millions of poor families over the years, and an increasingly insupportable burden for the communities where it is located.

For these units are not taxable by local government and their residents pay little in taxes as well. Yet these are the people whose requirements for public services are greatest.

The initial imbalance between local needs and available resources is not static; it has tended to escalate. Federal public housing policy—like many other Federal welfare policies—lures the rural poor to cities large and small. At the same time, medium- and high-income taxpayers, along with more and more industry and businesses, are moving out of the central cities. And the result is that more and more cities have less and

less resources to deal with the human problem of poverty whichever more urgently demands solution.

It is the impact of this syndrome on education that concerns me today.

An excellent education is the one opportunity most likely to save this generation of public-housing children from becoming the parents of the next. They need it most, and they are not getting it in large part because school districts

in which the Federal Government has chosen to locate its public housing projects cannot afford to provide it.

Testimony presented before the House General Subcommittee on Education indicated that enrollment in certain surveyed areas doubled because of immigration with the construction of federally financed housing—but nobody offered to pick up the tab for doubling the number of classrooms.

Children from nonpublic housing in the district can suffer as well. They attend the same crowded and financially overburdened schools. Their parents are forced to bear a heavier tax burden for education, receive less for their money, and look for ways to escape to the suburbs. The cycle of fiscal decline continues—presumably in an atmosphere of increasing frustration and bitterness between public housing residents, local citizens, and local government.

The estimated per pupil expenditure in the United States for the 1968-69 school year has risen to \$895. With local governments contributing about half the cost of public elementary and secondary education, this places an average burden of about \$450 on local tax sources.

I ask unanimous consent that a table containing the estimated public school revenue per pupil and percent of education costs borne by local, State, and Federal governments for the 1968-69 school year be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

Total public school revenue per pupil in ADA, 1968-69

1. New York	\$1,500
2. Alaska (7-\$1,066)	1,421
3. New Jersey	1,115
4. Maryland	1,105
5. Delaware	1,099
6. Connecticut	1,086
7. Oregon	1,070
8. Vermont	1,015
9. Michigan	991
10. Nevada	981
11. Wisconsin	976
12. Illinois	973
13. California	959
14. Hawaii	943
15. Kansas	929
16. Minnesota	918
17. Massachusetts	914
18. Pennsylvania	908
19. Rhode Island	899
20. Washington	897
United States	895
21. Wyoming	892
22. Indiana	865
23. New Hampshire	861
24. Montana	856
25. Arizona	851
26. Louisiana	844
27. Iowa	834
28. Colorado	823
29. Florida	804
30. New Mexico	796
31. Virginia	794
32. Ohio	785
33. Missouri	783
34. North Dakota	752
35. Texas	717
36. Kentucky	699
37. Nebraska	695
Utah	695
39. South Dakota	678
40. Oklahoma	677
41. Maine	670
42. Idaho	642
43. North Carolina	631

Total public school revenue per pupil in ADA, 1968-69—Continued

44. Georgia	\$625
45. West Virginia	613
46. Tennessee	611
47. Arkansas	603
48. Mississippi	588
49. South Carolina	583
50. Alabama	484

Estimated percent of revenue for public, elementary and secondary schools from local governments, 1968-69

[In percent]

1. New Hampshire	86.0
2. Oregon	75.6
3. Nebraska	74.8
4. South Dakota	73.7
5. Massachusetts	70.7
6. Wisconsin	69.4
7. Colorado	68.9
8. Illinois	68.1
9. New Jersey	67.9
10. Vermont	66.2
11. North Dakota	66.0
12. Montana	65.4
13. Connecticut	64.3
14. Iowa	63.2
15. Kansas	63.0
16. Indiana	61.1
17. California	59.9
18. Ohio	59.8
19. Rhode Island	59.7
20. Missouri	59.4
21. Maine	58.0
22. Maryland	56.0
23. Oklahoma	55.4
24. Nevada	54.0
Wyoming	54.0
United States	51.9
26. Michigan	51.7
27. Minnesota	50.1
28. Virginia	50.0
29. Idaho	49.7
30. Pennsylvania	49.3
31. New York	47.9
32. Utah	41.9
33. Texas	41.3
34. Tennessee	39.4
35. West Virginia	37.6
36. Arizona	36.4
37. Arkansas	36.4
38. Florida	33.3
39. Kentucky	32.8
40. Washington	32.5
41. Alaska	29.6
42. Louisiana	26.9
Mississippi	26.9
44. Georgia	25.7
45. South Carolina	24.3
46. Alabama	24.1
47. New Mexico	23.1
48. Delaware	19.9
49. North Carolina	19.8
50. Hawaii	5.2

Estimated Percent of Revenue for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools From State Governments, 1968-69

[In percent]

1. Hawaii	84.8
2. Delaware	72.7
3. North Carolina	67.3
4. South Carolina	63.6
5. Georgia	63.2
6. Louisiana	62.8
7. New Mexico	61.8
8. Washington	60.8
9. Alabama	60.0
10. Florida	56.5
11. Arizona	55.2
12. Mississippi	53.1
13. Utah	52.0
14. Kentucky	51.3
15. West Virginia	50.2
16. Tennessee	48.7
17. New York	47.8
18. Texas	47.1
19. Arkansas	46.7
20. Pennsylvania	45.2

Estimated Percent of Revenue for Public Elementary and Secondary Schools From State Governments, 1968-69—Continued

[In percent]

21. Alaska	44.7
22. Michigan	44.3
23. Minnesota	43.3
24. Idaho	40.9
United States	40.9
25. Virginia	40.7
26. Nevada	38.8
27. Maryland	37.3
28. Ohio	34.9
29. Maine	34.7
30. California	34.3
Missouri	34.3
32. Indiana	34.0
33. Rhode Island	33.6
34. Oklahoma	32.7
35. Iowa	32.6
36. Connecticut	31.3
37. Vermont	29.7
38. Kansas	29.2
39. Montana	27.6
40. New Jersey	27.5
41. Illinois	26.7
42. North Dakota	26.1
43. Wisconsin	26.0
44. Wyoming	25.4
45. Colorado	24.0
46. Massachusetts	22.4
47. Oregon	17.7
48. Nebraska	17.6
49. South Dakota	11.4
50. New Hampshire	9.1

Estimated percent of revenue for public elementary and secondary schools from the Federal Government, 1968-69

[In percent]

1. Alaska	25.7
2. Wyoming	20.6
3. Mississippi	20.0
4. Arkansas	16.9
5. Alabama	15.9
6. Kentucky	15.8
7. New Mexico	15.1
8. South Dakota	14.9
9. North Carolina	12.9
10. West Virginia	12.2
11. South Carolina	12.1
12. Oklahoma	11.9
Tennessee	11.9
14. Texas	11.6
15. Georgia	11.0
16. Louisiana	10.3
17. Florida	10.2
18. Hawaii	10.0
19. Idaho	9.3
Virginia	9.3
21. Arizona	8.0
22. North Dakota	7.9
23. Kansas	7.8
24. Nebraska	7.6
25. Delaware	7.4
United States	7.3
26. Maine	7.2
Nevada	7.2
28. Colorado	7.1
Montana	7.1
30. Massachusetts	6.9
31. Maryland	6.7
Oregon	6.7
Rhode Island	6.7
Washington	6.7
35. Minnesota	6.6
36. Missouri	6.3
37. Utah	6.1
38. California	5.9
39. Pennsylvania	5.5
40. Ohio	5.3
41. Illinois	5.2
42. New Hampshire	4.9
43. Indiana	4.8
44. New Jersey	4.6
Wisconsin	4.6
46. Connecticut	4.4
47. Iowa	4.2
New York	4.2
Vermont	4.2
50. Michigan	3.9

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, because Federal housing is tax exempt and adds nothing to local school revenue, housing authorities usually make small payments in lieu of taxes. A recent U.S. Office of Education survey of our 35 largest cities found that the average payment for education under this arrangement was \$11.61 per child.

One need only subtract the average payments in lieu of taxes from the local cost of education per pupil, to realize the staggering problem faced by local school districts dependent on local tax sources.

Mr. President, it is time for the Federal Government to meet its obligations—to step in and rescue these children and these school districts—unless we are prepared to pay the awful cost in idleness, welfare, and waste for generations to come.

I am therefore introducing for myself and Senators INOUYE, of Hawaii; MAGNUSON, of Washington; BAYH, of Indiana; NELSON, of Wisconsin; DODD, of Connecticut; MCGEE, of Wyoming; HATFIELD, of Oregon; METCALF, of Montana;

HARTKE, of Indiana; HOLLINGS, of South Carolina; STEVENS, of Alaska; HART, of Michigan; BROOKE, of Massachusetts; WILLIAMS, of New Jersey; KENNEDY, of Massachusetts; TYDINGS, of Maryland; HARRIS, of Oklahoma; MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; GRAVEL, of Alaska; and MONTROYA, of New Mexico, a bill to amend the definition of "Federal property" in Public Law 81-874 to include low-rent housing assisted under the Federal Housing Act of 1937, thus entitling children living therein to be considered "federally connected children," and to receive the benefits of educational assistance to federally impacted areas.

Under this amendment, children living in public housing would be considered "B" students under Public Law 874, meaning that local school districts would be reimbursed for approximately one-half of the local cost of education for each pupil in the school district living in public housing.

Aid under this amendment would be given to the local school districts for use in their general operating budgets and

would be administered by the U.S. Commissioner of Education under authority vested in him.

This would enable school districts to use the money as they saw fit and to provide much needed assistance without creating yet another new agency and without the further proliferation of bureaucratic red tape.

In fiscal year 1970, approximately \$226,916,000 would be required, an average of \$198 for each of the estimated 1,144,908 children living in Federal housing, in addition to the estimated entitlement of \$662,246,000 under the impacted areas law as it now stands.

I ask unanimous consent that a table listing the number of Federal housing units by congressional district, the estimated number of eligible students in each district, and the estimated entitlement, based on one-half of the estimated 1970 state average "A" rate, be printed in the Record at this point.

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

ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS, BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM

[Based on number of units completed as of June 30, 1968]

State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)	State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)
Alabama:				Connecticut:			
Total	29,532	48,431	\$7,265,000	Total	13,059	21,417	\$5,544,000
1	3,870	6,347	952,000	1	3,184	5,222	1,352,000
2	2,941	4,823	724,000	2	827	1,356	351,000
3	3,513	5,761	864,000	3	2,770	4,543	1,176,000
4	2,662	4,366	655,000	4	4,373	7,172	1,856,000
5	3,371	5,528	829,000	5	855	1,402	363,000
6	5,857	9,605	1,441,000	6	1,050	1,722	446,000
7	3,807	6,243	936,000				
8	3,511	5,758	864,000	Delaware, at large, total	1,614	2,647	489,000
Alaska, at large	532	872	349,000	District of Columbia, total	9,665	15,851	2,859,000
Arizona:				Florida:			
Total	3,432	5,629	903,000	Total	20,493	33,609	5,041,000
1	1,954	3,205	514,000	1	1,436	2,355	353,000
2	497	815	131,000	2	902	1,479	222,000
3	981	1,609	258,000	3	1,827	2,996	449,000
Arkansas:				4	1,447	2,373	356,000
Total	7,229	11,856	1,778,000	5	2,245	3,682	552,000
1	2,274	3,729	559,000	6	3,892	6,383	957,000
2	2,198	3,605	541,000	7	1,190	1,952	293,000
3	1,801	2,954	443,000	8	612	1,004	151,000
4	956	1,568	235,000	9	1,554	2,549	382,000
California:				10	540	886	133,000
Total	30,080	49,331	9,106,000	11	3,616	5,930	890,000
1	496	813	150,000	12	1,232	2,020	303,000
2	170	279	51,000	Georgia:			
3	1,328	2,178	402,000	Total	36,513	59,880	8,982,000
4	505	828	153,000	1	4,032	6,612	992,000
5	5,382	8,826	1,629,000	2	3,317	5,440	816,000
6	1,354	2,221	410,000	3	3,313	5,433	815,000
7	1,292	2,086	385,000	4	3,186	5,225	784,000
8	650	1,066	197,000	5	7,188	11,788	1,768,000
11	40	66	12,000	6	3,391	5,561	834,000
12	326	535	99,000	7	2,816	4,618	693,000
13	1,060	1,738	321,000	8	2,903	4,761	714,000
14	2,155	3,534	652,000	9	2,220	3,641	546,000
15	1,460	2,894	442,000	10	4,147	6,801	1,020,000
16	1,761	2,888	533,000	Hawaii, total	3,124	5,123	809,000
17	1,564	2,565	473,000	Idaho:			
18	938	1,538	284,000	Total	259	425	82,000
21	3,326	5,455	1,007,000	1	95	156	30,000
22	445	735	136,000	2	164	269	52,000
26	601	986	182,000	Illinois:			
29	489	802	148,000	Total	52,915	86,780	21,741,000
30	2,421	3,970	733,000	1	13,122	21,520	5,391,000
32	712	1,168	216,000	2	2,479	4,066	1,019,000
33	1,131	1,855	342,000	3	2,395	3,928	984,000
38	491	805	149,000	4	563	923	231,000
Colorado:				5	912	1,496	375,000
Total	4,310	7,068	1,671,000	6	151	248	62,000
1	3,596	5,897	1,394,000	7	9,784	16,046	4,020,000
3	660	1,082	256,000	8	1,039	1,704	427,000
4	54	89	21,000	9	4,382	7,186	1,800,000
				10	127	208	52,000
				12	455	746	187,000

ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS, BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM—Continued

[Based on number of units completed as of June 30, 1968]

State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)
Colorado—Continued			
14	749	1,228	\$308,000
15	576	945	237,000
16	660	1,082	271,000
17	1,010	1,656	415,000
18	2,149	3,524	883,000
19	1,070	1,755	440,000
20	1,831	3,003	752,000
21	3,302	5,415	1,357,000
22	1,191	1,953	489,000
23	1,359	2,229	558,000
24	3,609	5,919	1,483,000
Total	7,442	12,204	2,521,000
Indiana			
1	1,819	2,983	616,000
3	612	1,004	207,000
4	423	694	143,000
5	200	328	68,000
7	496	813	168,000
8	1,932	3,168	655,000
9	300	492	102,000
10	464	761	157,000
11	1,196	1,961	405,000
Total	504	827	198,000
Iowa			
1	20	33	8,000
3	80	131	31,000
4	230	377	90,000
6	40	66	16,000
7	134	220	53,000
Total	1,363	2,235	397,000
Kansas			
1	60	98	17,000
2	229	376	67,000
3	474	941	167,000
4	500	820	146,000
Total	15,114	24,787	3,719,000
Kentucky			
1	2,299	3,770	566,000
2	1,198	1,965	295,000
3	1,297	8,687	1,303,000
4	1,483	2,432	365,000
5	1,106	1,814	272,000
6	3,109	5,099	765,000
7	622	1,020	153,000
Total	19,489	31,961	4,795,000
Louisiana			
1	6,900	11,316	1,697,000
2	5,856	9,604	1,441,000
3	1,263	2,071	311,000
4	977	1,602	240,000
5	786	1,289	193,000
6	820	1,345	202,000
7	2,291	3,757	564,000
8	596	977	147,000
Total	396	650	138,000
Maine			
1	270	443	94,000
2	126	207	44,000
Total	12,419	20,367	3,825,000
Maryland			
1	753	1,235	232,000
3	6,533	10,714	2,012,000
4	3,160	5,182	973,000
6	1,246	2,043	384,000
7	587	963	181,000
8	140	230	43,000
Total	24,589	40,325	12,748,000
Massachusetts			
1	927	1,520	480,000
2	1,107	1,815	574,000
3	100	164	52,000
4	1,315	2,157	682,000
5	2,183	3,580	1,132,000
6	776	1,273	402,000
7	1,149	1,884	596,000
8	3,507	5,743	1,815,000
9	10,428	17,102	5,406,000
10	1,722	2,824	893,000
11	480	787	249,000
12	900	1,476	467,000
Total	13,413	21,997	3,536,000
Michigan			
1	200	328	53,000
2	120	197	32,000
3	240	394	63,000
4	510	836	134,000
5	60	98	16,000
6	23	38	6,000
7	32	52	8,000
8	883	1,448	233,000
9	200	328	53,000
10	170	279	45,000
11	432	708	114,000

State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)
Michigan—Continued			
12	362	594	\$95,000
13	4,244	6,960	1,119,000
14	1,820	2,985	480,000
15	540	886	142,000
16	698	1,145	184,000
17	2,316	3,798	611,000
18	163	267	43,000
19	500	656	105,000
Minnesota:			
Total	7,553	12,388	2,073,000
Mississippi			
1	199	326	55,000
3	245	402	67,000
4	2,718	4,458	746,000
5	3,003	4,925	824,000
7	379	622	104,000
8	1,009	1,655	277,000
Total	6,165	10,111	1,517,000
Missouri			
1	1,009	1,655	248,000
2	906	1,486	223,000
3	700	1,148	172,000
4	1,250	2,050	308,000
5	2,300	3,772	566,000
Total	12,437	20,397	3,590,000
Montana			
1	5,077	8,326	1,465,000
3	3,055	5,010	881,000
4	200	328	58,000
5	2,376	3,897	686,000
8	543	891	157,000
9	432	708	125,000
10	754	1,237	218,000
Total	1,069	1,753	391,000
Nebraska			
1	833	1,366	319,000
2	2,358	3,867	904,000
3	963	1,579	369,000
Total	4,154	6,812	1,592,000
Nevada, at large			
Total	1,815	2,977	480,000
New Hampshire			
Total	1,750	2,870	732,000
1	1,470	2,411	615,000
2	280	459	117,000
Total	36,282	59,502	15,423,000
New Jersey			
1	2,134	3,500	907,000
2	1,533	2,514	652,000
3	1,831	3,003	778,000
4	2,407	3,947	1,023,000
5	424	695	180,000
6	211	346	90,000
8	2,890	4,740	1,229,000
9	784	1,286	333,000
10	5,109	8,379	2,172,000
11	6,886	11,293	2,927,000
12	248	407	105,000
13	5,674	9,305	2,412,000
14	4,025	6,601	1,711,000
15	2,126	3,487	904,000
Total	1,187	1,947	292,000
New Mexico, total			
Total	84,641	138,812	38,201,000
New York			
2	40	66	18,000
3	40	66	18,000
5	295	484	133,000
7	1,447	2,373	653,000
9	3,149	5,164	1,421,000
10	4,235	6,945	1,911,000
11	8,117	13,312	3,663,000
12	8	15	4,000
13	1,402	2,299	633,000
14	7,516	12,326	3,392,000
16	2,100	3,444	948,000
17	2,324	3,811	1,049,000
18	15,029	24,648	6,783,000
19	6,333	10,386	2,858,000
20	1,153	1,891	520,000
21	7,007	11,491	3,162,000
22	5,007	8,211	2,260,000
24	3,762	6,170	1,698,000
25	2,253	3,695	1,017,000
26	511	838	231,000
27	12	20	6,000
28	215	353	97,000
29	2,975	4,879	1,343,000
30	475	779	214,000

ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS, BY CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT, FOR LOW-RENT HOUSING PROGRAM—Continued
 [Based on number of units completed as of June 30, 1968]

State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)	State and congressional district	Number of units	Number of pupils	Entitlement (based on 1/2 estimated 1970 State average "a" rate)
New York—Continued				South Carolina:			
31.....	572	938	\$258,000	Total.....	6,951	11,400	\$1,710,000
32.....	405	664	183,000	1.....	2,033	3,334	500,000
33.....	549	900	248,000	2.....	1,409	2,311	347,000
34.....	1,659	2,721	749,000	3.....	875	1,325	215,000
35.....	170	279	77,000	4.....	1,906	3,126	469,000
36.....	178	292	80,000	5.....	528	866	130,000
38.....	34	56	15,000	6.....	200	328	49,000
39.....	26	43	12,000	South Dakota:			
40.....	1,309	2,147	591,000	Total.....	526	863	175,000
41.....	4,334	7,108	1,956,000	2.....	526	863	175,000
North Carolina:				Tennessee:			
Total.....	16,409	26,912	4,036,000	Total.....	25,079	41,130	6,169,000
1.....	1,253	2,055	308,000	1.....	1,867	3,062	459,000
2.....	1,362	2,234	335,000	2.....	3,002	4,923	738,000
3.....	1,195	1,960	294,000	3.....	3,303	5,417	813,000
4.....	1,699	2,786	418,000	4.....	2,677	4,390	659,000
5.....	2,690	4,412	662,000	5.....	4,904	8,043	1,206,000
6.....	2,237	3,669	550,000	6.....	1,556	2,552	383,000
7.....	2,130	3,493	524,000	7.....	1,153	1,891	284,000
8.....	2,195	3,600	540,000	8.....	1,554	2,549	382,000
9.....	542	889	133,000	9.....	5,063	8,303	1,245,000
10.....	226	371	56,000	Texas:			
11.....	880	1,443	216,000	Total.....	37,976	62,280	10,805,000
North Dakota:				1.....	1,754	2,877	499,000
Total.....	536	879	157,000	2.....	1,116	1,912	332,000
1.....	356	584	104,000	3.....	4,105	6,732	1,168,000
2.....	180	295	53,000	4.....	1,374	2,253	391,000
Ohio:				5.....	2,267	3,718	645,000
Total.....	27,152	44,530	6,720,000	6.....	758	1,243	216,000
1.....	423	694	105,000	7.....	1,990	3,264	566,000
2.....	5,676	9,309	1,405,000	8.....	820	1,344	240,000
3.....	2,334	3,828	578,000	9.....	2,120	3,477	603,000
6.....	475	779	118,000	10.....	1,494	2,450	425,000
7.....	330	541	82,000	11.....	1,853	3,039	527,000
9.....	1,953	3,203	483,000	12.....	1,184	1,942	337,000
10.....	190	312	47,000	13.....	1,335	2,189	380,000
12.....	1,903	3,121	471,000	14.....	2,087	3,423	594,000
13.....	651	1,068	161,000	15.....	2,349	3,852	668,000
14.....	968	1,588	240,000	16.....	1,684	2,762	479,000
15.....	1,396	2,289	345,000	17.....	1,286	2,109	366,000
16.....	196	321	48,000	18.....	352	577	100,000
17.....	324	531	80,000	19.....	424	695	121,000
18.....	500	820	124,000	20.....	5,829	9,560	1,658,000
19.....	1,376	2,257	341,000	21.....	382	626	109,000
20.....	2,822	4,628	698,000	22.....	564	925	160,000
21.....	4,830	7,921	1,195,000	23.....	1,409	2,311	401,000
22.....	272	446	67,000	Utah:			
24.....	533	874	132,000	Total.....	30	49	7,000
Oklahoma:				1.....	30	49	7,000
Total.....	582	955	152,000	Vermont, at large:			
1.....	80	131	21,000	Total.....	178	292	50,000
2.....	51	84	13,000	Virginia:			
3.....	28	46	7,000	Total.....	13,771	22,584	3,884,000
5.....	423	694	111,000	1.....	1,802	2,955	508,000
Oregon:				2.....	5,627	9,228	814,000
Total.....	2,328	3,819	935,000	3.....	2,885	4,731	814,000
1.....	640	1,050	257,000	4.....	466	764	131,000
2.....	68	112	27,000	5.....	500	820	141,000
3.....	748	1,227	301,000	6.....	700	1,148	197,000
4.....	872	1,430	350,000	7.....	226	371	64,000
Pennsylvania:				9.....	431	707	122,000
Total.....	46,845	76,823	15,808,000	10.....	1,134	1,880	320,000
1.....	4,407	7,227	1,487,000	Washington:			
2.....	3,854	6,321	1,300,000	Total.....	7,999	13,118	2,196,000
3.....	4,525	7,421	1,527,000	1.....	3,220	5,281	884,000
4.....	1,036	1,699	350,000	2.....	500	820	137,000
5.....	1,253	2,055	423,000	3.....	422	692	116,000
6.....	1,328	2,178	448,000	4.....	501	822	138,000
7.....	424	695	143,000	6.....	1,510	2,476	414,000
8.....	239	392	81,000	7.....	1,846	3,027	507,000
9.....	1,789	2,934	604,000	West Virginia:			
10.....	1,214	1,991	410,000	Total.....	2,311	3,789	568,000
11.....	150	246	51,000	1.....	757	1,241	186,000
12.....	580	951	196,000	2.....	250	410	62,000
13.....	307	503	103,000	3.....	574	941	141,000
14.....	6,264	10,273	2,113,000	4.....	550	902	135,000
15.....	2,524	4,139	852,000	5.....	180	295	44,000
16.....	199	326	67,000	Wisconsin:			
17.....	2,130	3,493	719,000	Total.....	4,549	7,460	1,659,000
18.....	246	403	83,000	2.....	368	604	134,000
19.....	400	656	135,000	3.....	150	246	55,000
20.....	5,263	8,631	1,776,000	4.....	180	295	66,000
21.....	688	1,128	232,000	5.....	2,946	4,831	1,074,000
22.....	1,241	2,035	419,000	6.....	50	82	18,000
23.....	98	161	33,000	7.....	97	159	35,000
24.....	1,702	2,791	574,000	8.....	26	43	10,000
25.....	1,674	2,745	565,000	10.....	732	1,200	267,000
26.....	1,854	3,041	626,000	Wyoming total:			
27.....	1,456	2,388	491,000	Total.....	30	49	13,000
Rhode Island:				Puerto Rico, total:			
Total.....	6,517	10,688	2,516,000	Total.....	32,455	53,226	6,121,000
1.....	3,719	6,099	1,436,000	Virgin Islands, total:			
2.....	2,798	4,589	1,080,000	Total.....	1,354	2,221	447,000
Grand total:				Grand total:			
	698,117	1,144,908	226,916,000				

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I also ask that the estimated entitlements for cities which contain the largest number of public housing units be printed in the RECORD at this point, along with the estimated entitlements for each city and the responses from various mayors of such cities.

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

LOW-RENT HOUSING—1970 ESTIMATED ENTITLEMENTS

[Based on number of units completed as of Dec. 31, 1967, in 35 cities, national average of 1.64 pupils per unit, and $\frac{1}{2}$ estimated 1970 local contribution rate]

City	Units	Pupils	Entitlement
New York City, N.Y.	64,633	105,998	\$43,919,000
Chicago, Ill.	32,960	54,054	12,973,000
Philadelphia, Pa.	15,719	25,779	5,800,000
New Orleans, La.	12,270	20,123	3,018,000
Boston, Mass.	10,973	17,986	4,859,000
Newark, N.J.	10,891	17,861	4,483,000
Baltimore, Md.	10,335	16,949	3,814,000
Washington, D.C.	10,056	16,492	3,051,000
Los Angeles, Calif.	9,287	15,231	2,894,000
Pittsburgh, Pa.	9,234	15,142	3,104,000
Atlanta, Ga.	8,892	14,730	2,210,000
Detroit, Mich.	8,180	13,415	2,696,000
Cleveland, Ohio	7,458	12,231	2,691,000
St. Louis, Mo.	7,245	11,882	2,388,000
Dallas, Tex.	6,372	10,450	1,568,000
Cincinnati, Ohio	6,146	10,079	2,217,000
San Francisco, Calif.	5,883	9,648	1,833,000
San Antonio, Tex.	5,563	9,123	1,368,000
Birmingham, Ala.	5,523	9,058	1,359,000
Memphis, Tenn.	5,045	8,274	1,241,000
Louisville, Ky.	4,962	8,138	1,221,000
Nashville, Tenn.	4,888	8,016	1,202,000
Miami, Fla.	4,508	7,393	1,109,000
Buffalo, N.Y.	4,370	7,167	1,192,000
Jersey City, N.J.	3,804	6,239	1,566,000
Norfolk, Va.	3,720	6,101	1,220,000
Tampa, Fla.	3,692	6,055	908,000
Denver, Colo.	3,596	5,897	1,474,000
Seattle, Wash.	3,520	5,773	924,000
Mobile, Ala.	3,403	5,581	837,000
Providence, R.I.	2,972	4,874	1,219,000
Richmond, Va.	2,885	4,731	804,000
Columbus, Ohio	2,881	4,725	1,040,000
Bridgeport, Conn.	2,678	4,392	878,000
Chattanooga, Tenn.	2,633	4,318	648,000

CITY OF PITTSBURGH,
April 25, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: Your letter of April 22 is extremely timely. As you know, all school systems within our central cities are on the verge of bankruptcy and are totally unprepared financially to provide improved education programs for the increasing number of poor youngsters in our central city areas.

We presently have about 10,000 public housing units within the City of Pittsburgh, and we are under great pressures to increase this supply. As we continue to develop additional low-income housing on scattered sites in other parts of our city to meet Title VI Civil Rights regulations of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the most urgent development problem that confronts us is that we are inflating school populations in already overcrowded schools and increasing the capital and operating budget requirements of the Pittsburgh school district.

Our school board has been unable to keep up with the population mobility and is struggling to add temporary structures and shift teachers from school to school. In addition to the construction of housing in new locations, we face the dilemma that the Catholic school system, because of economic circumstances, is closing its schools and thrusting the education burden on the public school system at an accelerated rate. Catholic schools until recently have accommodated approximately half our school children.

These two factors—the population shifts because of the redistribution of housing opportunities for Federally-assisted housing for low- and moderate-income families and the closing of Catholic schools—have helped to

exacerbate an already serious financial crisis which, in our judgment, must be met with increased State and Federal assistance.

I feel it is urgent that the Federal Government provide some measure of financial relief, and your proposal would be a significant step in that direction. I also agree with your comment that this aid should be provided directly to the school districts, without the usual restrictions and red tape that normally accompany Federal grants.

In effect, Congress would be recognizing that "payments in lieu of taxes" which we are receiving from our existing public housing communities are insufficient to meet the problem of improving community services for low- and moderate-income families.

Education of the young in underprivileged families must be one of our highest priorities in breaking the poverty cycle and dependence on governmental funds in the future.

You can be assured of my support in your innovative proposal.

Very truly yours,

JOE BARR, Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF
TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Your letter of April 22, 1969, addressed to me as Mayor of the City of Seattle, has been forwarded and was received here yesterday. I resigned my office as Mayor of the City of Seattle on March 25th and reported as an Assistant Secretary in the Department of Transportation on April 1st.

Since the time of the introduction of your bill is quite close, I am going to take the liberty of commenting as though I were still serving as Mayor of Seattle. If this were the case, I would, of course, confer with our local School Board, but certainly see no reason why the type of legislation you propose should not receive full support from that body. It appears to me that the general idea of your legislation is sound and would provide practical and workable support to the hard-pressed school districts affected.

I look forward to meeting you at some time to discuss the problems facing the Department of Transportation in the field of urban systems and environment, which is my particular assignment here in DOT.

Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

J. D. BRAMAN,
Assistant Secretary for
Urban Systems and Environment.

NEWARK, N.J., April 29, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Your bill to amend the definition of "Federal property" to include low rent housing, thereby permitting cities with a major commitment to low rent housing to be eligible for additional federal aid, is a wise and much needed action.

I believe the amendment is entirely within the concept of a strengthened federal-local partnership to aid our neediest citizens. Newark, as you know, has one of the highest percentages of persons living in public housing units in the nation. We should not be penalized, but assisted for pursuing the goal of providing decent housing for low income families. This amendment provides that assistance and its passage would provide a much needed increase in our financial resources.

If I can be of any help in testifying in behalf of your bill, please let me know.

Warmest personal regards,

HUGH J. ADDONIZIO,
Mayor.

NEW ORLEANS PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
April 29, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: I have been asked to acknowledge your April 22, 1969 letter to Mayor Schiro in which you request comment re proposed legislation which if enacted would provide local school districts with partial reimbursement for the costs of educating children who reside in public housing. This legislation, if passed, will be most helpful to New Orleans. I hope it will receive favorable consideration in Congress.

To further detail the extent of the educational needs created by the high incidence of public housing in New Orleans, I am enclosing an expanded statement with this letter. I hope this information will be pertinent and will assist in the favorable consideration of the legislation you propose.

Sincerely,
THOMAS W. PAYZANT,
Administrative Assistant to the Superintendent.

PUBLIC HOUSING AND EDUCATIONAL DEPRIVATION IN NEW ORLEANS

The incidence of educational deprivation in New Orleans is found to be extremely high particularly where heavy concentrations of the predominantly black urban poor are channeled by common characteristics of poverty into densely populated public housing projects. The growth and development of these projects has required the building of neighborhood public schools which of necessity serve the large influx of children that comes with the opening of the projects. Since 1954, seventeen public schools, which almost exclusively serve housing project children, have been built in New Orleans. In several instances more than one school has been constructed to serve a single public housing project. The largest housing project in New Orleans, Desire, serves approximately 15,000 residents. More than 7,500 children from this project attend three elementary schools, a junior high school, and a senior high school that serve only this small geographical area.

The educational deprivation apparent in large numbers of children who live in public housing projects takes several forms. Speech patterns and oral communications skills are poorly developed. Reading and arithmetic achievement are well below city and national norms. Children are motivated, if at all, toward activities or interests not customarily considered appropriate for the formal school setting and traditional patterns of learning. Factors of poverty, such as, malnutrition, unstable and emotionally depressing family conditions, and transiency make education all the more pressing but difficult for the deprived child.

Such conditions of educational deprivation point to the need for new educational approaches that can effect learning situations relevant to the special needs of the deprived child. Smaller classes, specially trained teachers, teacher aides, social workers, individualized instruction, food services, medical attention, additional materials, and new and more expensive types of equipment are required to make possible a learning environment which can help to eliminate educational deprivation. The addition of such necessary resources and services raises significantly the per student cost for the education of the educationally deprived child. The number of educationally deprived children is exacerbated by the high incidence of public housing in New Orleans. Public housing per capita in New Orleans is above the average for cities of equivalent size. Sixteen housing projects with approximately 13,000 housing units are now in operation. During the 1967-68 school year 894 white children or 2.43 per cent of the white public school student population lived in public housing projects in New Orleans;

17,767 Negro children or 24.67 percent of the Negro public school population lived in public housing projects.

The Housing Authority of New Orleans is planning additional public housing in the city, which will place additional demands on the public schools in the future. The New Orleans Public Schools have received small relief in terms of payments in lieu of taxes or other financial benefits from the Housing Authority. In lieu of taxes, the Housing Authority remits to the City of New Orleans a payment equal to ten percent of shelter rental income less utility costs. These payments are intended to defray the cost of services such as police and fire protection, garbage collection, public street maintenance and other municipal services. The New Orleans Public Schools function as an independent agency and receive no direct payments in lieu of taxes from the Housing Authority for education services. The school system does receive a small portion of the city's revenue received from the Housing Authority.

In fiscal 1968 the school system's share amounted to \$124,828.09. With a 13 mill property tax for schools in New Orleans this amount is roughly equivalent to that which could be raised on \$9½ million of assessed valuation, or property with a market value in New Orleans of approximately \$38 million. More than \$120 million has been spent on the construction of public housing in New Orleans over a twenty year period. Of course the actual value of Housing Authority property far exceeds \$120 million. In short, payments in lieu of taxes based on rental income from housing units do not come close to meeting the tax revenue producing potential of Housing Authority property if it did not have tax exempt status.

For the 18,661 children who lived in public housing units during the 1967-68 school year and attended public schools, the \$124,828.09 which was received from the Housing Authority to help offset the cost of their education, provided an average of \$6.63 per child. \$6.63 per child is far short of the fair share financial contribution which is required to meet the challenges of alleviating educational deprivation among the high concentrations of the urban poor who live in public housing projects and attend the public schools in New Orleans.

The New Orleans Public Schools must have additional financial resources to meet the needs of many educationally deprived children who know only the limited environment of the densely populated housing project and the school that serves it. With additional resources the public schools will be better able to alleviate some of the factors contributing to educational deprivation which negatively affect learning opportunities for children.

CITY OF CHATTANOOGA,
April 25, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: I was delighted to receive your letter of April 22, 1969 concerning your intention to introduce a bill which would assist school districts in cities where federally financed public housing is located.

I believe that your proposal has great merit for the cities where federally financed public housing is located. Clearly there is a need for additional education assistance in benefits for many of the children living in public housing. The proposed method by which funds would be available to the local school districts is in my judgment the most practical and acceptable one available at this time.

Let me congratulate you upon your proposal and extend my full and wholehearted support to the legislation.

If I can be of assistance to you at any time, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

A. L. BENDER,
Mayor.

CHATTANOOGA PUBLIC SCHOOLS,
Chattanooga, Tenn., May 1, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Mayor Bender of Chattanooga has shared with me your letter of April 22 telling me of your proposed bill which would assist school districts in cities and towns where federally financed public housing is located.

I am delighted to know of your proposal and wish to commend you for it. Such financial assistance which could be added to our operating budget where it is needed would certainly be welcome, and I think your proposal to make funds available in this manner is good.

Sincerely yours,

JACK D. LAWRIE,
Superintendent.

CITY OF BALTIMORE,
May 1, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: I want to take this opportunity to wholeheartedly endorse your proposal for expanding the definition of "Federal property" to include low-rent housing assisted under the Federal Housing Act of 1937.

This idea certainly makes a good deal of sense and it quite naturally would bring some badly needed educational assistance to Baltimore. What I find extremely attractive is that the provision would enable school districts to use the money as they saw fit.

You might be interested to know that I have forwarded your proposal for further revenue, to Mr. Francis D. Murnaghan, Jr., President of the Board of School Commissioners, and to Dr. Thomas D. Sheldon, Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Baltimore City Schools. Should you have any specific questions concerning local educational problems, please feel free to contact either of these gentlemen at your convenience.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. D'ALESSANDRO III,
Mayor.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
San Francisco, April 25, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator, Senate Office Building, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: This letter serves to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 22, 1969.

I am delighted to prepare comments and will forward them to you at my earliest opportunity.

The legislation you propose would meet a grave need in the city of San Francisco.

Thank you for your courtesy in informing me about this legislation.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH L. ALIOTO,
Mayor.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Buffalo, N.Y., April 30, 1969.

HON. FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor, City of Buffalo,
Buffalo, N.Y.

DEAR MAYOR SEDITA: In regard to your letter dated April 22 and attachment from U.S. Senator Thomas Eagleton, my office has reviewed the information we have to date concerning P.L. 874 and public housing. Attached are comments you may wish to incorporate in your response to Senator Eagleton.

In view of present fiscal constraints in

Buffalo, we would urge federal authorization and funding of such legislation to provide general operating aid without further red tape or categorical restrictions. It is important, however, that the Senator be advised that the method he suggests has some shortcomings, as noted attached.

Yours sincerely,

JOSEPH MANCH,
Superintendent of Schools.

BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Bridgeport, Conn., April 29, 1969.

SENATOR THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Your amendment to PL-81-874, relative to allowance for children living in public housing, makes more sense and, incidentally, more dollars than any suggestions we have heard. The money that is absolutely needed in the cities will go directly where the need is greatest, without bureaucratic frustrations.

Please persist in your efforts. Any assistance this office can provide is yours.

Very truly yours,

LESTER SILVERSTONE,
Superintendent of Schools.

CITY OF BUFFALO,
May 5, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Your letter of April 22 concerning city school districts was sent by me to our Superintendent of Education. I am attaching a copy of his response. I hope this will be useful.

Sincerely,

FRANK A. SEDITA,
Mayor.

CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER,
Denver, Colo., May 1, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: The administration of the City and County of Denver certainly favors the bill to amend the definition of "Federal property" to include low rent housing as outlined to me in your letter of April 22nd.

The Board of Directors of our Denver Housing Authority also favors this change since, by the Board's calculation, it would mean considerable financial assistance to the Denver School Board.

I would suggest, however, that School Boards who would benefit from this financial assistance should be required to use the additional Federal monies in the disadvantaged areas where generally the quality of education and the physical facilities many times are inferior to that in more affluent areas. In Denver, at least, our public housing is located in these disadvantaged areas.

Sincerely yours,

W. H. McNICHOLS, Jr.,
Mayor.

CITY OF MEMPHIS, TENN.,
May 2, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: I appreciate very much being afforded the opportunity to comment on your proposed Bill, which would amend P.L. 81-874 to qualify children living in federally financed public housing as Category "B" students in our public schools.

The Memphis City School System qualified for 874 funds when the guidelines lowered the qualification requirement to 3 per cent. All of our students that are qualified are Category "B" students; therefore, we particularly like that feature of your Bill. We are hopeful of receiving approximately \$900,000 under 874 next year. I am sure that you are aware of a strong movement in the Congress

to raise the qualification requirements to 6 per cent and appropriate funds only for Category "A" students. An amendment of this nature would disqualify Memphis—we would not get a dime. You are, no doubt, also knowledgeable of H.R. 514 passed by the House of Representatives on April 23, 1969. This Bill amends 874 by adding a new Category "C" which includes all pupils living in public housing.

Memphis, like all other large cities, is experiencing great difficulty in financing the services and capital improvements which its citizens desire and deserve. If your Bill passes and is fully funded, it would benefit us greatly.

Speaking for the Memphis City Government and the Board of Education, with whom I have discussed this matter, we strongly endorse your proposed Bill and wish you success in getting it accepted by the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

HENRY LOEB.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
Jersey City, N.J., May 1, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Thank you for your recent letter regarding your intention to introduce an amendment to the definition of "Federal property" for P.L. 81-874 and the explanation of the commendable effect it would bring to bear on urban areas such as Jersey City.

Your proposed amendment is imaginative and constructive and aims toward the solutions so sorely needed today for the complex crises confronting the nation's larger cities.

I wish you success in your venture.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. WHELAN,
Mayor.

METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF
NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY,
Nashville, Tenn., May 2, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senate, Committee on Labor and Public
Welfare, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: I have your letter of April 22 and certainly agree with you that the children in the housing projects constitute a heavy burden upon the local school operations. Your approach to helping solve this problem would be most beneficial to the local governing body operating the school system, as well as giving us an opportunity to, perhaps, give a better education to these children who are the ones who most desperately need the educational process.

I shall be in touch with our staff people to determine in what ways we can be of assistance in carrying out the thrust of your Bill. In addition to this, I shall talk to our Congressional group in Washington, as well as your colleagues in the Senate.

Thanking you very much for this information, I am

Very truly yours,

BEVERLY BRILEY,
Mayor.

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO,
San Antonio, Tex., May 6, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: Although the School Districts in San Antonio are not directly under the City of San Antonio, your proposed Bill would certainly be most beneficial to them and I sincerely hope that it receives favorable consideration by both the House and the Senate.

Sincerely,

GERALD C. HENCKEL, JR.,
City Manager.

OFFICE OF THE CITY MANAGER,
Richmond, Va., May 5, 1969.

Senator THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: The Administration of the City of Richmond offers its wholehearted support to your proposed bill which would offer financial aid to school districts where federally financed public housing is located.

The superintendent of the Richmond Public Schools, Dr. H. I. Willett, estimates that the current enrollment in the local school system of children living in public housing units is 5,936. Based on a total enrollment of 42,384 the students living in public housing units constitute 14% of the total enrollment. The necessity of public housing increased the concentration of students in school facilities and has increased the cost per pupil facilities due to the socio-economic background of the students. This extra financial aid from the Federal government would be most welcome at a time when municipal expenditures are increasing faster than revenue receipts.

Although Richmond is a progressive city, it is an old one. Typical of our Nation's central cities, Richmond suffers from the flight of affluent citizens to the suburbs. The plight of our central cities has been the subject of many recent publications. The March, 1969, issue of *Nation's Cities*, published by the National League of Cities, is devoted to the subject, "Financing our Urban Needs". The opening lines of this Report pointedly express the fiscal crises we face:

Central city governments are being burdened with far more than their share of urban costs.

They are burdened with more than their share of welfare costs, education costs, and regional facility costs. They are paying costs that should more properly be borne by the federal government, paying costs that should more properly be borne by the state governments, paying costs that should at least be shared by their suburbs, paying many costs that should be met by private enterprise and should not be subsidized by any level of government—federal, state or local.

They are burdened with far more costs than they can meet with their present taxing powers or their present tax resources, more costs than they can meet under today's state-imposed restrictions on their taxing authority, more costs than they can meet without pushing their tax rates so high that they would drive still more people and more business to lower-tax shelters outside the city line.

I respectfully recommend this issue of *Nation's Cities* to your attention. It is an excellent investigation and report on our present day urban ills. Pages 30 through 34 specifically deal with State and Federal aid to education and welfare problems in our central cities. I am sure that I can speak for Dr. Willett and the Richmond School Board in offering to furnish any further information which you may find helpful in securing passage of this bill.

Sincerely,

ALAN F. KIEPPER,
City Manager.

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR,
St. Louis, Mo., April 24, 1969.

HON. THOMAS F. EAGLETON,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR TOM: The bill you propose to help school districts in cities and towns where federally financed public housing is located would, I believe, provide an important assist to the Saint Louis Board of Education in its efforts to provide quality education to children living in public housing.

I am certain that the Saint Louis Board of Education would be able to make good use of the \$2,388,000 it could receive for the

11,882 public housing children it serves or will serve.

As you well know, it is extremely vital that we intensify our efforts to provide the highest level of education possible to children with disadvantaged backgrounds because they, perhaps more than children from middle-class backgrounds, demand specially tailored, high caliber instructions.

In a related area I think consideration must be given to methods of providing improved physical facilities for the education of children from public housing areas. The money currently available for the funding of modern housing for low- and moderate-income families could be supplemented by funds to aid in the construction of new school facilities concurrent with the construction of such housing.

I am certain that the Board of Education and the citizens of Saint Louis appreciate your efforts to help provide the means to make a quality education possible for all our children.

If I may be of further assistance, you are assured of my cooperation.

Sincerely,

ALFONSO J. CERVANTES,
Mayor.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that 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. 2147) to consider children living in federally assisted public housing as federally connected children for purposes of educational assistance to federally impacted areas, introduced by Mr. Eagleton, 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. 2147

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the second sentence of section 303 (1) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress), is amended by striking out "and (C)" and inserting in lieu thereof, (C) low-rent housing assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, and (D)";

(b) The fourth sentence of such section is amended by striking out "the United States Housing Act of 1937,".

(c) The amendments made by this Act shall become effective July 1, 1969.

S. 2148—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936 TO ENCOURAGE SHIPBUILDING

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 to give to unsubsidized shipowning companies the same tax deferments as have been available to subsidized companies for more than 30 years.

It would be my hope that testimony on this measure will be received in conjunction with hearings on a bill (S. 1915) introduced on April 22 by the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee to provide a broad new program to revitalize our deteriorating merchant fleet. The chairman (Mr. MAGNUSON) is to be commended for his longstanding concern over the state of our merchant marine, and his continuing efforts to strengthen our maritime strength.

Under present law, any earnings of a shipping company receiving an operating subsidy that are deposited in reserve funds to be used for the construction of new American ships are exempt from Federal taxes. In reality, the exemption is a deferment, because the depreciation base of new ships built with these deposits is reduced by the amount of deferred deposits. As a result, the taxes which have been deferred on the first ships are recovered through lesser depreciation deductions on the new vessel. This means that earnings of subsidized vessels can be used to their full amount to build new ships without first having to pay taxes on those earnings. The deferment has effectively doubled the amount of equity money available for subsidized ship construction.

But the situation is different under present law for the unsubsidized shipowner. He may establish a construction reserve fund and deposit his earnings in it, but he may not defer taxes on these earnings even though they are used for new ship construction. As a result, the amount of money available for ship construction to the unsubsidized operator is substantially less than that to the subsidized operator from the same amount of earnings.

The program does not reduce the amount of tax revenue to the Government; it only delays collection. In addition, it has the beneficial effect of generating shipyard and seafaring jobs, shipyard profits, and, ultimately, new ship operating profits. All of these of course, are subject to tax. I am reliably informed that the passage of legislation extending tax deferments to unsubsidized operators would generate many millions of dollars worth of new construction in U.S. shipyards. In my judgment, the bill will provide a common ground on which industry, labor, and Government can unite.

There is no question as to the urgency of solving the problems of our merchant marine. The age and condition of our fleet has deteriorated to the point where we can no longer afford the luxury of subserviating this aspect of our national security and defense. In World War II, we built and operated the world's largest merchant fleet. Three-fourths of our existing Navy and merchant fleets were built during that crash shipbuilding program. Today, 80 percent of the Soviet merchant fleet is less than 10 years old, while 70 percent of all U.S.-flag cargo ships are more than 20 years old.

As is evident from our situation in Vietnam, a strong merchant marine is vital for the deployment and maintenance of our military forces, and for the logistical support of military operations. More than 90 percent of our military supplies and 65 percent of our personnel in Vietnam are transported by ships. We are operating the largest and longest seafaring operation in history.

But with the preponderant part of our existing Navy and merchant fleet approaching the age of 25, we cannot afford much longer to postpone the inevitable. We either must expand our shipbuilding program to offset deficiencies of previous years, or we must accept the fact that we are destined to become a second-rate sea power. With the United States

standing virtually alone as the leader of the free world, I cannot imagine the American people accepting such a fate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2148) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to encourage shipbuilding, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 2151—INTRODUCTION OF THE SOUTHWESTERN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the Southwestern part of the United States—bordered by my State of Texas on the east, California on the west, and reaching to Colorado in the north—there exists, as in the rest of the country, some claim that we have achieved equality of economic opportunity, that everyone has an equal chance to get ahead.

The reality lurking under this claim is that for a group of 3,465,000 persons, 12 percent of the population of the Southwestern States, equality of economic opportunity awaits the future. It is a myth, and not a reality, today for the Mexican-Americans of the Southwest.

The Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest at one time greatly outnumbered the English-speaking people in the area. By 1790 the white population had reached 23,000 and was practically all Spanish. But by 1848 all the land in the Southwest—except for a strip later added by the Gadsden Purchase—had been acquired by the United States, and the one-time majority of Spanish-speaking people became a minority in the face of the influx of English-speaking people who flocked to the land.

With minority status came economic disadvantage. And exploitation. And discrimination. But throughout all these years the Mexican-American people have lived their lives with patience and courage. Equality of opportunity has not been theirs, yet they have been good citizens, good parents, have fought for democracy in our wars, and lived their lives as best they could. I might add that with respect to the number of Congressional Medals of Honor awarded, their percentage per population is the highest in the Nation.

I believe the time has come when we can no longer ignore the fact that 12 percent of the people of the southwestern United States do not have equal access with the rest of the population to economic advancement. The time has come when we must do something about the poor schooling, low health standards, job discrimination, and the many other artificial barriers that stand in the way of the advancement of the Mexican-American people along the road to economic equality.

The most promising area for progress is in the field of education. We have already made a significant step toward providing education for Latin Americans with the passage of the Bilingual Education Act which I sponsored in the 90th Congress. Now it is our task to provide adequate funding to carry out the aims of this program.

In addition to the problem of the proper education of the young, there is the larger problem of what to do about the heritage of human exploitation. As Ronnie Dugger has noted in the Texas Observer:

The Mexicans in America have done the dirty work of the Southwest.

I'm still appalled by some of the things I saw out there.

Said Bill Crook, former regional director of the war on poverty, after returning from a tour of the Big Bend country of Texas:

The way of life endured by some Mexican American citizens here in Texas is incredible—something out of the 18th century. A separate culture and different language has resulted in a lack of communication between the Mexican-Americans and the Anglo community along the border which fosters public apathy and indifference to the plight of this minority. Texans would gag on their food if they could witness the kind of poverty I saw on that tour. It's shameful and stupid that nearly 700,000 families—29% of the population—should be hopelessly locked in poverty in this prosperous and progressive state. There are human beings existing in the indescribable . . . cruel as can be found anywhere in the world. . . . It would be criminal for a civilized people aware of such misery to remain inactive.

So that we do not remain inactive in the face of poverty existing amidst plenty, I am introducing today the Southwestern Human Development Act of 1969. The bill authorizes \$100 million to be used for programs of education, training, health, leadership, citizenship, and programs designed to assist the Mexican Americans of the Southwestern United States to overcome the special barriers they have encountered, so that through self-help they may achieve equality of economic opportunity with the rest of the population.

The bill states that the programs "shall be directed toward the elimination of poverty and the achievement of individual economic independence through cultural adjustment, the development of employment opportunities, improved human performance, motivation and productivity, or the betterment of the conditions under which people live, learn, and work."

The philosophy behind this program is self-help. If it is successful, it will be because it makes contact with the natural instinct toward self-reliance and independence that exists in every human being. Therefore the bill specifies that the programs "shall be conducted so as to emphasize self-help and individual responsibility among the participants," and that they "shall, to the maximum extent possible, actively involve the participants, or representatives of the participants in positions of responsibility in the planning and administration of the programs."

This is a regional development program. It is authorized to operate in the Southwestern States. There is precedent for such a regional approach in the Appalachian Regional Development Act. Only in this case we concentrate upon the development of human productivity rather than the physical environment.

A program of this magnitude is a necessity if our words about equality of economic opportunity are ever to lose

their hollow ring. In Texas in 1959, the median income of Mexican Americans was only 57 percent that of Anglos. More than one-half of Mexican-American families exist on an income of less than \$3,000 per year.

I introduce this bill today with the hope that Congress will see the justice and the necessity of taking affirmative action. We can no longer sit idly by and engage in the hypocrisy of saying that this is a land in which every American has an equal chance to get ahead. But we have the wealth to make our country truly a land of equal opportunity, and from our folklore we have the tradition that it should be so. Let us begin to make the myth of equality of opportunity a reality for the Mexican Americans of the Southwest.

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

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

The bill (S. 2151) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to establish a southwestern human development program, introduced by Mr. YARBOROUGH (for himself and Mr. MONTROYA), 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. 2151

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting at the end thereof a new title, as follows:

"TITLE IX—SOUTHWESTERN HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 901. This title may be cited as the 'Southwestern Human Development Act of 1969'.

"FINDINGS AND STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

"SEC. 902. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the Mexican-Americans of the Southwestern United States, while blessed with a long and distinguished history and a rich cultural heritage, have not shared properly in the Nation's prosperity. It is the purpose of this title to assist such persons to overcome the special barriers they encounter, so that through self-help they may achieve equality of economic opportunity with the rest of the population.

"PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 903. The Director is authorized to enter into agreements with any Federal, State, or local government agency or any other public agency or with any private organization for the establishment and operation of education, training, health, leadership, citizenship, and other programs designed to carry out the purposes of this title. Such programs—

"(1) shall be directed toward the elimination of poverty and the achievement of individual economic independence through cultural adjustment, the development of employment opportunities, improved human performance, motivation, and productivity, or the betterment of the conditions under which people live, learn, and work;

"(2) shall, to the maximum extent possible, actively involve the participants or representatives of the participants in positions of responsibility in the planning and administration of the programs;

"(3) shall be conducted so as to emphasize

self-help and individual responsibility among the participants; and,

"(4) shall be of such size, scope, and design as will make a substantial impact toward achieving the purposes of this title.

"SEC. 904. The Director shall prescribe regulations to prevent programs under this title from displacing presently employed workers or the impairment of existing contracts for services.

"INFORMATION, PLANNING, AND ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 905. (a) The Director shall inform leaders of the people intended to be assisted by this title of programs which may be carried out pursuant to this title.

"(b) The Director may provide assistance in the planning and administration of programs being carried out pursuant to this title.

"ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 906. From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 908 for each fiscal year the Director shall allot an amount to each Southwestern State based upon the number of persons with Spanish surnames in such State and the per capita income in such State, in such manner as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title. The Director shall establish criteria for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of the geographic distribution of persons with Spanish surnames within the State and the relative need of such persons in different geographic areas within the State for assistance under this title. The Director shall define the term 'Southwestern State' for the purpose of this title.

"NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL

"SEC. 907. (a) The President shall within ninety days after the enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on Southwestern Human Development for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in bringing about equality of economic opportunity for Mexican-Americans of the Southwest, and making recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of eight persons. The Director shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Director shall make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(c) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year after the enactment of this title. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding \$100 per day including traveltime; 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 Government service employed intermittently.

"AUTHORIZATION

"SEC. 908. There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of \$100,000,000 to carry out the provisions of this title."

SEC. 2. Section 601(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by—

(1) striking out "four" in the third sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof "five"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "One such assistant director shall have the title 'Assistant Director for Southwestern Human Development', and shall be responsible for carrying out, subject to the direction of the Secretary, the provisions of title IX of this Act."

SPANISH-SPEAKING CITIZENS OF THE SOUTHWEST

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the economic oppression suffered by many of our Spanish-speaking people in the Southwest needs little documentation. It is common knowledge that the American goal of economic opportunity for all of our citizens has not been achieved. Nor is it likely that we will achieve this goal in the days ahead given the present intensity of our National effort in this direction. No group of our citizens is more aware of the need to increase the national effort than the 8 million persons in the Southwest living in poverty. We can no longer ignore the artificial barriers that disadvantage our Spanish-speaking people and inhibit their economic health.

Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with the distinguished Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) in sponsoring proposed legislation to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The bill, the Southwestern Human Development Act, would authorize \$100 million to be used for programs of education, training, health, leadership, citizenship, and other activities designed to assist the Spanish-speaking people in our Southwestern States to overcome the barriers they encounter, so that through self-help they might achieve equality of economic opportunity with the rest of the population. Prompt consideration and enactment of the bill would demonstrate an awareness on the part of the Congress of the special problems facing the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest.

I reemphasize that this program has as its underlying philosophy the character trait of self-reliance. The programs to be conducted in accordance with this bill will emphasize self-help and individual responsibility among the participants. Those individuals directly involved, either as participants or as representatives of participants, will occupy positions of responsibility in the planning and administration of the programs.

The responsibility of Congress to those individuals in this land not enjoying full participation in our society is clear; the Southwestern Human Development Act affords an opportunity to act in accordance with this responsibility. Let us not permit the needs of our Spanish-speaking population to continue to go unanswered.

S. 2152—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL ASSIGNING TOP PRIORITY TO SCHOOL CHILDREN FOR SURPLUS DAIRY PRODUCTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to assure that schoolchildren receive top priority for surplus dairy products.

This proposal would enable the national school lunch program to receive first call in the distribution of butter, cheese, dry milk, and other dairy products obtained by the U.S. Department of Agriculture through price-support programs.

Only 18 million of the 50 million American children attending public schools today have a school lunch program available at their schools.

This leaves many children, including more than four and a half million undernourished children from poverty homes, without a mid-day meal away from home.

Dairy products form the nutritional base of our national school lunch program. This legislation will give the health and well-being of millions of American children top priority in our efforts to eliminate hunger from our country.

Currently, surplus commodities held by the Agriculture Department are initially earmarked for domestic commercial trade or foreign export. The products are only available for the school lunch program after these distribution channels are exhausted.

This bill would also enable the Department to purchase dairy products at market prices from regular commercial sources when surpluses on hand do not meet the full needs of the school lunch program.

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

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

The bill (S. 2152) to amend the National School Lunch Act with regard to surplus dairy products and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. NELSON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2152

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Section 9 of the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758) be amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Dairy products acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation through price support operations shall, insofar as they can be used in domestic nonprofit school lunch programs, be accorded top priority for that purpose over any other disposition and so donated and used without regard to the possibility of domestic or export sale. To the extent that Commodity Credit Corporation stocks of dairy products are not adequate to supply the full needs of the domestic nonprofit school lunch programs additional supplies shall be provided through purchases at market prices."

S. 2156 AND S. 2157—INTRODUCTION OF THE NOLO CONTENDERE AND IRS TREBLE DAMAGE BILLS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Monday taxpayers were able to rejoice a bit at the news that local government treasuries likely would be enriched by several million dollars in reimbursement for excessive prices paid due to a price-fixing conspiracy in plumbing ware.

What may come to be the most expensive price-fixing case in history concluded Friday with the conviction of three companies. Twelve others earlier had pleaded nolo contendere—no contest—in the Government antitrust suit.

However, the taxpayers' joy would have been modified if they knew that they would subsidize about half of the millions in damages likely to follow this suit. Or, if they knew that acceptance of the nolo plea from the 12 companies may cause hundreds of thousands of dollars of needless expenditures by local governments attempting to collect damages. Today I would like to reintroduce—making the third time on the track for each—two bills which would change this situation.

First is the proposal to amend an Internal Revenue Service ruling of 1964 which allows violators of the antitrust laws to deduct their penalties as "necessary business expenses." This ruling—which came in the wake of the electrical price-fixing cases and which was a flip-flop from what had been considered to be the IRS position—thus far is estimated to have saved two corporations alone more than \$170 million in taxes. New information just compiled by the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly shows that 19 electrical companies paid more than \$405 million in damages in those cases—or escaped more than \$200 million in taxes.

Needless to say, that money had to be made up by someone—and unfortunately that someone has been the individual taxpayer.

Tax reform is a popular issue these days. Most likely this is because the average middle-income taxpayer has made it clear that he is fed up with paying more than his fair share of taxes.

And I think there is no tax burden shifted to the smaller taxpayer that is more onerous than this one. For it means that he is subsidizing law violators and, therefore, lessening the economic penalties the law had imposed.

A small man may not deduct a traffic ticket as a "necessary business expense," and I do not wonder that he cannot see why a company should be allowed to deduct penalties for criminal violations. I cannot understand it either.

The immediate need for tax reform across the board is evident. However, the urgency is even greater that we pass this bill promptly. For not only are the millions of dollars involved in the 300 private suits in the plumbing case involved, but settlement is imminent in the drug cases. Published reports are that five leading drug firms who were convicted of fixing the prices of antibiotics are trying to settle the private suits for \$120 million. If the present IRS regulation is allowed to stand, that vast sum will be deducted on the companies' tax returns—saving them approximately \$60 million in taxes.

The second measure I reintroduced today is aimed at eliminating a quirk in the law that causes an inequity in the treatment of antitrust violators—and makes it difficult for local governments and small businessmen to collect for damages.

In the plumbing case, as I said, 12

companies pleaded nolo contendere. In the eyes of the law that plea allows the same punishment as if the plea had been guilty. In fact, four executives of those 12 companies were given jail terms by U.S. District Court Judge Louis Rosenberg.

However, as the law now stands, anyone who thinks he was damaged by price fixing on the part of the companies pleading nolo will have to repeat the Government's extensive—and expensive—discovery work to prove a crime was committed before they can claim damages.

Private litigants suing the companies found guilty need only prove damages to collect.

My bill would allow the court to accept a company's plea of nolo in a Government antitrust suit as prima facie evidence that the law has been violated—giving a nolo plea the same treatment as a guilty plea. This would eliminate repetition of the Government's work—and allow many who were damaged but do not have the funds to prove a law violation to collect what is due them.

This bill also would surely reinforce the "private treble damage suit" deterrent to violating the antitrust laws which Congress conceived when enacting the laws.

I call the attention of those interested to these hearings, and I ask that the complete text of the bills be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, as well as the tabulation of settlements in the electrical cases.

One more note: as drafted, the IRS bill most likely will be referred to the Committee on Finance, headed by the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG). Knowing of that able committee chairman's deep interest in this area—exemplified by his own bill in the last Congress—I am most hopeful we will have early hearings so that Congress may work its will on this bill soon. I introduce the two bills and ask that they be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and tabulation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills (S. 2156) relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws, and (S. 2157) to amend section 5(a) of the Clayton Act with respect to the evidentiary effect of judgments and decrees entered in proceedings instituted by the United States under the antitrust laws introduced by Mr. HART, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Finance and the Committee on the Judiciary respectively and, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2156

A bill relating to the income tax treatment of treble damage payments under the antitrust laws

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (1) section 162 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to deduction of trade or business expenses) is amended by redesignating subsection (f) as subsection (g), and

by inserting after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) **TREBLE DAMAGE PAYMENTS UNDER THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS.**—No deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for two-thirds of any amount paid or incurred on any judgment entered against the taxpayer or in settlement of any action by reason of anything forbidden in the Sherman Act (Act of July 2, 1890, c. 647, 26 Stat. 209, as amended) brought against the taxpayer under section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 15), by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

(2) That part III of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by inserting at the end of part III the following new section:

"Sec. —. **TREBLE DAMAGE PAYMENTS RECEIVED UNDER THE ANTI-TRUST LAWS.**—Gross income does not include two-thirds of any amount received during the taxable year on any judgment entered for treble damages or in settlement of any action by reason of anything forbidden in the Sherman Act (Act of July 2, 1890, c. 647, 26 Stat. 209, as amended) brought by the taxpayer to recover treble damages under section 4 of the Act entitled 'An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes', approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731; 15 U.S.C. 15),

by reason of anything forbidden in the antitrust laws."

(3) The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to amounts paid or incurred, or received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

S. 2157

A bill to amend section 5(a) of the Clayton Act with respect to the evidentiary effect of judgments and decrees entered in proceedings instituted by the United States under the antitrust laws

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 5(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes", approved October 15, 1914 (38 Stat. 731, as amended; 15 U.S.C. 16), is amended as follows:

Substitute a colon for the period at the end of section 5(a), and add following the colon these words: "And provided further, For the purposes of this section, a final judgment entered after a plea of nolo contendere in a criminal proceeding brought by or on behalf of the United States under the antitrust laws shall be given the same effect as a final judgment entered after a plea of guilty."

The tabulation, presented by Mr. Hart, follows:

TREBLE DAMAGE SUITS IN ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT PRICE FIXING CASES

Company sued	Number of cases	Number settled	Number litigated	Total paid or agreed to
GE.....	1,782	1,782	5	\$227,057,000.00
Westinghouse.....	1,775	1,775	(?)	126,000,000.00
Allis-Chalmers.....	1,006	1,003	3	\$34,346,556.00
Allen-Bradley.....	54	54	0	113,990.00
Carrier Corp.....	75	75	0	1,385,000.00
A. B. Chance.....	162	162	0	208,596.82
Cornell-Dubilier.....	69	69	1	10,770.00
Federal Pacific.....	411	411	1	1,697,422.74
Cutler-Hammer.....	102	102	0	106,000.00
Foster Wheeler.....	29	28	1	750,000.00
Ingersoll-Rand.....	83	83	0	1,000,141.82
I-T-E-Circuit Breaker.....	209	208	1	\$5,564,274.71
Joslyn.....	293	293	0	\$692,612.28
Kuhlman Corp.....	127	127	0	(?)
McGraw.....				
Moloney Electric.....	391	391	0	1,470,035.59
Ohio Brass.....	234	234	0	1,852,000.00
Porter, H. K.....	277	277	0	1,418,941.11
Sangamo Electric.....	258	258	0	(?)
Southern States.....	164	164	0	\$216,600.00
Square D.....	50	50	0	66,075.00
Wagner Electric.....	357	357	5	\$2,214,000.00
Worthington Corp.....				
Total.....				405,274,016.07

¹ Approximate.

² Few.

³ Plus interest of \$1,673,866.

⁴ Plus interest.

⁵ Not supplied.

⁶ Includes Porcelain Insulator.

S. 2158—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL AUTHORIZING SUPERGRADES FOR BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENTISTS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the marked expansion of scientific activities within the Federal Government in the past decade has created a severe shortage in a variety of scientific specialties. The Civil Service Commission has been responsive to this situation in the physical and natural sciences by providing extra incentives for recruitment and retention of civil servants in those categories. This includes the availability of unrestricted supergrades for scientists in the physical and natural sciences. However, behavioral and social scientists have not been included in the categories eligible for these unrestricted supergrades.

With over 70 pieces of major legisla-

tion in the field of social welfare since 1961, the need for competent behavioral and social scientists to help administer these programs is obvious. However, all agencies, and especially those within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, involved in these new programs have found it extremely difficult to recruit new senior staff because of the severe limitation in the number of supergrades.

Earlier this session I introduced the National Social Science Foundation Act of 1969. Since 32 Senators joined me as cosponsors this year, it is logical to assume that favorable action on this legislation soon will be forthcoming. Should the National Social Science Foundation be established, the need for additional senior administrative staff from the behavioral and social sciences would be increased.

This legislation I now introduce, in and of itself, creates no new Federal positions. It merely makes it possible for such positions to be created as they are needed. It is time for Congress to act so that legislation that we have passed may be implemented without arbitrary limits on needed scientific personnel from the behavioral and social sciences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2158) to permit positions primarily concerned with the behavioral and social sciences to be classified at GS-16, GS-17, and GS-18, without numerical limitation, introduced by Mr. HARRIS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2160—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL PROVIDING FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION IN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REGIONS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to provide for highway construction in economic development regions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

Regional economic development is a vital concept—not only for rejuvenating some of this Nation's most depressed areas, but for rejuvenating progressive and constructive federalism. The Appalachian regional development program's success, which is hard to measure economically because of its long-range nature, can be measured in a governmental sense. In Appalachia, 13 States have involved themselves in a working partnership with the Federal Government so that a once-prosperous region, can again both share and contribute to the Nation's prosperity.

There is another vital lesson to be learned from regional economic development in the Appalachian region. That program has spent the majority of State and Federal funds committed to it on new highways that are designed to open up the region for the commerce and industry that are the key to the new jobs and higher incomes for its people. This, obviously, is not a new idea. We have seen what the Interstate Highway System can do economically for an area—where a single interchange can lead to large-scale development which in turn can generate millions of dollars for the local economy.

However, as we have seen in Appalachia, there are depressed areas of this Nation which the Interstate System only traverses and does not develop by its mere presence. In such areas highways and local access roads leading to new plant sites and to jobs and markets are the key to economic development.

The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 authorized the establishment of regional economic development commissions, similar to that for Appalachia. Since 1965, five of these title V commissions have been designated and funds have been appropriated for their organization, initial planning and for limited research, technical assistance, and public facility supplementation.

This spring, my Economic Development

Subcommittee of the Public Works Committee has been holding extensive hearings both here in Washington and in the various regions, in order to determine what next is required to make these regional programs a reality. There have been a number of bills introduced in both Houses of the Congress to extend and revise the work and the programs of these commissions.

However, none of these bills has been directed specifically at this issue of highways being the principal tool of economic development. Therefore, I am today introducing a bill which would authorize \$10 million for each of the title V regional commissions for each of the next 2 fiscal years. These funds could be used for initial planning, engineering, right-of-way, and construction of developmental highways and local access roads.

I am fully aware that this amount of money will not buy a great many miles of highway in, for example, a region the size of my native Four Corners area. But because of the long leadtime required between planning and construction, it is important to start now. All of the commissions have undertaken research and studies in the field of transportation. All have called for the provision of additional highway funds to open up their depressed areas for commerce, industry, tourism, recreation, and full development of their resources.

We have dramatically seen in Appalachia how a new developmental highway can cut driving times between urban centers, enlarging the commuting radius so that those once isolated from jobs can get to them easily. Such highways also extend the service area for vital public facilities such as hospitals, colleges, vocational schools, and airports. We have also seen how a local access road can result in a new industrial park, a new recreation area, or a new low- and moderate-income housing project.

These are the things which have been done for one regional economic development area and must be started now for them all. Research, technical assistance, supplemental grant funds, and the commissions themselves can only do so much. The real basic program funds must be provided if these regions are going to proceed properly with economic development. This is what my bill attempts to do.

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

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

The bill (S. 2160) to provide for highway construction in economic development regions established under title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, introduced by Mr. MONTGOMERY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2160

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating section 510 as section 511, and inserting a new section 510 as follows:

"Sec. 510 (a) The Secretary of Transportation (hereafter in this section referred to as 'the Secretary') is authorized to assist in the construction of development highways and local access roads serving economic development regions established under this title which will further the purposes of this Act. The provisions of title 23, United States Code, that are applicable to the construction and maintenance of Federal-aid primary and secondary highways and which the Secretary determines are not inconsistent with this Act, shall apply, respectively, to such development highways and local access roads.

"(b) The Commissions shall transmit to the Secretary designations of (1) the general corridor location and terminal of the development highways, (2) local access roads to be constructed, (3) priorities for the construction of segments of the development highways, and (4) other criteria for the program authorized by this section. Before any State member participates in or votes on such designations, he shall have obtained the recommendations of the State highway department of the State which he represents.

"(c) No project authorized under this section shall be implemented until (1) applications and plans relating to the project have been determined by the Secretary to be compatible with the provisions and objectives of title 23, United States Code, that are not inconsistent with this Act; and (2) the regional commission involved has approved such project and has determined that it will contribute to the development of the region, which determination shall be controlling.

"(d) On its completion, each development highway not already on the Federal-aid primary system shall be added to such system and each development highway and local access road shall be required to be maintained by the State as provided for Federal-aid highways in title 23, United States Code.

"(e) Federal assistance to any construction project under this section shall not exceed 50 per centum of the costs of such project, unless the Commission determines that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, but in no event shall such Federal assistance exceed 80 per centum of such costs.

"(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each of the regional commissions for the purposes of this section, to be available until expended, the sum of \$20,000,000 for the two-fiscal-year period ending June 30, 1971."

S. 2161—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AID THE POSTAL ESTABLISHMENT TO GATHER CERTAIN INFORMATION ON THE THIRD-CLASS MAIL CATEGORY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which will aid our Postal Establishment in gathering meaningful financial, statistical and accounting information on mail matter falling within the third-class category.

The more than 20 billion pieces of advertising sent through the mails are used by tens of thousands of small businessmen to generate billions of dollars of sales annually. Unfortunately, the Congress has never had before it, when considering postal rate legislation, factual data on the six subclasses which make up the third-class category. As a result, we very often have been legislating postal rates in the dark.

When the information provided for in this bill has been gathered, the Post Office Department and the Congress, will have a greater understanding of the vexing

postal rate problems which confront all of us today.

I am pleased to have my able colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2161) to aid the U.S. Postal Establishment in providing for the accumulation, analysis, and dissemination of reliable and meaningful financial, statistical, and accounting information in regard to all third-class mail matter, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and Mr. BELLMON), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 2162—INTRODUCTION OF THE POISON PREVENTION PACKAGING ACT OF 1969

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1969. This bill amends the Hazardous Substances Act and gives the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare authority to require safe packaging of hazardous substances—safe packaging which will help us to control a pressing medical problem, the accidental poisoning of our children.

At this very moment some small child is innocently exploring the universe of heights, sounds, and tastes in the limited environment of his home. In the process of this exploration he is poking into the medicine cabinet, reaching into his mother's purse, crawling under the kitchen or bathroom sink, or rummaging in the garden shed and possibly swallowing a potential poison. As many as a million children a year fall victim to accidental ingestions. As many as 400 tragic deaths result; more than 40,000 children under 5 are hospitalized. This is a precious price to pay for curiosity, agility, and innocence.

The high human costs of accidental poisoning in terms of death and suffering are matched by high economic costs. Recently a young boy who swallowed some lye was hospitalized for almost a year. The total cost for his care was about \$7,000. Although this was an extreme case, over 27 percent of all poisoning cases require extended medical care beyond the date of the accident.

Under existing Federal statutes, there are but two avenues of protection open to those who wish to prevent accidental poisonings. First, labeling of dangerous goods can be required. Second, particularly dangerous substances can be banned from the marketplace. Unfortunately neither of these two approaches adequately protects against accidental poisonings. Meaningful labels are important because they alert adults to potential dangers lurking within harmless looking packages. But even the most vigilant parent cannot keep a 24-hour watch over his offspring; and to the curious child who has momentarily eluded the inhibitive parental eye, writing on a label is a meaningless danger signal. Likewise, banning is not a feasible preventative approach. Most of the products which cause injury to the innocent child

are indispensable to the modern household. How can such things as aspirin, soaps and detergents, cleaners, vitamins, and insecticides be banned from the market? Obviously they cannot.

The best approach to preventing accidental poisonings is to provide for the safe child-resistant packaging of hazardous household substances. The effectiveness of this approach has recently been demonstrated. One type of child-resistant device has been tested in Canada over a 1½-year period with startling results: accidental poisonings from substances dispensed in the container were drastically reduced from 2,000 a year to three. The same compelling results were achieved at Madigan General Hospital in Washington State, where accidental childhood poisonings were slashed 97 percent.

The bill I am introducing today amends the Hazardous Substances Act to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to require the safe packaging of hazardous household substances. In promulgating these rules, the Secretary will consult with an advisory committee to ascertain the state of the art in safety packaging, and will consider existing package technology and the benefits such technology can bestow upon the children of our Nation.

The passage of this bill will lead to the prevention of thousands of unnecessary poisonings each year. If safe packaging requirements are coupled with present education efforts, new labeling requirements, and curative poison control center programs, the number of accidental poisonings which lead to serious injury or death can be markedly reduced. Human and economic savings will be immeasurable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks along with a letter which I have sent to Secretary Finch asking him to revise the existing labeling requirements for hazardous household substances.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2162), a bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to provide for child-resistant packaging to protect children from serious personal injury or serious illness resulting from handling, using, or ingesting any hazardous substance, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Moss (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. 2162

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 "Poison Prevention Packaging Act of 1969."

SEC. 2. (a) Section 2(f)(2) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1261(f)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'hazardous substance' shall not apply to economic poisons subject to the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, nor to foods, drugs, and cosmetics subject to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, nor to substances intended for

use as fuels when stored in containers and used in the heating, cooking, or refrigeration system of a house, but such term shall apply to any such substance for purposes of child-resistant packaging as authorized by this Act. The term 'hazardous substance' shall apply to any article which is not itself an economic poison within the meaning of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act but which is a hazardous substance within the meaning of subparagraph 1 of this paragraph by reason of bearing or containing such an economic poison."

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(r) The term 'package' means any container or wrapping in which any hazardous substance is contained for consumption or use by individuals for purposes of personal care or the performance of services ordinarily rendered within or about the household, but does not include—

"(1) shipping containers or wrappings used solely for the transportation of any consumer commodity in bulk or in quantity to manufacturers, packers, or processors, or to wholesale or retail distributors thereof, or

"(2) shipping containers or outer wrapping used by retailers to ship or deliver any commodity to retail customers unless it is the only such container or wrapping.

SEC. 3. Section 3 of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1262) is amended by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e) and by adding immediately following subsection (c) the following new subsection (d):

"(d)(1) If the Secretary finds that, notwithstanding cautionary labelling or any other requirements made pursuant to this Act, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, or the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, or any other provision of Federal law, the degree or nature of the hazard involved in the presence or use of any hazardous substance in or around households is such that the objective of the protection of the public health and safety of children requires the special packaging thereof, he may, after consultation with the members of the technical advisory committee provided for in paragraph (2) of this subsection, and subject to the procedures set forth in paragraph (2) of subsection (a) of this section, establish, by regulation, standards for the child-resistant packaging of such substance. Standards established under this subsection shall be designed to prevent or substantially reduce the hazard of serious injury or serious illness to children likely to handle, use, or ingest such substance.

"(2) For the purpose of assisting in developing such standards, the Secretary shall appoint a technical advisory committee composed of not more than 15 members who are equally representative of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, manufacturers of household consumer products and widely recognized independent packaging consultants. The Secretary shall consult with the members of the technical advisory committee before finally establishing any standards pursuant to this subsection."

"(3) Members of such technical committees who are not regular full employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding \$100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

SEC. 4. (a) Section 4 (a) of the Hazardous Substances Act (15 U.S.C. 1263 (a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The introduction or delivery for introduction into interstate commerce of any

misbranded hazardous substance, banned hazardous substance or hazardous substance in a package failing to comply with standards established pursuant to section 3 (d)."

(b) Section 4 (c) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(c) The receipt in interstate commerce of any misbranded hazardous substance, banned hazardous substance or hazardous substance in a package failing to comply with standards established pursuant to section 3 (d) and the delivery or proffered delivery thereof for pay or otherwise."

(c) Section 4 (g) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The manufacture of any misbranded hazardous substance, banned hazardous substance or hazardous substance in a package failing to comply with standards established pursuant to section 3 (d) within the District of Columbia area or any area not organized with a legislative body."

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment of this Act except that the amendments made by section 4(a) shall become effective on the first day of the second month after regulations have been established pursuant to the amendments made by section 3 of this Act.

The letter, presented by Mr. Moss, follows:

MARCH 19, 1969.

HON. ROBERT H. FINCH,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Department of Health, Education, and
Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: President Nixon has proclaimed the week of March 16 through the 22nd as Poison Prevention Week. Each year there are over 80,000 accidental ingestions of household substances. More than 30,000 children under the age of 5 are hospitalized because their basic curiosities cause them to explore their home environments and place in their mouths accessible objects or substances. Most of these ingestions can be prevented.

Parents can and should take precaution to place dangerous substances out of the reach of the curious youngster. Under the Federal Hazardous Substances Act the manufacturers of hazardous household substances are required to label their products so that parents will be apprised of the dangers the products present. Unfortunately, the present labeling requirements are not reducing the number of accidental ingestions. Further labeling requirements are needed.

To that end I am urging you, Mr. Secretary, under authority of Section 3(b) of the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to establish additional label requirements. Every hazardous household substance should have a uniform symbolic designation—a modern day skull and crossbones type symbol—which immediately alerts the buyer of the product to its potential dangers. Such a symbol should be predominantly displayed in a uniform place on the package containing the hazardous substance. In this way parents of small children will immediately know which products are dangerous and place them out of the reach of children. As children mature, the symbol will serve as a useful teaching aid for parents; mothers and fathers will be able to teach children to avoid coming in contact with any object displaying the uniform danger symbol.

Of course the above labeling requirement I am urging will only partially prevent the needless poisoning of our children. The curious child, not always supervised by his parents, will not follow predictable behavior patterns. His search for knowledge in a limited environment will bring him to the most unexpected places—even places allegedly out of the reach of children. And too, parents will not always heed even the obvious symbolic warning label.

To provide additional necessary protection for our children, I will shortly introduce leg-

isolation giving you, Mr. Secretary, authority to pass safe packaging regulations for those products that present an unreasonable risk of harm to children because of the high incidence of ingestion. Such authority will do much to prevent the accidental poisoning of our children.

Thank you for considering my urgent request.

Sincerely,

FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator.

S. 2163 AND S. 2164—INTRODUCTION OF BILLS CONCERNING IMPROVEMENTS IN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills. The first bill provides for the creation of a commission to examine the feasibility and desirability of various methods by which the structure of the District of Columbia government may be improved and by which the District of Columbia may achieve a greater measure of self-government than presently exists. The other bill provides the District with a nonvoting delegate in the House of Representatives.

The first bill establishes a 15-member commission which would submit to Congress and the President a comprehensive report of its findings and recommendations. The 15-member commission would be comprised of two members of the House of Representatives, two members of the Senate, five members appointed by the President, four members elected by the people of the District, and the commissioner of the District of Columbia and chairman of the City Council shall be ex officio nonvoting members of the commission.

I am aware, as I know everyone else is, that local self-government for the District is a most complicated, confusing, and controversial issue. There is as much controversy over the form of government the District should have as there has been over home rule itself. Many agree with the principle, but are in total disagreement with the methods.

The Senate has passed home rule legislation in six Congresses since 1949, but still the District does not have self-government. I do not believe we can attain the goal of self-government by taking a step backward and rehashing again some warmed-over proposal which would be doomed to certain failure. The path which we have traveled so often in the past is now a deep rut leading to oblivion. If home rule is ever to get off the ground, we should forget past failures, admit we must take a new approach, and get on with it. The 850,000 disenfranchised citizens of the District deserve better than our reconsidering rejected plans which will only result in another exercise in futility.

The problem is not in wanting to do it, but getting it done. A commission on government for the District of Columbia is the most practical, realistic, and orderly means of obtaining the best form of government for the District. The commission could draw upon the knowledge of nationally known experts in the fields of municipal administration, finance, and urban development. It could give thorough consideration to the many al-

ternative plans which have been presented over the years to arrive at the very best possible form of government for the District. The citizens of the District, through their elected representatives on the commission, would have a direct participation in the formation of a proposal. Those who are to be governed would have a voice in what form that government would take.

The second bill, Mr. President, provides for a nonvoting delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives. The delegate would be elected by the voters of the District and would be equal in every way to the other Members of the House of Representatives except that he would not vote.

Those who must obey the law should have a share in making the law. The people of the District carry all the responsibilities of citizenship yet they are denied the fundamental right of representation. To amend the Constitution to give the District voting representation in Congress is a long and difficult process. An important and expeditious first step to be taken now to reach that eventual goal is to provide the District with a nonvoting delegate. This first step would establish a much needed link between the people of the District of Columbia and the Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills (S. 2163) to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; and (S. 2164) to establish a Commission on Government for the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. PROUTY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2076) to provide for the establishment and administration of a National Wildfire Disaster Control Fund.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2036) to provide educational assistance to veterans attending elementary school.

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

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the name of the senior Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER) was inadvertently omitted as a cosponsor of S. 2094 when the bill was introduced on May 8. I ask unanimous consent that Senator MILLER be added as a cosponsor, and that his name be included as a cosponsor at the next printing of the bill.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I

ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1519) to establish a National Commission on Libraries and Information Science.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2068) to amend the Labor-Management Relations Act to permit employer contributions to trust funds for scholarships and day-care centers.

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

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at their next printing, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1933) providing for Federal railway safety and of the bill (S. 1938) to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) be added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1189) to improve educational quality through the effective utilization of educational technology.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senators from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1808) to prohibit harmful employment of children in agriculture.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 819) to exempt senior citizens from paying national parks and forests entrance, admission, or user fees.

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

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 8) to make the National Labor Relations Act applicable to the agriculture industry.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), be added as a cosponsor 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 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. RANDOLPH) and the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 2073) to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of certain materials to minors; and the bill (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. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1708), the "Federal Lands for Parks and Recreation Act of 1969."

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

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 438) to amend section 8332 of title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited services of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 2045) to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs in order to provide within the Federal Government for the representation of consumers' interests and to undertake studies designed to achieve superior implementation of consumer programs throughout the Federal system.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 937) to amend title 5 of the United States Code to provide training opportunities to congressional employees, and for other purposes.

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

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of

the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) and the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE) be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1076) to establish a Youth Conservation Corps in the Departments of Interior and Agriculture.

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

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A JOINT RESOLUTION AND RESOLUTION

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 32) to create a standing Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), be added as a cosponsor of the resolution (S. Res. 30) to amend the Standing Rules of the Senate relative to the Select Committee on Small Business.

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

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BOGGS) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 85) to provide for the designation of the period from August 26, 1969, through September 1, 1969, as "National Archery Week".

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

Mr. TYDINGS. I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) be added as a cosponsor of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 101) to authorize the President to issue a proclamation designating the last full calendar week of April of each year as "National Secretaries' Week."

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

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CRIME

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, Senator BIBLE, I announce that hearings before that committee on crime and its \$1½ billion annual cost to the American small businessman will begin May 21 at 11 a.m. in room 318 of the Old Senate Office Building. The hearings will continue May 22 and 23.

The hearings will center on the Small Business Administration's report, "Crime Against Small Business," such study ordered by the Congress by the Small Business Protection Act of 1967. The small businessman's stake in the problem of cargo theft and pilferage at airline terminals, marine docks, and from trucks, will also be examined.

Anyone wishing to appear should notify the Small Business Committee staff.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON TWO OIL BILLS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I announce that the Subcommittee on Minerals, Materials and Fuels of the Interior Committee has scheduled public hearings for May 20 on Senate Journal Resolution 54, a measure to grant the consent of Congress to an extension of the Interstate Oil Compact, and S. 1193, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to prevent termination of certain Federal oil and gas leases under particular circumstances.

Both of these measures are sponsored by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. ANDERSON.

The hearing on these measures will open at 10 o'clock in the Interior Committee room, 3110 New Senate Office Building.

The subcommittee, of which I am chairman, will welcome the views of any Senator or member of the public on either of these measures.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the two pending treaties.

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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, with the understanding that it be called off at 12:30 o'clock p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the hour of 12:30 o'clock not having arrived, let me say that after discussing the matter with the distinguished minority

leader and the managers of the resolution on both sides of the aisle, I should like to make a unanimous-consent request that at the conclusion of the vote on the pending treaties, and after a reasonable period for the transaction of routine business there be a 2-hour limitation on debate on the resolution, the time to be equally divided between the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), with 1 hour on each amendment thereto.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this request is rather new to me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thought the Senator had agreed to it yesterday.

Mr. JAVITS. No; I did not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw the request, because the hour of 12:30 has arrived.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The Senate resumed the consideration of executive business.

CONVENTION ON OFFENSES COMMITTED ON BOARD AIRCRAFT—AGREEMENT WITH CANADA ON NIAGARA RIVER DIVERSIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the unanimous-consent agreement of yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the resolution of ratification of Executive L (90th Cong., second sess.), a convention on offenses committed on board aircraft; to be immediately followed by a vote on the resolution of ratification of Executive C (91st Cong., first sess.), an agreement with Canada on Niagara River diversions.

The yeas and nays have been ordered on both the convention and the agreement, and the clerk will call the roll on Executive L.

CONVENTION ON OFFENSES COMMITTED ON BOARD AIRCRAFT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is it possible to ask one or two questions under the rule, before the roll is called?

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

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. Is the Senator from Alabama handling this matter?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; I am, temporarily.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) and I—and I know this is so of every Member of Congress, and particularly the members of the Senate Commerce Committee—have been concerned with the question of hijacking. I understand that this treaty follows the usual procedure—that an offense committed on an aircraft should be tried by the country in which the aircraft is registered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But it does not go to the question of the hijacking, because, as I understand the testimony, and from the questions asked of the officials of the State Department, Cuba has not signed the treaty. I do not know whether Cuba

has any intention of signing it. The Soviet Union also did not enter into it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct.

Mr. MAGNUSON. What bothers me about that problem is that we have an airline that flies from New York to Moscow, which service has just been inaugurated. Was there any testimony that the Soviet Union would become a party to this treaty?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I recall, the distinguished chairman of the committee on yesterday indicated that that was a possibility, and also that Cuba, at some future time, might join, although it was brought out that this was not the appropriate vehicle to consider the question of hijacking.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It would seem to me that the Soviets would welcome a treaty like this because of the inauguration of the American-Soviet service to Moscow.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the service is twice a week. I hope its inauguration will lead to their signing a truce treaty provision.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Twice a week, I think. If something could be done to convince the Cubans to enter into the treaty, I think it would be well. The problem involves Cuba. Many airlines move into and out of Cuba with airplanes that do not belong to the United States. If Cuba entered into the treaty, perhaps we could do something about the hijacking. The Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) and I are only two members of the committee, but we think the best way to get at it would be to have a treaty for extradition from Cuba.

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

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. It is my understanding that the treaty makes it mandatory that there shall be legislation on the subject following the ratification of the treaty, which I assume—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; it is not mandatory.

Mr. COTTON. Which I assume would come from the Commerce Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. To implement the treaty.

Mr. COTTON. I had some reservations that we were obligating ourselves to legislation and the Commerce Committee has had no opportunity to consider the treaty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator's committee will handle that legislation.

Mr. COTTON. I understand that, but the treaty obligates us to produce something. What happens if we fail to agree?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not obligate the Commerce Committee. It is in the discretion of that committee to approve or disapprove the implementing legislation proposed by the administration.

Mr. COTTON. But we have a treaty obligation to produce a bill.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Not necessarily. We do not really have to do anything. This country is so big that it can thumb its nose at anybody; but, in fairness, the treaty contemplates legislation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. We are not trying to thumb our nose at anybody, but we are trying to stop the hijacking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This treaty does not undertake to stop hijacking.

Mr. MAGNUSON. That is something we will have to do later.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This treaty does not undertake to do that.

Mr. COTTON. I have reservations about putting ourselves in the situation where we are morally bound to produce legislation and the burden of inaugurating it would be on the Commerce Committee, and yet the Commerce Committee did not have any opportunity to examine this treaty before we obligated ourselves.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would have no objection to the Commerce Committee's taking a look at the treaty, in the same way that the Armed Services Committee looked at the Nonproliferation Treaty. I do not mean to be giving up our jurisdiction over it, but it would be fine for the Commerce Committee to give it consideration. We have often done that with respect to treaties relating to taxes.

There was no objection to this treaty. The administration and the Airline Pilots Associations representing nearly all the pilots in America, are for it. I know of no one who opposes it. It is a relatively simple treaty, but it is not designed to deal with the difficult problem of hijacking. It was thought that an agreement dealing with hijacking could not be obtained at this time which would be effective, much as we would like to have one. I have no disposition to urge it. If the Commerce Committee wants to look at it, that is satisfactory with me.

Mr. COTTON. I do not ask to do that at this late hour. However, I hope this action will not establish a precedent.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It does not really do very much. The legislation will be up to the Commerce Committee.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It is a step forward, but we have to do something to implement it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Hopefully.

Mr. JAVITS. This will be the framework. It is a frame of reference for something that could be ultimately productive; even a hijacking.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Exactly.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the State Department on the subject.

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

COMMUNIST COUNTRY ATTITUDE TOWARD TOKYO CONVENTION

We have no reason to believe that there is serious U.S.S.R. or other Communist country objection to the Tokyo Convention which would prevent them from adhering if a substantial number of other countries were to adhere to it.

Cuba, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the U.S.S.R., and Yugoslavia participated in the International Conference on Air Law in Tokyo at which the final negotiation and the adoption of the Convention took place.

The text of the Convention was finally adopted at Tokyo by a margin of 36-0 with one abstention. That one recorded abstention was the U.S.S.R. The delegate of the U.S.S.R., in a fairly mild statement, called the work of the conference "positive" and noted that the conferees had cooperated successfully to resolve a number of problems. He criticized Article (1) for applying to all penal offenses rather than being limited to acts which jeopardize safety or good order and discipline on board, Article (6)(2) for per-

mitting passengers to take preventive action without the captain's authority in certain cases, and Article 17 for possibly dangerous vagueness and he attributed his delegation's abstention on the text of the Convention to these "inadequacies." A more extensive summary of this statement may be found in ICAO Document 8565-LC/152-1, Minutes of the International Conference on Air Law, Tokyo, September 12, 1968.

Bulgaria, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and Yugoslavia participated in a meeting of the ICAO Assembly in Buenos Aires which, on September 28, 1968 adopted without objection a resolution urging all States to become parties to the Tokyo Convention.

Mr. MAGNUSON. This treaty gives us a framework within which to work.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Tokyo convention should be promptly ratified by the U.S. Government. It makes many desirable changes in the legal situation concerning offenses and other acts threatening civil aircraft.

First, to date, the competence of the state of registry to apply its criminal jurisdiction to acts aboard its aircraft in flight anywhere in the world has not been as solidly established by international practice as law of the flag jurisdiction has for ships at sea. The convention would confirm that competence. Second, the acts of a pilot or crewmember in restraining of off-loading a passenger whose conduct threatened an aircraft's safety might today be judged by potentially different laws depending upon the jurisdiction in which the aircraft was flying at the time the measure was taken but under the convention, those acts would be judged by the rules of the convention.

Another improvement relates to extradition. Presently, many extradition treaties only permit extradition for an offense which was committed in the territory of the requesting state. The convention would allow crimes committed aboard aircraft to be extraditable by providing that those crimes are considered as having been committed in the territory of the state of registration.

A further and most significant improvement on the present legal situation is in the protection guaranteed by the convention to passengers in civil aviation who might be accused of offenses and subjected to measures of restraint, off-loading, or delivery to foreign authorities. Under the convention, such a passenger could not be carried involuntarily under restraint beyond the next point of landing. If taken off the plane at a foreign airfield, the passenger would be entitled to assistance in immediate communication with his country's authorities, to an immediate factual inquiry, and to at least favorable treatment as that country's own nationals receive.

As sound as this convention is, it does not assure punishment or extradition of hijackers. It does, however, obligate states party to expedite the onward passage of a hijacked plane's passengers and crew and to return the plane and cargo to their lawful owners. Ratification of this convention should be viewed as a good but partial step toward meeting the hijacking problem. I believe that it would facilitate the taking of further and necessary steps.

The convention deserves ratification

for what it does do on the subject of hijacking as well as for the sound rules it establishes in regard to criminal jurisdiction, the authority of the pilot and crew, extradition treaties, and the protection of accused passengers. It is the first multilateral convention to deal with hijacking and, as such, it constitutes a recognition that dealing with hijacking is a responsibility of the international community as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that a background sheet on this convention be printed in the RECORD.

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

TOKYO CONVENTION—FACT SHEET
BACKGROUND

The Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft was developed in the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) over a 13 year period of study and negotiation begun in 1950. It was signed at Tokyo on September 4, 1963 after approval by a diplomatic conference, and transmitted to the Senate on September 25, 1968.

Scope.—The Convention is applicable to all aircraft (except those used in military, customs, or police services) while in flight or while on the surface of the high seas or other areas outside national jurisdiction. Nothing in the Convention would apply to a flight of an aircraft wholly within the territory of its state of registration.

Purpose.—Its aim is to promote the safety of civil aviation.

Major features.—It establishes the competence of a state to extend its criminal jurisdiction to acts aboard aircraft of its own registry in flight anywhere in the world. It authorizes the pilot, crew and passengers to take certain actions to preserve safety or good order and discipline on board the aircraft, and grants legal immunity for actions taken within that authority. Significant protection is given to persons who might be subject to measures of restraint, off-loading from the aircraft, or delivery to foreign authorities. The Convention obligates states to permit the onward passage of the crew and passengers of a hijacked craft as soon as possible, to return the aircraft and crew to the rightful owner, to make a factual inquiry into the hijacking, and to report thereon to the State of registry. If an offense would be extraditable under a treaty but for the fact that it did not occur in the territory of the requesting State, the Convention would cure the defect.

The Convention does not itself make any act a crime and does not require extradition or prosecution of an offender.

Status of Convention.—It has been signed by the following 33 countries:

United States, Canada, China, Congo (Brazzaville), Denmark, Germany Fed Rep., Guatemala, Holy See, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Liberia, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Israel, Colombia, Belgium, Mexico.

It has been ratified by the following 9 countries:

China, Denmark, Italy, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom, Mexico.

Ratification by any 12 States will bring it into force.

Implementing legislation.—Legislation has been submitted to assure that U.S. criminal jurisdiction applies to acts aboard U.S. registered aircraft in flight anywhere in the world.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification

of Executive L (90th Cong., second sess.), a convention of offenses committed on board aircraft? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 93, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 29 Ex.]

YEAS—93

Allen	Gravel	Mundt
Allott	Griffin	Murphy
Anderson	Gurney	Muskie
Baker	Hansen	Nelson
Bayh	Harris	Packwood
Bellmon	Hart	Pearson
Bennett	Hartke	Pell
Boggs	Hatfield	Percy
Burdick	Holland	Prouty
Byrd, Va.	Hollings	Proxmire
Byrd, W. Va.	Hruska	Randolph
Cannon	Hughes	Ribicoff
Case	Inouye	Russell
Church	Jackson	Saxbe
Cook	Javits	Schweiker
Cooper	Jordan, N.C.	Scott
Cranston	Jordan, Idaho	Sparks
Curtis	Kennedy	Sparkman
Dirksen	Long	Spong
Dodd	Magnuson	Stennis
Dole	Mansfield	Stevens
Dominick	McCarthy	Symington
Eagleton	McClellan	Talmadge
Eastland	McGee	Thorndike
Ellender	McGovern	Tower
Ervin	McIntyre	Tydings
Fannin	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Fong	Miller	Williams, Del.
Fulbright	Mondale	Yarborough
Goldwater	Montoya	Young, N. Dak.
Goodell	Moss	Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Cotton
NOT VOTING—6

Aiken	Brooke	Mathias
Bible	Gore	Pastore

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 93 and the nays are 1. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

AGREEMENT WITH CANADA ON NIAGARA RIVER DIVERSIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make clear my strong support for the pending agreement which will be of tangible benefit to the Nation and to the State of New York. The erosion of the American Falls at Niagara has been a matter of serious concern to conservationists—particularly in New York State—for many years. At last, we have before us for approval an important and technically feasible first step toward a

lasting solution for the preservation of the American Falls through advanced hydroengineering techniques.

The work which is proposed to be undertaken not only will seek to save—and correct past damage to—a great natural wonder and world-famous tourist attraction. The Niagara Falls are also an important source of hydroelectric power which is vital to the economic well-being of, particularly, the northern regions of New York State. The New York State Power Authority has cooperated in the preparation of these plans and fully supports them. Here we have a happy union of the conservationists cause and enlightened economic exploitation of hydropower.

In addition, we must not, in my judgment, overlook a most crucial aspect of this proposed legislation—the fact that it is a cooperative agreement between the United States and Canada. As such, it is a good example of the kind of mutual planning and cooperation which must continue to be the hallmark of United States-Canadian relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the order of yesterday, the next question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification of Executive C (91st Cong., first sess.), an agreement with Canada providing for additional temporary diversions from the Niagara River for power production purposes?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) are necessarily absent.

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

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 94, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 30 Ex.]

YEAS—94

Allen	Dominick	Inouye
Allott	Eagleton	Jackson
Anderson	Eastland	Javits
Baker	Ellender	Jordan, N.C.
Bayh	Ervin	Jordan, Idaho
Bellmon	Fannin	Kennedy
Bennett	Fong	Long
Boggs	Fulbright	Magnuson
Burdick	Goldwater	Mansfield
Byrd, Va.	Goodell	McCarthy
Byrd, W. Va.	Gravel	McClellan
Cannon	Griffin	McGee
Case	Gurney	McGovern
Church	Hansen	McIntyre
Cook	Harris	Metcaif
Cooper	Hart	Miller
Cotton	Hartke	Mondale
Cranston	Hatfield	Montoya
Curtis	Holland	Moss
Dirksen	Hollings	Mundt
Dodd	Hruska	Murphy
Dole	Hughes	Muskie

Nelson	Saxbe	Thurmond
Packwood	Schweiker	Tower
Pearson	Scott	Tydings
Pell	Smith	Williams, N.J.
Percy	Sparkman	Williams, Del.
Prouty	Spong	Yarborough
Proxmire	Stennis	Young, N. Dak.
Randolph	Stevens	Young, Ohio
Ribicoff	Symington	
Russell	Talmadge	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—6

Alken	Brooke	Mathias
Bible	Gore	Pastore

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

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.

A RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a time limitation of 3 hours on the pending resolution, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) and the distinguished senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS); and 1 hour on any motion or amendment, the time to be equally divided between the Senator who makes the motion or offers the amendment and a Senator on the opposing side, who is to be designated at the time.

Mr. JAVITS. It being understood that the printed substitute, which is in two parts, will be in order notwithstanding the rule of germaneness.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

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

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine morning business was transacted:

ALABAMA-COUSHATTA INDIANS ARE INTEGRAL PART OF BIG THICKET STORY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Big Thicket area in southeast Texas is known for its biological value and unique natural beauty. It is also noted for its great historical significance. Many of the most exciting and significant events of Texas history took place in and around the Big Thicket.

My bill, S. 4, to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres, seeks to protect these various resources for future generations to enjoy.

Mr. President, deep within the Big Thicket is located the Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation. These proud and skillful people are very much a part of the Big Thicket story, having lived in Texas since the early 19th century. They

were friends of Sam Houston—one tribe that remained friendly despite great injustice. The people of Texas are very proud of them.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Sunday, January 12, 1969, edition of the Houston Post, entitled "The Pendulum of Life," which describes the life of the Alabama-Coushatta Indians, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

ALABAMA-COUSHATTA INDIANS—THE PENDULUM OF LIFE

(By Nora Louise Krisch)

The pendulum of life has brought the Alabama-Coushatta Indian woman back to the chores her ancestors were cultivating some 200 years ago.

Crafts such as dyeing wool with tree bark, berries and fruit stains, weaving colorful belts and blankets with the same primitive frames used before the white man came, and making pottery are again part of the woman's life after being neglected and almost forgotten for many decades.

But for the Alabama-Coushatta these steps backward are really paving the avenue for their future existence.

Less than a decade ago the Indians were struggling for survival when the Indian Village tourist playground became a reality. But in order to attract the tourists the Indians had to revive the crafts and dances of their ancestors.

The Alabama-Coushatta Indian reservation is 4,351 acres located in the Big Thicket of East Texas near Livingston (some 90 miles from Houston).

Along with the women, the men have become involved in the transition to the past.

The menfolk switched from their pulpwood cutting, which was the main occupation of the Indians in this area, to show business. Indians from other reservations in other states were brought in to teach the Alabama-Coushatta tribal dances.

The art of making hunting implements such as the blowguns used to kill small game was revived.

More than 80 families make up the almost 600 tribal members, and until 1965 the average income for each family was slightly more than \$1,000 a year.

The older men and women who remember how to perform the lost arts learned in their childhoods teach the young girls and boys. The baskets are woven with pine needles from long leaf pines and strips of river cane native to the Big Thicket.

When pottery making was revived commercial clay was ordered, but the Indians prefer the good clay deposits found on the reservation.

Commercial clay will crack if it is not kiln fired. The other is fired by piling hot coals around bowls and continuing the fire until the clay is hard-baked.

Interest in gardening has been rekindled since it was the Indian who introduced squash, watermelons, corn, wild rice and potatoes to the white man.

On the reservation the booths are in the shape of teepees but only because it is expected. The Alabama and the Coushatta Indians were woodland Indians and have always lived in log cabins. Only plains Indians built teepees.

One of the first problems faced when the tribal dances were revived was that when the Indians were converted to Christianity dancing was forbidden. Until recently there was no dancing on Sunday.

In 1881 Presbyterianism reached the pine forests of East Texas and the stomp and jangle of native dances had no place in their pattern of religion.

The small frame houses the Indians live in now (generally two families to one house) were built during the 1920's and 30's. Only in recent years have the dwellings been equipped with running water and indoor toilets.

The houses are well-kept and clean but are crumbling with age and the Indian is reaching back to his past to financially support him today and hopefully tomorrow.

The teenage girl may quietly weave baskets for the tourists but when not on view she is very average. She is interested in the mod age but her approach is a bit more subdued. And although her skirts may not be mini she is not hindered in doing the latest dances and sharing that universal love for rock music.

On the reservation there is a school for elementary students. Teenagers attend Livingston High School.

And the dreams of higher education become reality at Pan American College in Edinburg, Haskell College in Lawrence, Kan., or at the vocational school in Fort Sill, Okla.

The young do not always return to the reservation after completing their education as many prefer not to return to a small town because there are not enough job opportunities.

Operation Head Start began on the reservation three years ago for the four and five year olds. Most of the children speak Alabama or Coushatta dialects for which there is no alphabet or symbol language.

English is the first written language these children are taught, and the program is sponsored by the Office of Economic Opportunity and the Indian Tribal Council on the reservation.

The Alabama first appeared in 1541 when Hernando De Soto attacked the village of Alibamo in northwest Mississippi. During the same time he visited the Coushatta village on the Tennessee River.

For 160 years there was no record of them until they appeared in 1702 on the upper course of the Alabama River, and in 1807 they moved into Texas.

Although they knew unhappy years they always held firm to Texas soil. They did not fight as did other tribes and remained at peace with not only their neighbors but with the various governments of Texas.

When the reservation system failed and the other tribes were removed to the Indian Territory in 1875 the Alabama-Coushatta were not.

The Alabama and Coushatta tribes have been traditionally and historically related. An old legend has it that each came out of the earth on opposite sides of the root of a certain tree and settled there in two bodies.

Although differing somewhat in language they have always lived near one another.

The word Alabama is believed to be from Choctaw "alba ayamule," which means "I open or clear the thicket." The word Koasati or Coushatta (the form generally used by neighboring whites) signifies "white cane."

RECESS

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, but not later than 1:30 p.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess.

The Senate reassembled at 1:30 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MONTYA in the chair).

SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL ON MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, President Nixon today asked Congress to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, returning to the President the power which he had prior to June 30, 1967, to modify callup procedures.

He has requested this power to make the following alteration in the current draft laws:

First. Change the order of callup so that the youngest would be drafted first.

Second. Limit the period of vulnerability to the draft to 1 year.

Third. Institute a random selection system for those who are actually drafted.

Fourth. Continue the college deferment with the understanding that the year of maximum vulnerability would come when the deferment expired.

Fifth. Standardize and make the policy of deferment and exemptions consistent throughout the Nation.

The President's proposals are designed to reduce the impact of the military draft on the almost 2 million men who reach draftable age each year. They are designed to make the draft more equitable and will bring a sense of justice and fairness to our draft system.

I am certain that the reduction of the period of vulnerability from 7 years to 1 year will minimize the impact of the draft on our young men and allow them to plan for the future. The changes proposed to institute a random selection process and to standardize the deferment and exemption policy throughout the Nation will reduce much of the current dissatisfaction with the present system. These changes will make our draft system more equitable, reasonable, and just.

I wholeheartedly support the President in this effort to reform the present draft system.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 1:30 p.m. having arrived, morning business is concluded.

A RESOLUTION TO EXPRESS THE SENSE OF THE SENATE IN REGARD TO CHANGES IN THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 194) to express the sense of the Senate in regard to changes in the Job Corps program.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution.

THE JOB CORPS PROGRAM SHOULD NOT BE CUT BACK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to speak in support of the resolution of the distinguished junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON).

I am deeply concerned over the Department of Labor's announcement to

close 59 of the 109 Job Corps conservation centers. From reading the testimony taken during 3 days of hearings before the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, I am concerned that the valuable work which has been performed at the conservation centers, will be wasted because of the premature shutdown of facilities.

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THE JOB CORPS?

What is the Job Corps all about? The Job Corps is a unique program, and not, as the Department of Labor seems to contend, merely one in the long series of manpower programs that are interchangeable. Job Corps enrollees are those young men and women who have dropped out—they have dropped out of school, and in many cases dropped out of our normal society. They are unemployed, uneducated and unskilled. Their environment is poor and many of them either have police records, or they are about to join the number who do. Many are on the edge of becoming narcotics addicts. The Job Corps takes them out of their environment—an environment which is unproductive and whose values may be antithetical to those of the society in general—and places them in Job Corps centers where they can, free from the pressures which have inhibited them, make a new beginning. It is important to note that the Job Corps program is not merely another form of job training. The young men and women who come to the Job Corps do not have the basic skills needed to undertake normal job training. As a matter of fact, the Department of Labor in their selection criteria for shutting down Corps centers uses as two of six tests the success the Job Corps center has had in improving reading and mathematics skills of Job Corps enrollees. None of the other job training programs manpowered under the Manpower Development and Training Act, or other programs such as JOBS have the educational training requirements that the Job Corps does. None of the other programs spend virtually half of the working time in educating the young men and women. So, the Job Corps must be considered a unique program; one which does a job that no one else has tried.

WHY SUCH A SPEEDY CLOSING?

In my opinion, one of the basic problems of this plan for closure is that the Department of Labor did not have sufficient time to think through what they were doing. The officials of the Labor Department, through their own actions, have in effect admitted this. One example is the announcement of the recent closing of Koko Head Job Corps Conservation Center in Hawaii. Through haste or bad advice, the Department of Labor announced the shutdown of the Koko Head Center and the plan to replace it with a minicenter in downtown Honolulu. But when a member of the House Education and Labor Committee informed the Department of Labor that the present Job Corps center is only 15 minutes from downtown Hawaii, the

Department decided to go out and take a look. Upon investigation, the Department of Labor discovered the center was not just a work camp out in the woods and reinstated it. So, I mention this to point out the fact that if more evaluation teams were sent out, I am sure different conclusions and more reasonable conclusions would have resulted.

Another Job Corps center that is to be closed down is the New Waverly, Tex., Job Corps Conservation Center. It offers vocational skills training in painting, automotive service, mechanic, carpentry, cooking, cement masonry, bulldozer operating, motor grader operating, and welding.

FACTORS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT

The Department of Labor set forth six factors which were considered in deciding which Job Corps center should be shut down. They are:

First. Average operating cost of the center per enrollee man-year.

Second. The average length of stay, in months, of enrollees at the center.

Third. The 30-day dropout rate at the center.

Fourth and fifth. Average reading and math gains by the enrollees. Sufficient information was not available from the women's centers to permit valid comparison, however.

Sixth. The percent of enrollees that were placed 90 days after leaving the center. This criterion was given twice the weight of the others because it measures the end product of the centers' efforts.

Aside from sending teams to receive a first-hand account of the progress being made at the centers, there are several factors which the Department of Labor should have considered. I want to discuss some of these factors and how they would relate to the New Waverly Conservation Center, the only conservation center located in Texas, which Secretary Shultz has announced he will close before July 1 of this year.

LOCATION OF CENTER NOT CONSIDERED

First, there was no consideration given to the center's geographic location as it directly relates to the population that the center serves. Critics, as well as proponents, of the Job Corps questioned the transfer of enrollees great distances across the country. The Job Corps statistics show that 41 percent of all Job Corps enrollees come from the southern part of our country.

Yet the only conservation center located in the South is the New Waverly center located in my State. Apparently, the Department of Labor overlooked this important fact because the plan now is to close the only conservation center in the area where the need is most severe. While there is talk of establishing some of the "minicenters" in this area, these new plans will do nothing to meet the needs of the "poorest of the poor" at the present time. It is true that we have outstanding vocational educational schools in this area, but contrary to the reports, these vocational schools simply are not geared to serve the Job Corps youngster who is in fact a pre-vocational-education youngster.

In addition, the New Waverly center is located near a major metropolitan area,

Houston-Galveston. This location is not only ideally located from the standpoint of corpsman off-center leisure time and cultural benefits, but this metropolitan area has a supporting minority population and a job market readily available to provide job opportunities for the youngsters. And again, my staff has investigated to find that one of the centers left open is isolated from any metropolitan area and has no ready job market near the center. This center does not have the supportive minority population that New Waverly has either. These are factors which do not fall out on charts and out of computers, but we are dealing with human lives and basic commonsense would dictate that these factors should be considered when the centers are compared.

WEATHER AT CENTER NOT CONSIDERED

Another factor that should be mentioned and apparently was not considered is the climatic conditions near the center. At first, one might conclude that this is not very important but an understanding of how a conservation center operates would cause one to look carefully at the climatic conditions. These young men have a great deal of their vocational training outdoors. Obviously, you can't expect young men to learn to operate a bulldozer inside a classroom. At New Waverly, heavy equipment is taught, using bulldozers and motor graders. And also, the congressional intent of conservation improvements cannot be completed if the climate is not conducive to outdoor activity. At the New Waverly center, the climatic conditions permits year-round outdoor activity.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE AT CONSERVATION CENTERS?

Another reasonable approach, if you are determined to close the centers, would be to consider the conservation improvements performed and the potential conservation improvements remaining. Section 106 of the Economic Opportunity Act clearly states the conservation center enrollees are to be assigned to centers "where their work activity is primarily directed to the conservation, development, or management of public natural resources." At a time when there is great concern for our environment in this country, this is a factor that the Department of Labor has again failed to put in their computer. Since the Job Corps conservation centers were created—under the competent direction of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture—this country has received from the Job Corps conservation enrollees conservation improvements valued at over \$66 million.

In my opinion, a survey should be made to determine if there is in fact conservation work left for the young men at the centers to perform. The New Waverly Conservation Center is located in the Sam Houston National Forest which consists of over 150,000 acres of forested land in east Texas. The New Waverly center is located within the project area with short travel distance to conservation projects and there is unlimited expansion area and years of conservation work yet to be done at the New Waverly site. Again, I am informed by authoritative sources that some centers are slated

to be left open which have limited expansion for conservation work. We are talking here about the future—the work that is yet to be performed—but the Department of Labor again did not consider another important factor, which, if considered, would result in New Waverly being among the top for conservation yet to be completed.

NEED FOR CONSERVATION WORK IN TEXAS

On April 24 of this year, I received a telegram from L. C. Walker, dean of the School of Forestry, Stephen F. Austin State College, in Nacogdoches, Tex. This is not a big university, but it is one of the leading schools of forestry in all the Southern States. In certain aspects of the pine forest research, this school does work that affects all of the pine forests of the United States. Dean Walker sent a telegram and here is part of what he said:

New Waverly Job Corps Center is the only unit in the Gulf South in conservation work enabling year-round outdoor opportunities for Texas and Louisiana men. Presently they are building a new work center at Yellow Pine while housed in college forestry summer camp near Milo. Five-year plan for building work centers and forest recreation facilities will be disrupted if the program is abandoned.

Also, training road and logging equipment operators. Discipline problems minimal. Recommend this center be retained.

That comes from the dean of the School of Forestry of Stephen F. Austin State College—Dean Walker is widely respected in his field and he has been called to Washington many times to discuss a variety of subjects. I mention his telegram and his praise of the New Waverly center to illustrate that it would be better to consult men of Dean Walker's stature to determine exactly how each center is carrying out the important purpose of conservation improvements along with training the young men before making any decision to shut down a particular center. The New Waverly center, I should note, ranks fourth in the Nation in the appraised value of work projects completed this year.

NEW WAVERLY DOES NOT HAVE RECRUITMENT PROBLEMS

Another important point is the Job Corps center's ability to maintain its enrollee strength. On April 23 of this year, I received a resolution commending the New Waverly center, passed by the San Augustine, Tex., Chamber of Commerce. The resolution reads:

The New Waverly Center operates a high level of efficiency by maintaining its corpsmen strength at near maximum level. During the second quarter of the current fiscal year, all other 224 man centers maintained an average strength of 186 corpsmen compared to 220 in New Waverly.

These are the very latest statistics available. I am informed the Department of Labor used the data for calendar year 1968 and it would seem to me that the most recent statistics should be used. If I am going to evaluate anything or compare any enterprise with another, the first thing I would want would be the very latest statistics. Otherwise, centers are going to be penalized for improving in the past recent months. As to the length of stay of the enrollee, the

number of months the average enrollee stays in the Job Corps, New Waverly is near the national average. In fact, the latest statistics show that New Waverly's length of stay is increasing whereas the national average is in fact decreasing.

For example, the length of stay—fiscal year to date shows the national average to be 5.9 months and New Waverly's length of stay is 5.7. The second quarter of fiscal year shows the length of stay on a national average to be 5.7 and New Waverly's length of stay to be 6.7, which is 1 month longer than the national average.

UNION PREAPPRENTICESHIP PROGRAMS

In 1968 the Job Corps and outstanding organizations such as the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, AFL-CIO, Marine Cooks and Steward Union, the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America joined together in an effort to salvage disadvantaged youths by establishing preapprenticeship training programs at 49 conservation centers throughout the Nation. The New Waverly Center has an arrangement with the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners to provide a carpentry preapprenticeship program with followup placement. Also, in addition to the ongoing carpentry program, the New Waverly Center would have received the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers program if Secretary Shultz had not announced his decision to close the center before July 1. Many other centers the Department of Labor plans to keep open do not have existing arrangements with these outstanding organizations to provide apprenticeships for these youngsters. Some centers slated to remain open are so located that staff recruitment is a problem. And yet, New Waverly has no staff problems and, in addition, New Waverly has the existing arrangements that I have mentioned.

It is indeed unfortunate that Secretary Shultz did not consider the arrangements that exist between Job Corps and the unions before he caused an abrupt halt to progress because those arrangements were virtually a breakthrough that I consider most significant. I am convinced that with the assistance of instructors from organizations such as the Brotherhood of Carpenters and the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers, the placement rate at New Waverly would have increased considerably this year. The overall placement of New Waverly is 66 percent according to the very latest statistics available. The graduates are averaging \$2 per hour. How many high schools do as well?

JOB CORPS DOES BASIC EDUCATION

The placement figure is quite high when you consider over a third of the youths entering Job Corps Centers read below the third-grade level. Many of these young men had given up the attempt to learn to read. The average entering enrollee reads at a 3.7-grade level and only 6.8 percent enter with reading levels over the sixth-grade level. There are 37.3 percent of the Conservation enrollees who are illiterate, 55.9-percent of the enrollees are semiliterate, which leaves only 6.8 percent who are literate. It is amazing to me that the Job Corps can

place 70 percent of all those who enter. It is because of the intensive ready and matter courses given at the Job Corps. And I am sure that if the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and the Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers of America were just given a chance at New Waverly, the placement record would be even higher.

LOWEST COST CENTER CLOSED

Secretary Shultz has emphasized cost in his discussion about the Job Corps. We have all heard that the closure of these centers is an economy move. But yet when they started to plan to close centers, they closed the most efficient center in terms of cost, that we have in the United States. That is the New Waverly Center, the lowest cost center in the country. The data used by the Labor Department shows New Waverly operating at \$3,436 per enrollee. The latest statistics for this fiscal year show an improvement in that low figure.

Now New Waverly is operating at \$3,380 per corpsman man-year. This figure is the lowest in the Nation; some of the centers left open operate at twice this cost. It is irrational to close the most efficient camp in the Nation, in terms of cost and then brand the whole plan as an economy move. I mentioned this to Secretary Shultz when he appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Poverty and he said the figure did not include the transportation. But even if you add the transportation cost that the enrollees incur in traveling from home to the New Waverly center, the figure will be the lowest in the Nation because as I have already mentioned New Waverly enrollees, on the whole, are closer to home than the enrollees at any other center. So I urge the Secretary and his cost analysts to review the figures and take into account the most efficiently operated Job Corps center that exists today.

Finally, I would like to read from an editorial appearing in the March 10, 1969, San Angelo Standard-Times:

Those participating as Job Corps trainees are those young people with little prospect otherwise for successful lives. They lack job training: Many also lack homes which can provide them with both the material and intangible necessities. The Job Corps is in large part a salvage operation: When the "salvage" is a success, society is rewarded with a citizen trained to support himself and his family. He can become, in other words, a contributing member of the community. Without the Job Corps, at least some never rise above their circumstances. They would become drains upon the community—either through criminal activity or society-dependent poverty. And their liabilities would be passed along to succeeding generations. Given the "without hope"—or very nearly so—young persons with which it deals, it is not surprising that the job corps track record of success is less than 100 percent. It would be a marvel indeed if it were otherwise. The expectable failures, however, do not diminish the value of its successes—nor decrease their benefit to the nation. For many young people the Job Corps today offers hope where none other exists."

Mr. President, this sums up what we all know. The testimony taken in the House and Senate indicate that there is no other place for the youngsters to receive their training. We have heard of the blueprints for the future but that does not serve the youngsters now who

are presently enrolled. This idea of shipping kids back home with broken dreams, is totally unacceptable to me. I asked Secretary Shultz and Assistant Secretary Weber both when they appeared before my committee for confirmation that these Job Corps centers should not be touched until Congress had time to consider this program. We all read the President's message of February 19, and he made a promise to us that full discussion from both sides would be considered. But the reverse has occurred. The Department of Labor has chartered a course which to me is unwise. Some of the best centers are being closed. I have tried to point out some very important factors that reasonable men should consider before such drastic decisions are made. So I urge the administration to halt these closings, at least until Congress can investigate to determine in a rational manner the future of the Job Corps—a most vital and successful program which is the only program that handles youngsters who are the "poorest of the poor."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD some of the letters I have received in regard to the closing of the New Waverly Job Corps Center, an article which was published in the Houston Post of April 26, 1969, and a factsheet concerning the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center.

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

TEMPLE INDUSTRIES,
Diboll, Tex., April 23, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I want to go on record as opposing the administration's plan to close our New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center in Walker County. This center is providing underprivileged young men with the education they need and vocational training.

The recreational potential of this area is great. The Corps men are doing much needed work in parks, forests, and other public reservations, and their contribution will enable us to realize our recreational potential.

I sincerely hope that the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center will be maintained.

Sincerely,

ARTHUR TEMPLE.

HUNTSVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Huntsville, Tex., April 22, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Enclosed herewith is a copy of a resolution adopted by the Huntsville-Walker County Chamber of Commerce on April 14, 1969.

We respectfully request your favorable consideration reference this resolution

Sincerely,

HARRY HOWARD,
Executive Vice President.

RESOLUTION

Whereas: The New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center is the only Conservation Center in the State of Texas; and

Whereas: The operating cost of the New Waverly Center has consistently been well below the national average; and

Whereas: The Center has operated efficiently and effectively as substantiated by its high on-board Corpsman strength ranking and by its high ranking in appraised value of completed work projects; and

Whereas: The New Waverly Center has enjoyed good community relations and received strong local support;

Now therefore be it resolved: That the Board of Directors of the Huntsville-Walker County Chamber of Commerce, assembled in regular session this 14 day of April, 1969, hereby supports the continuance of the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center so long as the Job Corps program exists.

Attest:

HARRY HOWARD,
JOLLY O. BENSON,
President.

WALKER COUNTY,
Huntsville, Tex., April 23, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: The New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center is one of the centers listed for closure in the near future. This center has been reasonably successful in the past. Operating costs have been low, needed projects of great benefit to the public have been done, community problems have been minimal and local support has been good. More importantly, the trainees are being taught job skills that are slanted heavily toward construction and which are now in such great demand. At the same time intensive attention is directed toward improving attitudes and developing social skills and citizenship.

I support the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center and I request that you do everything that you can to insure the continuance of the Center.

Sincerely,

AMOS A. GATES,
County Judge.

SAN AUGUSTINE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
San Augustine, Tex., April 25, 1969.

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: We wanted you to be informed of our recent action in behalf of the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center, New Waverly, Texas. Enclosed is a copy of the resolution wired to Senator Gaylord Nelson, chairman of the Manpower Sub-Committee, Labor and Public Welfare.

With all good wishes, I remain,

Sincerely,

K. JOE DiMAGGIO,
President.

RESOLUTION

Be it Resolved that we the undersigned members of the board of directors of the San Augustine Chamber of Commerce do, by our signatures, urge the Manpower Sub-Committee, Labor and Public Welfare, under Senator Gaylord Nelson, Chairman, to reconsider the closing of the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center of New Waverly, Texas, in lieu of the following reasons:

1. A national closing of all such centers is not under proposal, only the closing of selected centers including New Waverly;

2. New Waverly is the only Civilian Conservation Center within the state of Texas, one of the most populous states in the Nation;

3. And further New Waverly is the only Civilian Conservation Center within the Deep South;

4. There is a large volume of work projects on the National Forest which makes ideal corpsman projects and the climate permits year-round outside work on projects;

5. The Center enjoys a very favorable logistical location being very close to a large segment of its target population—underprivileged youth;

6. The operating costs of the New Waverly Center has consistently been well below the national average to the extent that it can train a corpsman for approximately \$540

LESS than the nationally averaged Centers per year (taken from last fiscal yearly figures);

7. The Center operates at a high level of efficiency by maintaining its corpsman strength at near-maximum level:

Example: During the second quarter of the current fiscal year (Oct., Nov., Dec., 1968) all other 224 man Centers maintained an average strength of 186 corpsmen compared to 220 in New Waverly (latest statistical figures available);

K. Joe DiMaggio, President; Sam Malone, Director; Charles L. Samford, Director and Mayor, Wyatt C. Teel, LeRoy Sparks, Ray N. McEachern, Glynn Purdy, Director and Treasurer; James D. De Zelle, Henry E. McLemore, E. C. Moon, Matthew J. Buchele, E. E. Benefield, J. P. Mathews, Directors.

BEAUMONT, TEX.,
April 25, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Deep East Texas Development Association, comprised of leading citizens of 8 deep east Texas counties, urge the retention of the New Waverly Civilian Conservation Center at New Waverly, Tex. This center is providing valuable training to 220 disadvantaged youths of the exact kind needed to make these youths desirable productive citizens. The carpentry and paintings programs in cooperation with national unions are especially effective. As well as providing valuable training these programs result in much needed recreation construction in the national forest areas around Sam Rayburn and Toledo Bend Reservoir we ask your help in keeping this center in operation.

LEROT SPARKS,
President.

HUNTSVILLE, TEX.,
May 5, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

The conservation Job Corps Center in New Waverly, Tex., has been an effective program for the training character and vocational training. They also contributed to the conservation of natural resources in a large area of East Texas. Your help in assisting this program to continue will be good for Texas and especially for a group of American youth.

W. E. LOWRY,
Sam Houston State College.

[From the Houston (Tex.) Post,
Apr. 26, 1969]

AT NEW WAVERLY: YARBOROUGH FIGHTS JOB CENTER CLOSING

WASHINGTON.—Sen. Ralph W. Yarborough, D-Texas, urged the Nixon administration Friday to reconsider the decision to close the Job Corps Conservation Center at New Waverly, 60 miles north of Houston.

Yarborough told Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz the New Waverly center had the lowest cost per man for training in the Job Corps program.

Shultz, appearing before a Senate labor subcommittee to defend the administration's decision to close 59 Job Corps centers this summer, said that every Job Corps trainee whose center is closed will get a chance to go to another center or take part in a different job training program.

"I realize that reasonable men may differ on their evaluation of the Job Corps program as well as to which centers should be closed," Yarborough said. "However, the New Waverly center has an enrollee cost of \$3,436, which makes it the lowest-cost center in the entire program."

Shultz told Yarborough the administration used several standards in reaching its decision and the average operating cost of the centers was only one factor.

Yarborough introduced letters and telegrams he received from Texas urging the government to keep the New Waverly center open.

Shultz made two main points in his testimony before the subcommittee:

(1) The Job Corps has done a poor job of meeting the needs of many poor youths, although it does meet some needs and about 50 per cent of the centers will remain open.

(2) The Labor Department uses a broad range of effective training programs for the poor and these will easily offset the reduction of 17,200 training positions which the Job Corps closings will cause.

Meanwhile, Yarborough joined in sponsoring a resolution introduced by Sen. Alan Cranston, D-Calif. calling for no shutting down of Job Corps centers until the Senate can evaluate the program and the decision.

"I do not believe that full debate and discussion are possible when the decision over which debate is to occur has already been taken," Yarborough said.

"I am co-sponsoring this resolution in the hope that the administration will reconsider its decision to close the Job Corps centers and allow proper hearings by the Congress on the scope and size of the Job Corps program."

CONROE, TEX.,
April 29, 1969.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: I would like to protest the closing of the New Waverly Job Corps Center, New Waverly, Texas.

It is not that I disagree with the judgment and the authority to close some of the centers, but why close a center that has such a high level of efficiency as this particular one.

Enclosed you will find a complete fact sheet compiled on the New Waverly Job Corps Center, showing its merits.

Your consideration in this matter will be appreciated.

Yours truly,

GUS W. DERRICK, D.D.S.

NEW WAVERLY CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTER FACT SHEET

1. New Waverly is the only Civilian Conservation Center in Texas.

2. It is the only Civilian Conservation Center in the deep South.

3. The climate permits a year-round outside work program.

4. There is a large volume of work projects on the National Forest which make ideal corpsman projects.

5. The New Waverly Center has good community relations and support.

6. The Center is located close to a large segment of its target population—underprivileged youth.

7. The Center is in a very favorable location logistically.

8. The Center is near the city of Houston and is ideally located from the standpoint of corpsman off-Center leisure time outlets.

9. The Centers' union affiliated (United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners) apprenticeship training program has been highly productive from both the standpoint of tangible benefits to the public and benefits in skills training to corpsmen.

10. The operating costs of the New Waverly Center has consistently been well below the national average.

Example: Cost/corpsman man-year (Fiscal Year to date): National Average, \$4,920; New Waverly, \$3,380.

11. The Center has operated at a high level of efficiency by maintaining its corpsman strength at near-maximum level.

Example: During the second quarter of the current fiscal year (the latest statistics available) all other 224-man Centers maintained an average on-board strength of 186 corpsmen. New Waverly maintained 220.

12. New Waverly's length-of-stay (number of months the average corpsman stays) is very nearly at the national average. Latest statistics show that New Waverly's length-of-stay is increasing whereas the national average is in fact decreasing.

Example: Length of stay (fiscal year to date): National average, 5.9 Mos., New Waverly, 5.7 Mos. Second quarter of fiscal year: National average, 5.7 Mos., New Waverly, 6.7 Mos.

13. New Waverly ranks tenth in the Nation in appraised value of completed work projects (\$791,055).

New Waverly ranks fourth in the Nation in the appraised value of work projects completed this fiscal year (\$186,230).

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and request unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 25 minutes on the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have listened with a great deal of interest to most of the dialog and debate regarding the suggested resolution proposed by my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and I rise at this point to make certain that all my colleagues in the Senate will have as clear a picture of the problem as possible before they vote on this resolution. At the outset, I would like to point out I have served on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee for the past 4½ years, and have watched with great interest the progress of the many separate programs which went to make up the complex picture bearing the title of the "War on Poverty."

The original idea and the stated purpose of this highly publicized, criticized, and sloganized war on poverty was, in my opinion, a most worthy one. I have been enthusiastic in supporting its objectives, but the planning, or lack of it, the organization and administration generally, I believe, have resulted in a dismal failure. Plans were promulgated which were not practical. Promises were made which were never kept. Bureaus were piled high with personalities whose performances often indicated their own self-interest rather than a true desire to help our less fortunate brothers.

Sometimes problems were created where no trouble had existed before. Tensions were intensified rather than relieved. Taxpayers' dollars, under the euphemistic term "Federal money," were squandered and wasted, and sometimes even stolen. The entire misadventure was cloaked in a sort of sacrosanct aura which called down the collective wrath of many of the self-styled professional liberals in our society if one dared even

to criticize or to suggest changes which might result in improvement.

From the very outset, this badly needed, universally backed war on poverty was off to a bad start on a very stormy voyage. From the very beginning I urged, and have continued to urge, that politics be removed from the program completely.

I was fortunate enough to get an amendment to the bill back in 1965, when I first came to the Senate, to remove politics from it. The amendment stated that community action program personnel and VISTA volunteers receiving the principal part of their income from poverty funds would be put under the Hatch Act. It was deleted, however, by the House. In subsequent legislation, I am glad to announce, it was enacted into law.

I am hopeful this will serve as an example and I will patiently continue to seek new means by which to eliminate politics from the program. These funds, designed for the poor, should not be used for political purposes. I have said it up to now—I will continue to say it—to do thus, as far as I am concerned, is a dishonest use of the money.

One of the programs of the entire package which has had probably as unfortunate a childhood as any has been the Job Corps, which was proposed to seek out those unfortunates who, for one reason or another, were not employed or were considered to be unemployable.

It was known that the educational capabilities of a great number of these unfortunate young people precluded their chances of ever getting any sort of employment other than the lowest grade of menial jobs. So it was proposed that they would be educated to fulfill the minimum need—I think the fifth grade in reading, English, and mathematics. At the same time, they were to be trained in a skill which would make it possible for them, upon graduation, to get and retain a job in competition with their fellows.

I enthusiastically supported this premise because, again, from the very beginning I have felt, and have so stated, that our primary responsibility was to provide jobs for all as the first step toward making self-respecting, self-sufficient citizens of all of our people. There should be no second class citizens in this great Nation of ours.

I have consistently sponsored and supported all programs which seemed to me to be capable of providing realistic and responsible approaches to this concept. I have watched carefully the development of the Job Corps and its experience and have been disturbed by some aspects of it over the past 2 years. I have felt that from the first the recruiting and screening have not been properly guided and have not been properly carried out or planned. Proof of that seems to be, apparently, in the figures presented by Secretary Shultz to the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, which disclosed that 26 percent of those screened and signed to contracts to enter the Job Corps never appeared. Obviously, there is something wrong—and it should have been remedied.

The next matter of great concern to me is the fact that, within 30 days of

those trainees who did appear, another 16 percent left the program.

And then, within the following 60 days, another 13 percent decided not to continue. The reasons given have led me to conclude that quite possibly much of the original thinking and planning was in great error. It was a fine idea, but the development was uncertain and unsound. Many of the boys and girls who left felt that they had been oversold. They felt that the sales pitch had been a little too strong for them.

Many left because of homesickness, and a great number because of fear. I underscore the word fear, because from the very outset I have felt that it was a mistake to mix a group of young boys who were having academic trouble and were in need of special instruction, in a large camp with some who had questionable records, and some, may I say, who had obvious records of development indicating hard-core criminal tendencies.

This first came to my attention about two and a half years ago, when I met a young man flying on an airplane at night, who told me he was running away from a camp because he feared for his life. He said another trainee had knocked him down the night before, sat on his chest, and held a knife at his throat.

I do not believe that, even in the hope of improving social justice, we have the right to subject young men to this sort of extraordinary atmosphere. In some cases, young people who are frightened to death of their associates will leave. Others might be started off on what may become a life of unfortunate crime, through no fault of their own but rather through the use of bad judgment and bad planning on our part.

I have always felt that this attempted mixing was a dangerous procedure, which might in the long run actually do more harm than good, and that it certainly would be unfair to a lot of youngsters to expose them in this sort of atmosphere. I know something of this, Mr. President, because in growing up I had the misfortune to be forced to live in all sorts of areas and atmospheres during my young lifetime, and I know what I am talking about. It would be my wish that all youngsters could be protected from that sort of fear and terror.

During the first couple of years, the reports indicate that in many communities the Job Corps camps created local problems and disturbances, which did not help the progress of the program. This was unfortunate. The preparation in the communities was badly done. The public relations, if you please, were badly handled. I recall discussions even about contracting for hotels and buildings and from the very outset the amounts of money that were made available came under general and constant criticism.

In spite of that, many of us felt that the growing pains were normal, and that as time went on, answers to the problems would be found, so that generally the program would finally accomplish what it had set out to do.

Two years ago, I asked the Director, Sargent Shriver, to please inform me and the members of the committee as to the actual progress of the Job Corps—how many boys and girls were benefiting,

how many were getting jobs, how many were believed to be permanently employed and the average rate of pay they were receiving. In other words, I requested that he merely tell us, the Members of Congress responsible for the matter, what was happening, so we could decide whether the program was a success or failure.

This information was not forthcoming. But finally, at long last, we received a report from the General Accounting Office which seems to indicate that the success of the Job Corps is very questionable, and that it would be very difficult to make a case for further continuance of expenditures of large sums of money, unless drastic changes were made.

So, Mr. President, this is not a new consideration. I am sure there are many Members of this body who have not had a great deal of knowledge about the problem, but I am sure that most Members from time to time have had mail from home expressing concern about the program. There always has seemed to be a lack of discipline, a lack of control, and a lack of complete understanding of the conditions and problems existing and the people involved; That, in my opinion, can be very dangerous.

I know it was wrong to pack up youngsters and transport them clear across the country, merely to get them out of an environment or a bad or broken home life. This was the original design. I never agreed with it. I never thought that it was needed, or proper, or that it would work. Evidence seems to show that in spite of the fact that the recruitment program spent more than three times as much money as the job placement program, much of the blame can be placed on recruitment, and in my opinion, on the original screening and the way the trainees were selected and processed.

I think it is shocking that after all the preparations, interviews, publicity, and salesmanship, 26 percent of those who applied and were accepted never appeared at the camps. This would indicate, at the outset, that there was something drastically wrong.

I am also concerned by the reasons stated in the GAO report for trainees leaving the camps. I would have thought that those in charge would have been able to find some way to change the conditions, and properly motivate the trainees so that they could stay in camp long enough to get the advantage of the training they so badly needed, and which we all so urgently wished to provide for them.

These are some of the reasons why I have opposed, on occasion, and am worried presently about the future of the Job Corps. Along with the reasons I have stated, there is the cost in taxpayers' dollars. It seems that an inordinate amount has been spent, and will continue to be spent if we continue the program as it now exists. I simply cannot find it possible to explain such unproductive uses of taxpayers' dollars to my constituents. It is difficult to explain to a man whose salary is \$12,000 to \$15,000 a year, who is trying to send two of his children through college at his own expense, why he should pay taxes in order

to provide training to individuals at a cost of \$8,300 per person.

I think there is a better way to do it. The great majority of trainees do not stay in the program long enough to gain any advantage whatsoever. Almost half leave before any advantage has been gained. There seems to be general agreement that 6 months is the minimum time needed. As I have already said, about half have left by the end of 90 days. Those who do stay for the full course gain a very questionable advantage, according to the reports. It would therefore seem to me that the entire approach might properly be greatly improved. Certainly the performance to date could not be hurt too much by any changes that might be made.

I should like to point out something which seems to get lost from time to time in a consideration of the job camps and in the debate. There is no desire or design to close the entire Job Corps program. There is no desire or design to push the young trainees off into the streets, back into their communities or ghettos, without a chance to continue their studies, their improvement, their job training, and all the other influences which are at present being provided for their betterment.

The suggested plan calls for the closing of only one-half of the Jobs Corps camps, and then on a selective basis. Those camps with the worst records will be closed and those with better records will be retained, in the hope that those having better records may be further improved.

I can see no reason why Senators, after the period of time in which the Job Corps program has been in existence, should object to a change of approach for at least one half of the camps. Their attitude does not make sense to me. I think it is way past the time when changes should have been made. I know that many emotional appeals were made before the committee and in the Senate Chamber. They seem to have been based on the fact that the young people would be denied completely any chance to help themselves in the future. This is just not the case. Secretary of Labor Shultz has specifically stated that it is not the case, and that no trainee would be put out on the streets without a proper, carefully selected program to go to.

In the hysteria and the obviously organized reaction to the announcement of the closing of some of the camps, at least one camp in California allegedly barred its gates to representatives of the U.S. Employment Service who had been sent there for the distinct purpose of interviewing trainees, in order to find out their desires, their needs, their dispositions, so that they might be transferred to other training programs, or to other existing Job Corps camps. There was almost an organized insurrection, I am told, and the Government representatives were not permitted to enter the camps.

I have heard it said that an attempt would be made to snatch these poor people and move them to other locations. Sometimes, surprisingly enough, such statements were made by persons who thought at the outset that it would be a splendid idea to take a boy from North Carolina and send him to a camp in

Oregon, or to take a boy from California and move him to a camp on the east coast, in order to get him away from an environment in which he was having difficult problems.

Next, I point out that the cost factor involved has always been a problem as far as I am concerned. At the outset we used a rough figure of approximately \$12,000 per trainee. We thought it was high. We said so. We were assured that this was an extra cost because of tooling up, getting the program started, and that then it would be cut tremendously with time and experience.

There were editorials and remarks to the effect that one could send a couple of boys to Harvard or Princeton for that amount of money. Of course, that is not the point. And those remarks were ill-founded and not fitting to those particular situations because these are special cases, and they do need special treatment. They need special consideration, and we want to see that they get it. But as far as I am concerned, I want to see that they get it in a practical, favorable, and productive manner.

I have always felt, as do most of my colleagues with whom I have discussed the Job Corps, that the cost has been out of line, that it has been unnecessarily high, because of bad planning, duplication of effort, and needless waste in administration. That, combined with the fact that the net result of the training program in my opinion has generally been a failure. It has never come up to the level of success I believe it was supposed to.

Still, at this late date, this program has a completely indefensible record, and after careful scrutiny, it should force us all to say that there must be a better way to accomplish this most needed job.

I have not touched on many of the reports, some of which have been mentioned, about the widespread problems within the camps, of homosexuality, the use of narcotics, and all of the rest.

I have not been an expert in these matters, nor do I intend to be. I leave that to others of my colleagues. My point is that this program, enthusiastically launched with great hopes, has just not worked the way it should.

I was told, for instance, that in one camp in California, the trainees had broken \$22,000 worth of windows the year before. That is very difficult to explain. I find it unacceptable. I know that many of my colleagues find all sorts of excuses for this condition, but until I can see a better system of discipline in these camps than I have seen in the past and greater progress than I have seen, I cannot continue my enthusiastic support. I have not seen the improvement that I look for.

I do not think the performance of the program has or will improve. Therefore, I think we must look to another method to accomplish the purpose. I think our obligation to the young people who need this training commands us to do this.

Mr. President, I would like to talk for a moment about the proposals made by Secretary of Labor Shultz and find whether any great damage is being done to the existing program or whether quite possibly the newly proposed program might do a better job for more people

in a more practical way and, may I say, at a smaller expenditure of money per individual.

Mr. President, I fully agree that we have an obligation to the youth of the country who need this training which I do not believe we are fulfilling adequately. By the same token, we have a commitment to the Nation's taxpayers—who, in my opinion, are already bearing too great a burden—to spend their tax dollars prudently and wisely so as to make certain that they receive the greatest possible return for their money.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

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

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I do not believe we have been fulfilling either of these obligations.

I would like now for a moment to look realistically at the new program suggested by the Secretary.

The administration has not asked that the entire program be eliminated, but only that the least effective centers be closed and that the young men and women enrolled in these training centers be given an alternative course to follow—either in other centers or in other manpower training programs.

It is true that many of these trainees have received help—job training, education, better health care, more nutritious food, and maybe for the first time in their lives some semblance of discipline and a variety of supportive services.

At the same time, I see no reason why we should conclude that this is the only way that these important elements can be given to the trainees. I believe there are other ways.

I completely agree with the Secretary that in the smaller urban training centers greater progress could be achieved in a shorter period of time and at a greatly reduced cost.

I agree that in many cases the educational level has been raised and that their skill in reading and math each year has been improved. However, I see no reason why this could not be done better in the newly proposed program.

As a matter of fact, I have seen some of the skill centers in Los Angeles, and I can attest that this is possible and practical.

Mr. President, in looking at the new program, certain things seem obvious to me. These proposed centers must be made to work. We must perform the job we have decided on. The boys not so far from home, in an atmosphere where they will be working, may be better off. Maybe we will eliminate one of the reasons of homesickness. Maybe we had better let them go home on week ends and not go through the attempt to completely break up a family unit. Maybe better counsel and closer supervision could be provided. Perhaps new and better jobs could be provided at the end of their training. Cooperative education can be tested. I think it will work. It has been in evidence in our country for over 50 years. Seventy-five thousand boys now enjoy the benefits of it in our great country.

We could cut out the unnecessary travel, integrate all the job training programs into one, and make the total facilities of this great government available to these young people.

Let us forget for a moment the emotional approach. I am as emotional as anyone in this Chamber, but I say there is a time when the practical approach must be tested and tried. We should stop telling these young people that they are different and start telling them that they are not different. They are citizens of this great Nation who just got off to a slow start; that is the only difference. We can help them and see that they run on a faster track and catch up with the rest. As to those who would be inclined to be spoiled, it is time to stop pampering them. Let them understand that they must take on some of the responsibilities for themselves, as most of us have to do, as the Founding Fathers of this great Nation did.

Certainly, there will be special cases. They should be treated as special cases, with special treatment. Certainly, there will be hard-core criminal cases, and they should be approached in a special way, not denied at all. They should be given extra care and treatment, in the hope of getting their training started and getting them started in society.

I wonder sometimes whether there are political aspects to this attempt. I say to my colleagues that it certainly would be unworthy to make a political football of an important matter of this kind. I do not believe that is the case. I sincerely hope it is not, and I am certain nobody will want to embarrass the new administration or the new Secretary of Labor. On the contrary, I am certain that all my colleagues would rather help him to find the solution to these problems.

So why not afford the new plan the same enthusiasm and the opportunity that was given to the old? Why not permit the new administration the right to attempt to improve? If they fail, then we will call them to task and change again, to make certain that this badly needed effort is not dropped simply because the beginning was wrong and the first turn was a bad one.

So I urge that the resolution proposed by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from California, be defeated. I believe the new program would do much more good than it would do harm; and I sincerely hope it will be given a fair chance and a fair trial, in the hope that it may succeed.

Mr. MONTROYA. Will the junior Senator from California yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MURPHY. I would be glad to yield extra time on the bill, so that the Senator from California will not be denied his full time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The junior Senator from California yields 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, I have listened attentively to the remarks of the senior Senator from California, and now I should like to elicit from him a little more clarification.

The senior Senator from California made a statement about some of the

enrollees in the Job Corps camps having criminal records.

Mr. MURPHY. Yes.

Mr. MONTROYA. Did the Senator mean to imply that most of the enrollees are in this category, or are the individuals about whom he speaks only isolated cases?

Mr. MURPHY. I am glad that my distinguished colleague has asked the question, because it gives me the opportunity to specifically nail it down. These were not the majority; far from the majority. I believe the figure is in the area of 6 or 7 percent, or perhaps even less. It was not my intent to imply that this was the majority; not at all. But I do feel that in some cases a small minority within some of these camps has taken over the inside administration and has formed gangs and has threatened and scared some of the other youngsters who have been exposed to that.

Mr. MONTROYA. The Senator also mentioned that there were some instances of sodomy or attempted sodomy.

Mr. MURPHY. I beg the Senator's pardon. I did not say "sodomy." I believe the RECORD will show I did not use that term.

Mr. MONTROYA. Well, did the Senator use the word "homosexuality"?

Mr. MURPHY. I did, yes.

Mr. MONTROYA. And what statistics does the Senator have in this respect?

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

Does the Senator from California yield additional time?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield an additional 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. MURPHY. I think we can get more time on the bill. I believe the majority leader will provide it.

Once again, I call my distinguished colleague's attention to the fact that I mentioned this only in passing, and stated that I had no intention to go into this matter or to stress it. I was not interested in these particular reports, which I have seen from time to time.

Mr. MONTROYA. I ask the Senator from California to be a little more specific. Does he have information with respect to the incidence of homosexuality in these camps?

Mr. MURPHY. As I have just explained to my colleague, I had no intention—and the RECORD will indicate that I so stated—of going into this matter or making anything of it.

I will attempt to get whatever reports I can. As I said in my statement, I have not read them; I have paid no attention to them. I have mentioned in passing that they exist. I do not believe this was the intent or the thrust of my remarks. My remarks were based on the fact that this program has been tried and it has been found wanting.

Mr. MONTROYA. Will the Senator yield me some more time, because he has consumed the little time that has been allotted to me?

Mr. MURPHY. I would be glad to yield. How much time does the Senator desire?

Mr. MONTROYA. Five minutes.

Mr. MURPHY. I yield 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California yields 5 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTROYA. I am glad the Senator has answered this question, because the state of the record indicated or implied that most of these boys had bad backgrounds and that they would spoil the good boys who come into these camps.

I have had quite an investigation made in the four Job Corps camps in New Mexico. They are run by the Forest Service. We have had good experience with these enrollees. When they have finished their matriculation at the Job Corps camp, they have gone out, and we have placed more than 60 percent of these enrollees. We have had very little trouble with them on Saturday nights or during their service in the camps. But the most important thing has been that they have contributed greatly to the conservation of our natural resources in the areas where they have been working.

I should like to elicit from the senior Senator from California some expanded views and more detail on the alternatives he has expounded upon; namely, the manpower training by the Labor Department as an alternative. I presume he is also thinking about on-the-job training.

I want to relate my experience to the Senator with respect to on-the-job training in the State of New Mexico. I have worked with different business people in the State of New Mexico, to try to start on-the-job training within the businesses, and we have met with frustration. We have met with insurmountable redtape and bureaucratic indecision with respect to on-the-job training.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MONTROYA. If I may be permitted to terminate.

With respect to manpower training, I would like to relate another experience. Under the rules of the Labor Department, before a manpower training project can be launched or approved, a survey must be made in the particular area, and then a determination must be made as to whether or not the trainee, after he finishes training, will be able to find a job in the particular area. If those criteria are not satisfied, the manpower training project is not approved. Therefore, I would assume that if these boys are relegated to on-the-job training programs or manpower training programs, they are going to meet with complete indecision in the matter.

Mr. President, that is the point I wanted to make to the senior Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished colleague. I might say that hopefully under the new administration some of the burgeoning redtape that made it so difficult in the past will be removed. I would also point out that in many of the training programs tried in the State represented by the proponent of the resolution and the present speaker we had some very good experiences. I would also like to compliment the Senator on the experience which has been had in his State in the Job Corps camps. I wish that generally that had been the record. The opinions I have expounded here are not my own. They came from reading. I suggest if the Senator has not read the GAO report, it is most interesting. There are reports on each of the poverty programs.

Mr. MONTROYA. I might state to the Senator from California that—

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I cannot provide this on my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has the floor.

Mr. MURPHY. Other Senators also wish to speak and I do not have the right to use their time.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. MONTROYA. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I might state to my good friend from California that the information I have imparted here today with respect to our experience in New Mexico is not only the result of my own personal investigation, but also 2 weeks ago, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Economic Development of the Committee on Public Works, I called in the Forest Service people at the hearing in Albuquerque. There I was apprised of the good work of the Job Corps and the good experience had by the Forest Service with respect to these boys and the job placement that took place after these enrollees were trained in a very good educational program.

Therefore, I assure my good friend from California that the information I have inserted in the RECORD is based on these hearings and my personal investigations in New Mexico.

Mr. MURPHY. I congratulate my colleague. I am more than pleased. It would be my sincere hope that under the recommendation of the Secretary of Labor all those camps in New Mexico that achieved a good record may be kept up and serve as good examples for the rest of the country.

Mr. President, I suggest—

Mr. MONTROYA. Well, I might say that these Job Corps camps—

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, the Senator—

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, the Senator is speaking on my time.

Mr. MURPHY. I did not understand that. I thought the time had been signaled as having expired.

Mr. MONTROYA. I might state to my good friend from California that the cost per enrollee is among the lowest in the four Job Corps camps in New Mexico.

Mr. MURPHY. I hope my distinguished colleague will be available to explain how this is achieved so it will benefit others, because this is one of the problems that we have with the Job Corps.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom is the time to be charged?

Mr. MURPHY. I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be made in order to accommodate the next speaker without the time being charged to either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 20 minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the senior Senator from New York.

Mr. President, the nature of this particular resolution, with amendments thereto, is of significant importance to the Senate, to the Nixon administration, and to the country. I participated in the Senate hearings and would like to express my position and some of the reasons for it.

Mr. President, I shall support the Nixon administration in its decision to reorganize the Job Corps and bring it into a coordinated overall manpower program.

Before turning to the substance of that decision and the pending resolution, I would like to make some preliminary observations for the RECORD.

First, as a Senator from Colorado, I would point out that we have two Job Corps conservation centers in my State. One, at Collbran, Colo., ranked eighth highest in performance in the Labor Department report, and was also one of those to be examined by the General Accounting Office. It is to remain open. The other, at Pagosa Springs, ranks 63d and is designated to be closed.

Second, although the sponsors of the pending resolution contend they have an open mind regarding the value of the Job Corps program as presently constituted, the resolution originally introduced by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) concluded that "irreparable damage" to the lives of thousands of disadvantaged youth "will be caused" by the reorganization. When I pointed out in committee such a conclusion does not fit an open mind, new language was developed and the sponsors reported the original resolution now before us.

Third, I think the RECORD should reflect the rather irregular procedure in bringing this resolution to the floor. The subcommittee voted along strict party lines on Tuesday, April 29, and the full Committee ordered it reported on April 30, just 48 hours before—and I emphasize the word "before"—the Comptroller General was scheduled to testify concerning the report of the General Accounting Office. When it acted on the resolution, the Commission had received testimony on only one of the two major studies of the Job Corps, that of pollster Lou Harris.

The Harris survey was contracted for by OEO just prior to the inauguration of President Nixon and cost the American taxpayer over a quarter of a million dollars. Mr. Harris obviously has quite an interest in the Job Corps. I ask unanimous consent that a list of Harris contracts with OEO be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, this list shows that he has done 11 different "work efforts" for OEO—for a "grand total" of \$808,650 paid to the Harris organization by the American taxpayers.

Fourth, while I am delighted to assist in gathering facts on Job Corps performance, I don't recall any Senate hearings being conducted when the Democratic administration dropped 17 Job Corps centers in 1968. They did that without any hearings whatsoever.

My final preliminary observation is that it seems a little strange to be debating this resolution on the floor without having received testimony from William Kelly, the man who has been director of the Job Corps the past 2½ years. I know that the chairman of the subcommittee invited him and he refused. Today, a letter from Mr. Kelly was placed in the hearing record on the nomination of Representative Rumsfeld to be director of OEO.

Mr. Kelly also has a self-serving statement in the hearing record on the Job Corps, but I suspect his refusal to appear personally stems more from a reluctance to be questioned about the Job Corps performance than from the fact that he is a holdover from the previous administration.

Aside from the genuine interest expressed by some in learning further details about the Job Corps reorganization, others have chosen to engage in some emotional wailing and some half-truths. It has been charged, for example, that the decision is arbitrary, that the Job Corps will be destroyed, whatever its value, and thousands of enrollees will be sent back to the streets. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The Secretary of Labor testified:

We do not anticipate the demise of the Job Corps, rather we seek to improve its quality and relevance to the realities of the labor market.

And the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Manpower said:

We are not dismantling the Job Corps. We hope we can improve its effectiveness by relating it more closely to existing manpower programs.

The Nixon administration has determined that complete residential services are not essential for all Job Corps enrollees, that training is not always best provided at a great distance from the enrollees home, and that Job Corps centers should not be operated as isolated entities divorced from other manpower programs and services.

We have heard a great deal about the \$100 million budget reduction in the Job Corps, but there are substantial increases in youth opportunities in the overall manpower program, of which the Job Corps is only a small part. For example, there is a \$200 million increase in the private industry/Government program for hard-core disadvantaged, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector—(JOBS—which increases training slots for out-of-school youth in that program alone from 28,800 in fiscal 1969 to 60,500 in fiscal 1970—an increase, if my mathematics are any good, of about 31,700.

I think we should also take note of the fact that when the Job Corps was created in 1964, there were only 27,000 training opportunities for youth in all our manpower programs, but the Nixon admin-

istration fiscal 1970 budget contains 368,600 training slots in a variety of programs for out-of-school youths.

Statements that youth now enrolled at the centers to be closed will be "turned into the streets" are without foundation in fact. Secretary Shultz testified he would make "an absolute flat guarantee" that the affected enrollees would have an opportunity to transfer to another Job Corps center, would receive full assistance in job placement, or would be given "priority" if they chose to go into another manpower program. In fact, \$1 million was set aside just to assist in this transition. Some measure of the earnestness of the Secretary can be gathered from his testimony before the House Committee just last week. As of April 11, here were 16,300 enrollees in the centers to be closed. Five-thousand-four-hundred have already chosen other manpower programs, and 5,000 have either already been transferred or are scheduled to be transferred to other Job Corps centers. He also stated there will be more vacancies in the Job Corps centers remaining open than individuals transferring from the closed centers, and that the Department will probably recommend the renewal of Job Corps recruiting in July.

Frankly, I am delighted that when recruiting resumes, it will be under a reorganized Job Corps program.

The Job Corps has cost the American taxpayer \$1 billion to date. While, no doubt, some have benefitted, the results are hardly encouraging. For example, in fiscal 1968:

Forty percent dropped out within 90 days, and 26 percent of those selected for the Job Corps did not show up at all.

Only 24 percent of conservation center enrollees completed the program, and only 43 percent of men's urban center enrollees and 38 percent of women's urban center enrollees completed it.

In my judgment, the report of the General Accounting Office supports the decision of the Nixon administration to take the action that it has with respect to the Job Corps. That report was based on an investigation conducted over a 14-month period, almost all of which, I might add, took place under the previous administration. It did take place as a result of an amendment, as I recall, placed into the act during the last Congress by the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY), the No. 2 Republican on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Not only the professional staff of the General Accounting Office were involved, but the Comptroller General also contracted with several independent firms and a number of specialized individual consultants. These are listed at pages 452-454 of the hearing record. I think this is a rather impressive weight of authority.

Also significant is the fact that the GAO report contains a control group—individuals who did not go to Job Corps—for comparison purposes. My discussion with Mr. Harris on this point regarding his survey was as follows:

Senator DOMINICK. It is my understanding that you did not have any so-called control

group. In other words, you did not take a group of people who had not gone to the Job Corps and use their statistics for the purpose of comparison. Is that correct?

Mr. HARRIS. That is correct, Senator. The nearest thing we have to a control group is the category III, people who did not receive very much Job Corps exposure. The aging is controlled, we have that, but we don't have that group that we would dearly love to have.

The GAO report does have a control group, even though the actual exactitude of statistics between those who went into the Job Corps and those who did not was a subject of debate.

While all of my colleagues will not agree on the value of the control group, I think the General Accounting Office is to be commended for at least trying this approach.

Unlike Mr. Harris, who testified he was reporting statistics but not making a judgment on the value of the Job Corps, the Comptroller General was directed by the 1967 amendments to determine "the extent to which such programs and activities achieve the objectives set forth in the relevant part or title of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 authorizing such programs or activities."

Again, I want to emphasize that the pending resolution was ordered reported out of the full committee before the subcommittee even received the testimony from the GAO.

Let me refer to some of the conclusions of GAO:

On an overall basis, it appears that the Job Corps had achieved only limited success in fulfilling its primary purpose. . . .

On the basis of studies by our contractor and ourselves relating to post-Job Corps experience, it is questionable whether Job Corps training has resulted in substantial economic benefit thus far for those youths who participate in the program, although our tests show that employment and earning power were somewhat greater after Job Corps experience than before.

We believe that increased employment and earning power among those included in our sample can be attributable, for the most part, to the greater employability of youths due to the process of growing up and the higher employment and wage levels.

I continue with the quotation:

It also appeared that Job Corps trainees had not done materially better than the other eligible youths who had applied to enter the program and then chose not to participate.

In summary, we believe 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 the Job Corps program can be fully justified.

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.

In accordance with the foregoing conclusions, we recommended in our report that the Congress consider whether the Job Corps, particularly with respect to Conservation

Centers, is sufficiently achieving the purposes for which it was created to justify its retention at present levels.

In deciding which centers were to be closed, the Department of Labor used six criteria: cost, length of stay, dropout percentages, reading gain, math gain, and placement. While there has been some criticism of these criteria, the record should reflect that these were developed and used by OEO in deciding which centers were to be closed in 1968, and the data used in these criteria by the Department of Labor were compiled by the OEO.

I think it is important, when discussing the list showing test results for all the centers, to keep in mind that the cost figure is for operating costs and does not include enrollee pay and allotments, transportation, conservation work project supplies and equipment, or center capital investments. The GAO report brings these figures back into perspective, stating that direct cost per enrollee man-year for fiscal year 1968 were \$6,600, but when indirect costs were included, the figure rose to \$8,300.

In view of the dropout rate I have previously referred to, I may add that this is an unbelievably astronomical cost to the taxpayer, at a time when we are suffering from problems involving revenues, in order to get rather unproductive training for people who need jobs and opportunity.

In my judgment, the key question in the entire Job Corps controversy is not whether residential training should be part of the manpower program, but the extent of the need for residential training and the form it is to take.

The GAO report, and the report and testimony of the Secretary of Labor all concur in the premise that residential training for "some" youth is sound and should be retained as an essential element in manpower programing. They also agreed that all of the youths in the Job Corps do not need residential training.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator ask that the time not be charged to either side?

Mr. DOMINICK. No; I ask that it be charged to our side.

The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is not present at this time; neither is the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY). I am the ranking Republican member of the committee present. May I yield myself 5 minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator yields himself 5 minutes.

Mr. DOMINICK. There are currently 37,469 beds in Job Corps camps, of which 17,805 will be phased out. However, the new forms of residential centers will house approximately 4,625 people. Consequently, there is a net reduction of 13,180 beds, although nonresidential training opportunities for disadvantaged youth are being increased many times that amount.

In addition to retention of 32 conservation centers, it is my understanding the new residential program will involve the following:

First, 15 regional residential centers for those whom full-time residence away from home is necessary;

Second, 10 near-city residential centers for those whose full-time residence away from home, permitting easy weekend commuting home; and

Third, two types of inner-city residential centers—one, a training facility with attached residential support; the other, a small residence with no training facilities for those enrolled in other training programs.

Many have expressed alarm that the new residential centers will not all be operational at the time activities will terminate at those Job Corps centers slated to be closed. Frankly, this concern misses the mark since a major theory of the reorganization is that not all those presently enrolled in the Job Corps are in need of a full-scale program as distinguished from other training alternatives.

In fact, Secretary Shultz testified before the House Committee last week that the new residential centers were not proposed in the context of immediate availability for all those now at Job Corps centers which will be closed. He did state, however, that about half of the new residential centers will be funded this summer, the remainder by fall, and most, if not all, will be fully operational by late winter or early spring.

Since the judgment has been made by the administration that some, but not all, Job Corps enrollees need a full-scale residential program a number of present enrollees in centers scheduled to be closed can obviously be placed in non-residential alternative programs.

When Assistant Secretary Weber was before the subcommittee, he testified as follows regarding the number of training opportunities for young people:

On the chart that the Secretary drew up he indicated that we hope to have next year approximately 386,600 training opportunities for young people out of school, and a rough calculation, looking at the statutory orientation of the programs involved, would be that approximately 338,000 would be focused on so-called disadvantaged as measured by income criteria, education, unemployment, and other relevant factors.

Mr. President, at my request the Department of Labor prepared a table entitled, "Enrollee Eligibility Standards for Manpower Programs." In order to assist in making the record on this subject as complete as possible, I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 2.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DOMINICK. In addition, the Department of Labor has provided a table entitled, "Man-Year Costs and Selected Characteristics of Participants in Manpower Program—Fiscal Year 1968," and

I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 3.

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

(See exhibit 3.)

Mr. DOMINICK. In interpreting the latter table, it is important to keep in mind that the total number of participants has changed considerably in the projection for fiscal 1970, as shown by the list in the hearing record at page 225. It is significant that the fraction of individuals who did not complete high school is at least 50 percent in each program and ranges up to 75 percent in the concentrated employment program—CEP—of fiscal 1968. Of course, the man-year operating cost for those under 22 years of age is considerably less in each program than in the Job Corps.

During the hearings, much was made by some of my colleagues of the reading and math levels of Job Corps being below their average educational attainment of ninth grade. According to the testimony of Secretary Shultz, ninth grade education is "not far off the mark" of those enrolled in the job opportunities in the business sector—JOBS—program. I understand that reading and math levels, however, are not available for JOBS or other programs since tests were not broken down beyond educational grade level.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's additional time has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I inquire how the time stands?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 28 minutes remaining.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 additional minutes, on the resolution if necessary.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I shall yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado, and I hope that we may be able to work out with the majority either some agreement for additional time, or perhaps they, if they will not use all their time, will yield us some, because we are running short.

I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMINICK. Since so much emphasis has been placed on reading and math levels, and I agree they are important factors, let us keep in mind that the written statement filed by the Director of the Job Corps shows that only 6.8 percent of enrollee cost is devoted to basic education, and only some 9.9 percent to vocational training. However, the representatives of the Labor Department testified that all of these alternative programs have education assistance in their supporting services. Indeed, nearly every one of the alternative programs contains prevocational education as well as basic education and vocational training. The table on page 384 of the hearing record lists these in detail, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibit 4.

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

(See exhibit 4.)

Mr. DOMINICK. I hope my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are not taking the position that supplementary reading and math can only be provided in the Job Corps approach.

In looking through the manpower report of the President for 1969, I was interested to find the following comment regarding the educational disadvantages, both in terms of nature and frequency, of those enrolled in the on-the-job training component:

On-the-job training of workers with severe educational and cultural handicaps has been aided by the development of "coupled projects" which combine skill training with basic education and help in developing communication skills and acceptable attitudes toward work. More than one-third of all OJT enrollees during Fiscal 1968 were in "coupled projects."

I also noted in the manpower report the following relevant data on the characteristics of the 61,000 people hired in the JOBS program in the late fall of 1968: 23 percent were under 20 years of age, average level of education was 10th grade or below, and unemployment averaged 23.7 weeks in the last year. As I mentioned before, the portion of the JOBS program dealing with out-of-school youth has been increased by President Nixon to 60,500 for fiscal 1970, nearly as many as the total number of enrollees of all ages just last fall.

This shift to greater emphasis on development of programs with private industry is also in line with a study recently completed by Dr. Larry Singell, associate professor of economics at the University of Colorado. The Denver Post reported on his study with the following statements:

Singell's study found that training efforts undertaken by private industry on its own initiative are far more successful than those offered by public and nonprofit agencies, considered as a whole. . . .

He recommended that expansion of job training efforts be concentrated on subsidizing private industry on-the-job training programs, in that they have proved to be the most successful. . . .

He attributed the success of private industry training—compared with the institutional type provided by the public agencies—to its immediate provision of a better job. . . .

His study revealed that the over-all drop-out rate in the private industry programs was 22 percent, but was 54 percent for those run by public and nonprofit agencies.

I ask unanimous consent that the articles to which I have referred, dated April 22, 1969, be printed at this point in the RECORD as exhibit 5.

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

(See exhibit 5.)

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I consider the pending resolution to be a thinly disguised veil, anchored in political motivation, and aimed at placing black hats on the Nixon administration by casting it as being unconcerned with disadvantaged youth. How else can one

reasonably interpret a situation where no Senate hearings were held by the Democratic majority when the Johnson administration closed 17 Job Corps centers last year, and the subcommittee and full committee order this resolution reported to the floor 48 hours before testimony is to be received from the General Accounting Office?

I also think it is ridiculous that the Director of the Job Corps refused to appear and testify. If he cannot make a meaningful contribution to the subcommittee investigation, then he has outlived his usefulness in my book, and should either resign or be replaced at once.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in opposing the Cranston resolution.

I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from New York in yielding this additional time.

EXHIBIT 1

JOB CORPS CONTRACTS AWARDED LOUIS HARRIS ASSOCIATES

Contract No.	Contract	Amount	Purpose
OEO-2375 ¹	Basic	\$44,600.00	Study of dropouts and discharges, November 1966.
	Supplemental agreement No. 1	69,000.00	Study of August 1966 terminees, \$40,000; study of "no shows," \$29,000.
	Supplemental agreement No. 2	41,500.00	Reinterview of August 1966 terminees 12 months after termination.
	Supplemental agreement No. 3		
	Total	155,100.00	
OEO-4076 ¹	Basic	13,700.00	Interview and report on 324 women Job Corps graduates from Los Angeles and Charleston Job Corps Centers.
OEO-4089 ¹	do	212,400.00	Continuing study of terminees 6, 12, and 18 months after termination.
	Supplemental agreement No. 1	-6,900.00	Cancel portion because of repetition.
	Total	250,500.00	
B89-4470 ¹	Basic	89,750.00	Pilot study on feasibility of conduct in followup on 100-percent terminees.
B89-4616 ¹	do	22,500.00	Study of "no shows."
B89-4617 ¹	do	50,000.00	Sample of Job Corps terminees for fiscal year 1968 from 8 selected centers plus 1,200 reference interviews.
	Supplemental agreement No. 1	15,000.00	
	Total	65,000.00	
B99-4771 (open)	Basic	257,100.00	5,000 samples 6 months after termination and 5,000 samples 12 months after termination plus 1,800 reference interviews.
	Paid to date	105,036.40	
	Balance	152,063.60	
	Total	257,100.00	
	Grand total	\$ 808,650.00	

Note: Concurrence on the authenticity of these figures was obtained from Sam Holman, accountant, of Louis Harris Associates.

¹ Work has been completed and the contract closed out.

² For 7 contracts and 4 additional efforts to (?) the basic contracts or 11 different work efforts.

EXHIBIT 2

ENROLLEE ELIGIBILITY STANDARDS FOR MANPOWER PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

	Age requirements	Must enrollee be below poverty level?	Other requirements	
Economic Opportunity Act:				
Neighborhood Youth Corps:				
	In school	14 and above	Yes	In 9th to 12th grade or equivalent age.
	Out of school	16 and above	Yes	Primarily for dropouts.
	Summer	14 and above	Yes	None.
	Operation Mainstream	22 and above. Emphasis on those 55 years old or older.	Yes	Unemployed or underemployed.
Manpower Development and Training Act:				
	Institutional	16 and above for training only; 17 and above for training and allowances. No more than 25 percent of those receiving allowances can be below 22.	65 percent must be below poverty level.	Emphasis on unemployed, but underemployed accepted. Emphasis on youth and older workers. Must be out of school 1 year to receive allowances. 65 percent must be "disadvantaged" as defined in Manpower Administration Order I-69.
	OJT	Applicable State minimum age law. Emphasis below 22 and above 45.	do	65 percent must be "disadvantaged."
Social Security Act: Work incentive program.				
	Jointly funded from MDTA and EOA:	16 and above	No	Must be on AFDC.
CEP				
	JOBS	None	Yes	Must reside in CEP target area. Must be "disadvantaged."
		Applicable State minimum age law. Emphasis below 22 and above 45.	Yes	Must be "disadvantaged."

EXHIBIT 3

MAN-YEAR COSTS AND SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS IN MANPOWER PROGRAMS, FISCAL YEAR 1968¹

Characteristic	MDTA		NYC		Operation Mainstream	New careers	CEP ²	JOBS ³	WIN ⁴
	Institutional	On-the-job	In-school and summer	Out-of-school					
Total number participants.....	140,000	125,000	373,500	93,800	12,600	4,300	13,600		
	Percent distribution ⁵								
Percent.....	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Sex:									
Male.....	55	68	54	49	84	37	49	70	49
Female.....	45	32	46	51	16	63	51	30	51
Color:									
White.....	51	64	54	50	60	25	16	10	62
Nonwhite.....	49	36	46	48	40	75	84	90	38
Negro.....	(45)	(33)	(42)	(45)	(25)	(74)	(79)	(77)	(33)
Other.....	(4)	(3)	(4)	(4)	(15)	(1)	(5)	(13)	(5)
Education:									
8th grade or less.....	19	16	13	28	57	15	23	14	17
9th to 11th grade.....	40	34	86	65	26	47	52	63	49
12th grade and over.....	40	50	1	7	17	38	25	33	34
Age:									
Under 19 years.....	15	12	94	61	4	1	36	13	13
19 to 21 years.....	24	33	6	37					
22 to 44 years.....	51	54			52	85	55	48	78
45 years and over.....	11	11			45	14	9	8	9
Duration of unemployment:									
14 weeks or less.....	55	65	64	73	61	62	52	36	
15 to 26 weeks.....	16	12					17	24	
27 weeks and over.....	29	23	36	27	39	38	31	41	
Head of household or family.....	55	54	1	10	63	62	55	(9)	95
Public assistance recipient ⁷	12	5	28	28	16	33	19	(9)	100
Man-year operating cost (for those under 22).....	\$1,885	\$660	\$1,486	\$2,800	\$3,820	\$4,200	\$1,090	\$3,110	\$1,500

¹ Except as noted.
² Cumulative from beginning of program in each city through September 1968.
³ Cumulative from beginning of each contract through January 1969.
⁴ Cumulative from beginning of program through December 1968.
⁵ Data for NYC, Operation Mainstream, and New Careers cover September 1967 through August 1968.
⁶ Information not available.
⁷ Participant or his family.

Note: Items may not add to 100 percent due to rounding.

EXHIBIT 4

Program	Target population	Program offerings
MDTA institutional.....	Adults and youths unemployed underemployed, low-skilled, disadvantaged, obsolescent-skilled.	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
MDTA, part-time and other-than-skill.....	do	Do.
MDTA, on-the-job training (OJT).....	do	Vocational training.
MDTA, coupled.....	do	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
MDTA, experimental and demonstrative (E. & D.).....	Hard-to-reach; disadvantaged youth, hardcore unemployed; older workers; minority groups.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, other supportive services.
MDTA, training for redevelopment area residents.....	Adults and youths, unemployed and underemployed in redevelopment areas.	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
Concentrated employment program (CEP).....	Adults and youths, hard-core unemployed, and disadvantaged in selected areas.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, other supportive services.
Special impact (Kennedy-Javits).....	Adults and youths, unemployed and below poverty level in urban poverty areas.	Vocational training, work experience, other supportive services.
Job Corps.....	Disadvantaged youth 14 to 21.....	Basic education, prevocational education, vocational training, work experience, other supportive services.
Neighborhood Youth Corps (out-of-school).....	Dropouts age 16 and over, poverty families.	Basic education, prevocational education, vocational training, work experience, ¹ other supportive services.
Vocational education.....	Anyone who can benefit from vocational education.	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
Work incentive program (WIN).....	AFDC recipients 16 and over who are not in school.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, work experience, other supportive services.
Job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS).....	Poor persons not having suitable employment and who are one of the following: (1) school dropouts, (2) under 22, (3) 45 years and over, (4) handicapped, and (5) subject to special obstacles.	Vocational training, basic education, other supportive services.

¹ Indicates primary offerings, if any.

EXHIBIT 5

[From the Denver (Colo.) Post, Apr. 22, 1969]
CU PROFESSOR'S FINDING: MOST HARD-CORE JOBLESS NOT IN TRAINING PROGRAMS
 (By Richard O'Reilly)

Fewer than half of the Denver-area hard-core disadvantaged who need training to get jobs are receiving such training, and efforts are falling further behind all the time.

Those are the findings of a new study completed by Dr. Larry D. Singell, associate pro-

fessor of economics at the University of Colorado.

Singell's study found that training efforts undertaken by private industry on its own initiative are far more successful than those offered by public and nonprofit agencies, considered as a whole.

In the three-month study undertaken this year, Singell determined there are 8,300 hard-core disadvantaged persons in the Denver area who need job training if they are ever to work their way out of poverty.

Another 4,000 are being added to that number each year, primarily high school dropouts, Singell reported.

But at a maximum, training programs aimed at such persons are helping only 3,400 of them yearly.

Thus, if these programs aren't expanded and if the dropout rate continues, there will be 15,000 disadvantaged persons in need of training by 1975 and 20,000 by 1980, according to Singell's study.

He recommended that expansion of job training efforts be concentrated on subsidizing private industry on-the-job training programs, in that they have proved to be the most successful.

Most firms engaged in such programs now pay for their efforts themselves, because government subsidies are too difficult to obtain and involve too much red tape, the study revealed.

Although the private industry training was the most successful, it helped only 3 per cent of those needing training.

Singell concluded that society can't expect private industry to train a more significant number of persons unless society pays the bill, because the profit motive must govern the number of hard-core unemployed for whom industry will finance training.

He attributed the success of private industry training—compared with the institutional type provided by the public agencies—to its immediate provision of a better job.

Most private industry trainees are hired by the companies when they start the training, and their futures are more assured than that of trainees who must seek a job after completing training, as in most of the public and nonprofit programs.

His study revealed that the over-all dropout rate in the private industry programs was 22 per cent, but was 54 per cent for those run by public and nonprofit agencies.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I rise reluctantly to put to rest a myth which has existed for some time in certain political circles.

I realize that with the youth of today puncturing so many myths held dear by persons over 30, one should go slow in adding to the discomfort of those on the long side of the generation gap.

However, after some contemplation, I decided that a commitment to our youth was more important than ease of mind for the middle-aged.

The myth in question holds that every so often the Nation needs a Republican administration to consolidate and organize through good business and planning techniques innovations enacted under Democratic rule.

Mr. President, that myth went the way of all myths when the administration announced the closing of 59 Job Corps centers.

It was the Earl of Chesterfield who observed:

Dispatch is the soul of business.

That may be true for business, but it is not true for government when dispatch means shattering the hopes and aspirations of thousands of young people seeking to better themselves.

It is not even true for business when dispatch results in acting without proper advance planning.

Mr. President, I understand that five of the 59 centers originally scheduled to be closed now will remain open.

Whether that change is a result of public and congressional pressure or of reevaluation, it points out that the decision to close the centers was not well thought out.

Who can measure the effect of the off-again, on-again decision on the youth at those five centers?

More important, who can measure the effect of the center closings on those men and women who will be transferred to different training programs at new centers in new areas?

And can we expect the youth of our ghettos to keep faith with a system which, in the name of fighting inflation in an affluent society, breaks faith with them?

Unless thought was given to those aspects of the decision—the decision, with or without dispatch, was without soul.

But merely from a good business point of view, the decision casts a shadow on the professional competence of those who made it.

Let me cite several points to emphasize that observation.

The closing comes at a time when Congress is reviewing studies on the effectiveness of the program. One survey indicates that persons completing a Job Corps program earn more money than before they entered the center, which is what the program is all about.

Further surveys indicate that graduates of conservation centers earn more than graduates of urban centers, yet two of the three centers to be closed in my State are conservation centers.

Even without those encouraging statistics, does it really make good business sense for management to close a project before the board of directors has had a chance to complete a review already in progress?

The validity of an announcement that some 62,000 openings in other training programs would be available for Job Corps participants was put in doubt when it was pointed out that the programs were not equipped to handle persons of the age and low educational achievement of youths eligible for the Job Corps.

That mistake, I am sure, was a result of lack of study and not of an intention to mislead.

At the time the closings were announced, the administration also said it would open a series of mini-Job Corps centers. No dates were given, but it now appears that the first of these minicenters will not open until the fall, and the last, not until next summer.

Is anyone willing to take the blame for those youths who might have gone to Job Corps centers this summer, but because openings will not be available may, for one reason or another, never seek admission?

One final point. I understand that recent estimates indicate that 66 percent of the Job Corpswomen and 20 percent of the Job Corpsmen who wish to remain in the program will not be placed in comparable training assignments.

What planning went into a decision that either will leave large numbers of persons half trained or will extend, at Government cost, their training periods?

Mr. President, these points emphasize the importance of approving Senate Resolution 194, which asks that action to close any Job Corps center be delayed until Congress has had an opportunity to review the program.

One might call this a good-business resolution, and if dispatch can be the soul of business, let us pass it with dispatch.

Mr. JAVITS. I now yield 5 minutes to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in these days and times, it is incumbent—in fact, it is vitally urgent—upon us to take every possible action that can be taken toward solving the enormous problems that beset this great land of ours. Each of us in this lawmaking body, I feel sure, has at heart what he considers the best interests of the Nation when he passes upon any action that comes before us for our judgment.

Mr. President, we now have a proposal to realign the Job Corps: to eliminate those features which have been shamefully wasteful and unproductive. Now I want you to bear in mind some pertinent and indisputable facts, because this Job Corps proposal has become a bone of contention among us, far out of all proportion to what is logical and what is sensible. Those who oppose the realignment claim that they do not want to see the elimination of this opportunity for certain of our young people. Those who support the realignment claim that the realignment is necessary to provide more and better opportunity for certain of our young people.

It is high time this Job Corps controversy be put into the proper perspective, and without mincing any words, that is what I am going to try to do. I want to emphasize facts, not illogical emotion and not partisan politics. The truth is this unwieldy and largely unproductive monstrosity which has evolved from our Job Corps legislation is seriously in need of extensive revamping.

Mr. President, every program that gives the disadvantaged, the unemployed, the discouraged, a chance to get back into the mainstream of our society and to become productive citizens is important. What is at issue is whether the program as presently set up is doing the job it was set up to do and whether or not the new proposal would do it better.

Mr. President, the essential fact is in spite of much misinformation to the contrary the Job Corps has cost a lot of money and produced very few results. I should like to read several excerpts from the individual views of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) and the Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) concerning this resolution:

We believe this is a sound approach and we 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. We 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.

Mr. President, it is incredible that this program has cost the taxpayers more than \$8,000 for each individual enrolled. The expense is bad enough but what is worse the money has not been spent wisely. The number of individuals who

have become placed in full time, productive jobs after Job Corps enrollment is most disappointing. In this regard I should like to read another excerpt from the views of Senators PROUTY and MURPHY:

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.

The carryover effect of this, of course, was to drastically increase the reduction in unemployment after Job Corps training reflected by the Harris OEO study.

Mr. President, it is obvious that an overhauling of the Job Corps is long overdue, and I have nothing but praise for the administration for coming forward with a plan to improve this program. The proposal is to strengthen the services, performance, and the results of the Job Corps for those young people who need this type of assistance.

The Department of Labor has recommended that 50 Job Corps conservation centers, along with seven women's centers and two men's urban centers, be closed and that 54 centers, including 32 conservation centers, remain in operation. And that new urban residential centers will be established in 30 cities, and that all of the centers will be integrated into the Nation's comprehensive manpower program.

Mr. President, how in the world can anyone find reason to call this an abolishment of the Job Corps? Where there has been a total number of 104 centers—some of them in remotely rural areas far removed from the homes of the trainees and from the industrial job markets—under the proposal there will be a total of 80 and at least 15 of the new centers will have much larger capacity than any of the conservation centers being closed.

Now for another fact. Bed capacity in the Job Corps 104 centers has been about 35,000—though this capacity is a dream because three out of every 10 youths that have been tediously recruited for the Job Corps have never shown up at the center, and nearly 40 percent of those who did get to the centers dropped out before graduation. And of those who graduated, only 60 percent were placed in jobs.

Mr. President, these statistics are enough to send us searching for a better way. Now when we speak of the Job Corps, we are speaking of a program that provided residence for 35,000 if all the beds could be filled and kept filled. We speak of a program that has cost some \$8,000 per year for every young person who has been accommodated, with extremely dubious results to show.

Mr. President, just keeping the Job Corps centers filled has been like the revolving doors of a department store on bargain day. Ten million dollars had to be budgeted this year to recruit enough youths to keep 35,000 Job Corps beds filled, while only \$3 million was budgeted for placing them into jobs.

The U.S. Navy only spends \$17 million

a year to recruit from 125,000 to 150,000 youths into military service.

The Department of Labor's manpower programs actually enrolled about 1½ million individuals in its principal training and work-experience programs in each of the last 2 fiscal years, and a similar number are enjoying the benefits of these programs in the current fiscal year. There are approximately 362,000 training opportunities a year now for youth in the manpower programs. This is more than 10 times the total capacity in the Job Corps.

Mr. President, recruitment for the Job Corps was never done on the basis of a youngster's need for live-in, around-the-clock residential service. Secretary Shultz does not believe that complete residential services are essential for all disadvantaged youngsters. The General Accounting Office carefully studied the Job Corps, and said:

A significant portion of Corps members have not met the qualifications considered necessary for participation in the program; and the alternative of enrolling applicants in other, less costly and possibly more suitable training programs, apparently was not always considered.

Secretary Shultz has made it quite clear that he supports the contention that residential services are essential for certain youths, and that comprehensive and intensive supportive services must be a part of any such program. In fact, the new Job Corps structure proposed by the Labor Department will provide a residential bed capacity for 22,000 youngsters. The disadvantaged youth of this country will get better, far better service under the new structure. Only those youngsters who really need a home away from home will be assigned to residential centers.

The 30 new urban residential centers to be established to supplement the remaining 54 Job Corps centers which will be kept in operation will all be aligned with the Nation's comprehensive manpower program. Emphasis will be put upon helping the youngster to become employable and then upon placing him into a productive job, the most serious lack in the present program.

Mr. President, under the new plan the Job Corps will be supported by, and will lend support to, all other manpower programs, instead of standing off by itself. The Labor Department is maintaining flexibility in its planning so that each new facility can be adjusted to the specific needs of the community in which it is located and can be closely coordinated with that community's existing manpower services.

Mr. President, two other pertinent facts need to be stated: One concerns service to rural residents. Because young men and women living in the country and small towns usually do not have access to formal training in their home communities, the Job Corps centers that are being retained and the new urban centers will be open to rural youth. Bear in mind that there will still be 32 conservation centers operating throughout the Nation.

The other pertinent fact is that Secretary Shultz has stated unequivocally and publicly that not a single youngster in the camps being closed will be denied

continued training and education. Employment and training counselors have been assigned to those camps to help the youngsters shift to one of the remaining 54 camps or to continue their training in another manner. As for the centers that are to be closed, proposals are being considered for converting the property to uses that will benefit the public and the communities in which the camps are located.

Mr. President, what the administration's proposal does is to eliminate the wasteful and unproductive aspects of the Job Corps and associate it with other manpower programs so that disadvantaged youths can be given their greatest possible chance to raise their education level, learn a job skill, and get a job. Those Job Corps features that have proved successful will be retained, strengthened, and expanded.

Training emphasis will be shifted to learning industrial skills and getting youths into jobs.

Mr. President, more and better services will be provided for all youth, under an experienced administering agency. No youth now in a Job Corps center will be deprived of continued training and the opportunity to make something of himself.

Mr. President, for the reasons I have outlined I cannot go along with the pending resolution. I have long been a supporter of technical education and job training as the best answer for helping the poor, but that has not been done in the Job Corps as it has been operated. This is one more area in which performance did not measure up to promise, and I urge that this resolution be defeated.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in recent days there has been an effort to categorize President Nixon's effort to reform the various manpower training programs under the Economic Opportunity Act as a step backward. Critics of Mr. Nixon's proposed changes have tried to convince the public and Members of this body that the purpose of the changes is to retard the manpower training program pursuant to some political motive.

A full examination of the facts surrounding the Secretary of Labor's decision to close some of the Job Corps training centers shows that there is no relation between the facts and the criticisms leveled against the decision by the supporters of the resolution now under consideration.

The criticism leveled against the closings are ostensibly based on two main considerations.

First, it is argued that the changes were done suddenly, in a manner attempting to evade congressional inquiry.

In reality, the Secretary of Labor and his Assistant Secretary for Manpower appeared before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and did a remarkable job of presenting all the relevant facts. They quite clearly and directly explained that the Job Corps program would be cut back in order to improve the effectiveness of the overall effort in manpower training. They further showed why individual camps were selected for closing and why others were left open.

According to the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. MURPHY) and the distinguished Senator from Vermont

(Mr. PROUTY), the committee heard more facts concerning various facets of the Job Corps camps and the manner in which they are operated during this 1 day of the Labor Department testimony than they had been able to get from the previous administration in the last 4 years.

While I am pleased to observe that some Senators on the other side of the aisle are interested in securing adequate testimony on the Job Corps program, I am moved to wonder why this awakening of interest did not occur until a Republican entered the White House.

The second argument made by the proponents of this resolution is that the closing of the Job Corps camps is an effort by the Nixon administration to retreat in the manpower training field. There will be wholesale elimination of opportunity for those who are now enrolled in programs in the Job Corps centers.

In fact, this is just not the case. As Senators who attended the committee hearings well know, Secretary Shultz pledged to "work with each individual" now in a camp designated for closing and has already taken steps to insure that each is provided equivalent educational, vocational, and related training opportunities.

I need not spell out the details of those steps and plans; they are explained in detail in the Secretary's statement before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. They stand by themselves.

The underlying motive for the attacks on the closing of some of the Job Corps camps stems from neither of the above reasons, although they are the ones most often given. Instead, the attacks appear to represent an unwillingness to examine the effectiveness of the role of the Job Corps camps have played in the manpower training effort. Furthermore, there seems to be a reluctance to allow the Secretary of Labor to analyze the role which the Job Corps should play in the overall program.

Some people seem unwilling to let the fresh thought and cleansing initiative of the new administration rearrange the Job Corps. Some seem more concerned with justifying the mistakes of the past than with allowing the changes which might save a very good concept to go into effect.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 3 minutes?

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I point out in these 2 or 3 minutes that I fear the Members of the Senate are losing themselves in numbers and counting sometimes irrelevant statistics.

My point is that the pending legislation involves people. It involves individual persons. It involves rehabilitation.

The problem is: What can Congress do to contribute to aiding those in our ghetto areas, and in other areas where they have great problems, in finding themselves and finding a place for themselves in American society?

I think that the point of the resolution lays bare one of the blind spots in

the present administration's recommendation. It tried to run the calculations on the Job Corps through a computer. It tried to reduce the program to a statistic. And every time one does that, he squeezes out the blood of compassion, and the warmth of humanity. This is what it is all about.

I think this is pointed up when one examines the central focus of the shutdowns in the program—the shutdowns of the camps out in the remote areas of the land in comparison to the ghettos in the larger cities in the East, for example.

Those closures were proposed at the expense of giving to those young men and young women a chance, in the wide open spaces of the land, to find their soul, or, to use a term from the modern vernacular, to find themselves.

How much money is it worth if a young person out in the open air of the vast spaces of the West discovers that he is an individual and addresses himself to fitting himself into his social, contemporary, society? The answer is that it is almost limitless in price. And that price never appears in the statistical runs that are being engineered to try to "evaluate" the Job Corps program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the Senator from Wyoming.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, it is this aspect of the Job Corps program that is the blind side of the administration's attempt to try to restructure the approach to this problem.

I think that on all sides of the question we stand with a single dedication. We want to do something, and we hope that something is the right thing. But, I submit that we cannot do that right thing if we leave out the people and generalities so deeply involved. We dare not reduce this to a ledger turned out by the Bureau of the Budget, one with no humanity and devoid of compassion.

This is where the Job Corps centers, scattered throughout the West, made a contribution that does not appear in dollars and cents on a ledger. These conservation camps did register in the ledger of humanity in the adjustment and the discovery of individuals.

Those who went through this experience, even in the old days of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the pre-World War II period, can testify to the meaning of an individual discovering himself in relation to the natural environment around him.

I think this is what is hanging in the balance in terms of opportunities for these young people in the Job Corps camps that are now proposed to be closed in the West. I make the petition that the administration reconsider this severe cutback at a cost far greater than dollars, and that the pending resolution be agreed to.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator

from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it is becoming increasingly difficult to keep up with the administration's statements on the Job Corps closings. Yesterday's rumor may or may not be today's policy; today's determinations are likely to be tomorrow's unfounded allegations.

And in the midst of all this confusion and doubletalk, the administration is resolutely pressing ahead with closings. Whatever the President meant by his February 19 promise to "provide time for full debate and discussion" on anti-poverty programs, it has apparently gone by the board with the Job Corps.

Announcement of the Job Corps closings was made on April 11—less than 2 months after President Nixon's "full debate" pledge—and as of last Friday, we learned that 1,400 trainees have already been transferred out of Job Corps centers. Some 4,000 more are due to be phased out in a matter of weeks.

As of yesterday, statistics that reached me were that, nationwide, 4,500 young men have dropped out since the closing orders were issued. I know that the figure at Camp Kilmer, in New Jersey, yesterday showed that approximately 450 trainees have quit because of the closings. Since the announcement of the closings, Camp Kilmer has lost nearly one-third of its trainees through dropout. They have given up and gone home, according to a Kilmer spokesman.

The resolution offered by the distinguished junior Senator from California is a bid for time—time to study the Job Corps programs, and time to make plans if change is needed. The situation reminds me of a paraphrase on the old saying:

Act in haste: repent at leisure.

I am afraid that if we allow the administration to act in haste, we will indeed repent—but in despair.

This resolution asks for time to study the Job Corps program. There is no justifiable reason to deny that time; no valid reason for the administration to shut down Job Corps centers so arbitrarily and so abruptly.

The Nixon administration estimates that closing down Job Corps centers will save \$100 million a year. In view of our national budget, \$100 million certainly is not an enormous sum; not an enormous sum in a nation that talks about spending \$7.8 billion on an anti-ballistic-missile system.

To delay a decision on the Job Corps for several months would involve a relatively small amount of money; a very small amount considered in terms of what the Job Corps has done.

If we rush ahead with these helter-skelter closings, the damage which will occur will be irreparable.

I would like to quote from the hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969.

Arnold Weber, Assistant Secretary of Labor, appeared at that hearing. The committee extended me the privilege of questioning him.

I asked Mr. Weber if all of the young

people at Job Corps centers now being shut down were to be transferred to other slots.

His answer was, "No, sir."

Later, I asked Mr. Weber if there was a place at other Job Corps centers for every man at Camp Kilmer, the center in my own State of New Jersey, which has been marked for closing.

His answer was:

We would hope to arrange this in such a way that people would be moved out in stages. In other words, it would not be, bang! somebody puts a "for sale" sign up on the camp.

I should think that an administration that announces a drastic decision such as shutting down Job Corps centers would have made these arrangements in advance; particularly when that administration announced that there would be places for all Job Corpsmen at centers now being phased out.

Furthermore, in view of the time period involved in this phaseout, I think the action is nothing short of "bang; somebody puts a 'for sale' sign upon the camp."

In any event, the confusion was further compounded. I asked Mr. Weber if he was sure of the fact that an orderly phaseout system had been arranged.

He said that all he knew is that he had directed his people to work with the Office of Economic Opportunity to develop a deactivation chart for each of the camps that are involved in the shutdown.

This confused and incomplete picture of phaseout planning expressed by Mr. Weber stands in marked contrast to the straightforward declaration made by Secretary Shultz on April 25. At that time, Secretary Shultz said:

Insofar as the individual people in the Centers are concerned, we have taken steps to look after their interests.

Have there been adequate steps? What are the plans? Or, as it seems, did the administration move to close the Job Corps centers and then begin planning for placing the trainees who were squeezed out?

Obviously, the administration made its decision without even planning for the orderly shutdown of centers. We must never forget that when we refer to centers, we are really talking about the human beings at those centers. We are toying with human lives. To make a decision without regard for those lives, is absolutely cruel and heartless.

That is why we need this resolution; that is why we need time to explore this decision fully and factually.

There are other signs of haste. I asked Mr. Weber about the future of the Police Training School at Camp Kilmer.

Camp Kilmer is the only Job Corps site which has a police training school. We are all familiar with that operation; we have 11 graduates of that school on the Metropolitan Police Department here in Washington; 10 are now serving on the Baltimore force; 15 others are on the police waiting list in New York.

They are ghetto youths, many of whom started with a hatred of policemen. Now they are policemen themselves, going back into the community. It is an obvious step forward toward solving the crucial problem of police-community relations. It is a step forward toward solving

the equally critical problem of meeting the manpower needs of our urban police departments.

I asked Mr. Weber about the plans for the future of the police training school. He assured me that the police training school would be continued, but he could not assure me that it would be picked up immediately when Camp Kilmer is shut down.

"We will discuss the situation," he said, "and, as I have indicated, have started to—with Job Corps officials—work out a transfer of that program." Time passes, but plans are not forthcoming. On Friday, Secretary Shultz said that "negotiations are underway" for the future of the Kilmer police academy.

Act in haste; repent at leisure. We have an enormously effective program. The Job Corps shutdown is announced and then the administration starts discussing what to do with the human beings and the programs.

We need time to talk these things over.

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz also appeared at the April hearings. He told of the criteria involved in deciding which camps would be closed. No. 1 on the list offered by Secretary Shultz was "Average operating cost of the center per enrollee man-year."

Yet last Friday, in testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee, Secretary Shultz said that "a desire for cost reduction was not the prime consideration in the establishment of the new centers."

Is cost a meaningful criterion? Can the cost-effectiveness standard be set aside for some centers, maintained for others? There are far too many unanswered questions in this regard.

Mr. Shultz also talked about changes in the criteria. He dropped two of the criteria which the Office of Economic Opportunity had used in rating Job Corps centers.

One of those was community relations. He called that "a difficult criterion to work with." I cannot help but wonder if criteria were dropped or inserted solely for the purpose of making a case against certain centers.

At Camp Kilmer, the community relations criterion would have to be dropped if a case were to be made for its closing.

After all, the Edison Junior Chamber of Commerce, a group representing the community where Camp Kilmer is located, saw fit to award the camp its "Good Neighbor of the Year Award."

The camp has been cited by such organizations as the National Council of Christians and Jews, the League of Women Voters, the Urban League, the NAACP, the Boy Scouts of America, Columbia University, New York University, and the City College of New York.

Community relations is a difficult criterion to apply when all you want to do is to close down centers.

It is even more difficult when you consider that the Kilmer Job Corps Center was the subject of praiseworthy articles that appeared in Newsweek, Time, the Saturday Review, the Wall Street Journal, the London Observer, and many other publications. Those are publica-

tions which sent reporters to the Kilmer Center. They looked, listened, questioned, and then praised the center.

We all have read the reports that a so-called confidential file was leaked to the press. That file concerned alleged misconduct at the Job Corps centers.

Those files revealed that in the first 6 months of 1968 there were 22 cases involving narcotics at Camp Kilmer. During those 6 months there were about 2,000 young men at Camp Kilmer.

Such statistics are really meaningless. In fact, the arrest record at Camp Kilmer is only 2.8 per 100 Job Corpsmen-year, and the conviction rate is 1.7 per 100 Job Corpsmen-year. When you consider that the Job Corps is dealing with the graduates of the most vicious "college of hard knocks" our Nation knows, I think the Camp Kilmer record must be regarded as excellent. It is a record which compares favorably with the overall national average of all young people.

Secretary Shultz talked about another change in criteria. He said the weight of placement rate had been doubled in considering which centers to shut down.

Does the Secretary know that placement is not the sole responsibility of the Job Corps? Does he know that placement also is handled by other agencies?

Has the Secretary looked at the positive side of the figures?

Camp Kilmer, for instance, placed 47 percent of its graduates. What would we say about an administration that closed down a cancer hospital because it only saved the lives of 47 percent of its patients?

Secretary Shultz mentioned average gains in reading and math as another criterion.

Again, I must ask if the Secretary, or the people who compiled his statistics, looked behind those figures. At Camp Kilmer, 83 percent of the Job Corpsmen are nonwhite and educationally handicapped. When we impose standard criteria on this group, it is like asking a man to run the 100-yard dash by starting 20 yards behind everyone else.

I think the overreliance on statistics again indicates that the administration is forgetting that they are dealing with human beings, and not just facts and figures.

Mr. Shultz included in his criteria the average length of stay. Did he take into consideration the length of training programs? Some are more involved than others and require more time. No allowance for that fact appeared in the administration's statements.

Mr. Shultz talked about costs, but he did not talk about the cost to society of a person whose life is spent in prison or in crime or on welfare.

I believe the Job Corps actually is a profitmaking enterprise. It has been estimated that the price of a wasted life to society is \$100,000. When you consider that it costs \$7,000 a year to keep a man in the Job Corps, and you weigh the fact that Camp Kilmer alone has graduated more than 5,000 men, I think that we are getting a bargain. Just multiply \$100,000 times the 5,000 Camp Kilmer graduates.

Of course, Mr. Shultz is something of a magician when it comes to figures. He intends to trim \$100 million from a pro-

gram and then enlarge and improve it. I do not know what fish and loaves he is using.

But, again, we must not restrict ourselves to facts and figures. What is the value of saving one human life, let alone 5,000? Who can put a price tag on that statistic?

Mr. Shultz and Mr. Weber were not the only persons to testify at the hearing. Four young men from Camp Kilmer also appeared. They certainly told it "like it is." Their reasoning was persuasive.

They made clear that the Job Corps is much more than just a job training center; it is a concept far different from some of the rumored and unclear alternatives that the administration wants to use to replace the Job Corps.

Walter Francis, a corpsman from Massachusetts, explained:

You see, Job Corps is a place where you come in by yourself and say, "I want to try to mature and be a man in society." So Job Corps starts to develop your body, mind, and spirit. It develops your mind in the sense of thinking positive, thinking more or less: "Well, I am going to go out and achieve something in life, where I have failed in society before I came to the Job Corps."

That was a dropout talking. When Mr. Shultz talks about the dropout record at Job Corps centers, he should always remember that the Job Corps deals with young men who were forced to "dropout" of society. The Job Corps gives them a chance to get back into the mainstream.

An interesting aspect of this "dropout factor" came to light in last Friday's statement by Secretary Shultz. He testified that the new residential "minicenters" are being planned to combat the dropout rate by mitigating "the normal feeling of loneliness and homesickness young boys or girls may feel when they are in unfamiliar surroundings."

I am afraid the Secretary's misconceptions are showing. In many cases—some would say most cases—the neighborhood life of the Job Corps trainee does not inspire fond memories and the "faraway blues." In many cases, "home" for the trainee means the street: tough, dirty, violent, poor, aimless, unproductive, splintered, and decaying. There are few corpsmen who pine away for a mother's home cooking and a father's loving comradeship; most corpsmen tell quite the opposite story—home was a trap to escape, not a lure to draw them back.

I would like to quote from the testimony of David Walker, a corpsman from the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn.

He told what the Job Corps did for him in areas remote from job training.

He said:

When I first came to Kilmer, I had a lot of problems, familywise, like I kept to myself, you know. But soon I learned that in my group meetings, if I bring out my problems, I find out that other Corpsmen have the same problems.

By our having the same problems, coming from the same environment and all, we can solve our problems within our group under the leadership of our group leaders.

Group living is the best thing in the world. I have found that out. It changed my way of thinking. When you are in a block, you think about getting the next man, but when you are in Kilmer, it is different.

I do not know where David Walker would be today without the Job Corps. He probably does not know himself. But we know where he is. And, that is because of the Job Corps.

The administration has said that the residential concept is not valid for all Job Corps. The administration wants to move the Job Corps back into the city, back to training centers.

The young men from Camp Kilmer have a different tale to tell.

Take Mr. Francis, for instance. He described it this way:

Everyone is benefitting by Kilmer. That is a place where you go and develop. You mature when you go away from home. If you have a girl friend on the block and you have this residential thing, you are not going to the school that the Government puts in the city. You are going over to your lady's house every chance you get.

Mr. Walker talked about what it is like in cities where young people indulge in "alcohol, dope, marihuana—these kinds of things." Then he added that a young man comes to the Job Corps and "breaks away from this kind of thing and develops himself into going back to society to work."

After listening to the witnesses, at the hearing, I am for the Job Corps more than ever.

While the closing of any centers deeply distresses me, I am particularly concerned at the closing of Camp Kilmer.

It is the only center in the Northeast, the teeming megalopolis of our country. There is no section of the Nation which needs a Job Corps center more or which obtains greater benefits.

Sixty-five percent of the men at Camp Kilmer come from the New York metropolitan area. Most can return home within an hour at a cost of less than \$1.

Now, the administration is asking these men to go to distant points. Those in the program now do not want to go and I am sure that they reflect the attitude of potential corpsmen.

They benefit from the residential concept, but they are in a place where they can return home for visits.

The other Job Corps centers are more distant from cities. The young men at Kilmer are used to the excitement of the cities. They do not want to go to small towns on weekends, and in many instances, smaller towns out of the metropolitan area are not particularly eager to have corpsmen in the community.

I might also point out that Camp Kilmer is the center of the New Jersey Urban Education Corps. That is a program aimed at training teachers for ghetto areas.

At Camp Kilmer, the Urban Education Corps trainees get a chance to work with the Job Corpsmen. They see how they live. They really get to know these young men. They learn how to make a connection with young people who have been hostile to our traditional educational system.

The Urban Education Corps interns are taught by the group leaders at Camp Kilmer. In return, they assist in the teaching program.

The precipitate closing of Camp Kilmer now endangers that program. There simply is no other facility in New Jersey which offers all the elements needed in

that program: space, students, and a workshop atmosphere.

The teachers trained by the Urban Education Corps someday will make programs like the Job Corps unnecessary. But now the urban education effort in New Jersey is at the very least seriously endangered.

No matter how it is viewed, the closing of the Job Corps is a national calamity. The April unemployment statistics show that while the rate of joblessness for whites remained steady at 3.1 percent, the rate for nonwhites soared from 6 to 6.9 percent.

The great majority of job corpsmen are nonwhite. As I mentioned earlier, the figure at Camp Kilmer is 83 percent.

The Job Corps is a program aimed at ending the disgraceful condition of a nonwhite unemployment rate being twice that of the white population.

There is no reason why the administration cannot delay its decision. If they do not, they will effectively bar Congress from expressing its intentions. Do they want these centers out of business before we can act?

I urge my Senate colleagues to support this resolution. There are too many unanswered questions about the administration's planning; too many gaps in the network of policy and procedure. Congress must be given the opportunity to conduct a thorough review of the role of the Job Corps. Hasty, precipitous action has simply got to give way to rational investigation. All the information must be gathered, all the alternatives explored, before any Job Corps centers are shuttered and abandoned. Let us endorse this resolution, and by so doing, affirm our belief in the processes of congressional review and comprehensive investigation. We are dealing in thousands of lives, and those lives deserve no less than complete attention.

I believe that the hearings of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare graphically describe, in human terms, what it means for a youngster, from the most abject kind of poverty, to have an opportunity for a new life, a life of productivity and promise, as the result of starting on a new life in the Job Corps.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

I yield to the Senator from Vermont for the purpose of making a motion.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I move that Senate Resolution 194 be recommitted to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit Senate Resolution 194.

Under the previous order, debate on the motion will be limited to one-half hour on each side, the time to be controlled by the Senator from Vermont and the junior Senator from California.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator explain whether the time for the quorum call is to come out of the time on the resolution?

Mr. JAVITS. I ask unanimous consent

that the time for the quorum call be charged equally to both sides.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, is this going to be a live quorum?

Mr. JAVITS. No.

Mr. PASTORE. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator wish the time to come out of the time for debate on the resolution?

Mr. JAVITS. The debate on the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Senate Resolution 194 reads in part as follows:

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.

I call attention to the fact that over a period of more than 14 months, the General Accounting Office made a very detailed study of the Job Corps and other programs under the direction of OEO, and submitted its report to Congress in March of this year.

This is the most factual and in-depth study that has been made of OEO and of the Job Corps program. I remember our 1967 hearings on poverty programs when many of us on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee were frustrated over our inability to ascertain specifics and facts with respect to the operation and administration of many of these programs. Generally, the people who appeared before us as witnesses said, "Give us more money and we will do a better job."

This study by the General Accounting Office, which incidentally was undertaken as the result of an amendment I offered on the floor of the Senate, included not only personnel of the General Accounting Office but also numerous other individuals, as well. I shall not undertake to read all of their names, but they appear in the GAO report to Congress. To assist in this examination the General Accounting Office engaged the services of three firms under contract: Resource Management Corp., of Bethesda, Md., Peat Marwick, Livingston & Co., of Washington, D.C., and Trans Century Corp., of Washington, D.C., and many individuals, all of whom had great expertise in various related fields.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the names of these individuals.

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

Benjamin Aaron, Professor of Law, University of California at Los Angeles.
Peter S. Bing, M.D., Los Angeles, Calif.; formerly, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.
Urie Bronfenbrenner, Professor, Department of Child Development and Family

Relations, The New York State College of Home Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

Glen G. Cain, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Wisconsin; on staff of Institute for Research on Poverty at the University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

John J. Corson, Consultant, Washington, D.C.

Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.

Roger O. Egeberg, Dean, School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

John Forrer, Bureau of the Budget, City of New York; formerly, Office of Economic Opportunity; formerly, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President.

Arthur M. Harkins, Director, Training Center for Community Programs, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Robert A. Levine, Urban Institute, Washington, D.C.; formerly, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Sar A. Levitan, Center for Manpower Policy Studies, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C.

Collin M. MacLeod, Commonwealth Fund, New York, N.Y.; formerly, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Garth L. Mangum, Center for Manpower Policy Studies, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., and Professor of Economics and Director of Human Resources Institute, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Rufus E. Miles, Princeton University, Princeton, N.J.; formerly, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Robert N. Moore, Robert N. Moore Company, management, marketing, and governmental consultants, Nashville, Tenn.

Joseph N. Reid, Child Welfare League of America, New York, N.Y.

Rosemary C. Sarri, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

James L. Sundquist, The Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.; formerly, Department of Agriculture.

Sidney E. Zimbalist, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, as I suggested yesterday in a rather lengthy statement, none of us in Congress are opposed to the objectives which we established when we set up the Job Corps program in 1964. We are concerned, however, because those objectives are not being met, and we have ample statistics and facts to justify that conclusion.

For example, OEO data supplied to the Department of Labor on Job Corps drop-outs for calendar 1968 indicates that the number of trainees completing training was 20 percent; that the number of trainees who received more than 90 days' training was 21 percent; that the number of trainees who received less than 90 days' training was 32 percent; and that the number of individuals recruited for the Job Corps who signed up but never reported to camp was 27 percent.

Then we see from the GAO report that about 40 percent of these young people dropped out of camps during the first 90 days in fiscal year 1968. It is clear that they cannot hope to obtain the training that is so vital to their futures if they are going to become self-supporting citizens from such attendance at the camps.

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

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sen-

ator from Vermont is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I now wish to compare the overall completion rates given by the Secretary of Labor for the Job Corps program and for other training programs. The overall completion rate for the Job Corps in calendar year 1968 was 36 percent; for men's centers it was 43 percent; for women's centers it was 38 percent; and for conservation centers it was 24 percent. That compares to a training completion rate of 68 percent for institutional training under the Manpower Development and Training Administration; to a training completion rate of 60 percent for on-the-job programs under MDTA; and to a training completion rate of 67 percent for the job opportunities in the business sector program known as JOBS.

The argument has been made that many of these trainees contributed immeasurably to conservation programs of one kind or another. I admit that is true, but submit that we are not operating the type camps which prevailed in the CCC days during the depression. Then it was a case where we had a massive depression and it was necessary to make work of some sort to take care of a very acute problem.

The objective of the Job Corps is to create jobs training to enable these young men and women to acquire the skills to make them productive citizens. The fact that so many of them fail to complete their courses and the fact that they have been unable to keep 40 or 42 percent in the camps beyond 90 days suggest without question that we have failed and failed miserably.

If we have many men and women who are unemployable and who cannot be trained for useful occupations, perhaps the Federal Government should become the employer of last resort and give these people, particularly the men, a chance to work in conservation programs. That is not the objective of the Job Corps program, however, and thus far we have not succeeded very well in training these youngsters for future employment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Texas, the chairman of the committee that considered this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I rise in connection with the motion to recommit the resolution. We were warned in committee that the distinguished Senator from New York might have a substitute resolution but not that there would be an attempt to recommit the original resolution. This resolution, Senate Resolution 194, as reported is an amended resolution, including suggestions offered by the distinguished Senator from Vermont; particularly the wording was changed to be more mild at the suggestion of the Senator. Therefore, I am surprised and I consider this motion entirely without merit.

When the resolution was introduced and referred to the proper subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare, proper notice was given and hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty. It was thereafter debated in the subcommittee and reported with a live quorum present to the full committee. The matter was debated for hours with a quorum present and the measure was reported to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, that resolution was submitted with the support of 32 Senators, which is almost one-third of the membership of this body. This is not a one-man resolution or a one-man idea. It had the support of 32 Senators, including Senators from the party across the aisle. It was submitted with that strong support to begin with. Hearings had started in April and ran over into May. We have the volume of hearings here on the closing of the Job Corps centers. The resolution does not provide that the President has to keep the Job Corps. It was the committee's understanding that no effort would be made to shut the centers down until the Senate had completed its work. However, in the midst of the hearings the administration has attempted to close 59 centers, including 50 of the 82 conservation centers, and they said this was on an economy basis. They said they had taken the most costly and wasteful and were closing them down.

Mr. President, I am very familiar with one center in my State of New Waverly, Tex. There the average cost per trainee is \$3,400 a year, which is one-half the cost in some other centers. Yet they wish to close this camp which is in the Sam Houston National Park. At least 31 percent of the trainees who go there are from the minority races. It is near the center of Houston and it draws the unemployed and trains them in forestry procedures. We have a letter from the dean of the Forestry Service there. There are nine spots there where they use these people to learn a new way of life. When they come there, 37 percent of these people are illiterate, and 55 percent are partially illiterate, so that only 6 percent were literate. They are given concentrated courses in reading and mathematics. I visited one urban center and found they take people who are illiterate and teach them to read. They have mathematics books without a figure in them. Sometimes they receive the equivalent of 5 years of mathematics. They are given several years of reading and the equivalent of 5 years of mathematics. Mathematics without a written word. They can see the figures. What the Job Corps is doing is taking boys and girls from the ghettos and teaching them to assimilate the learning they failed to get while in school. It would be tragic to close them down now. If the resolution is recommitted as the able and distinguished Senator from Vermont (Mr. Prouty), wishes, the Senate will not have considered whether it should be consulted in the closing of the Job Corps centers. The Senator with whom I have served for years, who is an able man and made a great contribution toward vocational education and I admire him greatly.

I regret the motion to recommit offered by him. With all due respect to his great ability, I believe it is ill-advised to send this resolution back when all the

work has been done on it. We had a larger attendance than normal in the committee, with more careful consideration.

All the resolution says is that it is the sense of the Senate that any action to shut down Job Corps centers or camps should be deferred until 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 the appropriations for that program. The administration would cut out the Job Corps without consideration of what it would cost. It says the Job Corps is costing too much and yet it picks out the most economical centers in the Nation to close down.

This shows that the speedup and the rapidity of the action of the administration is not based upon the realities of the situation. We have taken these young people out of the ghettos and given the promise of job opportunities. This promise should not be cut off. With thousands dropping out of the program because they fear it will not continue, it will wreck their morale and destroy their trust that the rest of the Nation wants to help them help themselves out of poverty.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 additional seconds.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 1 full minute to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. That is doubling my request. I thank the Senator for his generosity in doubling my time.

I want to say in closing, Mr. President, that I think the motion to recommit is unusual where the resolution in question has received careful consideration by both the subcommittee and the committee. It was reported in executive session with a live quorum, and was carefully considered for hours in full committee. All it says do is to hold this in the status quo until Congress has an opportunity to review the Job Corps program. As a co-equal body of government, the executive branch should do that voluntarily. But it is not doing it. It is placing the onus upon us. All we do in courtesy is to tell the Executive that it is the sense of the Senate that they should be giving us an opportunity to study the matter.

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

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I thank the distinguished Senator from California for his courtesy.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I support the administration's decision to close 59 Job Corps centers. I am wholeheartedly convinced that no other action could have been taken in connection with a program which is as

poorly structured, badly administered, wasteful, and ineffective as the Job Corps. These judgments are not mine alone but have been officially stated by every reputable study of the program and its participants. By examining the Job Corps recruitment and screening activities, its center operations, training programs, and disciplinary problems, and by looking at the post-program employment experience of enrollees, we are easily able to see that almost no judgment of the Job Corps could be too harsh.

The recent Comptroller General's report on the Office of Economic Opportunity programs, the Job Corps among them, stated that, in the matter of Job Corps recruitment, it has been estimated that 900,000 youths are eligible for the program but that even the fiscal 1968 quotas of 82,000 youths was not met and that only 73,000 entered the program. The recruiting agencies provided the General Accounting Office with reasons for their inability to meet quotas, among which was "disinterest of eligible youths in the program" and "discouraging reports on the Job Corps program by returning, terminated corpsmen." I maintain that a program that can neither stimulate interest among those who are supposedly in need of its benefits nor excite even the most minimal loyalty among those who have been through it—I maintain that such a program is, to put it plainly, a flop.

But let us look further. The GAO report also states that in a large number of cases—33 percent in one study, 22 percent in another—important eligibility criteria are often waived and enrollees are admitted into the Job Corps, some of whom did not meet certain behavior standards and others of whom had "a history of serious criminal or antisocial behavior." In other words, the Job Corps sets up standards and rules which it often ignores. A program that does not abide by its own rules cannot teach and will have difficulty in teaching youngsters to abide by society's rules. Moreover, there is little opportunity for an able youth to escape the damaging culture of the streets—and that is, after all, the purpose behind the Job Corps—if the worst elements of the streets are allowed to accompany him into the program, as apparently they often are.

The suspicion that the Job Corps centers are unwholesome places becomes a certainty when we see in the GAO report that large numbers of enrollees do not manage to stay in the Job Corps even for the 6-month minimum recommended by the program. Of 73,500 Job Corps members who left the program in fiscal 1968, only 26,300 were classified as graduates. Of the remaining 47,200 youths, 18,200 had remained over 90 days and 29,000 less than 90 days at the centers. The Secretary of Labor, in his recent report on the restructuring of the Job Corps, says that only about 35 percent of the youths that left the Job Corps in fiscal 1968 were graduates, and almost 40 percent left before 90 days. The reasons for leaving most readily identified by the centers and most frequently expressed by the termines interviewed by the GAO investigators were, first, dissatisfaction with the center or Job Corps as a whole; sec-

ond, homesickness; third, the inability to obtain desired vocational training; and fourth, the fear of bodily harm.

After reading this shocking and depressing list of reasons, I find myself wondering how the framers and administrators of this program can imagine that it is helping the enrollees.

Let us turn for a moment to the operations of the Job Corps centers themselves, first the conservation centers. These centers seem, in many instances, to be almost total failures. They supposedly provide on-the-job training in work conservation projects, but, as GAO tells us:

The nature of the projects limit[s] the opportunities for intensive vocational training. Projects such as cleaning debris from beaches and parks, cleaning out undergrowth in forests, and seeding barren areas call primarily for common labor. Projects such as building and road construction, while providing greater potential for skills training, were not required to the extent necessary to allow the centers to provide intensive and progressive vocational training.

In other words, the Corpsmen at conservation centers were not being trained for any future jobs but were just being used as common laborers. In fact, GAO reports:

At some centers, the emphasis placed on the need to accomplish conservation work projects appeared to have adversely affected in varying degrees the training program and resulted in the instructors performing the role of foremen rather than teachers.

Regarding the academic programs, the GAO found that "few Corpsmen achieved the program goals established by Job Corps for conservation centers that were equivalent to about a seventh-grade public school level." On every level, it seems, most of the conservation centers have failed: the work done by the Corpsmen was not at all to their future advantage and their classroom performance was allowed to remain negligible. After reviewing this dismal record, we can clearly see why the Department of Labor is closing 50 conservation centers.

With regard to the men's and women's urban centers, the picture is not much more helpful. GAO reports that at the time of its review there were no uniform criteria for graduation. The report says:

Consequently, a number of Corps members were classified as graduates, although it did not appear that they have developed the necessary attributes required for employment in the area of their vocational training.

There were academic requirements in the urban centers but GAO says that most of the centers it reviewed did not enforce the requirements. As a result, many Corps members had not reached an acceptable academic level. Nevertheless, such Corps members were often listed as graduates, a classification which may initially help the termines obtain employment but will certainly also, as the GAO says, "increase the possibility of—the termines—losing the job obtained because of his or her inability to perform satisfactorily and may have an adverse effect on attempts to place future graduates."

The Job Corps centers also generally showed themselves incapable of placing very many of their graduates in jobs. The GAO investigators report:

Although some confirmations of initial placements were made by all centers, we found that reports of placements were not fully accurate. One center reported placements solely on the basis of confirmations that interviews were scheduled between trainees and prospective employers.

Follow-up procedures were found to be equally inadequate and misleading.

Now let us examine the crucial part of any kind of job training program: the post-training employment experience. Have Job Corps trainees obtained employment? Are their jobs in the areas for which the Job Corps trained them? Have their earnings been better than they would have been without the Job Corps experience? Have employers been pleased with the performance of the trainees? Have the trainees remained employed? The chief answer to every one of these questions is "no."

A report done for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce included an evaluation of the Job Corps and its effectiveness. Its conclusions regarding post-Corps job experience is:

Although a significant number of Job Corps graduates are initially employed, their employment, for the most part, is not a direct result of the vocational training received in the program. Seventy-two percent of those surveyed who were employed, were not employed in the skill for which they were trained. It may be assumed that for the most part current economic conditions are more responsible for the graduates' employment than their Job Corps training.

The GAO report comes to similar conclusions in this area when it reports that of the August and September 1967 trainees surveyed, 22 percent had never worked for the employers they were reported to have been hired by upon termination. Of the remaining trainees who had worked for the reported employers, 75 percent had left their jobs and only 25 percent were still employed at the time of the GAO inquiry. The GAO study also reported:

It appeared that Job Corps trainees had not done materially better than the other eligible youths who had applied to enter the program and then chose not to participate. It is questionable whether Job Corps training has resulted in substantial economic benefit thus far for those youths who participated in the program.

The GAO study shows that the average wage for terminated corpsmen was \$1.87 an hour as opposed to the \$1.90 an hour earned by the average youth who applied for the Job Corps and then decided not to join it—a shockingly small return on an exorbitantly expensive program. I will discuss the costs of the Job Corps a bit later.

The chamber of commerce study included a survey of the employers of Job Corps trainees. The employers surveyed rated the majority of the graduates as only "poor" or "satisfactory" in the three categories for which opinion was solicited—training, skill level, and work habits.

The report maintains that employers have a low opinion of the Job Corps' ability to train enrollees and gives examples:

One welder hired three graduates at \$3.10 an hour, two of whom were laid off because

they "were not capable of doing work required" and the third quit.

One electrical firm hired 12 graduates, 10 of whom "resigned" and two of whom were laid off.

A manager of a refrigeration repair service hired three graduates who quit after several months. He indicated that they "did not have enough training" and should have been "assigned to service shops for additional training."

The GAO investigation also found that the employers who discharged the former Corps members gave multiple reasons for doing so, by far the most frequently cited of which was "failed to perform duties adequately."

Mr. President, from initial misconceptions in planning the program to continuous miscalculations in administering the program, the Job Corps has misused deprived youths by not training them adequately—it has misused some of our Nation's business leaders by encouraging them to hire corpsmen—and it has wasted and misused the taxpayers' money.

There are a number of cost estimates per enrollee in the Job Corps—all of the estimates are intolerably high; not even the most misguided partisan of the program has denied its enormous costs. The recent GAO report says that "enrollee man-year costs for fiscal 1968 were \$8,300." That is enough to support a student in the best college in the Nation, an anomaly which has been pointed out by the Congress to the Job Corps administrators ever since the program began but which they have apparently been unable to alter. A lower, but equally devastating, figure appeared in a 1967 joint publication of the Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations with the National Manpower Policy Task Force, by Garth L. Mangum and Lowell M. Glenn. They report that the Job Corps cost \$6,880 per enrollee, almost \$4,000 higher than the next expensive job-training program—the Neighborhood Youth Corps—and a full \$6,370 higher than the vocational rehabilitation program. The same information tells us that of the percentage who completed the various job-training programs, the Job Corps had the lowest—22 percent. I could go on in this vein, illustrating by means of statistics and conclusions from respected sources how the Job Corps has failed, but I feel that the point has been made.

I have hitherto shown that the Job Corps has failed in its declared task of providing dropouts with job training. But it has failed additionally in the job of instilling even a modicum of discipline in many of its centers. From the program's inception, we in the Congress have received continuous reports of crime and disorders created by the presence of Job Corps members in the cities and towns adjacent to the centers.

In 1966 in Kalamazoo, Mich., a group of Job Corps trainees clashed with a rival group in a riot that spread over several city blocks and required 500 policemen to quell; in Kentucky, 150 enrollees wrecked the Breckinridge Center in a riot set off because of a protection racket run inside the installation; in Camp Kilmer, N.J., complaints were made in nearby towns about the rising crime rate,

which was blamed on the corpsmen; in my own State of West Virginia at the Charlestown Women's Job Corps Center there were reported drunken fights, thievery, and immoral conduct. In 1967 the reports were similar: April disturbances in Tomah, Wis., and Evansville, Ind., resulted in enrollees from nearby centers being temporarily barred from those cities; in New Bedford, Mass., corpsmen in July threw rocks at policemen and in October engaged them in a scuffle of near-riot proportions; Astoria, Oreg., and Yakima, Wash., were declared off-limits to local Job Corps trainees because of disturbances. In 1968 and now in 1969 we have heard less about Job Corps outrages, signifying, perhaps, that certain overdue reforms were instituted.

As to internal discipline problems in Job Corps centers, such as thievery, alcoholism, drugs, and the like, it is difficult to be specific about them, since newspaper reports are sketchy. I would hope that the November 1967 GAO report on the Parks Job Center, in Pleasanton, Calif., is not typical. It stated that during a 60-day period in 1966, the Parks Center Review Board dealt with 45 cases of various infractions of discipline, the most prevalent of which was sodomy, carried out with assault, fighting, drunkenness, or threats of violence. Other incidents included the selling, possession, or use of marijuana, assaults, robbery, being AWOL, and extortion.

In my view, the Job Corps program is indefensible from every angle: It does not do its job—it may even be negatively effective; it is outrageously expensive; its side effects, on surrounding communities and perhaps on the trainees themselves, are damaging. Surely it makes no sense to continue a totally inadequate program merely because it exists; surely the Congress is not so unimaginative in outlook that it would rather retain a familiar failure rather than make way for an untried program with possibilities. I say nothing at this time about the small inner-city Job Corps centers the administration is planning: I would perhaps have preferred to see the total abolition of the Job Corps. But the Labor Department thinks that by closing many of the large isolated centers and opening a few small inner-city centers, it can make the Job Corps work and I am willing to reserve judgment on that. But I am as persuaded of the folly it would be to allow the Job Corps to continue as it has been doing, as I am convinced of the wisdom in phasing it out.

The Job Corps is a program which has failed its creators, its administrators, its advocates, its well-wishers, and its enrollees. Nothing good can come of continuing up a path that leads nowhere; only good can come of stopping, turning around, and going back. Let us support the President in his wise decision to cut back the unsound, inefficient, deleterious, money-losing operations of this aberration of a program known as the Job Corps.

The idea of the Job Corps was basically good. But the effort to project that idea into a workable program has been a dismal failure.

We need manpower training programs which will adequately prepare trainees for jobs that actually exist. And we need programs with adequate followups to determine how well the trainees are adapting to their new jobs, how efficiently they are performing, and how long they are staying on the job. Such was not the case with the Job Corps.

I shall vote to recommit the resolution.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD pertinent material.

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

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1969.

Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: I am replying to your

request for financial data relating to operation at the Women's Urban Job Corps Center in Huntington, West Virginia, and the Job Corps Conservation Camp at Anthony, West Virginia.

Enclosed is financial data on the operating and staff expenses of these two installations from the period July 1, 1967 to June 30, 1968 (FY 68).

For FY 1968 the cost per man-year including total center and enrollee direct costs at the Anthony Conservation Camp was \$6,566. For the Huntington Women's Urban Center the FY 68 total center and enrollee direct cost was \$7,170.

I would like to point out that these costs do not reflect capital investment for the two Job Corps Centers. In the case of Anthony, total capital investment (cumulative from inception) amounts to \$1,048,255, and for the Huntington Center the capital investment was \$898,018.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM L. GIFFORD,
Special Assistant for Legislative Affairs.

JOB CORPS CENTER FINANCIAL DATA, PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 1967, TO JUNE 30, 1968
HUNTINGTON, W. VA.

Activation date.....	Jan. 11, 1966.
Type of center.....	Women's urban.
Man-years.....	320.
Capacity.....	345.
End of period enrollment.....	323.
Capital investment (cumulative from inception).....	\$898,018.
Construction and rehabilitation.....	\$650,119.
Equipment (including Government furnishings).....	\$247,899.
Name and address of contractor or agency: Xerox Inc., Rochester, N.Y.	

	Total costs Fiscal year 1968 to June 30, 1968	Cost per man-year
Center operating expenses:		
A. Enrollee expenses:		
1. Clothing.....	\$48,458	\$151
2. Subsistence.....	109,154	341
3. Medical and dental fees, supplies and services.....	9,913	284
4. Educational supplies, services and rentals.....	36,443	114
5. Vocational supplies, services and rentals.....	3,696	12
6. Morale, recreation and welfare supplies, services and rentals.....	0	0
7. Enrollee transportation.....	36,029	113
Total enrollee expenses.....	324,693	1,015
B. Operations and maintenance:		
1. Motor vehicle operations and maintenance.....	0	0
2. Other general purpose equipment operation and maintenance.....	0	0
3. Center facilities maintenance.....	67,454	211
4. Communications.....	29,460	92
5. Utilities and fuel.....	40,416	126
6. Center administration supplies and services.....	120,825	377
7. Legal and accounting services.....	189	1
8. Insurance.....	13,789	43
Total operations and maintenance.....	272,133	850

JOB CORPS CENTER FINANCIAL DATA, PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 1967, TO JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.—Continued

	Total costs Fiscal year 1968 to June 30, 1968	Cost per man-year
Center operating expenses:		
C. Other operating expenses:		
1. Lease costs.....	132,570	414
2. General and administrative expenses.....	88,838	278
3. Contractor's fee.....	83,733	262
Total other operating expenses.....	305,141	954
Center staff expenses:		
A. Staff salaries, wages, and benefits:		
1. Managerial and support personnel.....	326,842	1,021
2. Educational program personnel.....	229,854	718
3. Vocational program personnel.....	125,976	394
4. Safety and recreational program personnel.....	41,577	130
5. Guidance and counseling personnel.....	127,254	398
6. Medical and dental personnel.....	65,365	204
7. Work project personnel.....	0	0
Total salaries, wages, and benefits.....	916,868	2,865
B. Staff travel:		
1. Training.....	9,338	29
2. Other.....	11,580	36
Total staff travel.....	20,918	65
C. Staff training.....		
	2,675	8
Total center staff expenses.....	940,461	2,938
Total operating and staff expenses.....	1,842,428	5,757
Less income.....	1,462	5
Subtotal center costs.....	1,840,966	5,752
Enrollee direct costs:		
A. Pay, allowances, allotments.....		
	\$380,480	\$1,189
B. Travel.....		
	73,280	229
Total center and enrollee direct costs.....	2,294,726	7,170
Work project costs:		
A. Work project supplies.....		
	(¹)	(¹)
B. Work project equipment, O. & M.....		
	(¹)	(¹)
Total work projects costs.....	(¹)	(¹)
Gross cost to appropriation.....	(¹)	(¹)
Less appraised value of work projects.....	(¹)	(¹)
Net cost.....	2,294,726	7,170

¹ Not available.

JOB CORPS CENTER FINANCIAL DATA, PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 1967, TO JUNE 30, 1968

ANTHONY, W. VA.

Activation date, Aug. 10, 1965.	
Type of center, Federal conservation.	
Man-years, 154.9.	
Capacity, 168.	
End of period enrollment, 152.	
Capital investment (cumulative from inception).....	\$1,048,255
Construction and rehabilitation.....	813,922
Equipment (including Government furnishings).....	234,333
Name and address of contractor or agency: Department of Agriculture, Neola, W. Va.	

JOB CORPS CENTER FINANCIAL DATA, PERIOD FROM JULY 1, 1967, TO JUNE 30, 1968—Continued

ANTHONY, W. VA.—Continued

	Total costs Fiscal year 1968 to June 30, 1968	Cost per man-year
Center operating expenses:		
A. Enrollee expenses:		
1. Clothing.....	\$40,770	\$263
2. Subsistence.....	84,963	548
3. Medical and dental fees, supplies and services.....	56,185	363
4. Educational supplies, services and rentals.....	13,344	86
5. Vocational supplies, services and rentals.....	6,038	39
6. Morale, recreation and welfare supplies, services and rentals.....	21,031	136
7. Enrollee transportation.....	(¹)	(¹)
Total enrollee expenses.....	222,331	1,435
B. Operations and maintenance:		
1. Motor vehicle operations and maintenance.....	13,931	90
2. Other general purpose equipment operation and maintenance.....	N/A	N/A
3. Center facilities maintenance.....	68,623	443
4. Communications.....	9,884	64
5. Utilities and fuel.....	18,934	122
6. Center administration supplies and services.....	45,168	292
7. Legal and accounting services.....	N/A	N/A
8. Insurance.....	N/A	N/A
Total operations and maintenance.....	156,540	1,011
C. Other operating expenses:		
1. Lease costs.....	(¹)	(¹)
2. General and administrative expenses.....	(¹)	(¹)
3. Contractors' fee.....	(¹)	(¹)
Total other operating expenses.....	(¹)	(¹)
Center staff expenses:		
A. Staff salaries, wages, and benefits:		
1. Managerial and support personnel.....	\$90,324	\$583
2. Educational program personnel.....	70,931	458
3. Vocational program personnel.....	10,619	69
4. Safety and recreational program personnel.....	10,420	67
5. Guidance and counseling personnel.....	117,006	755
6. Medical and dental personnel.....	8,031	52
7. Work project personnel.....	87,682	566
Total salaries, wages, and benefits.....	395,013	2,550
B. Staff travel:		
1. Training.....	4,758	31
2. Other.....	17,515	113
Total staff travel.....	22,273	144
C. Staff training.....	952	6
Total center staff expenses.....	418,238	2,700
Total operating and staff expenses.....	797,109	5,146
Less income.....	(¹)	(¹)
Subtotal, center costs.....	797,109	5,146
Enrollee direct costs:		
A. Pay, allowances, allotments.....	184,486	1,191
B. Travel.....	35,472	229
Total center and enrollee direct costs.....	1,017,067	6,566
Work project costs:		
A. Work project supplies.....	106,563	688
B. Work project equipment, O. & M.....	21,024	136
Total work projects costs.....	127,587	824
Gross cost to appropriation.....	1,144,654	7,390
Less appraised value of work projects.....	178,965	1,155
Net cost.....	965,689	6,235

¹ Not available.

JOB CORPS EXPERIMENTAL AND DEVELOPMENT CENTERS COST DATA, FISCAL YEAR 1968

	Capitol Job Corps Center, Wash- ington, D.C.	Chicago Job Corps Center, Chicago, Ill.	Blue Ridge Job Corps Center, Marion, Va.	Data for 3 centers
Center operator.....	Westinghouse Learning Corp.	Brunswick Corp., Community Resources Division.	Brunswick Corp., Community Resources Division.	
Activation date.....	Sept. 17, 1965 ¹	Sept. 12, 1966.....	Nov. 29, 1967.....	
Total center and enrollee direct costs.....	\$640,835	\$1,311,934	\$857,872	\$2,810,641
Man-years of training.....	58	105	79	242
COSTS PER MAN-YEAR				
Center and enrollee direct costs.....	\$11,049	\$12,495	\$10,859	\$11,614
Amortization of capital investment ²	276	276	276	276
Allocation of recruiting, placement, head- quarters and regional office expense.....	772	772	772	772
Total costs per man-year.....	12,097	13,543	11,907	*12,662

¹ This center was operated directly by Job Corps until Sept. 15, 1966, when the contractor assumed responsibility for operations. The center was closed June 20, 1968.

² Represents fiscal year 1968 amortized portion of capital investment which from activation of the centers to June 30, 1968, was as follows:

	Construction and rehabilitation	Equipment	Total
Capitol Job Corps Center.....		\$6,177	\$6,177
Chicago Job Corps Center.....	\$74,493	90,678	165,171
Blue Ridge Job Corps Center.....	156,611	30,286	186,897
	231,104	127,141	358,245

³ This amount of \$12,662 includes costs for the Blue Ridge Job Corps Center; however, Job Corps reported an average cost of \$13,028 per man-year which does not include the center because it had been in operation less than 9 months as of June 3, 1968.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL,
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., May 7, 1969.

HON. ROBERT C. BYRD,
U.S. Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BYRD: This is in response to an inquiry from your office on May 6, 1969, requesting verification of your understanding of maximum costs per enrollee in the Job Corps program.

According to Job Corps records the highest cost per enrollee has been incurred in its experimental and developmental centers. During fiscal year 1968 three such centers were in operation. Data concerning these centers as furnished by Job Corps for fiscal year 1968 are enclosed.

We trust that the information will be of assistance to you.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT F. KELLER,
Acting Comptroller General
of the United States.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, the debate on the resolution from both sides, from those for and against the resolution, for and against the motion to recommit, has drifted away from the intent of the resolution to the merits and the demerits of the Job Corps program itself.

The intent of the resolution, as the report from the committee indicates, is to preserve the right and the prerogative of the Congress to consider an ongoing program, through authorization and appropriation processes, before action is taken. This in effect would provide fulfillment of a pledge given by the President when he sent a message to Congress on February 19 telling Congress, the poor, and others, they would be given a full opportunity to be heard before any action is taken changing the nature of the OEO.

We have heard repeatedly from Senators who are opposed to the resolution, quoting from the report of the Comptroller General on the Job Corps. I should like to read what is the most significant

aspect of that report. It relates directly to the intent of this resolution. I read from page 66, under the heading "Recommendation." This recommendation follows certain conclusions which indicate there is room for improvement in the Job Corps; that the program should be modified, as all agree who have participated in debate, regardless of their point of view:

Recommendation: In accordance with the foregoing conclusions, we recommend that the Congress consider whether the Job Corps program, particularly with respect to conservation centers, is significantly achieving the purposes for which it was created to justify its retention at present levels.

The Comptroller General recommends, not that the administration proceed to cut back the Job Corps, but that Congress, in light of this and whatever other information may be available, consider the matter.

We have also heard repeatedly from Senators opposed to the resolution what was referred to today on the floor as an absolute, flat guarantee from Secretary Shultz that every young man and every young woman in the Job Corps now in a camp about to be closed would be given the opportunity for training in an equivalent program if these orders are carried out.

I know that those pledges and those guarantees were made in perfect good faith by the Secretary of Labor. I know, of course, also, that they are accepted in full good faith by those who are opposing the current resolution. The fact, however, is that the Secretary of Labor himself is out of touch with what is actually happening in the Job Corps centers, and he is unable to provide the assurances which I feel we need and which others feel we need if the pledge, that there will be an opportunity for every young man and every other woman, is to be fulfilled. They have never indicated that there would be an early opportunity, nor necessarily any opportunity, for those who are waiting in line to go to camps. Indeed, the Secretary of Labor has failed to answer a telegram asking how many were shut off at that stage of the process.

But going now to these pledges, let us see what is actually happening in the camps.

In order to ascertain what is happening in the camps which have received the closing orders, a wire was sent, on May 2, to the heads of all 54 camps facing total closure—not partial closures, or those saved by subsequent second-thinking—but the 54 which face total closure.

Replies came back from 52 of those 54 camps, responding to the following questions:

1. Has a team from the Employment Service visited your center subsequent to the announcement that it was to be closed?
2. How many of your enrollees have they personally interviewed?
3. Have they, at this point, developed specific alternative plans for each youngster which will enable him to continue training either at another Job Corps Center or in some other Manpower program?
4. What is their advice to the youngsters who indicate they are returning home? Do they have a specific plan worked out for them?

Mr. President, the answers to those wires were shocking. They show that there are no adequate answers to those questions to meet the needs, the hopes, the dreams, and the careers of those who were seeking training in Job Corps centers.

Why is that happening? Why are there no good answers?

The reason is there is no real possibility of rendering such answers.

These wires come from a geographical spread, all across the Nation. They indicate that there is total chaos, that there has been no planning, that there is absolutely no way in which the pledge of the Secretary of Labor, accepted in good faith by many Senators, can be fulfilled.

I shall now read from some of the telegrams. These are a representative cross section of what is contained in all of them:

One wire says:

It is interesting to note that most corpsmen do not meet entrance criteria for Manpower Development and Training Act programs. Also, these programs seem to be filled. Employment Service staffs in the corpsmen's home towns seem extremely reluctant to make any firm commitments as to placement. The usual extent of the phone call is that (1) the home town employment service man will say, "Have the boy stop in when he gets home and I will talk to him." It has been difficult to get more definite statements. The problem seems to be in the corpsmen's home towns.

Another wire:

Training programs either do not exist, are filled, or are not designed for the segment of the poverty population that is in the Job Corps.

Another wire:

The Employment Service team has no specific plans to implement upon arrival at the center. They informed the corpsmen that the Employment Service had nothing to do with transfers to other centers, and that it was very doubtful if any Federal training program would be available to them at this time. The corpsmen returning home were told (a) to report to the local Employment Service with a Form 511; (b) that it was doubtful if any MDTA or other training programs are available at this time; and (c) it was doubtful that those who were still unskilled and without a GED certificate will be able to find further employment at this time. There is definite confusion and uncertainty on the part of the Job Corps trainees.

Another wire:

Neither the Employment Service counselor nor I have received any instructions or information about vacancies that are now open in other Manpower Training programs. At this time we are doubtful that enough vacancies will occur to accommodate all corpsmen wishing to transfer. The only advice we can give the exiting corpsmen, with the limited information available, is to tell them to report to the local Employment Service office. We cannot guarantee them a job or placement in another training program. Our outlook is dim that we will be able to accomplish this goal before our closure on June 30.

I could go on reading these telegrams at great length and find the same thoughts. All of them indicate exactly the same thing: That these promises cannot be kept, that there is great confusion and uncertainty on the part of the administrators of the Job Corps centers that are being closed as well as the en-

rollees, and an almost total dashing of the hopes that these young men and young women have that they will have an opportunity to continue their training.

It is for these reasons that many of us believe this resolution should be adopted and that the commitment resolution should be defeated. We seek to insure that there will be adequate time for these people to be taken care of; to preserve the right of Congress to deal, through its appropriation and authorization processes, with matters of this import, with programs which have been created by acts of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the 52 telegrams I have referred to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

MAY 2, 1969.

Would deeply appreciate your responding to a few questions for me.

1. Has a team from the Employment Service visited your center subsequent to the announcement that it was to be closed?
2. How many of your enrollees have they personally interviewed?
3. Have they, at this point, developed specific alternative plans for each youngster which will enable him to continue training either at another Job Corps Center or in some other Manpower program?
4. What is their advice to the youngsters who indicate they are returning home? Do they have a specific plan worked out for them?

The answers to these questions will be most helpful to the Committee. We would appreciate a speedy reply—by telegram if possible.

ARIZONA

KINGMAN, ARIZ.

May 5, 1969.

In reply to your May 2nd telegram received 5/5, the following information is furnished:

1. Yes, Tom Landa, from Phoenix ES office.
2. All who want to return home upon closure, 79 corpsmen.
3. No, job opportunity listings have not been furnished E. S. counselors.
4. He has taken names and home addresses and is advising C/M to report to nearest E.S. office, giving them the address. He is instructing corpsmen to inquire at the E.S. office in their home town by any Manpower Training programs. He is instructing C/M that their readjustment allowance will be picked up in the same E.S. office for C/M staying in Job Corps over six months. Readjustment allowance for those staying less than six months will be determined by Job Corps. E.S. counselor will furnish list of names to local E.S. agencies so that they will be expecting Corpsmen.

BEN MURDOCK,

Center Director, Kingman Civilian Conservation Center.

WINSLOW, ARIZ.

May 6, 1969.

COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS, Washington, D.C.:

In response to your telegram received Winslow Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, May 3, 1969, Arizona State Employment Service representative started interviews of corpsmen, April 28. Thirty-two interviews completed as of May 1st. Interviews continue. This Center has not been advised of alternatives for corpsmen to continue training at another center or manpower program. The employment service representatives are advising corpsmen returning home, to contact their local employment service office. Local employment office being so noti-

fied. Indications are that corpsmen will be given priority in placement in MDTA. Neighborhood Youth Corps. NABS programs.

PAUL BARNES,
Center Director, Winslow Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

GLOBE, ARIZ.,
May 4, 1969.

The following are answers to your telegraphic inquiry Saturday, May 3, 1969, regarding follow up placement for corpsmen in training at this Center.

1. One E.S. counselor visited this Center part of the week of April 28th.

2. Approximately 1/2 (one half) of 40 corpsmen who want to terminate as a result of the announced closure.

3. No specific placement plan has been developed for the terminating corpsmen from the San Carlos Job Corp Center.

San Carlos corpsmen have been instructed by the E. S. counselor to report to the screening agency in their home town responsible for their induction into the Job Corps.

4. Corpsmen are told by the E. S. counselor to report to their home town screening agency. No known follow up placement plan has been developed for departing corpsmen at this Center, except to report to their screening agency. The E. S. counselor told the Center he did not know what was planned for the future training and or placement of corpsmen.

Chairman Perkins: As you may already know, San Carlos J. C. center is rated 9th in the Nation. Only 7 centers operate at a lower cost per corpsman man year. San Carlos has a unique Spanish to English language program involving 25/35 corpsmen at all times who do not speak English when they arrive. These young men are extremely worried about what is to happen to their future. San Carlos consistently enrolls 15/30 Indian corpsmen. San Carlos has a very good racial balance of corpsmen and staff; Negro, Indian, Mexican American and Caucasian. It is good business to keep the best located. Most effective, and efficient center in operation—and this Center has a four season working climate.

CLYDE J. STIMPSON,
Center Director, San Carlos Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

CALIFORNIA
REDDING, CALIF.,
May 4, 1969.

Reply per your request.

1. Yes, on April 29 a team of one.

2. 80 percent of the 105 on board. 50 enrollees resigned or were discharged during the first two weeks after closure announcement—a very unusual loss.

3. No, 20 percent to be interviewed. Team member has encouraged enrollees to remain in Job Corps and wait for assignment to another Job Corps center.

4. Team member advises those enrollees who wish to return home that she can only guarantee eventual assignment to another Job Corps center. It appears there are no identifiable specific plans at this time.

GRANVILLE W. TILGHMAN,
Toyon Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

RIVERSIDE, CALIF.,
May 4, 1969.

In response to your telegram of 5-3-69 I am also deeply concerned about the future of Job Corps enrollees particularly those here at the Los Pinos Conservation Center. The following is in response to your questions.

1. Mr. Joe McDonald employment service counselor arrived on center April 29th. He plans to remain on center until our job is completed. His cooperation and assistance has been good. However he is limited in the assistance he can give due to the lack of

direction he has. For your information to clarify our response to questions 2, 3, and 4 we proceeded upon receipt of the official word of closing to establish a plan of action designed to deal realistically with our corpsmen and staff. Corpsmen through their corpsmen advisors (staff members) made the initial basic decision to remain in the program or to terminate their enrollment. These decisions were reviewed by my key staff and some corpsmen were further counseled. Therefore at the time the E. S. representative appeared on center we were able to furnish him with a total roster of our population subdivided into the following categories: 1, going home, 2, transfer to another center. Many corpsmen chose to resign rather than transfer to another center.

2. As indicated above Mr. McDonald could not see where he could improve on the interviews already accomplished by our staff. Therefore he is assisting our counselor to exiting corpsmen. All exiting corpsmen are interviewed before their departure.

3. All corpsmen that wish to remain in Job Corps are remaining on center until an opening occurs at another center. To date 20 corpsmen have been offered transfers to other centers. Neither Mr. McDonald nor I have received any instructions or information of vacancies that are now open in other manpower training programs. At this time we are doubtful that enough vacancies will occur to accommodate all corpsmen wishing to transfer.

4. The only advice we can give for exiting corpsmen with the limited information available is to report to their local employment office. We cannot guarantee them a job or placement in another training program.

We should note that the E. S. counselor and my staff and I will do everything possible to obtain jobs for other training programs for our corpsmen. As stated above our outlook is dim that we will be able to accomplish this goal before our closure on June 30th.

PAUL C. SWEETLAND,
Center Director, Los Pinos Job Corps Center.

PALMDALE, CALIF.,
May 5, 1969.

Replying to your telegram dated 5-3-69, answers to your numbered questions are as follows: (1) Yes, two State employment counselors were here Tuesday through Friday, April 29-May 2. (2) They personally interviewed 29 enrollees out of about 119 on board; 29 is the number of enrollees at our center who indicated a preference to return home after careful interviewing by our own vocational committee. (3) Generally, no; they have developed alternative proposals. Approximately 12 corpsmen returning to the area under the counselors' jurisdiction. However, none of these proposals are so specific as to be a firm commitment for further training, due mostly to prior commitments to adults in local area. Transfers to other Job Corps centers are so far being handled by TWX from R. J. Conroy, associate director, Job Corps CCC. We have been authorized 10 transfers to Gary, Tex., and 10 transfers to Clearfield, Utah, urban centers within the next few days. (4) They can only advise corpsmen returning to States other than California to report to the corpsmen local employment service office, where counselors are supposed to have the information necessary to assist the corpsmen further. (5) They are unable to make specific plans for corpsmen returning home in the local area. This appears to be prior commitments. In States other than California, this is due to the fact that ES counselors reporting to us have no jurisdiction or information relating to specific opportunities, placement, or training outside their own area.

STANLEY LYNCH,
Fenner Canyon Job Corps Conservation Center.

SONORA, CALIF.,
May 5, 1969.

Re your telegram May 3, 1969, following are our answers:

1. Yes—Mrs. Little from YOC in Stockton visited center for two days, on April 29 and April 30, 1969.

2. 23 corpsmen had indicated intent to return home. All 23 were interviewed.

3. There were no manpower training plans known to the interviewer for these corpsmen who wished to return home. There were no definite job placements known.

4. Corpsmen were advised to report to YOC or employment office in their home area. Employment services would try to work out something. There was no specific plan developed for them at this time.

DIRECTOR ROBERT L. ROYER,
Five Mile Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

YUCAIPA, CALIF.,
May 3, 1969.

The following are answers to your questions by telegram received at this center 0900 hours Saturday May 3.

1. Yes. Mr. William Capron and Mr. William Ashcroft from Colton WOC interviewed Corpsmen at this center on April 22.

2. They personally interviewed 41 Corpsmen. Some have already transferred to other centers. They did not interview those Corpsmen who had elected to transfer to other centers.

3. No specific plans were communicated to Corpsmen or center staff by the team.

4. The team advised the Corpsmen who are returning home to report to their local WOC and employment service office for interviews. No specific plans have been worked out for them.

JOE E. GRIGGS,
Center Director, Oak Glen Job Corp Center.

WILLOWS, CALIF.,
May 3, 1969.

In reply to telegram of May 3, 1969.
1. Yes, one man arrived 4-29-69 thru 5-1-69.

2. Interviewed: 46 Corpsmen who wanted to go home out of 141 present at center 4-29-69—11 out of 46 decided to stay with Job Corp after interview.

3. No. Employment Service representative was not given direction to develop specific alternatives.

4. Most were advised to contact employment service office when arrived home. No specific plans.

DEAN LLOYD,
Director, Alder Springs Job Center.

PLACERVILLE, CALIF.,
May 5, 1969.

The following in reply your telegram dated May 3.

1. One man half day for two days one man and two women three quarters of third day.

2. None.

3. None. Any alternative plans for our Corpsmen have been done by center staff only.

4. None, as result of answer to your question number two.

WILLIAM O. COTTER,
Center Director, Sly Park Civilian Conservation Center.

PLEASANTON, CALIF.,
May 6, 1969.

Per your telegram of May 2, 1969 the following is in response to your questions:

1. Yes employment service arrived approximately April 28.

2. Twenty-six corpsmen interviewed. These were corpsmen who were resigning.

3. Employment service representatives are making copies of information received from resigning corpsmen, during their interview,

relative to their training interests. A copy of this information is then sent to his hometown screener.

4. Advice given by employment service representatives to corpsmen interviewed is to report to the local department of employment upon returning home.

EUGENE R. ALLEN,
Center Director, Parks Job Corps Center
for Men.

COLORADO

PAGOSA SPRINGS, COLO.

Reurtel, May 2. Center received official closure notice April 25. E S counselor team visited center on April 28-29. At my request they interviewed only 38 corpsmen (those who elected to return home). Transfers to other centers being arranged by Washington OEO/Job Corps. No action necessary from E S on those individuals. E S did not work out an individual plan for each trainee but did prepare résumé of individuals qualifications for submission to his local E S office. Also referred trainee to his local E S office for possible placement in job MDTA, NYC, etc.

RANDALL R. HALL,
Center Director, Pagosa Springs Job
Corps Center.

IDAHO

MOUNTAIN HOME, IDAHO,

May 6, 1969.

Following are the answers to the questions contained in your wire of May 2:

1. A team from the Employment Service has visited the center subsequent to the announced closure. They were here on April 29, 30, and May 1.

2. A total of 67 enrollees were interviewed.

3. I do not at this time have any knowledge of specific plans developed for each youngster which would enable him to continue in other manpower programs. Enrollees desiring to remain in Job Corps are being transferred to centers remaining open.

4. Enrollees returning home are being advised to contact the Employment Security Office nearest their home. I do not have any knowledge of a specific plan worked out for them.

JOHN S. BOYLES,
Center Director, Mountain Home Job
Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

GRANGEVILLE, IDAHO,

May 5, 1969.

1. Team of 3 Employment Service representatives and 1 OEO representative visited our center for two days subsequent to the announcement.

2. They personally interviewed 66 CM.

3. They had not developed any plans for placing CM at other centers or in other programs. They interviewed only those who planned to separate from the JC. MDTA is not applicable because most of our CM do not meet the age requirement and are from areas where no MDTA is available. Jobs and training possibilities are not available. Chief Employment Service representative stated that CM would receive letters from their Employment Service advising them to remain in the Job Corps.

4. No plan worked out and no advice given to CM returning home except to remain in JC.

5. Almost all CM are depressed at thought of returning to their home environment. Letter follows.

PAUL McNUTT,
Center Director, Cedar Flats Job Corps
Center.

ILLINOIS

CARTERVILLE, ILL.,

May 5, 1969.

In reply to your telegram that was received May 3, 10:30 a.m., the local Employment Service contact the center by phone subsequent to the announcement of closure to ask

if they could be of help. However, by the time of this contact all corpsmen who wished to terminate from the program had already been sent home. The reason for this early termination was due to the public announcements by radio and TV and newspaper. There was a great deal of unrest among the corpsmen to return to their homes. All Job Corps procedures were followed in regard to terminating. Corpsmen with reference to the Employment Service in their home area. The center director indicated that if in the future the center needed help he would contact the local Employment Service office.

EUGENE STEVENSON,
Center Director, Crab Orchard Job
Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

IOWA

CLINTON, IOWA.

May 3, 1969.

In reply to your May 3 wire regarding placement of terminating Corps women we appreciate you continuing concern for their welfare answering your specific questions.

1. Two representatives from the Employment Service Office are on center each day Monday thru Friday.

2. To date have interviewed 43 of the 760 Corps women on board.

3. Employment Service teams are attempting to formulate plans by phoning Corps women's home area Employment Service Offices examples of plans—XXA—Boys jobs limited to domestic work training not available due to small size community. Will have to relocate when babies health permits.

B—Returning to high school.

C—Contact Employment Service Office no commitment.

D—MDTA business program open if she can pass test. No MDTA for nursing, which was her Job Corps vocational area DA.

E—MDTA business program open if she can pass entrance test. No MDTA for nursing, which was her Job Corps vocational area.

3—Report to Opportunity Center. Clerical jobs appear plentiful.

F—Report to Employment Service Office. No commitment over phone, no training program opened now.

G—CEP, Charles Edgar Paul program, can probably place in employment.

H—Eligible win program.

I—Report to ES Office.

FM—No training program, but possibly employment as nurse aid.

J—Report to YOC very little in training programs, but might be able to place as nurse aid.

K—Go to ES Office; they will get into MDTA or another training program.

L—Planning to open child care center in priority area. Might be opening there.

4. Employment Service advise for Corps women to report to local Employment Service Office or YOC when they return home. Very few specific commitments as above examples indicate. We sincerely hope this information will be valuable and informative to your committee. We are grateful for your continued interest.

DR. WILLIAM A. ATKINS,
Director Job Corps Center for Women,
Clinton, Iowa.

KENTUCKY

In reply to your telegram May 3, 1969 addressed Center Director, Cumberland Gap, he advises me as follows:

"1. Three representatives of the employment service reported to the Center on Wednesday, April 30.

"2. Our counselor states that they have talked with approximately 20 corpsmen.

"3. We are handling all transfers through Mr. Conroy's OEO office. The employment counselors have been very cooperative.

"4. At this point no definite plan has been worked out for any corpsmen. Many of our corpsmen are 16 and 17 years of age and are not eligible for manpower training programs. The counselors also feel that all op-

portunities for training are filled until FY 70. Approximately 43 are transferring and 60 are returning home.

"CUMBERLAND GAP JOB CORPS CIVILIAN
CONSERVATION CENTER,
"CUMBERLAND GAP, KY."

CHARLES S. MARSHALL,
Acting Regional Director, National Park
Service, Richmond, Va.

FRENCHBURG, KY.,
May 5, 1969.

1. Yes.

2. 26.

3. Yes.

4. To report to specific referral organization in their home area in order that other training programs can be made available to them part.

Question 4. Yes in all cases except where a termination corpsman desires to check out his personal possibilities.

DALE FISHER,
Center Director, Frenchburg Job Corps
Civilian Conservation Center.

(For Cumberland Gap Center, see Virginia.)

MAINE

POLAND SPRING, MAINE,

May 5, 1969.

In response to your your telegram of May 2 asking questions concerning employment service representatives, the following answers are submitted: 1. Representatives from employment services have been present at this center since April 24. 2. They have interviewed approximately 15 enrollees who have elected to resign from Job Corps rather than transfer to another Job Corps center. 3. The employment services teams have the responsibility only for arrangements concerning enrollees not wishing to remain in Job Corps. The center, with assistance of Job Corps Headquarters, has the responsibility for arranging transfers of corpswomen to other Job Corps Centers. In other words, employment services representatives will be working only with those young women who choose to resign from Job Corps. It appears that employment services representatives are encountering difficulties in either finding programs or in counseling enrollees to take advantage of available programs. Thank you for the opportunity of testifying before your committee.

ROBERT G. LAKE,
Center Director, Poland Spring Job Corps
Center for Women.

BAR HARBOR, MAINE,

May 6, 1969.

The following is furnished in answer to your telegram of May 2.

1. One employment service representative was on the center April 28 to May 2nd.

2. Twenty one corpsmen were interviewed.

3. Since interviewed fourteen of these corpsmen were returned home at their request. Two were transferred to Breckenridge Job Corps Center and five remain on center.

4. Corpsmen are advised to contact their local employment service office.

No specific plans known.

CLARENCE O. DENSING,
Center Director, Acadia Job Corps Civilian
Conservation Center.

MARYLAND

HAGERSTOWN, MD.,

May 5, 1969.

Ref your telegram info request herewith. (1) 3 members Md. Dept. Employment Security visited center April 28th. They did not have info on placement opportunities avail. Arranged to return on May 6th, asked staff for full résumé of progress of each corpsman from Maryland. (2) None. (3) None to our knowledge. (4) None to our knowledge.

GLENN HILL,
Catoctin Job Corps Civilian Conservation
Center.

MASSACHUSETTS
SOUTH WELLFLEET, MASS.,
May 6, 1969.

Reyrtel May 2nd answer to your questions are:

- 1 A Yes.
- 8 A QR.
- 3 A No, referring to employment organizations at home.
- 4A—Same as 3.
- 4B—No.

ROSS D. HARRISON, JR.,
Acting Center Director, Wellfleet Job Corps, Civilian Conservation Center.

MICHIGAN

MARENISCO, MICH.,
May 5, 1969.

Following is the reply to your questions about employment service assistance to Ojibway:

1. Three people from the employment service spent a total of 4 man days at Ojibway between April 30 and May 2.
 2. They interviewed a total of 28 corpsmen.
 3. No specific plans were developed since the employment service people who came here said they did not have sufficient available information on other programs.
 4. Advice to youngsters returning home is to contact their original screener of the employment service there. No specific plans were worked out for individuals.
- These employment people left on May 2 and indicated they were thru here.

JAMES R. LIST,
Center Director, Job Corps Center Civilian Conservation Center.

CADILLAC, MICH.,
May 3, 1969.

1. Yes, an employemnt team has visited Hoxeyville.
2. 32 Enrollees have been interviewed.
3. The team has been primarily interested in enrollees resigning from the center and have not contacted any that are transferring to other centers.
4. Each enrollee returning home has completed an application form for personal interview, has been instructed relative to location of employment officer in his immediate home area, has been counseled and has been presented a card introducing him to employment counselors. Information is also being mailed to each employment agency involved and a Job Corps form 75 is included. Information has also been requested by the employment service members pertinent to all resignees and all AWOL discharges on and after 4-21-69. They will also receive a copy of JC 75 and this information will also be mailed to employment agencies in area concerned.

FLOYD MARITA,
Center Director, Hoxey Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

MINNESOTA

CASS LAKE, MINN.,
May 5, 1969.

Your telegram asking for specific information concerning this dislocated corpsman has been received in as much as I have been directed to respond to request for information thru normal forest service channels I must inform you that a reply will be prepared explated thru these channels shortly.

WILLIAM MORDEN,
Director, Lydick Lake Civilian Conservation Center.

CASS LAKE, MINN.,
May 6, 1969.

The information below is in response to your telegram to Wm. D. Morden, Center Director, Lydick Lake, concerning corpsmen displaced by the closure of the center:

- "1. One man from the Minnesota State

Employment Security Commission visited the center subsequent to the closure announcement.

"2. All necessary paperwork was completed by center staff prior to the visit. No personal interview was conducted.

"3. ES Representative is referring all corpsmen not from Minnesota to the ES people nearest their home. Those from Minnesota are being handled by the Minnesota Employment Security Commission.

"4. We are not knowledgeable of any specific plans for dislocated corpsmen when they return home. Each corpsman is directed to contact his local ES Representative upon his arrival home.

"LYDICK LAKE JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTER."

CHESTER H. OLSON,
Job Corps Coordinator, U.S. Forest Service, Milwaukee, Wis.

ROCHERT, MINN.,
May 5, 1969.

In reply to your telegram dated May 23rd, the following answers to your questions are: No. 1, yes, No. 2 none, No. 3 (a) specific plans for corpsman wishing to transfer to other Job Corps centers have been made, (b) ES Counselors indicated they could not offer specific programs for corpsman returning to State other than Minnesota. No. 4 (a) they will advise corpsmen who are returning home to report to the local employment security office, (b) no.

DOYLE A. HUGHES,
Center Director Tamarac Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

MISSOURI

St. LOUIS, Mo.,
May 3, 1969.

In reply to your telegram dated May 3, 1969, answer to questions follow: question #1, yes, two people, both are recruits; question #2, 35 enrollees from Tuesday, April 29 to Friday, May 2; questions #3 and #4, St. Louis centers counselors handle transfers. So far no specific alternative plans for the enrollees that are terminating has been worked out. A few girls that desire to relocate have been driven to local gatehouse. No significant results.

ALOYUSUS ANDROLEWICZ,
Director,
St. Louis Job Corps for Women.

POPLAR BLUFF, Mo.,
May 3, 1969.

The answers to your questions in reply to your telegram received today: 1. Yes. 2. 57 to date. 3. 70 of our 200 enrollees will transfer to other Job Corps Centers, the rest will return home. No placement in alternative programs have been made by E.S. at this time. 4. Advice consists of referral to home town E.S. office for hope of placement on U job or other training. No special plans worked out for them. No definite referrals or placements for any youngsters returning home. Our information from a Twx received from O.E.O. office in Kansas City May 2 indicates only five placements of displaced corpsmen as a result of interviews at eight centers.

E. J. VANDERMILLEN,
Center Director, Poplar Bluff Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

NEBRASKA

OMAHA, NEBR.,
May 5, 1969.

Reference your telegram of May 3 re future of Job Corps enrollees. . . . Replies to your questions follow:

1. No; however, the director for unemployment for the State of Nebraska, Mr. Keith Myers, has volunteered whatever support is needed to make the transition orderly. One representative from his office is available to counsel students who elect to return home

rather than be transferred to other Job Corps centers.

2. Twenty-six as of this date.

3. The ES representative talks mainly to those electing to leave the Job Corps program. He acquaints each departee with the local manpower program available in her community. The center, as a representative of the OEO has been handling all transfers to other JC centers.

4. Each is handled on an individual basis as previously stated, they advise them concerning job opportunities available in their home community and other federally sponsored manpower programs for which they are eligible.

L. H. GLAAB,
Acting Center Director, Omaha Women's Job Corps Center.

NEVADA

CARSON CITY, NEV.,
May 3, 1969.

The following information is submitted in response to your telegram to the Clear Creek Job Corps Center, Carson City, Nevada, regarding employment service assistance to relocating corpsmen because of center closures.

1. Clear Creek has had excellent relations with employment service personnel since 1965. Employment service personnel have visited the center on several occasions but specific visits were not made to the center immediately prior to or after our announced closure.

2. A person from employment security has been on the center during the past week. I estimate he has personally interviewed about 80 youths.

3. It is my understanding that the development of specific alternatives for each youth departing the center presents a complex situation to local employment service personnel. I am confident that at this time specific alternative plans for all individuals concerned have not been formed relative to actual placement in other manpower programs or transfers to other Job Corps centers. For corpsmen wishing to transfer to other Job Corps centers I anticipated some difficulties in matching a youth current training area and interests with comparable opening in receiving centers.

4. Resigning youths are being advised to go to their local employment service offices when they arrive home for placement in other training programs. I am not aware of the extent of the training programs available in a youth's home area nor the time factors which might be involved in actual placement if openings are available. To my knowledge local employment service personnel who are working with us do not know what actually is available to the youth when he returns home in most cases because of the number of areas involved. If we can be of further assistance please advise.

GEORGE M. SMITH,
Center Director, Clear Creek Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

NEW JERSEY

EDISON, N.J.,
May 5, 1969.

We are pleased to supply the following in answer to your questions:

1. Yes, they arrived and began work on April 29th with a daily average of 8 persons interviewing, departure date is unknown.

2. Team has interviewed 275 graduates to date out of a possible 471 corpsmen those are to graduate Kilmer during May they are giving graduates priority in interview since many of those terminating choose not to be interviewed by employment service they have only seen 62 out of 137 who have chosen not to transfer and are not eligible to graduate 200 corpsmen are presently AWOL most of whom will possibly not return for interview by employment service.

3. OEO is offering corpsmen transfer to Atterbury or Breckinridge employment services main interest is in placing May graduates they are referring terminees other than graduates to local employment services offices for future placement effort.

4. They are urging each corpsmen returning home to contact employment service representatives as soon as possible after arrival. I trust these answers will be of value if I can be of other service please let me know.

WEBBER,

Center Director, Kilmer Job Corps Center for Men.

NEW MEXICO

GRANTS, N. MEX.,
May 5, 1969.

In reference your telegram this date;

- (1) Yes.
- (2) 30 enrollees personally interviewed.
- (3) No.
- (4) They have set up interviews with employment service vocational counselors when they return home.

Thank you for your concern,

D. M. BIRD,

Center Director, Grants Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

LAS VEGAS, N. MEX.,
May 3, 1969.

In reply your telegram May 2, 1969:

1. Yes.
2. Twenty-two corpsmen they did interview.
3. No only to one corpsmen.
4. Their advice was to stay in Job Corps program. No specific plans worked out.

MAURICE MARCHBANKS,

Luna Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center.

MOUNTAINAIR, N. MEX.,
May 6, 1969.

Re your telegraphic request of May 2 1969.

1. yes, a team of three members from New Mexico State Employment Service spent six days on this center.
2. the esp personally interviewed 38 enrollees.
3. no. 4. the esp has encouraged all corpsmen to remain in job corp. Corpsmen who do not want a transfer and would be terminated were interviewed and a card filled out for the es office.

They do not have precise plans for the terminating corpsmen.

CHARLES R. HARTGRAVES,

Center Director, Mountainair Civilian Conservation Center.

MESCALERO, N. MEX.

Reference your telegram to me dated May 2, 1969. The information you requested is furnished below in the same sequence as the questions asked:

1. A team of two interviewers and one counselor visited the 8-canyon center subsequent to the announcement of its closure.
2. All enrollees at the center ie 128 have been personally interviewed.
3. Specific alternative plans which would enable youngsters to complete training at another job corps center or some other manpower program have not been developed because suitable openings are not available.
4. Advice given to youngsters who have indicated interest in returning home is to stay in job corps and transfer to another center. They have advised corpsmen who prefer to return home to enroll in a manpower program, if possible, or attempt to find a job. Specific programs have not been worked out for corpsmen returning home.

Copies of this wire have been furnished bureau of Indian affairs area and Washington offices.

CLARK STANTON,
Center Director,
Eight-Canyon Job Corps.

CXV—775—Part 9

NORTH DAKOTA

DICKINSON, N. DAK.,
May 6, 1969.

I have received your request for information on phasing corpsmen out of the Job Corps program. The following answers to your questions are given so that you may evaluate the progress being made in placement of corpsmen either in other training programs or specific development plans. (1) A B team from the employment service has visited the center and worked with corpsmen who do not want to continue Job Corps training, during the past week they have interviewed nine corpsmen for additional training or job replacement outside the Job Corps. In all cases no specific plans for placement have been developed. They are to continue with these interviews on May 5. It is hoped that remaining 50 will be interviewed for placement and development of specific plans this week.

EDWIN R. BUTLER,
Acting Center Director.

OHIO

PEDRO, OHIO,
May 5, 1969.

Reference your telegram 5/2:

1. Team from Ohio employment service is scheduled to visit the center beginning noon May 5th.
2. Expected that they will interview approximately forty Corpsmen.
3. A Mr. Curtin from Columbus office has informed me by phone that they will only be able to place Ohio Corpsmen. They will send information on out of State Corpsmen back to local employment offices.
4. I am not able to answer this at this time if you wish I will keep you informed on this point in item 3 as interviews are held and information becomes available.

PAUL R. NATALE,

Vesuvius Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, Pedro, Ohio.

PORT CLINTON, OHIO,
May 5, 1969.

Reference to telegram, May 3: 1. One Job Corps screener out of Cleveland, Ohio; three State of Ohio mobile employment unit workers and one State of Ohio Job Corps coordinator were here on center April 29 thru May 2nd. The Job Corps screener and the three mobile employment unit workers will return on Monday, May 5th. 2. This team has personally interviewed 41 enrollees of the 78 scheduled to terminate. 3. Each team member has made contact with the Employment Service office in each enrollees hometown. Request for allotment of specific training and/or vocational rehabilitation slots have been channelled thru the Employment Service in each enrollees hometown. This procedure has been followed also where specific job contacts have been made transfers are being channelled by O.E.O. 4. Enrollees under 18 years of age have been advised to enter a program at home or return to school. Efforts are being made to obtain jobs for those enrollees 18 years and over. 4A. There was no significant plan arranged for placement of young men, especially those outside of the State of Ohio, altho they contacted the screeners of all corpsmen who desired to go home or be placed. There was fair success in finding placement. To get an overall picture other centers should be contacted.

JOHN L. FULBRIGHT, JR.,
Center Director, Ottawa Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, Port Clinton, Ohio.

OKLAHOMA

SULPHUR, OKLA., May 5, 1969.

1. Team from E. S. here seven working days. A conscientious team, concerned about what to do with C/M and staff.

2. No. C/M originally desiring to go home 26 team interviewed approx.—20 gone or going home as a result—10 all other C/M desire Job Corps program.

3. No C/M going home must contact local E.S. for jobs or training. Only local E.S. knows availability of such local opportunities. Above calls made. Nothing firmed up. Local E.S. agreed to provide usual service with preferential treatment.

2. No. Their only advice was to contact local E.S. counselor when they arrive home.

Thanks for your interest in worthwhile program. Program successful by showing it has corrected many deficiencies but has been treated by unfavorable political action at all levels. Center has 93 C/M Friday AM—Center placed one C/M on job Friday. Present now at Center 92.

Result of closure announcement: Lost or AWOL—13; resignations—4; medical discharges—2.

EDWARD C. RODRIGUEZ, JR.,
Arbuckle Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, Sulphur, Okla.

HEAVENER, OKLA., May 5, 1969.

Here are the answers to your questions concerning assistance rendered terminating our corpsmen:

1. Yes.
2. 45, a number of these have decided to stay in Job Corps.
3. No.
4. (A) To report to the local employment office at home when specific plans can be formulated. (B) No.

We appreciate your interest and concern for the future of these boys.

BENNIE R. WOODS,
Center Director, Hodgen Job Corps Civilian Conservation Center, Hodgen, Okla.

OREGON

TILLAMOOK, OREG.,
May 5, 1969.

Below are answers to questions in your telegram of May 2, 1969: 1. Employment Service team arrived Tuesday April 29th. Center received a call on Friday April 25 for arrangements to visit following week. Concerning closure we have not received any official statement from the Department of the Interior. The situation is confusing. Center received telegram from Secretary of Labor indicating plans for closure. Mr. Peet (Manpower Admin.) telegram indicated 5 urban centers to be closed, and E.S. counselors to arrive at urban centers. At bottom of this telegram statement indicated conservation centers would receive notification on May 1st. OEO informed centers of proposed visit by Employment Service team. Specified team should talk only to corpsmen desiring not to transfer.

First two paragraphs of Kenneth Robertson, regional Manpower Admin. to Russ Morgan, Commissioner, Dept. of Labor, Salem, Oregon, were as quoted "The following Job Corps centers are now in the process of being deactivated and are scheduled to close in three weeks: Alpine, Kingman, San Carlos, Sly Park, Toyon, Los Pinos, Koko Head, Cedar Flats, Mountain Home, Clear Creek, Malheur, Tillamook, Cispus, and Moses Lake. Department of Labor commitment for services to Job Corps enrollees in centers being deactivated is now modified to provide transfer to another center for any Job corpsman who desires it even if this necessitates providing additional bed capacity in remaining centers.

"Therefore you are requested to immediately provide as counselor teams to report for duty in the above centers no later than Thursday morning, April 24. Counselor teams should be instructed as follows: "Tillamook Center was made a conference call with Employment Service representative present to

Job Corps headquarters on April 29 to clarify situation. Job Corps headquarters stated: "Headquarters office was handling all transfer of 448 vacancies 447 filled and would inform centers as vacancies occurred."

2. 37 enrollees interviewed on Tuesday, April 29 thru Thursday, May 1st. The Employment Service team departed the center Thursday, May 1 when it was mutually agreed upon that their exact function was certainly unclear. The Employment Service team was willing to delay any of their activities with corpsmen until the center director was informed as to their exact reason for being sent to the Job Corps center.

3. This question certainly makes clear the role that the center director had in mind for the employment service team to be concerned with; however the employment service team had no specific plans to implement upon arrival at the center. They informed the corpsmen that the employment service had nothing to do with transfer to other centers and that it was very doubtful if any federal training program would be available to them at this time.

The employment service teams only plan upon arriving on the center was to interview corpsmen who were terminating and filling out a Form 511 which is the regular job application used in applying for work with the employment service. No definite referrals were made, and the corpsmen are told to report to the employment service for job assistance when arriving home.

4. The corpsmen returning home were told (A) report to the employment service with Form 511. (B) it is doubtful if any M.D.T.A. or other training programs are available at this time. (C) it is doubtful if unskilled Job Corps returnees without a G.E.D. certificate will be able to find sound employment at this time.

No specific plan—except for the definite confusion, and uncertainty on the part of the Job Corps terminees and the center staff who feels a responsibility to the corpsmen.

It should be noted that the employment service team were definitely sympathetic about the decision to close Job Corps centers, because they had functioned as Job Corps screeners for the past seven years. They expressed regret as to the assignment they had been given.

RICHARD W. SCHLACHTER,
Director, Tillamook Job Corps Civilian
Conservation Center, Tillamook, Oreg.

BURNS, OREG.,
This replies to your communication of 5-3-69. Advised all congressional inquiries relating to legislation must be coordinated through the Secretary of Interior. Would appreciate submitting your requests to that office.

MALHEUR JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CONSER-
VATION CENTER.

PENNSYLVANIA

WARREN, PA.,
May 5, 1969.

Reference your telegram to Blue Jay Center Director William Erickson. As of May 5 no employment service personnel have visited Blue Jay subsequent to closure announcement. Consequently replies to all other questions are negative.

RALPH H. FREEMAN,
Supervisor, Blue Jay Job Corps Civilian
Conservation Center, Warren, Pa.

TENNESSEE

TOWNSEND, TENN.,
May 5, 1969.

Regarding your telegram of May 2, 1969:
1. A team from the employment service composed of five members has visited our center.

2. Interviewed approximately thirty corpsmen.

3. Have not developed specific alternative.

O.E.O. is making provisions for transfer of corpsmen who wish to transfer.

4. Very little advice to youngsters returning home. Did take applications and gathered information about the corpsmen's interest and ability.

To date they have placed one corpsman.
CARROLL OGLE,

Center Director, Tremont Job Corps Civilian
Conservation Center, Townsend,
Tenn.

TEXAS

CONROE, TEX.,
May 5, 1969.

Your inquiry by telegram received on May 5 is answered accordingly:

1. Yes.
2. 23 corpsmen have been interviewed.
3. No, they are being referred to menial type jobs in accordance with the type of training they have had. Many are not employable.
4. They are advising the corpsmen to stay in the program.

No. They are only referring these corpsmen to local employment services, no specific plan of action is being worked out.

NEW WAVERLY JOB CORPS CIVILIAN CON-
SERVATION CENTER.

UTAH

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
May 6, 1969.

In reply to your telegram of May 3, 1969:
1. Employment service personnel visited our center.

2. They interviewed forty-six out of 90 corpsmen who expressed interest in terminating from Job Corps. They have scheduled interviews for the remaining corpsmen prior to their departure from our center.

3. No, specific plans have not been developed which will enable corpsmen to continue their training. Employment service staff have made contact with corpsmen's home town employment office but only about five actual placements have been made. The majority of these have been to the neighborhood youth corps which is primarily financial assistance rather than training. So far, OEO has been scheduling transfers to other Job Corps centers adequately. It is interesting to note that most corpsmen do not meet entrance criteria for manpower development training act programs. Also, these programs seem to be full. Employment service staff in corpsmen's home towns seem extremely reluctant to make any firm commitments as to placements. One man, in fact, refused to give his name to the E.S. man who was working here. The usual extent of the phone call is that (1) the hometown employment service man will say, "Have the boy stop in when he gets home and I'll talk with him." It has been difficult to get more definite statements. Referrals then are just the name of an employment service man the corpsman is to see when he arrives home.

4. The employment service people working at our center have been cooperative. They have attempted to effect placement for corpsmen who want to terminate. They have also encouraged all corpsmen to stay in Job Corps and transfer to a surviving center. The problem seems to be in the corpsmen's home communities. Training programs either do not exist, are full, or are not designed for the segment of the poverty population that is in Job Corps.

EARL G. INGRAM,
Center Director, Casile Valley Job Corps
Civilian Conservation Center, Utah.

WASHINGTON

MOSES LAKE, WASH., May 5, 1969.

I should be happy to answer in as far as possible the question you put to me on May 2 in your telegram concerning employment services actions centered around the closure

of this center. Employment office personnel from Moses Lake and Spokane have met with me to discuss their instructions concerning what part they should play in the closure of the center. Their instructions are similar to the instructions sent to us by J. N. Peet, manpower administrator. The main exception was that the following paragraph was deleted from their teletype instructions:

Department of Labor commitment for services to Job Corps enrollees in center being deactivated is now modified to provide transfer to another center for any Job Corpsman who desires to even if this necessitates providing additional bed capacity in remaining centers.

Additional references to the Department of Labor commitments to assure transfers to another center for each trainee who desires it were deleted from their instructions. My discussions with Labor representatives center around theirs and my general lack of knowledge concerning the placement of Job Corpswomen in training programs in or near their homes. Our corpswomen wish to stay in Job Corps and volunteered when they signed up to complete their training. The agreement we reached was that I would let them know when they should return to the center to carry out instructions they received from their regional office.

Employment services personnel have not interviewed any enrollees because we had not received specific notification via our contracting officer that the contract to operate the Moses Lake Job Corps Center for Women had in fact been terminated 3/4. Employment services personnel were quite in the dark and agreed with me that no plans should be made until more specific instructions, plans and tentative solutions to the dilemma had been ascertained.

As a matter of interest to you and the committee, we have had no more than normal attrition since the garbled announcements and information first started on April 17 until May 1. We have had 4 medical terminations, 8 transfers to JC/XW throughout the country, 2 transfers to other centers, 8 graduates, 5 disciplinary discharges, 1 administrative discharge, 38 voluntary terminations per request of the parents. We normally have an input and output of 60 per month.

If you require further information please feel free to contact me and I will try to supply what I can.

NEIL W. SHERMAN,
Center Director, Moses Lake Job Corps
Center for Women, Moses Lake, Wash.

RANDLE, WASH.,

May 5, 1969.

Ref your wire of 5-5-69 we share your concern for the corpsmen who will be displaced by the closure of Cispus. We are actively working with responsible federal and state agencies to minimize this impact. Answers to your specific questions are as follows: 1. Yes. 2. All corpsmen at the center have been counseled and advised by the counselors assigned from the State employment service. 3. No, they were unable to develop a specific plan for each individual due to the uncertainty of available program in corpsmen's home area or the specific training program vacancies available at other Job Corps centers. 4. Each corpsman was advised to contact his local employment service representative upon returning home. Again they were unable to work up a specific plan for each corpsman.

LARRAYA FELLOWS,
Center Director, Cispus Civilian Con-
servation Center, Randle, Wash.

WEST VIRGINIA

WHITE SULPHUR SPRINGS, W. VA.,

May 5, 1969.

Reference your telegram to George Kreger May 3, 1969. Following information is submitted.

Question 1. Has a team from the employment service visited your center subsequent to the announcement that it was to be closed.

Answer. On April 29, 1969 two persons from W. Va. Bureau of Employment Security visited center to interview W. Va. trainees. A total of 7 corpsmen were involved.

Question 2. How many of your enrollees have they personally interviewed.

Answer. A total of seven corpsmen have been interviewed.

Question 3. Have they at this point developed specific alternative plan for each youngster which will enable him to continue training either at another Job Corps center or in some other manpower program.

Answer. The corpsmen interviewed were encouraged to accept transfer to another center because neither jobs nor other program placements were available. The corpsmen were told that finances were not available to support manpower programs.

Question 4. What is their advice to the youngsters who indicate they are returning home. Do they have a specific plan worked out for them.

Answer. They were advised to stay at Job Corps because no other programs were available.

GEORGE F. KREGER,
Center Director, Anthony Job Corps
Civilian Conservation Center, White
Sulphur Springs, W. Va.

HUNTINGTON, W. VA.,
May 5, 1969.

Re your telegram 5-3-69 a team of U.S.E.S. personnel were in Huntington center last week interviewing graduates and corpswomen who did not want to transfer to another center. Only thing done was to fill out a Form 511 work application and a resume which will be sent back to uses in corpswomen's home area the corpswomen were instructed to contact local uses office upon return hopefully, but questionably efforts would be made to place either in work situation or other labor department programs. Majority of corpswomen are being transferred to other job corps centers. We are handling this ourselves 55 graduates were to have been interviewed by U.S.E.S.

WILLARD H. DUETTING,
Center Director, Huntington Womens
Job Corps, Huntington, W. Va.

WISCONSIN
PARK FALLS, WIS.,
May 5, 1969.

The following is in reply to your request for information of employment service:

1. A team of seven men from Wisconsin State Employment Service visited center on April 24, 25, 28 & 29.

2. State employment interviewed approximately 70 Corpsmen planning to terminate Job Corps program.

3. Tentative plans were developed for all Corpsmen terminating for either other training programs such as MDTA or possible employment. In most cases Corpsmen were advised to continue Job Corps training. However majority interviewed chose to return home.

4. Specific plans were difficult to prepare due to the lack of information on training programs or possible employment in other States. Employment Service counselors prepared necessary forms and contracted employment service in the youths home town.

R. F. MUMMU,
Center Director, Clam Lake Job Corps
Civilian Conservation Center, Clam
Lake, Wis.

WYOMING
CASPER, WYO.,
May 5, 1969.

The following are answers by number to your question received via Western Union May 5, 1969:

1. Yes.
2. 17 to date.
3. MDTA referent—2 employment possibilities good—7 number training program available—7 return to public school—1 rest of corpsmen remain at center pending disposition.

4. A. Make immediate contact with employment service, Gatehouse, or YOC; B. Specific plans listed in three.

J. D. ANDERSON,
Center Director, Casper Civilian Conservation, Casper, Wyo.

Mr. CRANSTON. I should like to add that I have here copies of each of the 52 telegrams, and I invite any Senator who wishes to examine them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield back all remaining time except for 2 minutes, which we shall hold in reserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I think that the wires which the distinguished Senator from California has alluded to are quite understandable, and are not unusual. These people are administrators and employees in some of the camps being closed and obviously they feel that their jobs may be at stake. That is a perfectly normal reaction.

The point is, as I have suggested before, Mr. President, and in great detail on the floor of the Senate yesterday: We are not doing the job. We have had difficulty; in fact, the quotas have not been filled.

In 1968, 90,000 youths were recruited; 73,000 entered the Job Corps program, but 17,000 never even showed up at a camp. The eligibility criteria were unavailable for 27,000 of the remaining 73,000 trainees. Of the 46,000 for whom data was available, however, approximately 10,000 did not meet Job Corps own eligibility requirements.

This shows that 22 percent of Job Corps trainees last year did not meet the eligibility requirements. Even so, however, only 68 percent of the quotas for men's camps were filled.

It seems to me that these are very important facts for us to consider. I should like to point out also that the funds for manpower training programs administered by the Department of Labor will be increased from \$1.9 billion to a proposed \$2.3 billion in fiscal 1970. This is so even though \$100 million is being taken away from the Job Corps program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PROUTY. I yield myself 30 seconds.

I should also like to point out that the Secretary of Labor has made it very clear that, even with the reduced level at the Job Corps program, 5,700 more slots will be available in manpower training programs for out of school youth in fiscal 1970 than were available in fiscal 1969.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on Monday of last week I made a statement on the floor of the Senate listing my reasons for supporting Senate Resolution 194, which expresses the sense of the Senate that any action to close Job Corps camps should be deferred until

Congress has had an opportunity to review the Job Corps program and decide upon legislation which would extend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, and appropriations for that program.

I rise today to discuss more fully one of the reasons I listed at that time. That reason concerns the inadequacies of alternative manpower programs that the administration proposes for young men that previously would have gone to Job Corps centers. As I pointed out in my statement last week, and during the hearings that the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty held on the closing of the Job Corps centers, the alternative manpower programs are serving people who, on the average, are older and better educated than those who are going to Job Corps conservation centers. For example, 60 percent of the MDTA trainees are aged 22 and above, compared to only 5 percent of the conservation corpsmen, and 45 percent of the MDTA trainees have a 12th grade education or more compared to only 7 percent of the conservation corpsmen. Similarly, in the Concentrated Employment Program (CEP) 64 percent of the participants are 22 years old or older, compared to 5 percent of the conservation corpsmen, and 25 percent of the CEP participants are high school graduates compared to only 7 percent of the Job Corpsmen. Statistics for the JOBS program show the same picture—56 percent of the participants are aged 22 or above, compared to only 5 percent of the conservation corpsmen, and 33 percent of the JOBS participants are high school graduates, compared to only 7 percent of the conservation corpsmen.

This information, and an understanding of the limited services provided by these alternative manpower programs, strongly suggest that these programs simply are not equipped, or accustomed to, dealing with the hard-core deprived young man who needs Job Corps training.

Moreover, the hearings of the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty revealed that very important information concerning the effectiveness of these alternative manpower programs simply does not exist. When Secretary Shultz appeared before the committee, he used statistics concerning the retention rate of the Job Corps, and the placement rate of the Job Corps program. I asked him at that time if he could provide us with similar information for all the other manpower programs administered by his Department, so that we could get an idea of how they compare with the Job Corps.

The information he was able to supply for the record unfortunately is incomplete. Data was not available regarding the retention rate of three of the alternative manpower programs—New Careers, Work Incentive Program, and Concentrated Employment Program—and information was not available on the placement success record of six of the alternative manpower programs—the In-School Neighborhood Youth Corps, Operation Mainstream, New Careers, Work Incentive Program, Concentrated Employment Program, and the JOBS program.

I asked a similar question of the Honorable Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, when he testified before the subcommittee concerning the GAO review of the Job Corps program. The information he supplied for the record was even more incomplete. It contained no factual information on the effectiveness of any of the alternative programs. It was simply a description of the goals of these programs. I ask unanimous consent that that portion of his reply directed to my question concerning the effectiveness of alternative programs for dealing with hard-core deprived children appear at this point in my remarks.

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

CHARACTERISTICS OF OTHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

We believe 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 community. On the other hand we also believe it possible that a certain number of youths of the type that have been served by Job Corps could be as well served and possibly at a lower cost by one of the various other manpower training programs designed to assist the underemployed or unemployed, low skilled and disadvantaged. A schedule of program characteristics for selected training programs administered by the Department of Labor, and of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity follows:

Program	Target population	Program offerings
MDTA institutional.....	Adults and youths unemployed under employed, low skilled, disadvantaged obsolescent skilled.	Vocational training ¹ , prevocational education, basic education.
MDTA, part-time and other than skill.....	do.....	Do.
MDTA, on-the-job training (OJT).....	do.....	Vocational training.
MDTA, coupled.....	do.....	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
MDTA, experimental and demonstration (E. & D.).	Hard-to-reach; disadvantaged youth, hardcore unemployed; older workers; minority groups.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, other supportive services.
MDTA, training for redevelopment area residents.	Adults and youths, unemployed and under employed in redevelopment areas.	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
Concentrated employment program (CEP).	Adults and youths, hard-core unemployed, and disadvantaged in selected areas.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, other supportive services.
Special impact (Kennedy-Javits).....	Adults and youths, unemployed and below poverty level in urban poverty areas.	Vocational training, work experience, other supportive services.
Job Corps.....	Disadvantaged youth 14 to 21.....	Basic education, prevocational education, vocational training, work experience, other supportive services.
Neighborhood Youth Corps (out of school).	Dropouts age 16 and over, poverty families.....	Basic education, prevocational education, vocational training, work experience, ¹ other supportive services.
Vocational education.....	Anyone who can benefit from vocational education.	Vocational training, ¹ prevocational education, basic education.
Work incentive program (WIN).....	AFDC recipients 16 and over who are not in school.	Vocational training, prevocational education, basic education, work experience, other supportive services.
Job opportunities in the business sector (JOBS).	Poor persons not having suitable employment and who are one of the following: (1) school dropouts, (2) under 22, (3) 45 years and over, (4) handicapped, and (5) subject to special obstacles.	Vocational training, basic education, other supportive services.

¹ Indicates primary offerings, if any.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in view of the lack of information about the effectiveness of alternative manpower programs for those now served by the Job Corps, the administration's decision to close 59 Job Corps centers is premature. For this reason, and for the other reasons I described in my statement last Monday, I urge passage of the Senate Resolution 194.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I believe very strongly that President Nixon is making a tragic error in closing 59 of the 109 Job Corps centers. One of the centers to be closed is located in the State of Utah—the Castle Valley Conservation Center, near Price. It is a good center doing a good job.

The question at issue is: Is this Nation more anxious to save a few dollars than it is to save young people?

The young people for whom the Job Corps program was designed are among the most disadvantaged in our society. The Job Corps has been their chance to climb up from the lowest rung—without such help most of them will be returned to their life of hopelessness and despair and some of them undoubtedly to a life of crime. These citizens might well be more costly to society in the long run as

welfare recipients and as criminals than they ever would as Job Corps enrollees. With Job Corps training many of them would become contributing members of society—paying us through the jobs they do and the taxes they pay for our investment now in the Job Corps.

The Nixon administration says it hopes the 13,000 trainees who will be thrown back on society with no training by reason of the closing of the Job Corps centers will be absorbed into existing manpower training programs. This is faulty reasoning. The manpower training programs were established mainly for those who once had jobs, but have been displaced by technology or for some other reason, and need new training and skills. The Job Corps, on the other hand, as the Washington Post has so well pointed out, "is a human renewal program, a last stand try at reclaiming the broke and broken youth when other programs cannot or would not take over."

I am almost willing to predict that if we close down our Job Corps camps now, we will soon be looking for some other means of helping the most deeply disadvantaged youth in our society. We cannot turn our backs upon them—not

on humanitarian grounds and not on economic grounds. It is in our best interests to try to turn them into contributing members of our society. We have a great problem here to solve and we might as well face up to it now.

I support Senate Resolution 194.

In conclusion, I ask unanimous consent to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD some of the letters I have received from the State of Utah protesting the closing of the Job Corps centers generally and Castle Valley Job Corps Center near Price, Utah, specifically. They speak more eloquently than I could of how seriously these closings will affect both the enrollees and the communities nearby.

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

STATE OF UTAH,
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND WELFARE,
April 17, 1969.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Through the news media we have learned that the Castle Valley Job Corps at Price, Utah is to be closed down in the very near future along with other camps. While the Job Corps has been here, I have had the opportunity to personally observe many of the Corpsmen.

The general public does not understand that these young men come from very deprived situations. When they arrive, the majority are unable to read, but if they can, they read on a second or third grade level. They have already miserably failed in the regular schools. They have a low self-image and have had very few satisfying experiences in life. These Corpsmen come from homes with all kinds of social problems; parents with emotional problems or mental illness, parents who are mentally retarded, parents with alcoholic problems, parents with inadequate personalities, or parents who are living in extreme poverty. These parents have been unable to raise their children, unable to provide a healthy, normal life so that they can become contributing members of society.

Because of these problems, it is necessary to place these youth in a special program where they can be taught personal cleanliness, how to dress appropriately, how to get along with their peers, how to accept responsibility, how to work, etc.

I realize that it is expensive to operate the Job Corps, but it is always costly to educate, train, and rehabilitate underprivileged, deprived individuals. It takes employees who have patience, understanding, who can demand respect, but are able to establish a relationship with these youth who may have never found it possible to feel close to or trust anyone. It requires personnel who recognize human dignity and the ultimate potential of the deprived individual.

Even with this type of program it still is not possible to reach and rehabilitate every person, but I believe that the percentage has been fairly good at the Castle Valley Camp. I have observed the changes in behavior and attitude of these young people after a few months. The Corpsmen always look clean and well dressed when they come to town. They have done many beneficial things for the community such as clean up programs, painting, and cleaning churches, fighting fires, etc. As they have been able to accomplish, win awards, or approval, they have gained self-respect. One year the youth contributed from their meager earnings and prepared and delivered Thanksgiving food baskets to eighteen of our Welfare families. I feel that the Job Corps has been fairly well accepted by our community although

at the beginning, there was much opposition to the program.

I feel that we should provide preventive programs for younger children such as the Head Start Program is doing, but I also feel we cannot forget about the youth the Job Corps has been working with. These are problems that the public cannot afford to overlook because if they are ignored now, society will eventually pay by supporting these individuals as they get involved in crime, marry and they end up on Welfare rolls, in prisons, or in mental hospitals, etc.

Will you please do what you can to keep the Job Corps from being eliminated as the Program has been proven in helping many young people from deprived minority groups as well as those who come from economically and emotionally impoverished homes. I would suggest an evaluation to see if elimination of waste or better methods of management might reduce expenses yet still provide the Corpsmen the necessities and allowing them to live as other young people in the community.

Respectfully submitted,

EVELYN ROBERTS,
Director, Carbon County Welfare Division.

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS,
Price, Utah, April 14, 1969.

HON. FRANK E. MOSS,
Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: We, the Board of County Commissioners of Carbon County, strongly object to and protest the phasing out of the Job Corps Conservation Centers and especially the Castle Valley Center located near Price. This center has been very valuable both to conservation programs of the Bureau of Land Management and assistance to local governments, cities, towns and counties in their recreation and public works programs. They have been especially valuable to Carbon County on the development of our local recreation projects such as rodeo grounds, race tracks, fair grounds and recreation area at Scofield Reservoir, and they have advised of their willingness to help in other contemplated projects. They have assisted the cities and towns in all their conservation programs such as Price City in reclaiming land for cemetery extension and in drainage in the south part of Price which is a mosquito infested area.

We strongly feel that the discontinuance of this program is ill-timed and will cause a sending back and retention of many young dropouts in their troubled community which to us seems to be an invitation to further the disastrous conditions in our cities and an insult to the young Americans that are trying to improve their lot so that they can secure employment in private enterprise.

We believe that everyone in the Congress should take a strong look at this program and continue with the good work which has been experienced with the local Castle Valley Job Corps Center.

Sincerely yours,
J. ARNOLD MATHIS, Chairman.
WALTER H. MAYNARD, Commissioner.
HECTOR CHIARA, Commissioner.

CARBON COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
April 15, 1969.

HON. SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SEN. MOSS: The Board of Governors of the Carbon County Chamber of Commerce wish to protest the removal of the Castlevalley Job Corp from this area.

Since it's beginning the Castlevalley Job Corp has designed it's programs to fit into the needs and responsibilities of the community. This cannot be done successfully in an urban center.

The economic effect the removal of this camp would have on the people of this area would at this time be disastrous. There is no

industry here that would be able to handle the thirty or more families this would directly effect. The absorption of the rest of the governmental staff would create a problem in itself. Where would these boys find a camp with the proper American ideals taught and displayed here? We feel that this camp has been a valuable example of the personal growth and development of the young men whom a tired society has almost forgotten.

We cannot believe that the removal of camps such as the Castlevalley Job Corp is the solution to a hundred million dollar problem. We feel that a more detailed study of the different camp situations would alleviate much of the expensive mistakes now being made and that a more realistic viewpoint on the wages paid in accordance to the surrounding areas would make a smaller financial cost to each camp program.

Yours very truly,
MACK A. JOHNSON,
President, Carbon County Chamber of Commerce.

PRICE MUNICIPAL CORP.,
Price, Utah, April 15, 1969.

HON. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senator,
New Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I am writing the following letter to you to express my own concern and the unanimous feeling of the other members of the City Council of Price City, Utah.

The last few days we have heard over the T.V. broadcasts and read in the newspapers of the curtailment of the Job Corps program throughout the United States. Our concern is with the proposed closing of the Castle Valley Job Corps Center located near Price, Utah.

The Job Corps camp near Price, Utah, has been completed, in its construction, and has been handling in excess of 200 Job Corps trainees. When this camp was first proposed and established, I, like other people of this community, had certain misgivings concerning such a camp; however, since its initiation we have observed the results with considerable satisfaction. Beyond any question the program has been worthwhile in training some of the more unfortunate youths of our society. We would strongly endorse the retention of this camp.

It appears that the proposal contemplates closing down certain camps and opening and constructing new ones near urban centers. This would certainly be a gross waste of money in view of the large expenditure made in constructing and completing the present camp near our City.

The other matters that concern us in our area by the contemplated closing of this camp would be the economic impact that its closing would have on our area. You no doubt recall the many meetings that we have held in order to develop some industry in this area to alleviate our depressed economic condition. The establishment of the Job Corps camp in our area contributed greatly in alleviating that economic condition. There are 37 full time employees at said camp who are local residents. In addition, there are approximately 15 more who came in from other localities but who presently reside in this area. In addition the purchases made from local merchants of materials and supplies for the operation of said camp and the expenditures of camp trainees while in town all have gone towards stabilizing the economy of this area. Though we are still classified as a depressed area the above camp has assisted greatly in creating a little economic stability. The closing of said camp would again start us down the road of decline economically.

I ask your assistance in doing whatever may be possible to retain the Castle Valley Job Corps Training Center in this area.

Respectfully yours,
MURRAY MATHIS,
Mayor.

SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH,
April 13, 1969.

HON. FRANK E. MOSS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TED: For months, I have intended to write you a note, telling you of my personal approval and satisfaction of your conduct as my Senator. I am proud of the way you represent my interests, and hereby pledge my active support to your expected reelection next year.

The reason for this note at this moment is to express my intense concern over the "Nixonizing" of Job Corps the past few days. Today, I listened to Dr. Arthur Burns pontificate over CBS, which raised my blood pressure considerably.

The truth is that the Nixon crowd have almost no comprehension of the problems Job Corps is handling, and the human problems of the Corpsmen who are assigned to Conservation Centers such as Castle Valley, in Price, I know the problems, for I worked with these young fellows for 24 months, before returning to the University last September.

In case any hearings are held by the Senate concerning this destruction of so much of Job Corps, I would like to make my views and experiences known. If hearings are in this part of the country I would be happy to testify in person, in favor of Job Corps in general, and Castle Valley specifically. If it weren't for the costs of transportation (which, as a student I cannot afford), I would be happy and eager to testify in person in Washington.

Dr. Burns today indicated that conservation centers didn't do vocational training. That is a false charge! Half the time of the Corpsman is devoted to developing work skills; the other half to education. Dr. Burns and his cohorts are apparently assuming that the basic work habits and education of Conservation Center Corpsmen is far higher than they are. These critics seem unable to comprehend that we have to spend a great deal of time teaching the elementary, basic work habits, such as report to work on time, and properly dressed, before we can work on a skill. We have to teach a third of the Corpsmen individual letters and sounds before we can teach them how to read simple, three letter words!

In my opinion, the taxpayer has received an excellent return for his monetary investment in the Job Corps Conservation Centers. Some has been in construction of conservation projects, of which you are well aware. Much more has been in the orientation of so many of these young men into participation in our American Way of life. When these young men arrive, many of them are bitter over the treatment they have had in their home communities. The are well educated in how to destroy; we have tried to re-educate them into becoming useful, constructive citizens who believe in the American Way, a tremendous accomplishment in itself.

Few of the Corpsmen we received at Castle Valley, and at Kingman, were able to qualify by education or experience for the urban centers such as Clearfield. Physically, most of them were malnourished upon their arrival, yet in far superior health at the end of their stay. I grant that there are many problems with these young fellows, but I can assure you that none of them are the same upon returning home, even those who stay the briefest of stays.

Another contribution of OEO in this area is the development of education materials best suited for the disadvantaged. These materials are widely used, and more widely used each year. Many schools, including some in Utah, are using these OEO developed educational materials to advantage. Few critics realize the quality and the quantity of these new materials, nor do they comprehend the tremendous contribution they will make (and are making already) to educational improvements.

I could carry on at length, and with conviction, concerning the many values of Job Corps, particularly the Conservation Centers. You are convinced, thank goodness; somehow, may we be able to help convince enough of your intelligent colleagues to inquire and investigate deeply into the values of Job Corps, and the implications in human terms of this closing of so many Centers. I view it as a tragedy to a million disadvantaged young people at the bottom of the economic and social ladder, people who feel they have no stake in American life, who have little reason not to destroy, when one of the most constructive programs of human development is so sharply curtailed by an insensitive executive administration.

If there is anything I can do as a concerned private citizen, to help reverse this destruction of Job Corps, do let me know.

Meanwhile, I feel confident you will do all you can to help restore the Job Corps Conservation Centers to the level of performance they were experiencing before being "Nixonized".

Keep up your great work!
Sincerely Concerned,

ROBERT D. GOFF.

PRICE, UTAH,
April 13, 1969.

Hon. FRANK MOSS
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: Thank you for protesting the closure of the Castle Valley Job Corps Center. I am sure you have been informed of what a bad effect this closure will have on the economy of Carbon County.

I am afraid not nearly enough has been said about the disadvantaged young men who will be sent back to their homes to go again on the welfare rolls. This will be another injustice they can add to the already long list of injustices which have been committed against the poverty stricken. Most of these young people are in their particular plight through no fault of their own. It is a sad thing when our administration does not care. These people are also citizens.

I am outraged by the fact that the closure is done in the name of economy. Fifty-nine centers will be closed and thirty new ones constructed! This is economy?

A great percentage of the Negro enrollees have left Castle Valley with a completely different outlook on life, their responsibilities to their families and their country, and a respect for white people. They have been treated with respect and have returned this respect.

I realize a small percentage have not benefited, but most have greatly. A certain number stay with the simpler trades simply because they do not have the mentality to do more. At least they have been removed from the welfare rolls and some good has been accomplished.

Someone must speak for these people and for our county. I appreciate your help and concern and hope you will continue.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA HANKS.

UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,
April 11, 1969.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MOSS: 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 the 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.

OGDEN, UTAH, April 8, 1969.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: I am writing to inform you of some information and concerns that I have about a program with which I am familiar. I am referring to the Job Corps where I have been a Psychiatric Consultant for a couple of years. During that time I have gotten to know some things about the Job Corps which I think are of a vital concern to us as a nation.

I think it would be a mistake to try to evaluate the Job Corps in terms of job training. I think the experience that the Job Corps provides for many of these deprived youngsters far exceeds the benefit of just the job training. These are youngsters who often times come from an atmosphere of gloom, failure, and chronic defiance of the authorities, etc. Frequently their experiences in the Job Corps demonstrate that there are people who are interested in their welfare. They learn individual and group responsibility and a sense of feeling worth while. The ultimate gain to these people in society as future citizens in our country far outweighs, I think, the benefit that they may receive only by the job training.

I am quite concerned about reports that the current administration is considering drastic cutbacks in the Job Corps. I am aware the nation has certain limitations as to what it can do with its resources and finances, and I do recognize that my association with the Job Corps naturally describes an interest in the Job Corps per se. However, I think that beyond that I have some objectivity that permits me to recognize and be concerned about the welfare of our nation as a whole. I would be quite willing to junk the Job Corps if I felt that this was to the best interests of the nation. However, I am in a position where I do have information and knowledge about this program. I would feel derelict if I didn't pass it on to people who are responsible for the continuance or discontinuance of this program. It is a vital matter to this country that it maintain its basic strength of its citizens as far as possible. I would hate to see the underprivileged find one more door shut in their face. I am hopeful that you and your colleagues will become well informed about the Job Corps and use your influence to further the welfare of our less privileged citizens.

Incidentally, I realize that in my income bracket I am paying more for the main-

tenance of these programs than is the average citizen. This is one program where the expenditure, expensive as it is, is justified. I have seen youngsters respond who I doubt would have, if they were left in their home environment. A positive influence in the life of a 17 year old may influence more than just one person as he later marries and has children.

Sincerely yours,

N. BLAINE BELNAP, M.D.

BRIGHAM CITY, UTAH, April 29, 1969.

Hon. FRANK E. MOSS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MOSS: The speed with which the Job Corps centers are to be closed and thirty urban skill centers established as replacements seems unduly abrupt and impracticable.

I urge you to vote against the immediate closing of the 59 Job Corps centers.

Perhaps there is a more efficient way of training the severely disadvantaged at less cost and higher rate of job placement than Job Corps. Possibly the small urban centers can do just that. But surely that cannot be ascertained, much less become a functioning program by July 1. The "mini" centers as now proposed will leave thousands unprovided for that were covered in the 59 centers to be closed.

My involvement with other poverty programs, particularly the education and training programs for migrants in Box Elder County has made me acutely aware that such programs require time for planning and development. The major single factor in hindering such programs is the fluctuation and uncertainty of funding and policy from the federal government.

The Job Corps trainees at Thiokol's Clearfield center, the women trainees in Kansas City are people I have met with a whole new world before them, not neutral statistics of success or failure. How can we once again dash such hopes, increase frustrations by closing down centers without adequate facilities for replacement? Frustrations and mounting violence are too evident now without deliberately adding more to the turmoil, and certainly more to the welfare costs.

The fact that Job Corps has, according to one survey, made the lifetime earnings of enrollees average a gain of \$18,075 which means less welfare support and more tax producers rather than tax consumers. Rural conservation centers have produced work that was valued at \$56 million by 1968. Such financial productivity must be a meaningful plus for the Job Corps experiment.

Because of your long standing concern for rights of all people this lengthy letter was probably not necessary. But I wanted you to know of the depth of concern felt by many for the future of equal opportunity programs. Such precipitous closing of Job Corps centers can waste the human investment already made. Please work to delay closing of centers.

Sincerely,

Mrs. JOSEPH P. GURRISTER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the resolution?

Mr. CRANSTON. On the resolution.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from California. We had agreed that if the minority ran short of time, we would work it out, and I am sure that we will.

Mr. President, I rise especially to speak on this motion to recommit, which I commend to the Senate, because I think it is a way out of the dilemma which we face.

If we recommit, the resolution remains pending before the committee. Then the committee will be in a position, at any time that it feels that the matter is being run incorrectly, or that Job Corps people are being dealt with summarily or improperly, to recast the resolution, send it back to the floor, and seek immediate action. It does give the committee a means by which to exercise its legislative oversight in a very effective way, and I think that this is undoubtedly the right technique, in view of the following situation:

This is a new administration, and we have all learned the hard way that the Executive has certain prerogatives. I received a salutary lesson on that point myself, Mr. President. I was one of those who sought to give President Truman money he did not want for bombers, time and again. He just left it in the bank, and there was nothing we could do about it but whistle.

This administration feels that it wants to recast the manpower training programs; that is really what is at stake here.

The Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE) was absolutely right when he said:

Let us look at this thing through the right side of the telescope.

The question is not about 23,000 slots in the Job Corps. The question is about 23,000 training slots and how we will manage them.

The administration represents to us—and I think it carries weight because there are a good many facts to back up its representation—that it will redistribute the job training opportunities and give us a list. Also, it will favor heavily the JOBS program, the program in which private business is involved and under which the youth has a job at the end rather than training, which is the best we can say for the Job Corps. We must also consider the cost-benefit ratio—that is the price tag and what it does—and the dropout rate, which is enormous. All of these things have been debated here. It is more prudent and economical to reallocate and redistribute the available money.

With respect to the charge—and I have made it myself—that if we deduct \$100 million from the Job Corps, how can we give more special training, the answer is that we add more than \$200 million to the JOBS program. So we are not dealing with the situation of putting the dollar above the man. We are dealing with a new administration which says, "Give us a chance to show that we can do a better job, and train more people to greater effect and at a lower cost ratio for this number."

I cannot help the group that follows the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) with the argument that it should not be done now. I say we have to give the administration this opportunity based upon this showing. However, what I can help them with is the fact that the

committee will maintain a continuing jurisdiction and surveillance. The administration promises will be carried out with respect to the dismantling of a given number of the centers and the redistribution of the people who want training to better effect than now.

The motion to recommit makes sense to me, without arguing all of the detailed figures which have been argued time and again.

We should look the thing over. This is the sensible way in which to get results and give the administration the opportunity to deliver on its promise to the American people. They have said, "We will give you a better job and more people and more assurance of getting jobs in the end."

The Senate should let us do it and say, "Let us keep a hand on the situation with respect to the way in which this closing is administered." That opportunity is given precisely by the motion to recommit.

It is for that reason that I hope the Senate will act in this way. I think it is the most prudent way we can act in a situation which, on the one hand, seeks to give an analysis upon this showing and, on the other hand, results in excess and inefficiency in the way in which the job is done.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I quite agree with what the distinguished senior Senator from New York has just said.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare will retain oversight over the Job Corps program. The GAO has made massive studies of nine individual camps. Each will be reported on in depth for our consideration.

The cost of operating these nine camps runs between \$8,001 and \$10,071 per trainee man-year compared to the national average of \$8,300.

When we have the advantage of perusing this material we will have greater additional information. But I point out that the conclusion reached by the GAO and Mr. Harris is that basically the Job Corps programs are not working as now being conducted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, as a co-sponsor of Senate Resolution 194 and as one who has observed firsthand the operation of Job Corps camps in my own State and in other parts of the Nation, I feel that the recent decision of the administration to close arbitrarily some 59 Job Corps centers should be withdrawn and that these centers should be continued in operation pending a further study of the Job Corps program both by Congress and the executive branch.

I, of course, realize and appreciate the importance of reducing expenditures. Yet while the administration's proposal to discontinue these Job Corps centers will result in a net reduction of 14,413 residential training positions, it does not guarantee a reduction in expenditure of Federal funds. It is not a question of whether to spend this money on Job Corps training camps or not at all, be-

cause if we are not utilizing these funds to train underprivileged youths, we may be spending more for welfare, crime control, narcotics control, and other less productive programs. Thus, I contend that the announced plans of the administration to close these Job Corps facilities is actually false economy and results in the denial of opportunities to young men and women to become productive members of our society.

The resolution under consideration today does not preclude the possibility that some changes in the operation of the Job Corps program are desirable. However, it does provide an opportunity for both Congress and the executive branch to study further the entire Job Corps program and to make careful and well-thought-out decisions rather than somewhat hasty and arbitrary decisions about its future operation.

Two of the facilities proposed to be discontinued are located in my own State of Oklahoma at Sulphur and Hodgens. These facilities have proved to be very effective, and more than 1,000 trainees have completed programs in each of these facilities since they opened. A substantial percentage of these trainees are now gainfully employed and are useful, productive members of this community. Local citizens have voiced overwhelming support for these training facilities both from the standpoint of the good which they have done for the community and from the standpoint of the training they have afforded the enrollees.

Mr. President, I feel that our efforts to train these previously untrained young men and women represent sound national policy, and I feel that the human investment we are making through the Job Corps is sound. I therefore hope that the resolution will be adopted and that the proposed closing of Job Corps facilities will be delayed until a great deal more study and consideration has been given to the decision. Mr. President, I also had submitted for the RECORD my remarks on the need to delay this decision on Thursday, May 8. My remarks at that time appear on page 11736 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I very strongly urge that the Senate reject the motion to recommit and adopt the resolution.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I strongly support the resolution to declare it 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." I oppose the motion to recommit.

I am aware that the Washington Post editorial of Wednesday, May 7, "Tread Softly on the Job Corps," has been quoted and has been inserted in the RECORD. Persons who have followed this issue certainly have had the opportunity to read this cogent analysis of the faultiness of the decision to close 59 Job Corps centers, involving 16,500 youths. Nevertheless, there are portions of the editorial worth repeating and emphasizing—time and again. The opening sentence goes to the heart of the substantive

issue involved in the closing order. I quote:

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.

It is my feeling that this is the assumption that has been made. I say this in view of the many criticisms related to cost of the program and in view of the statements by the administration witnesses on how they are actually to provide more training opportunities for disadvantaged young people. They seem to have failed to realize the degree to which the young persons in Job Corps require attention. I do not argue that Job Corps at this stage is able to assume the responsibility of training all of our "hard core" disadvantaged young people. I do maintain that it is misleading to propose the shifting of this task to the general manpower and training program we have today. Almost 40 percent of the Job Corps enrollees have an eighth grade education or less. But the average enrollee reads at only a fourth-grade level. Ninety-five percent read at an eighth-grade level or below. Sixty-three percent of them have failed to qualify for the draft. Eighty percent of the enrollees have not seen a doctor or dentist in the last 10 years. Experiences have been brought to my attention where enrollees do not even have knowledge of the daily routine health care practices which are thought to be second nature. This information is not new. It has been repeated on many occasions in hearings, reports, and now during this debate. I seriously question how such persons can be incorporated into the regular manpower programs.

The administration did not outline a plan through which the training opportunities would be made available for such persons. They have not done this. Their figures do not provide the answer.

Many opponents of the pending resolution have voiced their commitment to programs for training of the out-of-school youth, as has the administration through the Labor Department. They agree on the need. But the point is, a feasible plan has not been submitted. And until there is such a plan and until there are provisions for an orderly transfer we should maintain the Job Corps at the existing level. Let us not perpetrate a cruel hoax on the many young people who in good faith and with desire to learn have entered the program. To move forward with the planned shutdowns would be a cruel hoax—witness the 4,539 enrollees who have quit the closed centers since the closing orders were issued.

Mr. President, February 19, the President of the United States, in his message to the Congress on the poverty program, stated:

By sending my proposals well before the Act's 1970 expiration, I intend to provide time for full debate and discussion.

This statement was encouraging. I feel the President was saying that we would have a cooperative effort of the executive branch and the Congress in reviewing

OEO with sufficient time for an exchange of views. The action to close the Job Corps centers is certainly not in line with the President's statement.

But even if the President had not made such a statement, it is my firm belief that a decision to close the Job Corps installations—installations authorized and funded by the Congress—should not be concluded without the opportunity for Congress to participate in the decision-making process. More importantly, the Job Corps decision involved a major redirection of policy in job training—the issue of the number of positions in residential-type training centers. Such an issue can be resolved. But the Congress must participate.

Mr. President, there are two Job Corps centers in West Virginia located in Huntington and Anthony which are scheduled for closing. The Huntington Center is for women. The installation at Anthony is a conservation center. Even if the West Virginia closings were not involved I would oppose the action by the present administration.

The Huntington Job Corps Center for Women since opening in January of 1966 has graduated 831 young women and has attained a placement rate of 75 to 80 percent. This record is above average. The average length of stay for all enrollees at Huntington is 5.8 months—graduates have averaged 9 to 10 months. The cost per person for this fiscal year is \$5,018. Graduates are earning an average of \$1.60 per hour. This center offers training programs for nurses' aides, clerk typists, business machine operators, institutional aids, graphic arts, IBM key-punch operators, file clerks, general office assistants, and retail sales.

The Anthony Civilian Conservation Center has enrolled 1,047 young men in its 4-year history. Last year the cost per enrollee was \$5,200. It is significant that 54.2 percent of all enrollees have made successful exits, being placed in jobs, transferred to other centers, or placed in school. Of those who have resigned 60 percent have later requested readmission. Nine training programs are offered at Anthony including carpentry, union carpentry, automotive, culinary arts, union painting, maintenance, medical aids, heavy equipment operators, and warehouse maintenance. Two contracts are currently in force with unions providing for a number of placements of graduates. The first, which began last June for a duration of 1 year, is with the International Carpenters Union. They agreed to accept 60 trained corpsmen as carpenter apprentices. Although the contract called for 1 year of training, 26 young men have already been placed and are receiving wages averaging more than \$3 an hour. They are now ready to place approximately 25 additional young corpsmen. In April 1969, a contract was entered into with the Plasterers, Painters, and Interior Decorators Union to accept 16 painter apprentices. The work accomplished by the Anthony Job Corpsmen on our public lands is significant. They have constructed, for example, 2- and 3-bedroom houses, warehouses, bridges, and sewage systems. I insert in the RECORD a partial listing of their work, as follows:

ANTHONY CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CENTER,
UNION CARPENTRY PROGRAM

Completed: 10 Adirondack Shelters at \$2,000 each—total \$20,000.00.

For the three southern Districts of MNF as follows: 5—Gauley, 4—Marlinton, 1—White Sulphur.

1—Four unit flush toilet (Sherwood Lake).
2—7 unit toilets (Sherwood Lake).

Built mess loading dock at Center.
Remodeled Office and storage space for Union office, eliminating the need for contracted work.

Completed \$20,000 3 bedroom residence at Sherwood Lake; \$15,000 garage-work shop at Sherwood Lake; \$1,500 oil house at Sherwood Lake; \$20,000 3 bedroom residence at Bartow.

Planned \$100,000 office building in Bartow to be started before the end of FY 1969.

Planned FY 1969: Garage work-shop; Vehicle Storage shop; VIS Contact Station—Sherwood Lake.

Total cost of completed projects, \$76,500.00.

NOTE: This does not include estimated cost for building of the mess loading dock and setting up the Union Carpentry Office.

Anthony Civilian Conservation Center: Conservation and building—Regular work program

Added value to community project and forest projects (Sherwood Lake, Blue Bend, etc.).

(Appraisal made by non-center personnel)

Fiscal year 1967	\$274,300
Fiscal year 1968	201,600
Fiscal year 1969	275,000
Fiscal year 1970	570,850

Total *1,321,750

*This does not include \$3,000,000 worth of projects requested by Ranger districts that are on record for the future.

Mr. President, it is my genuine hope that the motion to recommit will be defeated and that the Senate will approve Senate Resolution 194.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has expired. The question is on agreeing to the motion to recommit. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLINGS. On this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). Were he present and voting, he would vote "nay." Were I at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE). If present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) is necessarily absent.

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. ALKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 47, as follows:

[No. 31 Leg.]
YEAS—46

Allen	Fannin	Percy
Allott	Fong	Prouty
Baker	Goldwater	Russell
Bellmon	Goodell	Saxbe
Bennett	Griffin	Schweiker
Boggs	Gurney	Scott
Byrd, W. Va.	Hansen	Smith
Case	Hatfield	Stennis
Cook	Hruska	Stevens
Cooper	Javits	Talmadge
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Tower
Dirksen	Mundt	Williams, Del.
Dole	Murphy	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Packwood	
Eastland	Pearson	

NAYS—47

Anderson	Holland	Moss
Bayh	Hughes	Muskie
Burdick	Inouye	Nelson
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pastore
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Church	Kennedy	Proxmire
Cranston	Long	Randolph
Dodd	Magnuson	Ribicoff
Eagleton	Mansfield	Sparkman
Ellender	McCarthy	Spong
Ervin	McGee	Symington
Fulbright	McGovern	Tydings
Gravel	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Metcalf	Yarborough
Hart	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hartke	Montoya	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Hollings, for.
McClellan, for.

NOT VOTING—5

Aiken	Brooke	Mathias
Bible	Gore	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was rejected.

Mr. PROUTY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the distinguished minority leader, because of his vote, have the right to ask for reconsideration?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator did not vote with the prevailing side, so he does not have the right to move for reconsideration.

AMENDMENT NO. 20

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 20 and ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is 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, if I may have the attention of the Senate, it is my judgment that we can settle the problem before us in less than 20 minutes.

I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized for 5 minutes. Let us have order in the Senate and in the galleries, please.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the essence of the difference between the two sides, which are so closely matched, is whether or not to actually stop the administration from going ahead with the closings of the Job Corps camps as they have been undertaken.

In my judgment there may be a majority view in the Senate. We will soon find out because this matter will be tested upon this particular amendment, which is in the nature of a substitute, there may be a majority which feels that it will allow the administration to go ahead with its program of manpower training with the precaution that in going ahead it does not ride rough shod over the rights of those now in that training, in the Job Corps camps.

The purpose of the substitute, in effect, is to put in the resolution the promises made by the administration, which, if carried out, would assure complete equity and justice to those now in the Job Corps camps that are being phased out. This ties into the broader objective of a more comprehensive and more effective manpower training program, which the administration in my judgment, has now presented.

This is the basic matter involved in the substitute.

I know there are a great many Senators who feel very strongly with the junior Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), just as there are a great many Senators who feel strongly with us. However, it seems to me that on a sense resolution—which is what we are dealing with here—it may be possible to fashion a more decisive majority for this position which will lock in the promises of the administration and at the same time enable the administration to go forward with its manpower training plan.

Now, that said, here is the factual situation. There are some 32,000 young men and women in these Job Corps camps. The administration proposes to reduce that number by some 16,000 people and to phase out those 16,000 into the following three categories: Those who go to other camps, those who take other forms of training, and those who go to centers which will also be residential as well as closer to areas where there actually will be jobs, rather than out in widely distributed areas of the country

more suited for conservation than for direct jobs for which the young people are being trained. The administration has assured us and has put up \$1 million to back up that assurance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PACKWOOD in the chair). The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 3 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, hence, the substitute which I have proposed provides first that any phasing out of Job Corps centers be carried out in a manner that will insure that equivalent—I emphasize the word "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; second, that 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 1969.

The administration has presented a program which includes the closing of 59 camps. They still plan to add 6,000 slots. There are a number of manpower training slots available. Let us remember that the entire Job Corps, even at the present rate, represents less than 10 percent of the total manpower slots for training available which is in the area of 360,000.

It seems to me that a new administration should be given the opportunity to embark upon a new approach and a new program. The new approach comes down to a trade off: What we give up in the Job Corps training camps, we gain in other opportunities. Remember, we are not God. We cannot choose child A as against child B. We must develop a national policy which gives voice to the national interest. It will help two or three children. It might be less advantageous for one or two others. That is to be expected. We cannot run it any other way. But what we trade off for the Job Corps slots is over 20,000 additional new slots in the JOBS program, which has the great advantage, in my judgment, of giving jobs at the end of the road. The real problem of the Job Corps is that no matter how we argue the desirability of training and getting people out of doors and taking them off the streets, the facts are that their training has not demonstrably resulted in jobs for them at the end of the road.

On the contrary, the attrition aside from all the other difficulties associated with the camps, has been unbelievable—about three-quarters of youths originally enrolled either do not attend or do not show up at all. Fifty percent fall by the wayside.

While \$8,300 is the figure put on the Job Corps training, the cost of an in-residence young person near a place where he can get a job, comes to somewhere between \$5,500 and \$6,000. It seems to me that it is simply nonproductive to bullheadedly persevere along the old line because, once upon a time, in the depression, over 35 years ago, we had the CCC camps.

That is what it really comes down to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the substitute resolution would give this majority—which we must recognize is not of the President's party—an independent voice to be asserted in respect to what Congress does and what the President does.

In the first place, the resolution is something that perhaps normally we would not have. The President would make a decision of this kind, the Senate would not overturn it, and then that would be it. But we do have a resolution if we adopt the substitute, and it would look safeguards into that resolution so that the plan as administered would be truly treating with justice, equity, and equivalency those affected now—to wit, those in the camps who will be released from the camps being closed, and the substitute would give assurance that over all, the total number of slots will not suffer. On the contrary, they will be upgraded. That is the purpose of the substitute resolution.

I would hope, upon this basis, that we could hold the administration's feet to the fire, which is its purpose, and, secondly, work out a situation where they can go forward with an effort which is a different effort from that made by the previous administration. It is different because it has a different character—to wit, the effort to profit from the relationship to the private enterprise system, and stimulate the private enterprise interest, in order to assure the job trainee a job at the end of the road. That is the purpose and intent of this particular substitute.

Mr. President, the substitute was presented in the committee. It was considered by the committee and it failed there. But I hope very much that we can, on the basis of the arguments which I have made, achieve a majority—and secure legislation for this approach on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I wish to speak very briefly; I ask my colleagues to look at the statement on their desks which contains excerpts that are totally representative of telegrams received from heads of Job Corps centers indicating that they cannot do for the displaced corpsmen what the substitute resolution assumes can be done by the Job Corps and the Department of Labor.

Wire after wire after wire has come in from heads of Job Corps centers, in response to several questions, indicating that there is no program, that they are sending the enrollees back home, that they are telling them to get in touch with their Employment Service, and that then perhaps something can be found for them.

Others say there is no comparable program and no place they can be put.

If we fail in this effort, if the substitute motion is adopted, there will continue to be chaos, confusion and heart-break which they will face, those who have been in the camps that are now closing down.

Quite briefly, I would also say this about the role of the Senate:

It was on April 11 that Secretary Shultz announced the closing. It was on April 25, following efforts individually, private and public, by Senators and others, to persuade the administration to reconsider. After talk had failed, the resolution was introduced, calling upon the President to wait until Congress could consider the matter. On April 29, the resolution was reported favorably by the appropriate subcommittee. On April 30, it was reported favorably by the full committee. Four hundred and fifty pages of testimony were printed and considered by those who chose to read them. Some 3 full days of hearings were held. Eighteen pages of the committee report reflected the views of the minority and the majority, and they were printed and made available.

Today, May 13, the Senate is now voting on this matter. I found it extremely gratifying that the Senate's processes and the body itself is able to respond expeditiously to the challenge it faces. This swift and responsive senatorial performance seems to me a stirring declaration that the legislative branch has a vital role to play on this question, and on like questions where public interest and congressional prerogatives are concerned, and that the legislative branch is prepared to fulfill that role.

This resolution calls simply for that opportunity, an opportunity for the Senate to participate fully in the processes of Government in accordance with traditions and precedent relating to our authorization and appropriation procedures and prerogatives. That opportunity can be afforded by rejection of the substitute motion and by adoption of the pending resolution.

Thus, I urge the Senate to reject the substitute so that we may proceed to consider adoption of Senate Resolution 194 which permits us to express our insistence upon orderly processes and upon the protection and preservation of our constitutional role in marking out Government programs for the executive branch to execute.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I ask unanimous consent that there be incorporated in the RECORD the statement by the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) favoring the substitute.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR BROOKE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I was originally a cosponsor of the Cranston resolution. I believed at the time that the Administration acted unwisely and prematurely in announcing its decision without prior consultation with the Congress. And I believed that it was unfair to enrollees in the program to terminate their training in mid-course.

However, I have also been critical of the program in the past, and would be among the first to admit that in terms of cost-effectiveness, as well as actual placement, it appeared to be one of our less productive efforts.

The Administration's decision was taken with these two considerations in mind. Regardless of whether we approve of the way in which the decision was announced, the fact remains that over a month has passed since the decision was put into effect. More than 6,700 trainees have either graduated, been transferred to other programs, or been slotted for transfer. The cost of reversing this process at this time would be prohibitive in terms of further disruption of human lives, not to mention the financial costs of reopening and maintaining the 59 centers themselves. Furthermore, I question whether such a reversal would be wise given the conscientious and commendable efforts of the Administration to provide counselling and appropriate placement for all those affected by the closings.

The Cranston resolution has made a major contribution to the Job Corps debate. It has put the Congress on record as being firmly in favor of job training for the young, and our consideration of it has made clear our deep concern that human concerns be placed above financial ones. But I believe that the passage of a resolution which would call upon the Administration to reverse its decision until the Congress has had an opportunity to evaluate the program is no longer a wise or timely course of action. Therefore, I believe the Javits substitute amendment, which states the sense of the Senate that equivalent training be provided for each affected trainee, is the most constructive action for the Senate to take at this time.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) have joined me as cosponsors of the substitute resolution.

I wish to address myself to the very interesting argument made by the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). I think there is a pretty grave question as to whether this is a constitutional prerogative which the Senate is now carrying out in the sense of the Senate resolution, or whether it does not really, at a very early stage of the new administration, invite the kind of confrontation which, at the very least, is premature, and which, at the very most, is highly undesirable.

The right to administer the laws has been exercised by both Democratic and Republican Presidents to give them the right to decide when they will or will not spend money appropriated by the Congress. There is nothing that gets up the back of a President more than to ram such a decision down his throat.

That is exactly what the resolution would do. It would be the first evidence of real partisanship which has so far come on the scene, in that the Democratic majority would, in effect, be saying to the President, "You have made an Executive decision, but we tell you not to carry it through."

That is essentially what the argument amounts to. I do not say we do not have any power to pass it. Obviously we do. But I think we ought to have clearly in mind that, at the very beginning of this new administration, we are proposing to abort the administration's plans with re-

spect to manpower training, rather than give it the opportunity—and I think, on a showing, an effort to do so would be made—to do a different but better job than has been done before.

After all, why did the American people elect a new administration? I beg my colleagues to have in mind that if real shambles result from this resolution, if it is adopted, the responsibility will definitely be off the back of the President, and if manpower training is thwarted and is less, and if the money that is spent for it is spent less usefully, it is not going to be the President's fault. I am not so sure that is very smart politics.

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

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator raises a partisan issue, but it seems to me that it is only on the Senator's side of the aisle that 100 percent partisanship is shown here.

Mr. JAVITS. I do not raise a partisan issue. I am sorry to disagree with my beloved friend. I am only pointing out that to make this a partisan issue—and it looks that way from the vote—is not very good politics.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. Does the Senator feel that one side of the aisle is indicating more partisanship than the other?

Mr. JAVITS. No, but I feel that, on occasion, one side shows it less wisely than the other.

Mr. HARRIS. Which side?

Mr. JAVITS. I think on this occasion it is the Senator's side. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, to complete the point, the administration has come forward with a program which gives, in my judgment, on the record at least, a new start, a new direction, a new basis for going forward with manpower training by balancing out differently than it has before the job training slots. That is what it comes down to.

I have been frank about the purport of the substitute itself. It is only to hold the administration to its promise. The fundamental point still remains that each Member of the Senate shall decide on his own that he does or does not wish to seek to inhibit the administration from out its proposed plan with respect to manpower training.

I cannot hope to win to the substitute those who wish to say to the administration, "Do not shut down any Job Corps training camps," but I am appealing to Senators who want to give the administration, on this showing, an opportunity to carry out a program which looks promising with the insurance that, in carrying out that program, it will do justice by those who are in the camps and those who are released from the camps and that it will do overall justice to all Job Corps trainees, because it will afford more slots, with greater opportunity for individuals to get jobs at the end of the road.

I, myself, supported the Job Corps. I voted for it notwithstanding hot arguments against it. But I am persuaded now that there is a more useful way to spend

money than at \$8,000 a head in the Job Corps, and that more youths can get an opportunity, than if we continued it at the present cost-benefit ratio.

With the plan of the administration, I think we are presented with a viable alternative. I do not necessarily take their word for it. Let us see if they will administer the program differently and fairly.

I heard the argument of the distinguished Senator from California. I yield to no one in my solicitude for the individuals concerned, live boys and girls who are entitled to the very direct help given them; but I do feel that the situation ought not to be obscured by the normal confusions which surround an operation of this character. The fact is that one can get many individual cases, through telegrams, which show that this particular boy or girl, or half a dozen of them, have been badly used, as they feel.

Representations have been made to us as to precisely how the number will be handled. It looks legitimate and right on its face. The substitute commits the administration to that. That is its purpose. I think it is the best way in which to handle the situation.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Before I do so, the Senator from California was very kind in yielding back his time. I shall yield to him if he needs time.

I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to comment on the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York. I believe this resolution is important not only to give the administration a chance to carry out its new program, but also as a vote of confidence for the Secretary of Labor.

I attended the confirmation hearings of the Secretary-designate before the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. I cannot ever recall hearing so many fine comments about a distinguished citizen of this country. He was lauded by industry. He was lauded by organized labor. He was lauded by almost everybody, Democrat and Republican.

Since his confirmation, he has shown promise of being one of the most distinguished Cabinet officers ever to serve his Government.

Mr. President, it is a question of judgment. Congress has made it eminently clear that we want to do as much for the American taxpayer as we can. We have also made it clear that we want to help to give the disadvantaged an opportunity. But we have also made it eminently clear that we want efficiency in Government. Unfortunately we all know there has been a certain amount of waste in the Job Corps.

This program is not one that has shown the highest yield on the dollars expended, although we admit it is a difficult area and that we have worked with the most difficult disadvantaged youth in the country. But I think it is a matter of judgment now as to whether the Secretary charged with the mandate of carrying out this program should be given authority to go ahead and see what

he can do with a given amount of dollars to maximize the equality of opportunity for our disadvantaged youth.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. By this sense of the Senate resolution, as pointed out by the distinguished Senator from New York, we are simply assuring now, backed by the authority of this body, that what the Secretary has said will be carried forward.

I have no doubt it would be carried forward anyway, but the Javits proposal would seek to assure that no youth in these programs would not be offered an alternate method of continuing his education and training, to make him qualified to take his role in modern industrial society.

This would place a responsibility on the Secretary, and one that he wanted to assume, to try to use the available money more effectively and efficiently.

Therefore, I say I would vote for it simply to give a new Secretary of Labor the chance to carry forward a program—a man who is an expert in this field, and one in whom we all have the greatest confidence.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the junior Senator from New York, and ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, his name appear as a cosponsor of the substitute resolution.

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

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, I speak as one who served in the House of Representatives, on the committee that wrote the poverty legislation on that side. I speak as one who, since 1961, has urged residential skill training for 16- to 21-year-old young men and women in our country.

I think this comes down, at this stage, to a very simple proposition. There can be no one in this body who does not now recognize that there have been many inefficiencies in the Job Corps. Perhaps the greatest has been the inability of the Job Corps to connect the young graduates with jobs at the end of the line.

Part of the reason for that has been the arbitrary and inflexible structure of the Job Corps; but the biggest reason has been our failure to integrate this problem in a continuity from beginning to end, so that when a youngster goes in he receives relevant training, and when he gets out at the other end, there is a job waiting for him.

After 3 years of the Job Corps, we had before us the specific facts that only about 11 to 15 percent of the youngsters who graduated got any help at all from the Job Corps in getting a job. Many of them were sent back to local employment offices with no real chance at all. A chit was sent there, saying, "Will you please help this youngster get a job?"

The difference between the Javits resolution and the Cranston resolution is very simple. The Javits substitute would give flexibility, to make it more workable; and the Javits substitute would do what the Cranston resolution tries to do: Assure that they will all have the op-

portunity to continue, as they are now, in the Job Corps, to be provided some kind of training, and that they will not just be dropped and sent home. That is essential, and it would be accomplished as much by the sense-of-Congress resolution submitted by Senator JAVITS as by the sense-of-Congress resolution submitted by Senator CRANSTON.

Are we going to freeze the Secretary of Labor and the Job Corps into the present situation until Congress makes overall decisions, or are we going to provide the flexibility for the Secretary of Labor to begin to make the system more workable now?

I think we should adopt the Javits substitute.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I think that the argument has been made to enable the Senate to judge the merits and vote accordingly. I am very grateful to the junior Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) for their support, with the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROURY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and others who had joined in this substitute.

Mr. President, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield himself 1 additional minute, so that the amendment can be read?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute, and ask that the clerk read the proposed amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 20

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. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment being offered by the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

I cosponsor this amendment because it will express the strong concern of this body, which I definitely share, that we not reduce the overall number of manpower training slots in Federal programs for disadvantaged young men and women.

This amendment will, in addition, make it clear that the Senate expects the Department of Labor to offer each Job Corps trainee affected by the reorganization a chance to receive equivalent training opportunities elsewhere in the Federal manpower training network.

But with these two important safeguards, the amendment will nevertheless permit the President to go forward with his restructuring of the Job Corps and his integration of the Job Corps into the entire network of Federal manpower programs.

The pending resolution, Senate Resolution 194, would stall this vital Executive action at a time when we can no longer afford inaction in the long-overdue reshaping of Federal job training resources.

The President and the Secretary of Labor are to be congratulated for their determination to make manpower training one of the priority accomplishments of the new administration. There is much that needs to be done, and there is little time in which to do it. New Federal resources must be committed to the task of job training, and resources already deployed in job training must be redirected to areas where they will do the most good for the largest number of job trainees at the lowest cost.

More than a year ago the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders issued its report, in which one of the key recommendations was the consolidation, expansion, and concentration of employment training efforts. That same report charged that Federal efforts to aid the poor were scarcely reaching the people most in need of help in our major cities.

Thus it should be with a keen sense of the urgency of our manpower training problems that we look at what the administration is proposing. At a time when Federal manpower programs are so important to the well-being of the Nation, and yet are bogged down in so many spots by ineffective use of resources and high dropout rates, the administration has shown to my satisfaction that it should be allowed to go forward in carrying out its plans. There must be safeguards imposed on what the administration does, and these are embodied in the amendment which I am cosponsoring. But once the safeguards are clearly enunciated by this body, then it is time to give the administration its chance to improve the Federal job training apparatus without further delay.

The Secretary of Labor, in his testimony before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty, has pledged that the Department will "work with each individual" now in a camp designated for closing. Each corpsman will receive continued training in another Job Corps center or in another Department of Labor manpower program.

The Secretary also has reported on the administration's plan to provide 368,600 job training slots for out-of-school youth in fiscal year 1970—a figure which is 5,700 more than the current fiscal year. While the Job Corps enrollment would be down from 70,000 this year to 47,000 next year, the number of out-of-school youth in the JOBS program—job opportunities in the business sector—the program conducted with private employers by the National Alliance of Businessmen, will rise from 28,800 to 60,500. This will come about, incidentally, as the administration plans to put JOBS programs in 125 cities, rather than the existing 50 cities.

And, as it has been said many times, the administration is not dismantling, or even emasculating, the Job Corps itself. The Job Corps will be gaining 30 centers it never had before, located in or near large cities, that are expected to combat

the high dropout rates caused in the past by long travel distances and homesickness once the trainees reached the camps.

Mr. President, the administration should be permitted to carry out its planned restructuring of the Job Corps without delay. I consider it most unwise for this body to pass Senate Resolution 194 and I urge that it accept instead the substitute amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE JOB CORPS

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, yesterday and on earlier occasions I have addressed myself to the very serious implications of closing a series of Job Corps centers throughout the Nation.

I should like to add to my previous remarks that I regard as ominous this tendency on the part of the administration to go its separate way on this crucial program. We in Congress must be enabled to determine the full magnitude of our critical poverty programs upon which millions of dollars and limitless hours of work have been expended. For how else can we determine whether these expenditures have been worthwhile or how they may be enabled to become more effective?

I am at a loss to understand, too, why the administration waited until Congress was out of session before making its announcement on closure of the Job Corps installations. This only demonstrates to me a weakness on the part of the Nixon administration; certainly it cannot be called an effort to aggressively secure knowledge about serving human needs most effectively.

What concerns all of us here is the need for eliminating gaps in services to our severely deprived youth. Until they attain another status, they are and must be entitled to the fullest presumption of remedial potential. In short, unless the administration can evolve more creative and dynamic means than the Job Corps for dealing with and assisting these young people, we cannot permit reduction of the program.

I call upon my colleagues to adopt Senate Resolution 194 and reject any attempts to weaken its thrust by substituting for its provisions meaningless language that would say nothing more than that we approve of what the administration is doing. I urge that this issue not become one of for or against the administration, but rather one of for or against the underprivileged youth of this Nation. I urge adoption of Senate Resolution 194 as reported by the committee.

It is my fervent hope that the administration will take into full consideration the sense of the Senate as expressed in Senate Resolution 194, and postpone this very serious and drastic action until we here have had an opportunity to review the program in depth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute submitted by the Senator from New York. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TALMADGE (when his name was called). Mr. President, on this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), would each vote "nay."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 53, as follows:

[No. 32 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Allott	Fong	Pearson
Baker	Goldwater	Percy
Bellmon	Goodell	Prouity
Bennett	Griffin	Saxbe
Boggs	Gurney	Schweiker
Case	Hansen	Scott
Cook	Hatfield	Smith
Cooper	Hruska	Stevens
Cotton	Javits	Thurmond
Curtis	Jordan, Idaho	Tower
Dirksen	Miller	Williams, Del.
Dole	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Murphy	
Fannin	Packwood	

NAYS—53

Allen	Holland	Moss
Anderson	Hollings	Muskie
Bayh	Hughes	Nelson
Burdick	Inouye	Pastore
Byrd, Va.	Jackson	Pell
Byrd, W. Va.	Jordan, N.C.	Proxmire
Cannon	Kennedy	Randolph
Church	Long	Ribicoff
Cranston	Magnuson	Russell
Dodd	Mansfield	Sparkman
Eagleton	McCarthy	Spong
Eastland	McClellan	Stennis
Ellender	McGee	Symington
Ervin	McGovern	Tydings
Fulbright	McIntyre	Williams, N.J.
Gravel	Metcalfe	Yarborough
Harris	Mondale	Young, Ohio
Hart	Montoya	

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Mr. Talmadge, for.

NOT VOTING—6

Aiken	Brooke	Hartke
Bible	Gore	Mathias

So Mr. JAVITS' amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, is time allocated on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains on the resolution?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) has

66 minutes remaining. The Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) has 11 minutes remaining.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I think this has been a very unfortunate 2 days that we have spent on this measure because we have been arguing between various expressions of the sense of the Senate, not advice of the Senate under the advice-and-consent clause. It simply involves the sense of the Senate as to what the Executive should or should not do.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I most respectfully request that the Chamber be cleared except for Senators and those attachés who have business in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At the request of the majority leader, the Senate Chamber will be cleared except for Senators and those aides who have immediate business with Senators.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask that the Sergeant at Arms clear the aisles immediately so that the Senator may proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so directs.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I hope that my 5 minutes can start now.

I think we have wasted 2 days talking about what may be the sense of the Senate. We have divided on almost strictly partisan lines on these various proposals. We did it first in the committee report, which shows all the Democrats on one side of the report and all the Republicans on the other side of the report, except for one. I believe the Senator from Oklahoma was not present on that day.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that this ought not to go down in history as a partisan division. This is not a partisan matter as far as I am concerned.

I am against this kind of expression of the sense of the Senate when I think the Executive has done its duty in trying to perfect a program that has proven to be an abysmal failure in many parts of the Nation—certainly in my own State—and incidentally save \$100 million while doing it.

As far as I am concerned, I want to approve the way in which the President has handled the matter.

Aside from that, I do not think that anything of this kind will affect the judgment of the President. It ought not to. We have divided almost evenly here on the various votes that we have taken, and there could not be any strong exhibit of feeling out of the Senate under that kind of condition.

When the General Accounting Office, which is our arm, tells us there are many things about this program, as it has—and I have read its report very carefully; when it is costing approximately \$8,300, on the average, for each boy or girl, much more than enough to send the boy or girl through Harvard if they were able to go; when such a small percentage of them have gotten employment afterward or stuck to it; when so many of them have

proved to be personal failures, then, so far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he welcomes the effort to turn this program into a little more effective effort, and he wants to make that clear at this time.

Mr. President, so far as my own State is concerned, we had one Job Corps center at St. Petersburg. It cost \$9,600 per year per girl. It was begun there during 1965 and 1966. It was practically run out of town, for reasons which I shall not discuss here. They tried to go to Miami, to take over one of the better hotels there, and people rose up in arms, because they thought the judgment of the administrators was so very poor, as it showed itself to be in so many phases of this program.

Mr. President, I think it is a useless and futile thing for us to have divided so closely for 2 days on a matter of this type which, after all, if it should be agreed to, is nothing but a pious expression of a small majority of the Senate. I do not believe it will have any effect. I do not believe it should have any effect.

In conclusion, just let me say this: The Senator from Florida voted against the motion to recommit because he wanted to vote on the merits. He voted against the substitute amendment because that, too, was an expression of a sense of the Senate supported only on one side of the aisle. But he is going to vote—and he told his friend the Senator from California, before this debate started, that he was going to vote—against this proposal, because he thought that it was unwise, that it would be futile, and that it would put the Senate in a very false position if it should pass.

Are we for improving this program? Are we for holding up the hands of the Executive if he tries to do an effective thing? Are we for holding up the hands of the Executive when he tries to save a hundred million dollars? So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he is for the President in those respects, and I want to be recorded on the merits of this matter and against the pending resolution.

The Senator from Florida thanks the Senator from California for yielding to him. I told him before he yielded that I would not be on his side. He was very gracious and very generous in yielding to me.

I hope the Senate will reject the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Do Senators yield back the remainder of their time?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELLENDER (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to

vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. TALMADGE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE). If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. GORE) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE) would vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 33 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Bayh	Jackson	Pastore
Burdick	Jordan, N.C.	Pell
Cannon	Kennedy	Proxmire
Church	Magnuson	Randolph
Cranston	Mansfield	Ribicoff
Dodd	McCarthy	Sparkman
Eagleton	McGee	Spong
Ervin	McGovern	Symington
Fulbright	Metcalf	Tydings
Gravel	Mondale	Williams, N.J.
Harris	Montoya	Yarborough
Hart	Moss	Young, Ohio
Hughes	Muskie	
Inouye	Nelson	

NAYS—52

Allen	Fannin	Murphy
Allott	Fong	Packwood
Anderson	Goldwater	Pearson
Baker	Goodell	Percy
Bellmon	Griffin	Prouty
Bennett	Gurney	Russell
Boggs	Hansen	Saxbe
Byrd, Va.	Hatfield	Schweiker
Byrd, W. Va.	Holland	Scott
Case	Hollings	Smith
Cook	Hruska	Stennis
Cooper	Javits	Stevens
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Thurmond
Curtis	Long	Tower
Dirksen	McClellan	Williams, Del.
Dole	McIntyre	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Miller	
Eastland	Mundt	

PRESENT AND GIVING LIVE PAIRS, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—2

Mr. Ellender, against.

Mr. Talmadge, against.

NOT VOTING—6

Alken	Brooke	Hartke
Bible	Gore	Mathias

So the resolution (S. Res. 194) was rejected.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I make a motion to reconsider.

It is my hope and my sincere prayer that President Richard Nixon will be one of the greatest Presidents in the history of our country. I do not say that because necessarily I am in favor of Richard Nixon; I am in favor of America.

I would hope that on matters of this sort, the President would be willing to sit down with men who have actually been in these camps and slept on the

ground with these boys, men who have been there and checked it out, and men who have seen what happened. I hope that it would be analyzed on that basis.

One reason I make that suggestion is that the President has been most kind and generous to this Senator. He suggested that I come down to talk to him about tax matters. During that conference, something came up concerning inflation and I had occasion to say, "If you want to do something about inflation, repeal the investment credit." His message came down, and there it was.

This is a very honorable and decent man. This man does not play partisan politics when the Nation's welfare is at stake. If I do say so, this is a man who wants to rise above small politics, and we should match him in being the same way.

All this resolution is asking for is the right to take a look to see what has been accomplished and what has not been accomplished, and having considered all of that, then to say: "All right. Now, here is what I would like to do, having considered that."

In my judgment, the President is a great man, but somebody must be his friend. On the ABM matter I will be one of his strongest supporters, and that will be one of our most difficult issues.

I hope our friends on the Republican side of the aisle and on the Democratic side of the aisle will separate themselves from any prejudice that might possess them at this moment and be willing to sit down with people who know the program better and who consider it their business.

The President has been willing to do that with people like RUSSELL B. LONG, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, and he has been willing to consider our suggestions. I am honored and proud that he did consider one of my suggestions, which was a good one. It is not going to get me any votes but the point is that he is a courageous and decent man.

Mr. President, this particular matter involves the future of about 18,000 children, youngsters who are about 18 years old. Perhaps the President is 100 percent right, but I have talked to the Secretary of Labor and that is where the recommendation came from. I think the Secretary is completely wrong on this issue.

If the President had thought about this matter and carefully considered it, and had taken all things into consideration, I am satisfied that it would not have been necessary for us to have this measure on the floor today. He would not have accepted the recommendation of his secretary.

Let me tell my Republican friends—I know how these things operate, because I used to be a whip a little while ago. I address myself to them this way: If you are ever going to give me a vote, vote for me this time.

If the Republicans think that they are getting some "Brownie points" by voting with the President on this, they can just forget about it. Frankly, he really does not care. This one is not important.

If you Republicans vote with him on the ABM, that would be a very important vote. He thinks that involves the survival of this country, no matter who is the President when the showdown comes. But, Mr. President, this is one thing where the Senator from California is asking for nothing more than the right to have the case heard. That is all he is asking for. He is saying: "Just hear my case."

I know some of these young people. The idea of taking young people headed for a life of crime and doing something for them is important. Many people have worked their hearts out to try to rehabilitate them and make good citizens out of them. This is what this resolution is all about.

The Secretary of Labor, I am afraid, does not realize what he is recommending. All we are asking is to hear the case. I will make a suggestion: Is there anyone here who can tell me if the Secretary of Labor has ever spent a night in a poverty camp? Stand up. The point is that GAYLORD NELSON, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, and a good man, has slept on the ground with those children. He knows what the problem is. He understands it. All we are really asking is just for the President to consider it, to hear both sides of the argument. He did that with the tax bill. That is important. That involves \$10 billion.

All we are talking about here are 10,000 little children. It is their future. It is their life. It is everything there is.

Now I voted against the Senator from California for one good reason, I wanted to position myself so that I can move to reconsider.

Mr. President, I would like to plead with my Republican friends, Please do not ruin this sanctuary of the wretched and the poor. You will regret it, if you do.

If I do say so, you Republican people have been very good to me. As good as they have been to me, I should like to return the favor by saying, Do not make this a partisan issue. Why not hear the facts?

I want to ask the Senator from California this question: Is he on the committee?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am on the committee.

Mr. LONG. Have the facts been presented?

Mr. CRANSTON. The facts have been presented in part but not in total. We do not know what we should about the Job Corps or other portions of the war on poverty at this time. We do not have the administration's alternative plans before us to consider.

Mr. LONG. The future of 18,000 children could be one dedicated either to crime or to being good citizens.

Let me ask the Senator from California, Have there been any uprisings, Communist inspired, in any one of these camps?

Mr. CRANSTON. There have been no riots since the Job Corps closing order was issued. On the other hand, there have been many riots on many campuses where other people are receiving an education.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) is chairman of that committee, and I think he understands the question as much as anyone here.

Is he here? I regret to say that he is not here.

The point is, he made an eloquent speech to an empty Chamber. No one heard him—that is, no one except possibly half a dozen people. I was there. All the Senator is asking is for the right to have his case heard.

I know this about the President of the United States. If this resolution is voted here tonight, he would be glad to consider it on its merits and be for it, or if it has no merit, then his answer would be accordingly.

I would like to urge Senators, if you have never been there and never slept on the ground with these boys, if you have never seen what it means to take a boy potentially dedicated to a life of crime and make him a good citizen of the United States, you should, at a minimum, be willing to consider the program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to reconsider.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I think that the Senator from California has made a very noble effort on behalf of the poor and the tempest tossed, those people who are lost as a part of our society. I voted against him for one simple reason, that I wanted to be in a position to make a motion to reconsider.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I want to express my gratitude to the Senator from Louisiana for all the valiant work that he has done on behalf of this resolution as well as for many other things I admire that he has done. I appreciate his friendship and his support in this. I thank all others who supported the resolution which I introduced. I also thank those who opposed it, especially for their fairplay and sportsmanship during this entire debate.

I regret that it did become a partisan effort. I think all those on the Republican side of the aisle know that I did my best to prevent this. I talked to the minority leader and the minority whip and to every other Republican Senator about this resolution stating why I was proposing it and urging that it not become a partisan battle—which it would not have become, of course, if they supported me in my efforts. But I intended it not to become a partisan issue, for I thought it would have a better chance for adoption and would help more people in the Job Corps if bipartisan support could be achieved.

We won two victories this afternoon. I recognize that we are not likely to win a third. I am reluctant to see the Senate tied up for a substantial amount of time in a losing battle for reconsideration.

But we do want to impress upon the President and the Secretary of Labor the position of the Senate. It is a position shared by every Senator, that the people

in the Job Corps be taken care of to the maximum degree possible and those who were about to enter the Job Corps be taken care of to the maximum degree possible.

I say, "to the maximum degree possible," because I recognize that all of them cannot be, and have not been, taken care of. Many of the training positions have been destroyed. Many of the enrollees will be back in and out of school. But perhaps with a renewed effort on the part of the administration or by a greater demonstration of interest, more people will be saved. I sincerely hope that they will be. For those reasons, and with those hopes in my heart, I urge the Senator from Louisiana not to ask for a reconsideration of the vote. And I urge the President of the United States, on behalf of all here, to do all that can be done through his administration to aid these young people.

Finally, I want to thank all those who have been involved on both sides of the aisle.

Several Senators addressed the Chair. Mr. LONG. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I want to thank the distinguished Senator from California for the very fine, gracious, and manly way in which he has handled himself not only throughout this matter, but also just now.

I remind all Senators that we have to pass on this question through the consideration of legislation very shortly. Certainly the President knows that this body is closely divided on the question of what centers there will be. I think that the Senator from California has suggested the appropriate handling of this matter and I hope that his suggestion will prevail. I think he has made enough of an effort that has been amply worth it. So far as I am concerned, I did not think so because I thought we were talking about a pious expression that seemed to indicate it would not bring good results. But I hope that every one here will remember that we have got to face up to this matter through legislation very shortly, and then is the time for us to look at the whole picture again.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me momentarily?

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to express my appreciation to the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). He was very effective and gallant. May I assure him that I will join with him in every effort to see to it that the administration will do everything it has said it will do and that the maximum solicitude is shown for these young people. I have deep faith that the Secretary of Labor and the President will join us in doing just that.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I want to clarify one point, and I am happy to have the opportunity to speak for 1 minute. I have no argument with Senators who have expressed the thought that when the Congress of the United States—the Senate in this instance—expresses the sense

of the Congress or of the Senate, it does not have a bearing upon the administration or the President of the United States.

I would remind the Members of this body that the Senate of the United States did express its sense of disapproval of the course followed by President Johnson when he cut back funds for the construction of the Interstate System.

During the fall of 1968, authority to obligate funds was withheld so that expenditures for highway construction could be curtailed \$200 million for fiscal year 1969. On December 1, 1968, full obligational authority was restored and the highway program is being carried forward at the level authorized by the Congress. Early this year there was some suggestion that highway funds might again be withheld and I think that the sense-of-the-Congress opposition to such cutbacks contained in the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, had an impact on the final decision not to make such a cut.

I only mention that as we finish the debate this afternoon because it would be wrong to say that what we do here in the Senate, in a sense-of-the-Senate or a sense-of-the-Congress resolution, has no effect upon the administration. It has had an effect, and I think it will have an effect again.

I think the debate on this matter has been helpful and wholesome and that the matters which have been discussed will bring to the President of the United States and the administration that he heads the realization that, although the resolution may be lost, as it has been, there is a real feeling on the part of Members of the Senate, regardless of party, that the Congress of the United States, as well as the executive branch, has a very definite responsibility in matters of this kind.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the President of the United States is an honorable and decent man, seeking to serve this Nation as the good Lord gives him the light, and I am sure that he will act as mercifully as the good Lord will permit him to do so. I think the President was fully advised on this matter. At the same time, he can read the RECORD; and if he does not read it, I think he has someone who will and report to him.

The Senator from California has made a noble fight and has explained his position so no one can misunderstand it. The Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON) also explained his position. I think they were right.

I suppose I am a poor loser. I feel that, as long as there is a chance to win, one should keep fighting. The Senator from California has persuaded me that we have been defeated. Therefore, I will not press the issue further. I withdraw my motion to reconsider.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to add my commendation to the warm expressions of praise already extended to the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON). The flawless manner in which he presented this measure to the Senate certainly points the way to what I am sure will be a number of outstanding contributions by him in the future.

This first effort by Senator CRANSTON has already demonstrated that in choosing him to represent their State, the people of California have selected an advocate of exemplary skill and ability. In the final analysis, the vote may have been against the resolution bearing his name; but there is no mistaking the fact that he made his position clear, he urged it with great persuasiveness, and his views with respect to the Job Corps, I am confident, will be taken by all with the deepest consideration. Senator CRANSTON has certainly marked the beginning of his role as a leader of legislation with great distinction.

I also wish to commend the strong efforts of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), the able and distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and the ranking minority member, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS).

These Senators and others joined to assure the disposition of this matter in an orderly and efficient fashion, and the Senate is grateful.

PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Montana about the schedule for tomorrow or about any succeeding day about which he knows.

INCREASED PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Order No. 155, H.R. 33. I do this so that it may be the pending business tomorrow.

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

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 33) to provide for increased participation by the United States in the International Development Association, and for other purposes.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action will be taken on this matter tonight, unless Senators want to speak on it, which I doubt.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that is the best I can do at this time in response to the question of the distinguished minority leader.

MR. JUSTICE FORTAS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD three letters: the first addressed to the Chief Justice of the United States under date of May 6, 1969; the second, bearing the same date, addressed to the Attorney General of the United States; and the third, dated the following day, May 7, addressed to Mr. William T. Gossett, president of the American Bar Association.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., May 6, 1969.

The CHIEF JUSTICE,
The Supreme Court,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHIEF JUSTICE: In this week's Life magazine there appears an article raising a serious question as to the propriety if not the legality of Justice Fortas' having accepted a \$20,000 fee from a private foundation controlled by Louis Wolfson, who at the time was under active investigation by agencies of the United States Government, including the Department of Justice.

It is a serious matter when the integrity of our courts is challenged, and for this reason I am asking that after you have examined the allegation as contained in this article you advise whether in the opinion of your Court the acceptance of the \$20,000 fee by Justice Fortas under the circumstances as outlined was a violation of the standard of conduct the American people have a right to expect of a man holding membership on the Supreme Court.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., May 6, 1969.

HON. JOHN N. MITCHELL,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: In this week's Life magazine there appears an article raising a serious question as to the propriety if not the legality of Justice Fortas' having accepted a \$20,000 fee from a private foundation controlled by Louis Wolfson, who at the time was under active investigation by agencies of the United States Government, including the Department of Justice.

After examining the allegations as contained in this article will you please advise me:

1. Was the acceptance of this fee by a member of the Supreme Court under such circumstances a violation of the law?

2. If not an actual violation of the law, does the Department consider it a violation of the standards of conduct expected of a man holding that high position?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., May 7, 1969.

Mr. WILLIAM T. GOSSETT,
President, American Bar Association,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. GOSSETT: Canons 4 and 24 of the Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association read as follows:

"Canon 4: A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; he should avoid infractions of law; and his personal be-

havior, not only upon the Bench and in the performance of judicial duties, but also in his everyday life, should be beyond reproach."

"Canon 24: A judge should not accept inconsistent duties; nor incur obligations, pecuniary or otherwise, which will in any way interfere or appear to interfere with his devotion to the expeditious and proper administration of his official functions."

In this week's Life magazine Justice Fortas is charged with having accepted a \$20,000 fee from a private foundation controlled by Louis Wolfson, who at the time was under investigation by various agencies of the United States Government, including the Department of Justice.

I am sure that the American Bar Association has read both the charges as outlined in Life as well as Justice Fortas' answer thereto; therefore, I am asking the question: Does Justice Fortas' acceptance of this fee under circumstances as outlined violate the Canons of Judicial Ethics of the American Bar Association?

Yours sincerely,

JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, yesterday I received a call from Mr. Gossett of the American Bar Association, acknowledging receipt of his letter and promising a reply within a few days.

As yet, I have not received any answer from the Chief Justice or the Attorney General; but we are confronted with persistent rumors that Justice Fortas' resignation is imminent, and a suggestion has been made that this may close the case.

Mr. President, I do not think that Justice Fortas has any choice except to resign, but under the circumstances his resignation will not suffice to answer the questions raised in these letters.

A strong inference has been made through the press media that the Department of Justice has additional evidence which if presented may go beyond the question of propriety and involve a legal question.

In fairness to Justice Fortas this inference of additional charges should not be left hanging in abeyance. If there is further evidence a resignation would not justify its being "brushed under the rug"; rather it should be openly presented, and the accused given an opportunity to refute it.

On the other hand, if there is no additional evidence it should be so stated and not left dangling as an additional cloud over a man who is already in enough trouble.

For this reason I reiterate that while I think Justice Fortas has no choice but to resign in the light of the charges already presented, nevertheless, regardless of developments I shall insist upon answers to these letters.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, May 13, 1969]

FORTAS AND THE COURT

The visit by the Attorney General to Chief Justice Warren last week, a visit now confirmed by both men, presumably was made in the hope that the case of Justice Abe Fortas could be satisfactorily resolved without fur-

their embarrassment to the justice or to the court.

It hasn't worked out that way. At first, neither Attorney General Mitchell nor the Chief Justice would comment on Newsweek's report of the visit. But yesterday, as the complaints against Fortas mounted, the confirmation came through.

Mitchell said that he had sought the meeting with the Chief Justice and that they met in the latter's chambers last Wednesday. "As a courtesy to the Chief Justice," Mitchell said, "I felt it incumbent upon me to inform him of certain information known by me which might be of aid to him." The Chief Justice has said nothing about the substance of their conversation. The reasonable inference is, however, that he knew the Attorney General would issue the statement he did issue, and that it is an accurate statement.

Another inference, and the only rational inference, is that the "certain information" conveyed to the Chief Justice was more damaging to Fortas than anything which has been made public to date. The Department of Justice acknowledged at the outset that the Fortas case was "under consideration," which surely means investigation although that word was not used. Furthermore, it is almost inconceivable that Mitchell would seek a meeting with the Chief Justice on a matter involving a member of the court unless he was satisfied that the information in his possession went beyond what was already in the public record.

In this situation, the Fortas case takes on a new dimension. There is quite obviously an added embarrassment to the court, and this just as the Chief Justice is preparing to step down after 16 years as head of the tribunal. It must also add to the embarrassment of Justice Fortas, who has acted as though he thinks he can ride out this storm without amplifying his earlier inadequate statement.

We do not believe this is possible. Justice Fortas should give a full explanation of the Wolfson affairs, and of any other matters that might be involved. If he is not willing to do this he can resign. If he is unwilling to take either of these steps, then it seems to us that the public has a right to all of the information bearing upon the activities of Justice Fortas which is in the hands of any government agency. Publicizing such information might serve further to prejudice the court. But in any event this can hardly be avoided. The damage has been done.

THE ABM AND EQUAL TIME

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I have not reached a final decision on how I will vote on the ABM, and I know there are many other Senators who are also undecided.

In order to enable Senators to cast their vote intelligently, I consider it important that they have available for their guidance the most expert independent testimony, more or less evenly divided between those who support and those who oppose the ABM.

Unfortunately, the press coverage, the hearings, and the TV coverage have thus far been heavily on the anti-ABM side. This lopsidedness makes it far more difficult for those of us who are trying to make up our minds in a conscientious manner.

In his recent article in Foreign Affairs, Dr. Donald Brennan of the Hudson Institute, pointed out that the great majority of the articles on the ABM controversy which have appeared in the American press have been anti-ABM. It is my understanding from several experts who have followed the literature carefully

that the anti-ABM articles have probably outnumbered pro-ABM articles by as much as 5 to 1. This was so simply because a majority of the editors are disposed against the ABM, and ordered their articles accordingly.

During the month of March, the Senate Subcommittee on International Organizations and Disarmament Affairs held extensive hearings on the ABM. Secretary Laird and several other witnesses testified for the Administration. But of the 12 nongovernmental witnesses called before the committee only two testified in support of the ABM. Because I considered this imbalance most unfortunate, I wrote to the subcommittee chairman (Mr. GORE) on March 21 and again on April 18, proposing that in the interest of a more balanced presentation, a number of expert witnesses who are disposed to support the ABM system be called before the subcommittee.

In my second letter I listed 16 such witnesses who could testify on the technological, strategic, and political implications of the ABM system.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to insert in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the full text of my two letters to the subcommittee chairman.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, roughly 2 weeks ago I was informed that the subcommittee planned to call Dr. Edward Teller and Dr. Eugene Wigner, the two experts who headed the list of names I had proposed.

Although the plan is to couple Dr. Teller and Dr. Wigner with new anti-ABM witnesses, this decision nevertheless does represent a move in the right direction, and I welcome it as a further evidence of the chairman's basic fairness.

Dr. Teller is scheduled to appear tomorrow morning, paired with Dr. Jerome Wiesner, of MIT.

This morning I learned that the NBC Television Network, which had covered much of the previous hearings live, including the adverse testimony of Drs. Killian, York, and Kistiakowsky, plans no live coverage or special treatment of the Teller-Wiesner confrontation before the subcommittee tomorrow morning.

I feel that this is most unfortunate, because the American public is entitled to a balanced presentation.

I therefore sent off a telegram to Mr. Julian Goodman, president of the National Broadcasting Co., urging NBC "to reconsider this decision in the interest of fair presentation on both sides of this highly complex and controversial subject."

I ask unanimous consent to insert the entire text of this telegram into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I want to repeat that I have not made up my mind on the ABM. There are many Members of Congress and countless thousands among the general public who are in the same position. My essential point is that

we are all entitled to an evenhanded presentation on this issue, pro and con.

I earnestly hope that we will have the benefit of such a presentation from now on.

EXHIBIT 1

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., March 21, 1969.

HON. ALBERT GORE,
U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALBERT: I believe that the hearings which your Subcommittee is holding on the question of the ABM have already performed a real service in helping to throw light on certain aspects of this difficult and troublesome problem. I want to compliment you, too, on the impartial manner in which the Subcommittee has conducted the hearings despite the very strong personal views which some of the members have on the issue of the ABM.

In the interest of providing Senators with the broadest possible expert opinion on which to base their judgment, I would like to propose that the Subcommittee invite the following additional witnesses to testify on the ABM:

1. Dr. Edward Teller.
2. Dr. Donald Ling, Vice President in Charge of Systems, Bell Laboratories.
3. Dr. Richard Foster, Director of Strategic Studies, Stanford Research Institute.
4. General Harold K. Johnson, Retired Army Chief of Staff.
5. Dr. Eugene Wigner, Nuclear physicist and Nobel Prize laureate, Princeton University.
6. Dr. Albert Wohlstetter, (For many years one of the top strategic analysts for the Rand Corporation; author of the "Fail Safe System"; at present at the University of Chicago).
7. Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski, former foreign policy consultant to President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey.

Collectively this group of proposed witnesses can, I am certain, provide valuable testimony covering the technological, strategic, and foreign policy considerations that must enter into the making of our decision on the ABM.

With every best wish, and with my congratulations again on the service you are performing,

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DODD.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., April 18, 1969.

The HON. ALBERT GORE,
U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ALBERT: Because I had heard something of the sharp division among the experts on the question of the ABM, I wrote to you on March 21, proposing that, in the interest of balance, the Subcommittee on International Organization and Disarmament Affairs call seven expert witnesses who, according to my information, were disposed to support the ABM system and were in a position to make an important contribution to the hearings then being conducted by the Subcommittee.

In renewing the matter at this point, I want to make it clear that I myself have not reached a final decision on how I will vote on the ABM. I know there are many other Senators who are also undecided. In order to enable Senators to cast their vote intelligently, I considered it important that they have available for their guidance the most expert independent testimony, more or less evenly divided between those who support and those who oppose the ABM.

As matters turned out, only two of the twelve nongovernmental witnesses who appeared before the Subcommittee testified in support of the ABM. (Dr. Hans Bethe, it is true, did concede that there might be some

point to the modified Safeguard System recommended by the President. But he has been a consistent opponent of anti-missile defense in the past, and his testimony on this occasion could certainly not be characterized as a ringing affirmation of belief in the need for anti-missile defense.)

Dr. Brennan and Dr. Fink, who testified in favor of the ABM, are men of outstanding competence who, according to my information, have closely followed the entire ABM development program and have up-to-the-minute knowledge of its present status. But their testimony was heavily overshadowed by the testimony against the ABM system because their names do not command the same kind of wide recognition as do the names of Dr. James Killian, Dr. George A. Kistiakowsky, Dr. Herbert York and some of the other witnesses who testified against the ABM.

In a letter which I received the day before the Easter recess, you informed me that my proposal would be discussed with the Subcommittee when Congress reconvened. I was therefore surprised to learn that the Subcommittee now plans to publish the body of the testimony which it took on its recent hearings early this coming week.

While it may be the intention of the Subcommittee to call other witnesses and print their testimony at a later date, I do believe it would have been preferable if this first volume of printed testimony could have been divided more or less evenly between witnesses on the pro and con side of the ABM debate. I say this because, by the nature of things, this first volume of testimony is bound to be considered a basic reference source in every Senate office over the coming weeks.

I therefore propose that the Subcommittee move as rapidly as possible to call before it the following list of expert witnesses who can testify on the technological, strategic and political implications of the ABM system:

1. Dr. Edward Teller: Recognized as one of the world's foremost nuclear physicists, Dr. Teller served as the founding director of the Livermore Laboratory. It is worth recalling that it was Dr. Teller more than any other person who succeeded in persuading President Truman to proceed with the hydrogen bomb, overruling the unanimous adverse recommendation of the distinguished scientists who composed the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission.

2. Dr. Eugene Wigner: Princeton University nuclear physicist and Nobel Prize laureate; recognized as one of the country's foremost authorities on civil defense.

3. Dr. Harold M. Agnew: Nuclear physicist; deputy director of the Weapons Division at Los Alamos Laboratories; former scientific adviser to Supreme Allied Command Europe; generally recognized as one of our leading experts on both nuclear weapons and the effects of nuclear weapons.

4. Dr. Alvin Weinberg: Nuclear physicist, director of the Oak Ridge Laboratories. Also one of this nation's leading experts on nuclear weapons.

5. Dr. John Wheeler: Princeton University nuclear physicist; co-author with Niels Bohr of the original paper on the mechanics of nuclear fission; recipient of the Fermi Award for nuclear physics.

6. Dr. Freeman Dyson: Nuclear physicist, Institute for Advanced Studies, Princeton University. Dr. Dyson, a prolific writer on various aspects of nuclear problems, is generally regarded by his peers as a particularly thoughtful analyst with a broad knowledge in other disciplines than nuclear physics.

7. Dr. Richard Latter: Nuclear physicist, Rand Corporation; participant in the Geneva test ban negotiations; member of the Air Force Science Advisory Committee.

8. Dr. Willard Libby: Nuclear physicist. Former member of the Atomic Energy Commission. Dr. Libby is not only an expert on nuclear weapons but also on the effects of nuclear weapons and defensive systems.

9. Dr. Albert Wohlstetter: For many years one of the top strategic analysts for the Rand Corporation; author of the "Fail Safe System"; at present at the University of Chicago.

10. Professor Zbigniew Brzezinski: Soviet expert, Columbia University; former foreign policy consultant to President Johnson and Vice President Humphrey.

11. Dr. Phillip Mosely: Director of the European Institute, Columbia University. Also widely regarded as one of our foremost Soviet experts.

12. Dr. William R. Kintner: Deputy Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, University of Pennsylvania. Co-author of "Protracted Conflict". Author of numerous books on various aspects of strategic problems. His most recent book is "Peace and the Strategy Conflict."

13. Dr. Richard Foster: For many years director of Strategic Studies at Stanford Research Institute. In charge of continuing study of defensive systems for the past 15 years.

14. General Harold K. Johnson: Retired Army Chief of Staff.

15. General Bernard A. Schriever: Former Commander, Air Force Systems Command.

16. Dr. Donald Ling: Vice President in Charge of Systems, Bell Laboratories. Has for many years participated prominently in technical evaluation of both U.S. and Soviet defensive systems.

I could expand this list substantially, but because the time of the Senate is limited, I have sought to confine myself only to those potential witnesses who are generally recognized as men of outstanding expertise.

Clearly, this is a situation where all the independent expertise is not on one side; and my argument is that, having heard one side, we should now hear the other.

As one Senator, I would like to hear what these ranking experts have to say about the ABM before I am called upon to cast my vote. I therefore hope that the vote on the appropriation for the Safeguard System will be deferred until the testimony of the experts I have here listed has been taken and printed, and until Senators have had an opportunity to study this new body of testimony for at least several weeks.

There is one final observation I would like to make. An effort has been made in certain quarters to characterize the debate on the ABM as a conflict between conservatives and liberals. Because I have always admired your nonpartisan approach to problems, I know you will agree that nothing could be further from the truth. The fact is that there are conservatives and liberals on both sides of this question; and the attempt to depict the division over the ABM as a liberal-conservative conflict only serves to confuse the issue rather than clarify it. Like so many other problems of our time, it is clear that this is an issue over which men of equal intelligence and equal integrity can sharply disagree.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. DODD.

EXHIBIT 2

MAY 13, 1969.

Mr. JULIAN GOODMAN,
President, National Broadcasting Co.,
New York, N.Y.:

Have just learned that the NBC Network plans no live or special coverage of Teller-Wiesner testimony on the ABM before Gore subcommittee tomorrow.

I hope it is not too late to reconsider this decision in the interest of fair presentation on both sides of this highly complex and controversial subject to the national television audience. Confrontation of two best-known experts on pro and con side is certainly news by any standards.

As matters now stand, the sum total of NBC television coverage of the ABM hearings

is heavily stacked against the ABM. Drs. Killian, York and Kistiakowsky, the three outstanding opponents of ABM and who testified before Gore committee, were televised live. Dr. Jack Ruina and several other anti-ABM witnesses were teletaped and carried on half-hour afternoon specials. So far there has been no such generous treatment for prominent nongovernmental pro-ABM spokesmen.

I raised the matter of the one-sided nature of the witness roster in two letters to chairman Gore, the first written on March 21 and the second on April 18. In these letters I pointed out that I myself have not yet reached decision on how I would vote on ABM. "In order to enable Senators to cast their vote intelligently," my letter said, "I consider it important that they have available for their guidance the most expert independent testimony, more or less evenly divided between those who support and those who oppose the ABM."

In order to rectify the balance, I submitted a list of sixteen experts who, according to my information, are disposed to support the ABM system. In part as a result of my letter, Senator Gore has now decided to call before the subcommittee two of the witnesses I proposed, Dr. Teller and Dr. Wigner. This does not completely rectify the serious imbalance that now exists, because Dr. Teller and Dr. Wigner will be offset by new anti-ABM witnesses. However, it does represent a move in the right direction.

NBC decision not to cover Teller-Wiesner hearing, and presumably Wigner hearing, represents a move in the wrong direction. Networks have great power over public opinion. On the whole, I believe they have sought to use this power fairly. But decision to cut off live coverage and special programs at the point where Dr. Edward Teller, most prestigious of all the pro-ABM witnesses, takes the witness stand, would violate tenets of intellectual fairness and would be serious disservice to American people.

Earnestly hope that NBC will reconsider its decision and will cover Teller hearings live. Believe public interest in Teller-Wiesner confrontation would more than justify special treatment.

THOMAS J. DODD.

THE FORTAS AFFAIR

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, ever since I entered public office I have been concerned with improving the operation of our judicial system. In 1968, after 2 years of hearings, I introduced the Judicial Reform Act which would require judges to disclose their financial interests and which would create machinery within the judiciary to deal with judges who, through their actions, have failed to meet the standard of "good behavior" required by article III of the Constitution, or who are unable to perform judicial duties because of disabling mental or physical infirmities.

My concern in this area is caused by the very real fact that our judiciary is the most sensitive and fragile branch of Government. It has neither the power of the purse nor the power to administer. Its ability to act as an effective instrument of government depends on its powers of reason and persuasion. It is for this reason that the judiciary takes upon itself certain restraints. Among these restraints are the Canons of Judicial Ethics which clearly state that a judge's official conduct should be free not only from impropriety but even from the appearance of impropriety, and that a judge's personal behavior both on the Bench and off should be beyond reproach.

I ask unanimous consent that canon No. 4 of the Canons of Judicial Ethics be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

4. AVOIDANCE OF IMPROPRIETY

A judge's official conduct should be free from impropriety and the appearance of impropriety; he should avoid infractions of law; and his personal behavior, not only upon the Bench and in the performance of judicial duties, but also in his everyday life, should be beyond reproach.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is significant that the appearance of impropriety is a violation not only of the spirit but of the letter of the Canons of Judicial Ethics. Courts, like all public institutions, are bodies of men, and the confidence they inspire depends upon the human qualities of these men. The American people have maintained their confidence because the members of the Federal judiciary have continued to inspire it. The strength of our courts can be only as great as the strength of those who have manned them.

We now find ourselves faced with a most unfortunate dilemma. Mr. Justice Fortas, an able lawyer and judge, received a \$20,000 check from the Wolfson Family Foundation at a time when Louis Wolfson and others associated with him were under investigation for possible criminal activity. That check was held until after Mr. Wolfson was indicted and was only then returned. During the time he held the check, Mr. Justice Fortas was serving on our Supreme Court. The facts of this transaction were brought to the public's attention more than 10 days ago.

On May 9 I wrote a personal letter to the Justice explaining to him my grave concern with published reports. I urged him to further publicly explain his role in the Wolfson transaction so that the cloud of impropriety which now hangs over his integrity and, indeed, over the entire judicial system, could be removed. I urged him to make that explanation immediately or if he were not able to explain further to resign forthwith.

In fact, the cloud over the Court has been darkened even further by the revelation of certain actions and statements by the representatives of the Department of Justice in this case. With every passing hour, the honor of the Federal courts, particularly the Supreme Court, is further impaired.

I believe the Fortas situation has deteriorated beyond recall. I have concluded that no explanation at this point can remedy the damage which has been done to the Court and to our entire judicial system.

For my part I will move forward to earliest possible enactment of the Judicial Reform Act and its judicial financial disclosure provisions.

But the course Mr. Justice Fortas must pursue is equally clear. The confidence of our citizenry in the Federal judiciary must be preserved. Mr. Justice Fortas must resign. He must resign immediately.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. 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

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate today, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 13, 1969:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. William Middendorf II, of Connecticut, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named graduates of the Coast Guard Academy to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of ensign.

Peter Thomas Aalberg.
Robert McFarlane Acker, Jr.
Frederick Robert Adamchak.
Andrew Warren Anderson.
David Burtis Anderson.
Russell Allen Askey.
Richard Clayton Barlow.
Robert Clayton Belote.
Bruce Arnold Bergmann.
Alan "R" Berry.
Michael (n) Billingsley.
William Kenneth Bissell.
Michael Thomas Black.
David Harold Blomberg.
Paul Jay Bodenhofer.
George Devereaux Bond II.
William Russell Bowen.
Douglas Brisbin Brown.
James Bernard Buckley III.
James Dale Burk.
Richard Edward Burke, Jr.
James Alan Cain.
Gary Richard Calverase.
Edward Michael Carapezza.
Daniel Leo Carney.
Timothy John Cenna.
Joseph James Clarke.
Warren Edward Colburn, Jr.
Jeffrey John Cottner.
John Frederick Curtis.
John Gregory Cwiek.
Donald Homer DeBok.
Ronald Edward DeMello.
James Thomas Doherty, Jr.
Robert Edward Donee.
David Claude Debois.
George Alexander Flanigan.
Joseph Frank Flayer.
Richard Edward Ford, Jr.
David Dexter Frydenlund.
James Daniel Garrison.
Paul Halpin Garrity.
Dale Howard Gebhardt.
Andrew Lotz Gerfin, Jr.
Robert Thomas Glynn.
Robert Carl Gravino.
Ronald Joseph Greto.
Bruce Evans Griffiths.
Wayne Robert Gronlund.
Donald Richard Grosse.
Richard Francis Gupman.

James William Gynther.
Gerald Lynn Hale.
Thomas Rupert Hamblin.
James Robert Hartney.
Phillip William Hawkins.
Robert William Henry.
George Forest Hetland, Jr.
Charles Hilton Hill.
Richard Lawrence Hilliker.
Alexander John Hindle, Jr.
Charles Arnette Huber, Jr.
James Donald Hull.
David Hurlbert Humphreys.
Steven Edward Hungness.
Robert Stephen Illman.
Timothy William Josiah.
William Robert Jurgens.
Barry Paul Kane.
Gerald Hoag Kemp.
Wenceslaus David Kinal.
John Richard Kissinger, Jr.
Christopher Gene Kreller.
Gregory James Labas.
Mark Lawrence Lavache.
Richard Alan Leclerc.
Peter Anthony Lenes.
Richard John Losea.
Thomas Raymond Lynch.
Gregory Hathaway Magee.
Robert Arling McCoy.
Walter Wingate McDougall, Jr.
John Francis McGowan.
Michael Joseph Mierzwa.
Eugene Anthony Miklaucic.
Eric William Miller.
John Kennedy Miner.
Michael Eugene Moore.
Charles Winwright More.
George Nicholas Naccara.
Glen Paul O'Brien.
Robert Clarence Olsen, Jr.
Gary Lee Pavlik.
James Walter Pennington.
Benjamin Blayne Peterson.
Robert Lawrence Pokress.
Mark David Present.
Paul Jeffrey Prokop.
Fred William Pryor.
Stanley Leon Renneker.
Mark Allen Revett.
Jeffrey Edward Robbins.
James Lee Robinson.
Pablo Moya Rodriguez.
Thomas Edward Rutenberg, Jr.
Daniel David Ryan, III.
Frederick Joseph Schmitt.
Roderick Anders Schultz.
Gregory Leonard Shaw.
Donald Raseley Shrader.
James Edward Smith, Jr.
Jay Mackenzie Snyder.
Chester Michael Sprague.
Dwight Randall Squires.
Elwood Edward Stoeger.
John Frederic Stumpf.
Robert Wilmot Thorns.
Richard Charles Vlaun.
Charles William Wade.
Darryle Mondart Waldron.
Edward Donald Walsh, Jr.
Howard Charles Waters.
Harold Franklin Watson.
Robert John Wenzel.
Larry Felix Wheatley.
Stuart Norman White.
Theodore Greenleaf White, III.
Frederick Nathan Wilder.
George Michael Williams.
Bruce David Wintersteen.
Robert Clifford Wise.
John Vincent Zeigler.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named (U.S. Naval Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Allen, John E. Macharach, Howard R.
Anderson, Scott D. Balsy, Jeri D.
Arbacas, William V., Beaulieu, Stephen A., Jr. III

Berry, William D.
Bessey, James P.
Boese, William J.
Boyer, Michael F.
Briggs, Richard H.
Brixey, Stephen A.
Buell, David G.
Bush, Richard P.
Buttrill, William S.
Campbell, Richard W.
Carlin, Stanley E.
Carr, Emerson F.
Chopak, Joseph B.
Clarke, Robert D.
Cohen, Larry D.
Conrad, Michael D.
Comiskey, Stephen W.
Cooley, Joel L.
Corrigan, Robert M.
Costello, Martin J.
Covey, John K.
Cowan, Robert W.
Creed, Jerry L.
Cross, Michael "J"
Denight, Terrence M.
Doig, William A., Jr.
Doolittle, John P.
Dunham, George R.
Dunn, Perry R.
Edwards, Stephen A.
Eikenberry, Robert C.
Estes, Kenneth W.
Estey, Donald H., Jr.
Farrow, Jerry M.
Fawcett, Robert J.
Fender, Robert G.

Fisher, Charles S.
Garland, William R.
Garner, Robert D.
Gass, James E., Jr.
Geary, Robert W.
Gray, John H.
Hagel, Lawrence B.
Hannemann, James R.
Hood, Ronald C., III
Horton, David S.
Hough, Michael A.
Jiminez, Jose L.
Johanson, Erick T.
Jones, William R.
Kendig, Edward S.
Ketchie, Scott D.
Kollay, Daniel P.
Kopp, William J.
Kuck, George V. H., Jr.
Langston, Edward R., Jr.
Lasher, John R., Jr.
Lees, Robert B.
Leonard, Edward M.
Linder, Stephen T.
Long, Daniel J.
Lottie, Richard O.
McBrier, Timothy A.
McDonough, Robert C. Jr.
McGee, Michael P.
Miller, Douglas L.
Mize, David M.
Morgan, William, Jr.
Normand, Andrew L.
O'Neill, Hugh J.

Pace, Nat M., Jr.
Pasquale, Thomas D.
Pitman, Thomas J.
Pomroy, Geoffrey W.
Porter, Charles R.
Post, John H., III
Provini, Charles R.
Rayburn, Ros (n)
Red, Richard P.
Ribalta, Charles (n)
Riggs, Jeffrey L.
Rogers, William C.
Rose, Michael P.
Russell, David P., III
Sandberg, James R.
Sciba, William L., Jr.

The following-named (U.S. Air Force Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jones, Perc L.
Reid, Viet S.

The following-named (U.S. Military Academy graduates) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bosshard, Steven A.
Heath, John W.
Leppig, William H.

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in

Snakenberg, John D.
Stromberg, Russel M.
Tanaka, Donald H.
Timperlake, Edward T.
Todd, James L.
Tolmie, John S., Jr.
Ture, Kenneth M.
Turner, James T., Jr.
Tyler, Thomas W.
Uhlemeyer, Arthur F.
Van Pelt, James S.
Ward, Stephen A., III
Wellington, Joseph A.
Wild, Edward B.

the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:
Gilbert, Ronald M.
Markle, Herbert H.

The following-named (Navy Enlisted Scientific Education Program) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Force, Allen L.

The following-named (staff noncommissioned officers) for temporary appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Joseph N.
Bode, Victor H.
Chovanec, Barbara J.
Dobson, Jesse A.
Epps, Robert R.
Jones, Ronald L.
Laws, Thomas L.
Richardson, Coy W.
Rush, John F.
Shewmake, David F.
Smith, Wharton S., Jr.
Stafford, Herbert B.
Thomas, Gary G.
Thompson, Wayne L.
Ward, Cecil E.
Wilson, John T.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 13, 1969:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
COURT OF APPEALS

Frank Q. Nebeker, of Virginia, to be an associate judge of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals for the terms of 10 years.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 13, 1969

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith.—Hebrews 10: 22.

God of our fathers and our Father God, who art sending Thy spirit into the hearts of men seeking to bring justice and peace to our world, may we with open minds and receptive hearts receive Thy spirit and with Thee strive to make justice and peace a reality in our day.

Give us grace to take to heart the dangers involved in our unhappy divisions and our unhallowed differences. Remove from us all that hurts our unity of spirit and all that hinders our forward march together. Kindle in us the fire of Thy redeeming love, strengthen us by Thy power and draw us closer to one another.

To Thee and to our country we consecrate the work of this day.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 2, 1969, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 3832. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide the grade of general for the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps when the total active duty strength of the Marine Corps exceeds 200,000.

APPOINTMENT TO THE JOINT COMMISSION ON THE COINAGE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 301, Public Law 89-81, the Chair appoints as a member of the Joint Commission on the Coinage the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. McCLURE, to fill the existing vacancy thereon.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT TODAY

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to meet this afternoon in markup session, while the House is in session. The subcommittee will be marking up amendments to the Older Americans Act of 1965. This request has been cleared with the ranking minority members of the subcommittee and the full committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

CAMPUS UNREST AND SCHOOL GUIDELINES

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, there is room for apprehension over the varying viewpoints expressed by administration officials on a policy of dealing with campus unrest. Most people, long dismayed by lack of action in dealing with these prob-

lems, were relieved when Vice President AGNEW and Attorney General Mitchell spoke out strongly against what is happening to American colleges. There is no question but that their statements reflected the overwhelming desire of the American people for a return to sanity, a lessening of unrest, and a firm attitude by college presidents.

Now Secretary Finch, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, has tipped the scales the other way by indicating his belief that the Federal Government can have only a very limited role in stemming the current disorders. He places a great share of the blame on the failure of American universities and suggests a commission to study the problems of change on campuses. This is a disconcerting development and one which it is hoped will not progress. There is nothing the United States needs less than another commission. We have had more than our share of commissions, which wasted the taxpayers' money and contributed nothing. The Government cannot fail to accept responsibility for preserving law and order if duly constituted local authorities fail to do so. Present day problems will not wait.

Secretary Finch also stated there is no room for change in Federal desegregation guidelines unless changes are dictated by the courts. This is directly contrary to campaign commitments by the President. The guidelines have long been the source of greatest agitation in anti-segregation problems. Time and again they have gone beyond the letter of the law and reflected the whim of race mixers rather than sound policies intended for the betterment of education. Needed schools have been closed without reason