EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

BYELORUSSIAN AMERICANS MARK 52D ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, American citizens of Byelorussian origin today mark the 52d anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. In Byelorussia, however, a national celebration has been replaced by observance of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ulianoff, the man we know as Nikolai Lenin.

The United Nations' Commission on Human Rights also has adopted a resolution to commemorate the birth of this man on April 20 of this year.

Might I say, Mr. Speaker, this commemoration is a most cynical humiliation of the idea of humanism. It is a public mockery of human rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as adopted by the United Nations.

This resolution demonstrates a flagrant injustice by the free world toward not only the Byelorussian nation, but all others who were conquered and suffered oppression under Lenin's rule.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most inappropriate for those of us who believe in freedom and justice for all to honor a man such as Nikolai Lenin.

I include the following letter at this point:

BYELORUSSIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA,
Queens, N.Y., March 9, 1970.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: March 25, 1970 will mark an anniversary of great significance for American citizens of Byelorussian origin, for on that day Byelorussians everywhere in the countries of the free world will celebrate the 52nd anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. In Byelorussia, however, a national celebration of independence is replaced by the observance of 100th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ulianoff (Lenin), former leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party and former head of Soviet Russian Government, glorified as the alleged benefactor of the Byelorussian people.

The United Nations' Commission on Human Rights on March 13, 1969 has adopted a resolution to commemorate the 100th year since the birth of Vladimir Ulianoff (Lenin), former leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party and former head of Soviet Russian Government, as a great humanitarian. This celebration will take place on April 20, 1970.

Byelorussian people is enslaved by Soviet Russia today and is unable to express freely its past and present experiences under communism and its opinion on the humanitarianism of Lenin. Therefore, we would like to present an opinion on the humanitarianism of Lenin with respect to the Byelorussian people and its country.

As a theorist of Russian Bolshevism, Lenin appeared as a decisive defender of the integrity of the Russian Empire, many years before usurping power in Russia. In his program, for the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Bolsheviks), Lenin acknowledged the right of non-Russian nations for self-determination down to separation, but not real separation. Lenin was against separation of non-Russian nations from Russia. His position was for holding them inside the borders of the Russian state and to convince his own party members to take the same attitude (Letter, by Lenin, from Krakau to S. Shaumian, November 23, 1913).

After usurpation of power in Russia on November 7, 1917 Lenin showed utmost hostility toward the liberation of all non-Russian nations, dominated by the Russian Empire. The Declaration of Rights for nations of Russia, accepted by the Bolshevik Government, was a repetition of the national policy as it was formulated previously in the program of the Bolshevik Party by Lenin.

The treatment of Byelorussia, headed by the Lenin government was—as follows. The First All-Byelorussian Congress consisting of 1,872 representatives convened in Miensk on December 15, 1917. This was a national Byelorussian assembly, whose aim was to decide the future statehood of Byelorussia. Bolshevik-Russian delegates were in a small minority. They were not able to influence the Congressional decisions. The Congress has chosen independence for the Byelorussian state. On December 17, 1917 the Red Russian Army dispersed the Congress by order of the Soviet Russian Government.

During the continuing war, at a favorable situation, the Council of the First All-Byelorussian Congress proclaimed independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918. In opposition to this independent Byelorussian state Lenin ordered the creation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR). This fictitious state, as well as its government, were created by the Soviet Government in Moscow. Proclamation of the BSSR took place on January 1, 1919 in the city of Smalensk which was conquered by Russia.

Later, the Soviet Russian Army conquered most of Byelorussia. Concluding peace treaty with Poland in Riga in 1921, Lenin without representatives from the BSSR divided the territory of Byelorussia as follows: The BSSR was alloted a territory of six counties of the Miensk district only, with a population of approximately 1.2 million. Poland was given approximately 100,000 sq. km. of Byelorussia with a population of approximately 4 millions. Directly to Russian SFSR there was annexed approximately 250,000 sq. km. of Byelorussian territory with a population of over 9 millions. This partition of Byelorussia and subjugation of her people existed until the death of Lenin. In this way Lenin brutally suppresed the aims of the Byelorussian people for self-determination and independence, and turned into a colonial people of Soviet Russia.

By introduction of his own totalitarian communist regime in Byelorussia, Lenin deprived Byelorussian people of all its human rights and freedoms, the rights recognized by the Western World at this time, and proclaimed earlier by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Those rights being: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of association, freedom of worship, freedom of economical activity, freedom to elect one's own government, freedom to choose one's habitat and travel abroad, immunity of home, independence of judiciary, etc. Freedom of activity was given to the Bolshevik Party only, which was executing orders from the central government in Moscow. The leadership of this party in Byelorussia was composed of non-Byelorussians. It was a reliable instrument for domination over the Byelorussian nation.

The constitution of the BSSR, as well as the USSR, guaranteed in writing most of the above mentioned freedoms. However, these constitutions exist on paper only to mislead the foreign opinion. In reality the Bolshevik Party is using such policies which are suiting her aims, ignoring completely existing constitutions.

Lenin introduced a very brutal tyranny by governing Bolshevik Party superiors. Called by him, hypocritically, "workers' and peasants' government," as well as a Central Committee of Bolshevik Party, included neither a single worker, nor a peasant. The Communist Party occupied a privileged place, that which was previously held by nobility in czarist era.

The Bolshevik Party represented a new ruling class of fascist type. It used a limitless and merciless exploitation of working people. Starvation and hunger, shortage of all necessary articles existed in reality during Lenin's rule. Only the members of the Communist Party were supplied through special exclusive distribution stores, unaccessible to the rest of the population.

This oppression of people was possible only by the use of mass and ruthless terror. In this field Lenin showed extraordinary ability. He organized Cheka (Extraordinary Committee—Secret Police) headed by the notorious F. Derzhynsky. This mill of death had no other predecessor in modern history. The infamous czarist security service (okhranka) in comparison with Cheka was a very liberal institution. The surveillance by police was raised to systematic denunciation of each person. The Cheka kept an accumulative file on all. A new crime was discovered in which each person became a suspect—the potential enemy of the Soviet Government. The arrests of innocent people in mass as those potential enemies; the relentless savage abuse and torture of imprisoned people, who were admitting the non-committed crimes; the shooting of people en mass without trial—all this, as a sword of Damocles, was hanging over a defenseless people, murdered by Lenin's bureaucrats, immune to any responsibility.

Lenin is the father of Russian Bolshevism, that which is oppressing Byelorussian people for over 50 years. This period is the most severe and tragic of all Byelorussian history. During this time the Bolshevik Moscow annihilated over 6 million of Byelorussians. But, at the present time, using systematic Russianization, deportations of Byelorussians to Siberia, and colonization of Byelorussia by Russians, the Moscow Government is attempting a complete removal from the globe of the separate Byelorussian nation and transforming it into a part of Russia. This genoside is a direct result of the Leninist national policies applied towards non-Russian nations of the USSR.

Miss Svetlana Alliluyeva, daughter of J. Stalin, recently made this public statement, ". . . all of this did not begin with my father. So many people think that he invented the system, the dictatorship, the police, the spying. But he didn't. He inherited it all from Lenin."

Lenin projected conquest of the entire globe by Bolshevism. He designed a universal USSR, of course, under the hegemony of Soviet Russia. This design is used by the present government of Moscow as a current program of realization. Soviet Russia is giving top priority to the development of her own military power, and is gradually realizing the testament of Lenin on the conquest and enslavement of the remaining independent countries. This subjugation of nations of central Europe after the 2nd World War, communist expansion in Greece, Korea and Vietnam, the recent military invasion into Czechoslovakia, all these are the con-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

current steps leading towards the realization of the expansionist plan designed by Lenin.

We are assuming, that proposal to commemorate the birthday of Lenin in the United Nations was initiated by the representatives from Soviet Russia, or by their subservient countries-satellites. The real aim behind this diversionist maneuver is to disorient nations of the free world, and to make them more vulnerable to gradual absorption by Moscow.

We would like to call your kind attention to the fact that this commemoration would be a most cynical humiliation of the idea of humanism. It would be a public mockery of human rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations. It will demonstrate a flagrant injustice expressed by the free countries towards the Byelorussian nation, which was conquered, oppressed and suffered heavily under Lenin's terrorist rule, as well as under the rule, inspired by him, of the present Government of Soviet Russia. We would like to ask you for decisive rejection of this celebration as completely inappropriate for people honoring freedom and justice for all.

At this time, the Byelorussians living in their native country do not have any opportunity to defend their national interests. Therefore, we take liberty to ask you for support of the desires of the Byelorussian people for liberation from Soviet Russian slavery, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian state.

Very respectfully yours,

JOHN KOSIAK,
President.

FARM PAYMENTS OVER $25,000

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 years I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of the farmers in the Nation which in 1967 and 1968 received huge sums of money from the U.S. Treasury in the form of farm program payments.

Each year, too, I have introduced amendments which would place a limit on the amount of payments any one farmer could receive from the Federal Treasury. The idea of limiting to a reasonable amount the maximum amount of funds going to a farmer has grown in popularity both among the Members of Congress and the Nation's citizens. This acceptance on the part of the citizenry stretches the length and breadth of the Nation and comes from the rural as well as the urban sectors.

Limitation of farm payments is an idea which is commonly accepted and so that each Member of the Congress can make a side-by-side comparison with the information placed in the RECORD the past 2 years, I am placing in the RECORD today the names of the Nation's farmers who in 1969 received $25,000 in Federal farm program payments—excluding wool and sugar—listing them by State and county.

I announced in Tuesday's RECORD that I again plan to introduce an amendment to place a limitation on Federal farm payments in the range of $20,000. The list of names as I have them assembled will assist every Member of Congress in determining which farmers in their State or district will be affected by such a limit.

During 1969, a total of 7,795 farmers received payments from the Federal Government in excess of $25,000. This is an increase of 1,881 farmers in this rather exclusive group over the previous year. These farmers divided a total of $93,333,643 more in 1969 than the farmers receiving these huge payments the previous year.

Listed below are some farmers who received exceptionally high payments both years. You will note that in nearly every case, the amount received by these farmers in 1969 was greater than before.

The tabulation follows:

	1968	1969
ARIZONA		
Maricopa County: Farmers Inv. Co	$504,389	$673,410
Pima County: BKW Farms, Inc	331,512	350,607
CALIFORNIA		
Fresno County:		
Giffen, Inc	2,772,187	3,333,385
Vista Del Llano Farms	745,647	778,624
Kings County:		
J. G. Boswell Co	3,010,042	4,370,657
South Lane Farms	1,177,320	1,788,052
Salver Land Co	786,459	1,637,961
LOUISIANA		
Natchitoches County: J. H. Williams	144,403	158,174
MISSISSIPPI		
Bolivar County: Delta & Pine Land Co	605,796	731,772
Leflore County: Buckhorn Planting Co	146,510	180,440
Sharkey County: Pantherburn Co	158,521	194,960
Washington County: Potter Bros., Inc	277,768	248,244
NEW MEXICO		
Curry County:		
John Garrett & Sons	111,799	179,598
Garret Corporation	94,423	147,319
James E. & John Garrett	(1)	124,899
NORTH CAROLINA		
Robeson County:		
McNair Farms	351,596	366,584
Southern National Bank	170,044	224,254
OREGON		
Umatilla County: Cunningham Sheep Co	84,993	88,305
SOUTH CAROLINA		
Sumter County:		
W. R. Mayes	156,284	185,039
J. E. Mayes	95,237	122,198
TEXAS		
Bailey County: Carl C. Bamert	96,348	101,763
Bowie County: Three Way Land Co	206,883	198,879
Brazos County:		
Tom J. Moore	289,883	325,886
H. H. Moore & Sons	283,962	310,411
Castro County:		
Hill Farms	174,815	130,979
Jimmy Cluck	142,345	172,359
Cochran County: J. K. Griffith	320,315	322,355
Dawson County: Bill Weaver	136,105	140,462
Hale County:		
Ercell Givens	156,583	172,152
I. F. Lee	131,881	183,638
Hidalgo County: Engelman Farms	155,011	
Reeves County: Worsham Bros	176,036	222,487
WASHINGTON		
Columbia County: Broughton Land Co	140,695	141,688
Whitman County: Glen Miller	116,844	123,532

(1) None.

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Alabama

AUTAUGA COUNTY	
McQueen Smith Farms	$147,272
Wadsworth Brothers	38,355
Autauga Farming Co	38,194
J. D. Dismukes	33,239
J. A. Rainwater	25,525
D. L. Yarbrough Estate	25,199
Total payees in county (6)	307,784
BARBOUR COUNTY	
W. L. Corcoran	83,235
BIBB COUNTY	
James Brothers	53,076
Young Brothers	46,401
J. C. Goodson	39,327
Total payees in county (3)	138,804
BLOUNT COUNTY	
Dean Pruett	95,738
Johnny Whitley	43,556
Total payees in county (2)	139,294
BUTLER COUNTY	
Harry Poole	32,654
CALHOUN COUNTY	
Sorrell Bruce Wesson	28,398
CHAMBERS COUNTY	
Fred Kendrick	27,740
CHEROKEE COUNTY	
Ellis Bros	38,699
Sewell Brothers	30,140
Jerrell W. Stepps	25,667
Total payees in county (3)	94,506
CHILTON COUNTY	
C. R. Childress	36,464
Charles F. Culp	25,140
Total payees in county (2)	61,604
COFFEE COUNTY	
J. A. Wise & Son	25,989
COLBERT COUNTY	
Herbert C. Harris, Jr	75,216
Billy Pullen	50,632
R. Gordon Preuit	49,728
Eugene V. Blythe	48,739
J. J. Johnson	45,049
W. Carter Reid	39,396
William Elbert Reid	38,879
Howard Keeton	38,113
Ben Fennel, Jr	38,081
Daniel Counts	37,017
Price Counts, Jr	32,809
Paul Reid	32,310
William Posey	31,815
Roe S. Woodis	31,221
Hollis Isbell	27,883
Charles Keeton	27,006
Bill Blackburn	25,992
J. H. Johnson	25,493
James M. Underwood	25,403
Oneal Sockwell	25,102
Total payees in county (20)	745,884
CONECUH COUNTY	
J. T. Ward	30,722

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Alabama—Con.

COVINGTON COUNTY

W. G. Foshee, Jr	$28,675
Crum Foshee	25,282
Total payees in county (2)	53,957

CULLMAN COUNTY

T. J. Pate	41,434
W. F. Blackwood	33,046
Carmon Maze	32,424
Total payees in county (3)	106,904

DALE COUNTY

Borland Bros	34,592
Jim Espy	29,427
Total payees in county (2)	64,019

DALLAS COUNTY

Joe I. McHugh	109,505
Beers Brothers	59,466
J. W. Suttle	48,232
James A. Minter, Jr	41,174
W. H. Watte and Son	39,251
R. Furniss Ellis	33,929
Carl Henderson	33,601
Cedar Creek Farms	33,126
W. J. Neighbors	32,171
Thomas E. McHugh	30,933
James A. Minter III	29,661
Nelson Norris	27,584
Total payees in county (12)	518,633

ELMORE COUNTY

J. Melvin Taylor	66,297
Wood T. Dozier	36,939
Harper Brothers	33,381
Garnand and Thornton	30,963
George Douglas McCartha, Jr	30,194
Ralph Till	26,086
Total payees in county (6)	223,860

FAYETTE COUNTY

J. C. Randolph	31,449

GENEVA COUNTY

Elmer Joe Motley	26,668

GREENE COUNTY

N. G. Garth	33,660
Elan Smith	28,731
Bayne Ethridge	28,301
Total payees in county (3)	90,692

HALE COUNTY

W. J. Chandler and Sons	90,472
Marvin D. Johnson	30,390
Waller E. Wedgworth III	28,166
Morrison Bros., Co	28,114
Turpin Vise	27,977
Total payees in county (5)	205,119

HENRY COUNTY

Kirkland Brothers	26,382

JACKSON COUNTY

W. C. McCord	27,155
James L. Medlock	25,006
Total payees in county (2)	52,161

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Jimmy M. Bagwell	25,929

LAUDERDALE COUNTY

Theo Scott	$34,444
Robert L. Winters	33,805
Andrew C. Walker	32,246
Hugh L. Rice, Jr	26,385
Harvell J. Walker	26,325
James Walker	26,268
Total payees in county (6)	179,473

LAWRENCE COUNTY

E. F. Mauldin	118,654
Dan Claborn	85,783
Albermarle Corp	84,045
G. T. Hamilton	76,970
James Blythe, Jr	76,192
Daniel Gilchrist	53,224
D. L. Martin, Jr	45,669
Wheeler Farms, Inc	40,421
Russell Armstrong	39,869
W. W. Hamilton	39,817
Grady B. Rose	36,339
Hugh J. Posey	36,102
W. J. Lee and Son	35,319
George Collins	34,798
Samuel R. Letson	34,426
E. H. Dewberry	34,168
Harold Green	33,752
Lynn Cross	33,641
Hubert Coffey	33,347
Grady Windle Parker	33,222
W. J. Dewberry	31,544
O. D. Brackin	30,997
Roland Cross	29,574
Benjamin A. Rose	28,304
J. R. Knouff	28,139
J. C. Claborn	27,943
Leon Hamilton	26,011
Jack C. Davis	25,724
Total payees in county (28)	1,233,994

LEE COUNTY

Robert E. Gullatte	26,846
Nelson Hillyer	26,586
Total payees in county (2)	53,432

LIMESTONE COUNTY

Walter B. Shaw	62,003
Joe R. Murphy	58,186
Ned Johnson	56,179
R. W. Anderson & Sons	51,657
Fred William Hays	47,640
Gene Thomas Burgreen	46,492
James T. Sanderson	42,614
Dan Atkinson	40,992
Lucille F. Bowles	37,281
Glennes V. Moore	36,108
Vester M. Leonard	35,463
Hargrave Brothers	34,917
Henry Charles Baucom	34,034
John D. Anderson	32,980
James P. Grooms	31,255
L. V. Moore	30,989
Grover C. Lawson, Jr	29,686
Luke Pryor	29,290
McDonald Farms, Inc	28,544
Winfred Barron	28,141
Glenn Black	28,047
Thomas H. Vann	28,006
Robert Horace Marks	26,702
Total payees in county (23)	877,206

LOWNDES COUNTY

B. C. Rhyne	54,785
G. T. Meadows, Jr	50,010
Harrell Hammonds	47,493
O. P. Woodruff	37,123
Total payees in county (4)	189,411

MACON COUNTY

Mrs. H. A. Torbert & Sons	$37,808
A. L. Lazenby Jr	36,471
F. C. Thompson	29,237
Robert F. Walters, Jr	26,273
Segrest Bros	26,094
Ben W. Walker	25,846
Total payees in county (6)	181,729

MADISON COUNTY

Douglass & Vandiver	62,802
Hunter Brothers	59,397
John W. League	56,506
Dublin Farm	55,253
Wilburn B. Douglass	53,399
John W. McCrary	50,215
W. Homer Tate	45,765
Robert L. Pickens	45,467
James E. Patterson, Jr	41,460
W. R. Spears	38,771
Donald Sublett	37,266
Tyler Denton	35,163
Ray Vandiver	35,001
Tom E. Lowery	34,258
Jack T. Clift	30,477
Carl A. Williams	29,850
Everett Jones	29,696
Grady Abernathy	29,528
R. F. Vandiver	29,324
Carlton Ikard	28,598
Wesley Thomas	28,378
C. Q. Lowery	27,792
M. E. Moore	27,024
Orville H. Esslinger	26,350
John W. Hays	26,202
Don Martin	26,201
Kenneth Pike	26,046
Walter Lowery	25,249
Total payees in county (28)	1,041,438

MARENGO COUNTY

James W. Glass	35,748

MARSHALL COUNTY

Harold Burnett	28,079

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

W. H. McLemore	50,495
T. O. McLemore	28,670
A. J. McLemore, Jr	25,164
Total payees in county (3)	104,329

MORGAN COUNTY

Percy Sharp	27,773
W. Aaron Beaver	27,067
Total payees in county (2)	54,840

PERRY COUNTY

J. C. Moore Mercantile Co	64,934
Ed Bobbitt	35,422
T. J. Jones	32,224
Total payees in county (3)	132,580

RUSSELL COUNTY

Ben F. Bowden	78,657

SHELBY COUNTY

D. E. Morris	37,480
L-B-L Ranch	34,697
John M. Thompson	27,668
Total payees in county (3)	99,845

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Alabama—Con.

ST. CLAIR COUNTY

Norris K. Waites	$25,758

TALLADEGA COUNTY

James D. Robinson	31,306
Robert M. Gambrell	30,719
Clyde A. Walker	27,247
Total payees in county (3)	89,272

TALLAPOOSA COUNTY

William M. Wisener	57,401

TUSCALOOSA COUNTY

Joe Rice, Jr	37,983
Darden D. Barton	34,708
J. L. Harper	33,191
Total payees in county (3)	105,982

WILCOX COUNTY

Raymond Pharr	26,793
Total payees in state (201)	7,738,254

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arizona

COCHISE COUNTY

Bill Hilburn	$187,574
Kinard Bros	66,745
Floyd Robbs	62,053
Jones Ranches	60,133
Edward Barnes	57,515
Eugene Allison	57,157
Montierth Farms	52,996
Buckner & Kidd	50,538
Jack Robison & Sons	43,289
Charles Wade	43,080
Wilcx. Lnd. & Ctl	43,935
Eddie Jay Sr	43,002
W. R. Shumaker	36,788
E. V. Hart	36,475
F. L. Heidel	36,366
Eaton Fruit Co., Inc	34,185
Roy Lee Young	34,077
Marvin Holmes	34,070
Wisks Ranches	31,627
J. C. Dunagan	31,121
Tx. Gr. Stg. Co	28,245
Boyd Smith	27,569
Delbert Motes	27,176
John Kimzey	26,812
Ernest L. White, Jr	26,805
V. C. Smith	26,739
Thomas W. Cook, Jr	26,170
M. K. Sellers	26,133
J. F. Schmelzla	26,095
W. R. Grimes	25,321
Total payees in county (30)	1,308,891

GRAHAM COUNTY

Melvin R. Bryce	63,747
Alf B. Claridge	44,877
Daley Brothers	34,765
Norman Welker	27,793
Glen Layton	27,483
Ned Daley	25,409
Total payees in county (6)	224,074

GREENLEE COUNTY

Adrian Richins	25,917

MARICOPA COUNTY

Farmers Inv. Co	$673,410
Youngker Farms	382,786
Goodyear Farms	275,654
David A. Shumway	215,684
Community Gin	178,790
Southmountain Farms	166,696
Roscoe Farm Co	161,122
Waddell Ranch Co	148,543
Leyton Woolf	142,061
F. C. Layton	141,324
Arena Co. of Ariz	138,494
Hugh Bennett	135,734
Ed Ambrose	127,912
Martori Bros	127,526
Harris Cattle Co	121,412
Carl E. Weiler	112,421
Davis Ranch Co	108,147
Morrison Bros	107,184
Fridenmaker Farms	106,771
H. L. Anderson	106,126
J. L. Hodges Farming Co	101,721
J. L. Golightly Jr	100,698
Gladden Farms	99,639
W. H. Haggard Jr	93,759
Woodrow Lewis	92,521
Power Ranches Inc	88,031
F. H. Hogue Prod. Co	87,638
Jacob S. Stephens	85,043
Barney-Mecham	80,775
Sutton Bros	77,650
Ben Riggs & Son	77,175
C. W. Neely	76,319
Rhodell Farms Inc	76,162
Phelps & Palmer	75,854
Skousen & Hastings	74,253
Travis H. Jones	74,135
Wallace Bales	74,076
M. B. M. Farms	73,879
Moore & Taylor	72,955
L. R. Layton	71,708
W. A. Heiden & Son	71,428
Hardesty Bros	70,660
Garcia Farms Ptns	69,055
William Hardison	68,873
Lee Wong Farms Inc	68,863
K. V. Jordon & R. B. Coplen	68,320
C. O. Pitrat & Sons	66,762
Henry L. Voss	62,998
John D. Hamilton	62,462
D. & R. Farms	62,180
S. & P. Farms Inc	62,045
Kempton & Snedigar	61,921
CCG Farms Inc	61,752
James M. Hamilton	61,539
Lone Butte Ranches	60,851
W. H. Haggard, Jr	59,616
Grant-Vaughn Ellsworth	59,228
Baskett Farms	58,268
Arid Zone Farms	58,024
Phil Ladra	57,661
F. M. Gorrell	57,145
Dougherty Ranch	56,637
King Farms	55,168
Arrowhead Ranches	55,080
D. L. Hadley	54,713
Bell Road Farms	54,139
John M. Williams Jr	53,249
J. R. Tucker	53,013
Jewell Turner Farms	52,453
Joe A. Sheely	52,262
Ray & Wayne Vanosdell	52,087
J. S. Hoopes	51,412
George Knapple	50,811
Earl C. Recker Co	49,281
R. & J. J. Blasdell Ptshp	49,254
Dobson & Patterson	48,201
Germain H. Ball	48,143
Sam Cambron	47,592
Turner Ranches	47,000
Ralph Shepard	46,454
Sossaman Farms	46,229
Donald Wiechens	45,892
J. V. Pace	45,396
Tommy Wheelis	45,173
Jerome Thompson	44,146
J. A. & R. Blasdell	$44,116
Fred G. Hilvert Co., Inc	43,893
A. Tumbling T. Ranch	43,598
W. P. Haggard & Son	43,593
Ed Weiler	43,562
B. & B. Industries	43,524
Earl S. Dobson	43,245
D. & D. Farms, Inc	42,975
Holly Ranch	42,419
Reed J. Kerby	42,304
Queen Cr Pot & Cold St., Co	41,812
Bill R. Moore	40,784
Gordon Cameron	40,669
Ronald W. Thayer	40,005
Trimble Farms	39,940
Jon A. Tucker	39,651
James Marioneaux	39,296
James L. Craddock	38,769
Paul Smith	37,863
J. L. Woolf	37,210
W. H. Jarnagin	37,136
R. Leslie Ward	36,131
Wiley Herman, Jr	35,865
Wallace Thelander	35,337
Win Farms	34,753
Anthon R. Cluff	34,420
Robert L. Cook	34,187
O. E. McGinty	34,110
Emory J. Hurley Est	34,058
William Wade	33,806
Allen F. Belluzzi	33,746
Wm. G. Brandon	33,572
Radius A. Hudson	33,524
W. H. Miller	33,487
C. H. Willis, Est	33,482
W. E. Hayden, Est	32,948
Sands Trading Co	32,948
Lloyd Martin	32,488
J. A. Wood Co	32,340
Percy L. Smith	32,055
Rudolph Johnson	31,940
Fremon Coker, Jr	31,709
Dave Kenly	31.628
West Valley	31,376
M. B. & C. E. Sanders	31,179
Bob Stump	31,141
Centennial Valley Farms	30,864
Rala Singh	30,826
Joe Bickman	30,639
John Fornes	30,446
Chet John & Sons	30,290
Cheatham Dairy, Inc	30,101
R. M. Hume	29,851
Nichols Farms	29,573
Rainbow Ranches	29,489
Ladell S. Wood	29,099
Marion I. Vance	29,095
Jack Barnes	28,994
Hugh L. Gieszl	28,757
Raymond Cook	28,497
Francis Schulz	28,381
Stanley McDaniel	28,011
Henry F. Backer	27,884
John Tolmachoff	27,881
James M. Shahan	27,758
Robert Ellsworth	27,480
Byron Patterson	27,317
Richard Mayfield	27,261
B. F. Youngker, Sr	27,011
E. Garth Lamb	27,008
Chas. F. Youngker	27,004
Ben F. Youngker, Jr	27,004
Richard Evans	26,974
A Lazy T Cattle Co	26,969
James L. McBride	26,882
Joe Bob Neely	26,817
Tolmachoff Farms	26,630
R. R. Wood	26,494
L. D. Henry	26,326
George Pew	26,146
Versluis Ranches	26,009
Howard & Ronald Henry	25,980
Gilbert Turner	25,476
Bartlett-Heard Co	25,287
A. L. Power	25,167
Total payee in county (170)	10,651,496

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arizona—Con.

MOHAVE COUNTY

Eldon K. Parish	$43,065

PIMA COUNTY

BKW Farms Inc	350,607
John J. & Ola V. Lord	176,760
John Kai	160,835
C & W Ranches Inc	111,599
J. Boyd White	98,241
Avra Land/Cattle Co. Ptnship	80,893
Ludd Payne	57,499
Watson Farms	56,717
David Anway	55,417
Wallis Farms Inc	53,557
Harvey Davison	51,876
Gladden Farms A Part	45,974
Growers Finance Gin	45,920
Midvale Farm Co	44,805
J. R. Norton Co	43,420
Buck Sam Chu	42,326
R. A. Davis	36,234
Woodrow Jarvis	34,585
Bull Farms	33,328
Evco Farms Inc. Synd	29,865
E. C. Barnett	28,964
R. G. Buckelew	28,462
Total payees in county (22)	1,667,884

PINAL COUNTY

Bud Antle Inc	596,293
C. & V. Growers, Inc	468,899
Hamilton Farms	432,206
Red River Land Co	391,237
John D. Singh	345,064
Ak Chin Farms	336,796
Gila River Farms	303,898
Bogle Farms, Inc	280,911
Arizona Farming Co	269,198
Kirby Hughes	245,643
W. T. Golston Farms	239,469
L-4 Ranches, Inc	213,273
Coury Bros	193,196
Rancho Tierra Prieta	187,815
Thunderbird Farms	163,779
Diwan Ranches, Inc	158,895
J. A. Roberts	156,415
Talla Farms, Inc	156,190
C. & A. Equipment Co	148,039
Isom & Isom	130,115
Finley Bros	127,087
Raymond Schnepf	121,978
Greater Arizona Ranch, Inc	116,341
Glenn Lane	111,064
McCarthy Hilderbrand Farms	106,609
Empire Farms	104,640
Fred Enke	104,222
Jack Ralston	97,491
Peter J. Robertson	95,729
L. Z. Farms, Inc	93,389
Combs & Clegg Ranches, Inc	91,466
Dunn Farms	85,860
Sunset Ranches, Inc	85,683
P. S. Thompson	85,332
Martin Talla	83,364
Duane Ellsworth	82,649
H. L. Holland	82,486
Wilbur Wuertz	82,479
Independent Gin Co	82,261
Anderson-Palmisand Farms	81,427
C. Ray Robinson	80,720
Phil Taber	79,515
C. J. & L. Farms	79,506
Chas. Urrea & Sons	75,153
Pinal Farms, Inc	75,000
R. W. Neely	74,966
H. L. Kendrick	73,312
Alex & Norman Pretzer	72,862
Charles Hill	72,350
A. C. T. Ranches, Inc	72,127
Jay Wilson	71,658
Crouch Bros	70,544
Buford Gladden	68,011
Larry R. Scott	67,436
Merlin Hamilton	67,044

PINAL COUNTY—continued

Chanan Singh	$65,743
El Dorado Rnch, Inc	65,389
K. K. Skousen	65,324
M. & S. Rnchs, Inc	64,834
Santa Cruz Farms, Inc	64,710
J. H. Farms	63,237
John Smith	63,196
Tracy Hutchins	62,971
Robert W. Brooks	62,201
Era Mae Barnes	61,724
Maricopa Growers Gin	60,924
Marathon Farms	60,868
Robert D. Bechtel	60,352
Rex Neely Trst	60,298
Buckshot Farms, Inc	58,836
Picacho Buttes Farms	58,463
Cameron Sides	57,859
Edward Pretzer	57,559
Dan C. Palmer	57,500
Otice Self	57,228
Max K. Schnepf	57,206
G. Buster Brown	55,860
Margie L. Hanna	55,797
Noel E. Martin	55,771
R. C. Smith	54,867
Max Nichols	53,663
C. S. C. Farms, Inc	53,114
Daley & Bogle	52,855
M. & W. Farms, Inc	52,422
Wm. E. Foster	52,186
Rodney Kleck	51,180
Fred R. North	51,116
Ernest McFarland	51,069
C. W. England	50,154
J. O. Burns	50,125
Harold L. Earley, Sr	50,059
John Dermer	49,995
Red Eye Farms Inc	49,842
R. P. Anderson	49,725
England & England	49,604
Howard Arthur Wuertz	49,467
D. H. Cole & Son	48,741
McFarland & Hanson Rnchs	48,638
Jack Nutter	48,584
Elsberry & Nowell	48,456
Bianco Bros	48,363
Sunshine Valley Rnchs	47,953
Herman & Carl Myers	47,129
Harlan Russell	46,669
M. C. Montgomery	46,506
Worth K. Bartlett	46,347
Dell Sellers	46,341
Frank Lang	46,335
W. D. Storie	45,953
Pinal Ranches	45,640
Earl Lane Estate	45,292
Paul Ollerton	45,250
Robert M. Davis	44,831
Frank Abate	44,252
Florence Farms Inc	43,661
Stanley Ellis	43,335
Dr. P. F. Hartman	43,108
Thayer A. White	42,987
Robert A. Taylor	42,934
E. I. & J. E. Jones	42,525
Marcus Vanderslice	41,835
Paul Pearce	41,599
Robert Ellsworth	40,973
W. S. Conner	40,858
Aulton S. Harris	40,597
Avra Plantations Inc	40,459
Green Reservoir Frms	39,820
W. & J. Farms	39,332
C. P. Honeycutt	38,557
Debb Stephens	37,866
Warren E. Cox	37,256
Carlton Farms, Inc	36,903
Duncan Butler	36,823
Delbert Lewis	36,818
Raymond Ford	36,716
Clemans Cattle Co	36,285
Luis Flores	35,889
Rodney Delange	35,659
Richard Cruz	35,577
Kortsen & Kortsen	35,569
Barbara Earley	35,474
Roger Goff	35,314
Agnes K. Beggs	35,098
Parke Gilbert dba Elaine Fms	34,962
David Tolmachoff	34,869

PINAL COUNTY—continued

Grant E. Peterson	$34,675
Emmett Grasty	34,382
West Coast Land & Cattle Co	34,147
Frank Graham	34,144
Norman Hagen	34,034
Rio Bravo Rnchs Inc	33,893
L. D. S. Church	33,878
Jack Nichols	33,869
W. A. Ladd	33,715
Mickey A. Clark	33,715
Robert Kanaga	33,276
R. F. Cunningham	33,061
S. C. McFarland	32,882
Storey Rnchs Inc	32,629
Jones Ranches Inc	32,389
Jack Connelley	32,306
C. L. Skousen & Son	32,296
Collerette Est	32,086
Howell Wadsworth	31,985
Hamilton Farms Inc	31,798
Picacho Land & Cattle Co	31,791
Marie White	31,744
W. W. Ritchey	31,430
Kortsen Bros	31,417
P. W. Vensel	31,390
Wayne Ray	30,959
Rogers & Rogers	30,934
Do-Bar Farms	30,908
J. E. Robinette	30,780
R. C. Goree	30,724
Black Land Frms Inc	30,670
Koenig Aviation Inc	29,647
John Payne	29,572
Wootan & Casey	29,451
Wales Ranches Inc	29,443
Wales Farms Inc	29,443
Robert Kirkland	29,147
C. B. Shiflet	29,114
Charles E. Wright	29,007
F. O. Barnes	28,956
Patrick Talla	28,769
Emmett Jobe	28,563
Irene McCown Waugh	27,690
Leonard Anderson	27,048
Mrs. Dale Combs	26,876
Ronald Miller	26,501
Thomas M. Carlton	26,322
Claude H. Evans	26,067
Jim Pate	25,610
Wesley D. Hood	25,496
Guy Gilbert Farms	25,472
Ellsworth & Kortsen	25,388
E. M. Layton	25,218
Louis L. Johnson	25,105
Total payees in county (199)	14,446,867

YUMA COUNTY

Barkley Co. of Ariz	332,642
Bruce Church Inc	229,638
Ben Simmons	225,151
Sherill-Lafollette	202,602
J. W. Olberg and Son	194,624
Winston Farms	172,391
Texas Hill Farms	143,243
Arthur Blohm	135,785
Glen Holt	128,928
Jr. & J. W. Cullison	122,053
C. M. S. Farming Co	120,624
Woods Co	116,531
Earl Hughes	115,891
W. J. Scott	107,327
Ed Hall	91,093
Fred Nussbaumer	86,991
D. M. Brown	84,495
Mauldin Mauldin	82,175
Dunn Farms	71,347
Stanley Snitzer	68,106
Wm. W. Harrison	66,710
M. E. Lee	63,254
M and V Farms	62,570
Clyde Curry	60,249
Robert Cockrill	56,600
Clayton Farms	56,568
Peters & Nall	55,340
T. W. Williams	51,756
W. M. Wootton	51,373
Ferguson and Sons	49,330
Riverside Ranches	46,315

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arizona—Con.

YUMA COUNTY—Continued

Wm. Thacker	$44,806
C and V Growers, Inc	44,596
Archie Mellon	44,391
Henry Leivas	43,462
Chrismer Farms	41,265
Louie Kehl	40,356
Pete Pasquinelli	38,536
Valley Packing Co. of Ca	37,586
Mark and Howard Moore	37,215
Oscar Walls	37,010
Burnis Williams	36,782
McElhaney Farms	34,619
Glen Sturges	34,025
Maricopa Dust Spray	33,388
Keller Farms	33,005
Wide River Farms, Inc	32,913
A. C. Cockrill	31,153
Clarence Phillips	31,073
John C. Smith, Jr	30,953
Garland Wisby	30,717
Gunther & Shirley	30,368
Cuming and Sons	30,305
Phil and H. D. Sibley	30,277
Dean Stanley	30,277
O. K. Weeks and Son	29,820
Cuming Farms, Inc	29,688
Moenk Fletcher	27,288
C. L. Stephens	27,165
Marion Griffin	26,664
George Silva	26,404
Tom Howell	25,943
Jack Ramsey	25,675
L. W. Simmons	25,537
Robert Woodhouse	25,351
Total payees in county (65)	4,580,315
Total Payees in State (494)	32,948,509

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arkansas

ASHLEY COUNTY

Gus Pugh Sons, Inc	$87,873
W. W. & Earl Cochran	66,092
Guy Botsford	53,114
James B. Young	41,987
C. C. Morschheimer, Jr	41,019
Kenneth Rice	40,542
B. E. Fisher	39,625
Victor Edwards	37,844
E. D. Gregory Company	37,490
CRC Lynn, Inc	36,600
William B. Deyampert	36,075
Billy E. Scroggins	35,856
R. E. Lee	33,119
John H. Ralph	31,521
Bobby Foster	31,136
James H. Gay	30,716
Jack Edwards, Inc	30,491
Charles E. Bridewell	29,618
Edith Robinson & Martha Rye	26,656
Bill Gibbs	25,677
Total payees in county (20)	793,051

CHICOT COUNTY

Keith Brothers	54,115
Rosamond Carpenter	42,947
Handley & Dunavant Farm	37,095
Yellow Bayou Plt., Inc	36,172
Alvin Ford, Sr	32,790
T. P. Borgognoni	32,121
Ray Black	30,112
B. and V. Pieroni	29,659
W. T. Dixon	29,116
Fred Woodall	28,965
A. S. Rocconi	27,917
Burchfield Farms, Inc	26,126
Ed Lawler	25,173
Total payees in county (13)	432,308

CRAIGHEAD COUNTY

Aubrey Wood	$31,179
Zane G. Beaton	27,285
Albert Johnston	25,641
Paul Owens	25,402
Total payees in county (4)	109,507

CRITTENDEN COUNTY

Rodgers Bros	119,806
Carlson Brothers	105,243
Bond Pltg. Co	100,676
M. K. & J. F. Rieves Jr	89,924
Pacco Inc	89,120
A. Angeletti Inc	86,363
Pirani & Sons	85,723
J. F. Twist Plantation	84,404
Bruins Plng. Co	79,176
Mallory Farms	72,361
Allen B. Helms	70,612
Lake Plantation	68,975
E. H. Clarke & Co	67,543
Joe Beck Trust	64,313
N. S. Garrott & Sons	62,642
Richland Plan Inc	58,782
Bernard Farms	55,752
Ray D. Ross	54,952
Alpe Brothers	54,390
Charles S. Riggan	53,594
D. & J. Inc	52,819
Morrison Bros	49,652
Johnny Greer	49,267
Nickey-Eason Plantation	48,509
William B. Rhodes Co	47,551
Carter Planting Co	47,261
Milton Lubin	46,728
James W. Young Jr	46,166
O. Neal & Son Inc	45,329
Earl C. Beck Jr	45,047
Ragland Plant Inc	44,796
L. G. Byford	44,265
Joe Rodgers	43,528
Sulcer Planting Company Inc	42,571
Handley Farms	42,552
L. C. Smith	41,869
Looney Bros	41,691
Oliver Bros	41,472
Alton Grant Farms	41,224
Nugenco, Inc	39,159
Fogleman & Son	38,767
Julian L. Hardin	38,748
F. G. Barton Cotton Co	36,833
E. J. Barham, Jr	35,377
Rembert & Miller Farms	34,007
John M. Swepston	33,910
H. M. Brinkley Est	33,834
David Harrison, Jr., Est	33,639
S. & W. Farms, Inc	33,545
Erle Biggs	33,381
Cupples Bros	33,331
H. P. Sisk	33,278
Dan Springfield, Jr	31,400
Manuel T. Sharp	31,340
C. L. Eubanks & Sons	30,909
Bollinger Bros	30,589
F. H. Griffin	30,313
Adolph Pirani	30,119
Joe & Willie Bramucci	29,976
Sam Crowder	29,961
E. P. Rainey & Sons	29,058
Hester Parker	29,023
Pirani Brothers	28,696
E. M. Ott	28,303
J. W. Prescott	27,408
Beuford J. Wallace	27,377
C. B. Britton	27,181
Cage Farm	26,816
B. P. Kelley	26,607
J. L. Currie	26,204
Aldo Marconi	26,025
E. J. Baker, Jr	25,669
Total payees in county (72)	3,417,431

CROSS COUNTY—continued

Robert W. Spencer	$52,657
John H. Johnston	45,527
Paul and Beene	44,116
W. M. Smith and Sons	41,555
Twist Grain Co	37,155
Cherry Farms	36,395
Ruston Farms	31,275
Ira F. Twist	29,576
R. W. Byrd	29,152
Paul McCutchen	27,295
Gordon Morris	26,982
Hugh B. Proctor Jr	26,772
Leslie Nix	25,472
Richard Twist	25,277
Total payees in county (14)	479,206

DALLAS COUNTY

Benton Taylor	33,343

DESHA COUNTY

R. A. Pickens & Son, Co	221,325
Stimson Veneer & Lumber Trust	85,107
Brooks Griffin	49,133
Clay Cross	47,930
Reedville Farms	40,734
P. W. Teeter & Sons, Co	38,890
McCulloch Planting Co	37,545
Bickham Bros	31,944
Martin Wood	30,812
Stimson Katterhenry Trust	30,299
Baxter Land Co	27,689
J. L. Britt	25,216
Total payees in county (12)	666,624

DREW COUNTY

R. G. Greenway & Virgil Greenway	39,514
John Arnn & Son	38,525
William Bulloch	35,504
Carl Pamplin	30,350
Tillar & Co	29,511
Bilgischer and Sponer	27,831
Total payees in county (6)	201,235

FAULKNER COUNTY

J. W. Brown, Jr	31,825

JACKSON COUNTY

Doyle and Wilmans Ptnrs	47,854
Burton Merc. & Gin Co	38,733
R. D. Wilmans & Sons Co	28,095
Bell & Carson	25,247
Total payees in county (4)	139,929

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Ar. State Penal Farm	148,628
Cornerstone Farm & Gin Co	98,010
Elms Planting Corporation	86,720
Lyons Planting Co., Inc	57,509
B. N. Word Co., Inc	55,867
Bost Farms	55,581
Jimmy Blair	51,122
Lake Dick Elms Farming Co	47,095
Hudgens Jeter	44,419
R. E. Watkins	42,782
Richland Planting Company	42,606
D. Stratton Inc	42,195
Stillwater Farming Co., Inc	39,741
M. A. Rose and Sons, Inc	39,673
New Gascony Elms Farming Co	38,552
W. A. Albright	38,431
Earl Chadick & Sons	37,063
Pipkin Farm	36,957
Noah S. Peek, Jr	36,711
S. R. Baugh	36,446
James Terkeurst	36,308
A. C. Hunter	33,768
Richardson Elms Farming Co	33,604
Earle T. Phillips	33,082

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arkansas—Con.

JEFFERSON COUNTY—continued

Leon Callaham	$30,868
W. W. West Company	29,895
Oscar Homer Jones, Jr	28,491
Archer Farm	28,350
L. L. Dutton & Son	28,179
Clarence Dutton & Son	28,077
Chambliss Farms	27,840
E. L. Burgess	26,647
Collins A. Andrews, Jr	26,643
Fish Lake Farms	26,556
Sam R. Cady	26,337
R. L. Bruton	25,409
Total payees in county (36)	1,546,162

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

Lawrence E. Taylor	55,105
Troyce E. Endsley	47,689
Carl Adams, Jr	37,166
Andrew Whisenhunt	35,969
James R. Murphy	31,221
William L. Goza	30,693
Mickey Walding	29,922
Ralph W. Braswell	26,382
Marvin McCalman	26,332
J. G. Allen, Jr	26,072
Total payees in county (10)	346,551

LEE COUNTY

Sweet Brothers	79,533
H. T. Dillahunty & Sons	77,899
C. E. Yancey & Sons	58,044
Robert May	56,664
Sherman Brothers	54,368
Bakers Farms, Inc	49,207
Miller Farms, Inc	44,189
Dan Felton & Co	43,477
Ed Vaccaro	41,918
C. M. Cooke	38,326
Dick Ed Thomas	38,054
Lindsey Farms, Inc	34,749
Mann Farms, Inc	30,921
Parten Farms, Inc	30,673
Ellis Evans	30,399
Sisk Farms, Inc	29,326
Jerry P. Hicky	26,494
Total payees in county (17)	764,241

LINCOLN COUNTY

H. R. Wood & Son, Inc	55,749
N. M. Ryall & Sons, Inc	51,109
Holthoff Brothers	48,667
Frizzell Farms, Inc	48,154
Marion F. Baugh	46,746
C. H. Clowers & Co	39,537
J. L. McEntire & Sons, Inc	33,607
A. O. French	30,922
Bruce Norton	28,314
Boscoe Blagg	25,941
Wood Brothers	25,895
K. Berzent Blagg	25,574
Total payees in county (12)	460,215

LITTLE RIVER COUNTY

E. C. Lavoice and Sons	32,854

LONOKE COUNTY

James W. Phillips	46,673
Luchen Walls	43,964
Robert L. Dortch, Jr	40,267
Albert Eugene Yarbrough	39,580
Basel Henderson	37,667
James Carroll Rollins	37,457
Sam McNeil	35,846
Odes Perry	30,551
Charles Capps	30,435
Jimmie H. Boggess	30,182

LONOKE COUNTY—continued

Wm. J. Bevis	$28,967
Waylon B. Sims	27,722
R. W. Morris	27,565
Bobby Gene Wright	25,367
James Workman	25,192
Total payees in county (15)	507,435

MILLER COUNTY

Price Plantation, Inc	36,028
Doyle Stevens	28,818
Total payees in county (2)	64,846

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY

Lee Wilson and Co	500,055
Wesson Farms, Inc	166,762
Midway Farms, Inc	120,178
Armorel Planting Co	107,147
Harold Senter	94,856
Ben Wood Farms	86,515
R. D. Hughes	78,056
C. J. Lowrance & Sons	76,543
R. Creecy & T. Tate	74,559
Clide Barnett	70,300
Lowrance Bros. & Co	68,966
Jack Hale	67,263
Larry Woodard Farms, Inc	66,879
Wilbur F. Johns Farms	65,510
Crosthwait Farms, Inc	65,244
W. J. Denton Est	65,005
Riggs Bros	60,398
C. B. Robinson	58,746
J. A. Crosthwait	55,794
John A. Edrington	54,349
Taylor Bros	50,227
Charles Nick and Richard Rose	50,207
M. J. Koehler	49,845
Charles W. Bowles	49,741
Langston Gin Co	47,810
R. J. Gillespie	46,966
J. E. Crain Est	46,945
B. C. Land Co	46,697
Russell Gill	46,370
Henry Battle	45,470
Sullivan Bros	45,427
John E. Crain, Jr	43,889
Larry J. Woodard	41,615
Amon Eugene Holt	41,605
John M. Stevens, Jr	41,213
Dan and Chester Caldwell	40,765
Ira G. Ashley	39,830
J. H. Felts and Sons	39,703
Glen A. Cook	39,209
Wesley Stallings	37,653
Stanall Farms	36,966
John M. Speck	36,705
Earl H. Wildy	36,642
Clifford Gillespie	36,092
C. L. Denton, Jr	34,063
W. M. Taylor, Jr	33,696
Chiles Planting Co	33,644
Cullom Bros	33,567
Nancy M. Trimue	32,896
Golden Lake Farms	32,844
Chas. Robert Jackson	32,638
Ashmore Bros. & Brown	32,376
L. T. Dillard	31,661
Clarence Crosskno	31,340
Joe Dilldine	31,093
E. H. Riley	31,068
H. T. Bonds Sons, Inc	30,866
Don Brinn	30,305
Bryce Grant	30,091
Speck Bros	29,372
Clyde Whistle	29,084
A. A. Banks	28,862
John W. West	28,710
Richard Cromer Farm	28,660
Robert Gammill & Son	28,460
Ohlendorf Farms	28,210
John B. Wilson	28,065
McGuire & Son, Inc	27,965
James H. Woodard	27,561
Moreland B. White	27,450
W. T. Metzger, Jr	27,404
Forrest Moore	26,989
Allen Metheny	26,546

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY—continued

Willis Stutts	$26,468
Charles R. Moore	26,384
A. E. Teaford	26,176
W. H. O'Keefe	26,136
R. C. Branch, Sr., estate	25,735
V. S. Johnson	25,465
Charles Wildy	25,338
F. B. Crews	25,180
Vaughn L. Shownes	25,104
Total payees in county (82)	4,148,139

MONROE COUNTY

Ralph Abramson	46,649
Ray Fuller	45,696
Amos Everett	27,704
Carter-Clifton Company	27,622
Floyd H. Shaw	26,756
Total payees in county (5)	174,427

PHILLIPS COUNTY

Howe Lumber Company, Inc	237,251
Highland Lake Farm	134,351
Brooks Griffin	120,537
Hill Farms, Inc	120,276
Alexander Farms, Inc	106,371
Tunney Stinnett	80,253
Wood-Sanderlin Farm	71,673
Ray Dawson	54,739
Buron Griffin	54,090
E. T. Wells, Inc	49,467
Riverside Farm	47,100
King-Wells Farm	45,312
Dixie Farm Company	45,185
Curtis Clark	44,559
Dave Inebnit	44,355
David Solomon	44,271
T. W. Keesee	42,851
Delta Plantation, Inc	42,364
R. J. Young	41,200
Solomon Bros., Inc	40,600
J. E. Storey	36,750
J. O. Wheeler	36,710
Harry Stephens	35,877
Joe Pillow	35,832
Oneida Planting Company	33,944
James E. Yancey	33,359
Catron Plantation	32,839
Bruce Byrd	32,628
Chesterfield Crisp	30,872
M. M. Crisp	30,711
J. A. Hill	30,678
Wooten-Epes Company	30,570
Loveless Farms, Inc	29,866
M. J. Lake	29,430
R. M. Hornor	29,125
F. O. Griffin, Jr	28,706
Chip Franklin, Jr	28,151
Woodrow Reed	27,848
Lester Crawford	27,697
David Brooks Griffin Trust	27,449
Winston Foster	27,340
Billy Hill	27,030
W. D. Suddath	26,836
R. J. Suddath	26,836
Jake Crow	26,339
A. F. Gregory, Jr	26,157
Thomas E. Young	25,724
Total payees in county (47)	2,282,109

POINSETT COUNTY

Hyneman Farms, Inc	139,709
E. Ritter and Company	134,432
Dan F. Portis	53,862
Fairview Farms Company	46,278
S. C. Chapin	43,170
Walter H. Provost	42,147
Citizens Gin Co., Inc	40,326
B. & H. Farms	37,668
Stuckey Bros., Inc	36,204
H. F. Underwood	34,361
Moreland Barton	33,203
Cecil H. Justus, Jr	31,463
Guy L. Prince	31,327

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Arkansas—Con.

POINSETT COUNTY—continued

W. T. Pearson	$29,599
Chickasaw Oil Mill, Inc	28,794
Frank Dean	27,656
Moon & Cash, Inc	27,410
Frank A. Bell	27,327
Norcross Farming Company	26,177
Portis Planting Company, Inc	25,845
J. D. Fletcher	25,766
Total payees in county (21)	922,724

PRAIRIE COUNTY

John D. Naill, Jr	26,553

PULASKI COUNTY

Reber McGhee & Son	52,818
Chapman Bros. Farm	35,419
Walter Isgrig	30,046
Craig Planting Co	28,768
J. B. Morgan	28,605
W. A. Ratcliffe, Jr	27,740
R. S. Bredlow	27,628
Walter C. Estes	27,242
Total payees in county (8)	258,266

ST. FRANCIS COUNTY

Miller Lumber Co	83,365
Shannon Bros. Entp	73,400
J. G. Adams and Son	71,384
A. B. Farms, Inc	56,188
W. W. Draper, Jr	53,774
Kellogg and Hughey	52,830
Luke E. Burch, Jr., Inc	50,065
Higgins Brothers, Inc	47,217
Chappell & Moore	44,759
C. J. Beasley and Son	42,165
Red Gum Plantation	41,866
Robert Brewington	41,255
Belle Meade Plantation	40,818
Lindsey Brothers	37,792
McCain Bros., Inc	37,769
Elmwood Plantation, Inc	37,608
Davis Biggs	37,250
V. E. Beene	33,182
B. McCollum, Jr	33,120
Thomas McDaniel	32,934
A. B. Malkin, Jr	32,445
J. C. Rice and E. Stough	32,175
Joe Burch	31,442
Troy W. Leoppard	31,271
Claud Buford	30,792
Earl Dean Williams	30,101
Hammons Farms, Inc	29,996
John C. Lindsey, Sr	28,982
C. D. Brown & Sons, Inc	28,930
R. T. Landrum	28,437
Freeman Nichols	28,153
Mound Planting Co	27,931
Oscie Hardy	27,688
F. W. Derossitt and Son	27,615
Betty M. Stoddard	27,371
Rex Twist	27,167
Joe Oswalt	26,772
Ida Mae Norsworthy	26,554
Harold Trigger Wall	26,334
Wheatley Mill & Gin Co. Farm	25,612
Total payees in county (40)	1,524,509

WOODRUFF COUNTY

Gerald L. Morris, Jr	70,323
W. L. McAdams	54,600
Gregory Farm, Inc	53,735
Bruce D. Tarkington	40,408
L. L. Cole & Son, Inc	35,687
Gum Ridge Corp	27,440
Total payees in county (6)	282,193
Total payees in State (450)	19,645,683

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—California

BUTTE COUNTY

Parrott Inv. Co	$76,636
Wright Lands, Inc	25,483
Total payees in county (2)	102,119

COLUSA COUNTY

H. & A. Andreotti	40,955
A. Steidlmayer & Sons	32,466
Total payees in county (2)	73,421

FRESNO COUNTY

Giffen, Inc	3,333,385
Mt. Whitney Farms	1,152,294
Vista Del Llano Farms	778,624
Boston Ranch Co	643,006
Telles Ranch, Inc	503,285
Jack Harris, Inc	475,924
Airway Farms, Inc	360,823
Raymond Thomas, Inc	272,280
W. J. Deal	244,755
Timco	241,965
Gragnani Bros	227,451
Schramm Ranches, Inc	215,435
J. E. O. Neill, Inc	215,295
M. J. & R. S. Allen	209,819
Clarence Matheson	205,755
Colt Ranch, Inc	178,949
Redfern Ranches, Inc	171,289
So. Pac. Company	161,068
V. C. Britton Co	155,252
Comfort Farm, Inc	147,462
Coelho Farms	144,954
Sumner Peck Ranch, Inc	139,100
Wood Ranches	132,139
Britz Chemical Co	125,604
Hammonds Ranch, Inc	124,691
Ryan Bros	121,525
Rabb Bros	117,072
Griffin & Griffin	116,892
Pilibos Bros, Inc	113,548
O. Neill Farms, Inc	113,546
Weeth Ranches, Inc	103,085
Melcombs Ranch, Inc	99,803
Gordon Bros	99,739
Enrico Farms, Inc	98,567
Linneman Ranches, Inc	95,940
Pacific Farms Co	94,876
Kriesant Operating Co., Inc	92,790
Giusti Farms, Inc	90,676
S. E. Lowrance Ranch	87,026
John & Alex Kochergen	85,801
M. L. Dudley & Co	83,672
Willson Farms, Inc	81,542
Price Giffen Ranch	81,482
Sierra Dawn Farms	80,971
Aladdin Ranch	80,456
J. & J. Ranch	80,035
Wayne Sniffin	77,446
Michael Giffen Ranch, Inc	76,142
C. H. & G. Farms, Inc	73,545
Sam & D. M. Biancucci	72,385
Pappas & Co., Inc	71,930
Milo Erwin	70,141
Richard Swearingen	68,760
Starkey & Erwin	68,106
Vincent Kovacevich	67,880
J. C. Andresen	67,846
Vernon Swearingen	67,778
Claremont Farms	67,658
Western Vly Ranches, Inc	66,055
Rusconi Farms	65,191
William E. Glotz	64,072
Goodman Traction Ranch	62,099
J. C. Conn, Inc	61,774
Drew Farms, Inc	61,299
Reuben Crosno	60,171
Davis Drier & Elevator, Inc	59,807
Harold O. Banion	59,287
Sommerville Farms, Inc	56,381
S. & S. Ranch, Inc	55,233
Wm. H. Noble	53,776

FRESNO COUNTY—continued

Marchini Bros	$53,042
Raven Land Co	52,359
John L. Errecart	51,667
Arthur J. Cuelho	50,756
Robert Cardwell	50,542
Poso Dairy Farms, Inc	50,183
Fred Rau	49,397
Wm. Erickson	49,292
Deavenport Ranches, Inc	48,674
Vierhus Farms	48,393
W. F. McFarlane	46,956
Davis & Huey, Inc	46,795
Irby Abercrombie	44,657
Del Testa Farms	44,483
Rogers Ranches, Inc	44,023
A & H Farms	43,394
Joe M. Lovelace	42,835
Half Moon Fruit & Pro. Co	42,532
D. T. Locke	41,756
Pucheau Ranch	40,976
Dean E. Pryor	39,945
Clayton Brown	39,863
Joe E. Yraceburu	38,939
F. Silveira & J. Peterson	38,825
J. A. Marshall, Est	38,715
Double J Farms	38,580
Perez Bros	38,509
Donald Bellando	38,402
Bill & Ed Koda	37,949
B T V Farms	37,830
Leavelle Bros	36,825
Dodd Fam. Liv. Trust	36,690
Edward Azhderian	35,956
Fairless & Pifferini	35,921
Hanson & Fortune	35,576
J. Teore & G. Tavares	34,533
Britz Fertilizer	34,423
Hale Bros	34,371
Martin Costales	34,011
Edgar Wilkins Ranch	33,785
The Desert Ranch	33,724
Melvin Coelho	33,634
Indart, Inc	33,576
Delbert Morse	33,472
Alfred Russell	33,046
Harnish Five Points, Inc	32,980
Ru Ann Dairy	32,555
Paul Crevolin	32,498
McKean Bros	32,438
A & D Koligian	32,437
Des Jardins Bros	32,167
Levon Azhderian	31,443
Mike Etcheberry	31,327
Diamond R Farms, Inc	31,060
Jarrott Ranch	30,699
Markarian Farms	30,698
Gerawan & Penner Ranches, Inc	30,215
Burnett Bros	29,611
Nichols & Wood	29,504
Ed Wilkins	29,202
John Teixeira	29,115
Jack D. Jones	28,602
D. J. Rowland	28,206
Carvalho Farms, Inc	28,153
Ernest E. Sullivan	27,333
Earl Brinkley	27,302
Frank Ayerza	27,040
United Packing Co	26,973
John Wm. Kinnunen	26,947
Jean Errotabere	26,752
Reece Bros	26,570
Hubert Beene	26,406
Alex Maul	26,335
Frank Chounet Est	25,858
Tai Hing & Co	25,855
E. Weeth & Son	25,796
Re-Al Farms, Inc	25,665
Echeveste & Elizalde	25,500
P. R. Farms, Inc	25,263
Earl L. Carter	25,123
Motte Ranches	25,084
Irwin R. Efird	25,010
Total payees in county (152)	17,058,144

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—California— Continued

GLENN COUNTY

Ernest M. Michael	$37,671
Shintaffer Farms	27,837
Ernest W. Michael	25,492
Total payees in county (3)	91,000

IMPERIAL COUNTY

H. B. Murphy Co	431,733
Elmore Co	218,565
W. E. Young & W. E. Young Jr	209,531
Sinclair Rches	193,869
Irvine Co	174,408
George B. Willoughby	165,889
Jack Elmore	165,708
Russell Bros. Rches, Inc	155,583
J. H. Benson Rchs, Inc	148,545
Hugh Hudson Ranches	140,943
C. T. Dearborn	131,032
Stephen H. Elmore	104,733
Kenneth Reynolds	104,023
Baretta & Little Farms	100,073
Donald K. Donley	95,916
Fifield Land Co	92,793
Raymond Oconnel & Son	92,010
Fifield Farms	88,397
Donald H. Cox	87,505
Abatti Bros	86,568
Griset Bros	86,393
Salton Sea Farms	84,514
Cal.-Tenn. L. & C. Co	82,587
W. & Q. Farms, Inc	79,530
Charles Vonderahe	76,792
California Sturges Ginning Co	74,371
Davis Beauchamp	70,084
Neil Fifield Co	67,647
Adamek & Dessert	66,406
Jack Bros. & McBurney, Inc	63,676
Stafford Hannon	62,522
Dearborn & Maraccini	61,663
Harry Schmidt Farms	60,699
Leroy Edwards	58,106
C. W. Sanders	56,237
R. S. Reese	51,567
Hawk & Sperber	50,756
Moiola Bros	47,495
Bonanza Farms	47,427
J. N. Osterkamp Rches	46,817
Edward M. Wavers	46,277
Jimmie Sekhon	46,220
J. M. Bryant	44,829
Ed Wiest	44,034
John V. Merten	43,038
Lee M. Whittle	42,954
Brandt Bros	41,512
J. Emanuelli & Sons	41,301
Preciado Bros	40,862
Antone Borchard Co	40,790
Berryman Farms	40,770
Johnny P. Singh	40,412
Delmar A. Brady	40,236
San Pasqual L. & C. Co	39,769
Homer Slater	39,615
Sundial Farming Co	38,604
D. Arrigo Bros. Co	37,472
Dixie Ranches	37,333
James A. Taylor	36,446
John R. Chas. & Chas., Jr., Kershaw	36,437
Fleming & Jack	36,066
House & Haskell	35,754
Michael D. Ayala	35,227
Dubois Ranch	34,970
Berylwood Inv. Co	33,753
R. B. Wilson Co	33,529
Perez & Morrell	32,839
John V. Borchard	32,839
J. R. & B. R. Smith	32,781
Robinson & Layaye	32,433
John H. Borchard	32,251
Brock Ranches	32,107
Robert C. Brown	31,845
Layton Farms	31,561
Earl W. Ashurst	31,409
M. & B. Farms	31,336
Deol & Sunghera	31,317
Allen B. Griffin	30,960

IMPERIAL COUNTY—continued

C. S. Sandhu	$30,855
Fritz Kuhn, Jr	30,714
Sweetwater Feeders	30,391
C. Alex Abatti	30,211
Valjon Trst	30,098
Ernest L. Ayala	30,060
James P. & Michael J. Casey	29,868
Correll Farms Inc	29,817
Charles C. Bowles	29,668
Edwin Chew	29,465
Dahm Bros	29,410
Green Valley Farms	29,354
Lerno Bros	28,145
Murray R. Hoffman	27,654
Robert Harp	27,385
L. L. Lyerly	27,064
Valley Properties	26,913
Alvaro Deen	26,712
Claverie Bros	26,490
Marlin E. Medearis	26,448
Luckey & Hellis	26,340
M. J. Labrucherie Rch	26,332
Loma Farms	25,032
Total payees in county (101)	6,349,437

KERN COUNTY

Kern County Land Co	974,163
S. A. Camp Farms Co	928,917
B. V. Fms & Miller & Lux	292,961
W. B. Camp & Sons	267,559
Santiaga Ranch	243,366
Houchin Bros. Farming	232,163
Giumarra Vineyard Corp	227,539
Ridgeside Farms	226,709
C. J. Vignolo	225,797
Mazzie Farms	207,146
Twin Farms	201,683
Joe Mendiburu	195,290
D. M. Bryant Jr	182,994
Coberly-West Co	171,367
M. & I. Farms	159,463
Reynold M. Mettler	156,566
EM H. Mettler & Sons	152,902
McKittrick Ranch Inc	142,358
Bidart Bros	137,096
Tejon Ranch Co	133,501
Standard Oil Co	121,254
Vcth Farms Inc	118,150
Wheeler Farms	117,869
The Mirasol Co	116,516
Willis & Kurtz	110,574
M. B. McFarland & Sons	102,872
Sill Prop. Inc	101,559
Rossi Farms Inc	99,140
Belluomini Bros	96,113
E. O. Mitchell Inc	89,985
Paul Pilgrim	89,582
Cattani Bros	87,008
C. Mettler	86,349
M. Lane	84,908
H. & H. Farms Inc	84,622
Antongiovanni & Jarrard	82,512
Tracy Ranch Inc	81,894
L. A. Robertson Fms. Inc	80,304
Wedel Farms	78,255
Kenmar Farm	77,981
Palm Farms Inc	77,488
Cerro Bros	77,218
Sanders Farms	76,113
Parsons Ranch	75,678
B. S. Baldwin & Sons	75,015
J. Antongiovanni & Sons	72,885
Wayne Kirschenmann	71,460
Garone Brothers	70,907
Fredlo Farms	70,201
Torrigiani Bros	69,645
James O. Payne	69,402
H. Buller Farms	69,251
Sanders & Sanders	68,011
Opal Fry & Sons	67,896
Melvin McConnell Fms	67,088
Henson & Sons	66,618
Tollie Barton	66,571
Porter Land Co	66,445
Angelo & Eugene Fanucchi	65,665
A. H. Wegis & Sons	65,177
Diablo Farms	65,062
Antongiovanni Bros	64,484

KERN COUNTY—continued

J. Kroeker Sons	$64,398
Camp & Lachenmaier	63,291
Barling Bros	62,662
Bloemhof Hay Co	62,491
John Valpredo	61,445
Joe Freitas Jr	59,768
H. Miller Tr. V. Chinn	59,690
Barnard Bros	59,000
Joe G. Fanucchi & Sons	58,616
K. & P. Farms Inc	58,500
D. C. Crawford & Son	58,130
Tejon Potato Co	57,941
Kern Valley Farms	57,725
Pandol & Sons	57,132
Three H Ranch	56,937
Milham Farms	56,733
Chase & Harmon Farms	56,419
Kirschenmann Farms	55,187
Russell J. O'Grady	54,067
Livio Palla	54,480
Claude Botkin Co., Inc	54,205
Jeffries & Lachenmaier	53,827
Scarrone Bros	53,471
D. & R. Farms	52,552
Sam Andrews Sons	51,439
Gal-Co Farms	51,191
R. H. Garlow Farms	51,081
Kenneth Twisselman	51,027
Maple Leaf Farms	50,477
E. D. Neufeld	49,885
B. L. Gibson	49,833
E. L. Goodspeed	49,343
Patterson & Hale	49,232
Stoller Bros. Inc	49,211
Bonanza Farms	49,078
R. B. Tucker	49,053
Gammon Bros	48,725
B. F. B. Farms	48,564
Tazioli & Son	48,140
Enbe Ranch	47,823
R. A. Jacobsen	47,718
Bruno Baggiani & Lido Isola	47,567
Woods Stone	47,464
Mike Hankins	47,330
Weidenbach Bros	46,727
Haddad Bros Fms	46,502
Barnard & Barnard	46,006
Jimmie Icardo	45,797
Henson & Landers	45,669
Sandrini Bros	45,457
Torigiani Fms	45,369
Johnston Farms	43,686
Costerisan Farms	43,590
Crettol Farms	43,546
Banducci & Son	43,505
M. Parker	43,176
Jack G. Thompson	43,148
V & C Farms	42,968
Elo & Vido Fabbri	42,790
K. Malofy & Son	42,187
Joseph J. Trino	42,105
Little & Hanes	42,097
Hudson Ranch	42,031
Guido Romanini	41,953
Howard Frick	41,375
Shafter Wasco Invest. Co	40,778
Costa Farms	40,710
Harry Banducci	40,607
Edward Kraft	39,607
D & B Moore	39,409
Mason Snow	39,324
Rancho Trio	38,309
Bleecker Farms	37,918
L. M. Betti	37,799
F. W. Handel Farm Co	37,546
F. Palla	37,290
L. A. Grant & Sons	37,120
John A. Malley	36,912
D. M. Steele & Son, Inc	36,868
J. L. Billington	36,472
Allen Bottorff	35,749
J. Pavlina	35,746
A. Palla	35,506
Roland M. Vallicella	35,350
Romanini Bros	35,232
W. S. Kimmel	35,165
V. C. McLain Est	34,776
Mahoney & Mahoney	34,506
John Kovacevich	34,423
Dale Snell	34,310
C. G. Muzinich	34,215

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—California—Continued

KERN COUNTY—continued

Triple J. Fms., Inc	$34,192
Banducci Farms	34,064
O. Torigiani Farm	34,012
Waldrip Fms	33,978
Lester Neufeld & Son	33,901
Buford L. Fox	33,288
Meadow Gold Farms	33,266
E. A. Yakstich	33,226
L. C. Kreim	33,179
L. I. Rhodes & Sons	32,717
Freeborn Bros	32,699
H. Visser	32,630
Louis E. Borel & Sons	32,395
Double L. Farms	32,334
A. L. Muzinich	32,194
Eugene Black	31,968
Pomeroy & Jewett	31,265
E. Neuman	31,208
O. D. Handel & Son	31,164
C. D. Ross	31,056
Lowrimore & Wood	31,022
W. P. Romero	30,963
Central Farms	30,849
Precie Farms	30,748
Skylane Farms Corp	30,190
Fox & Williams Fms	30,184
Pete Romanini Fms	29,734
Frank C. Bury	29,732
Beck & Sons	29,681
Geo. Noroian	29,548
M. L. Rockwell	29,506
Warren McCulley	29,246
W. C. Handel & Sons, Inc	29,081
C. Valpredo	29,022
Delis Farms	28,940
Destefani Farms, Inc	28,100
Regan Farms	27,785
A. Neufeld Farms	27,765
Derby Farms	27,494
M. L. Stephens	27,488
Richard Elrich	27,448
G. H. Baumgardt	27,391
B. J. Handel Co	27,282
Banducci Frmg. Co. Inc	27,229
Bernard Sasia	26,877
Dave Bloemhof	26,782
Bruno Cauzza	26,703
Lee Roy Janzen	26,407
Two M. Farms	26,259
George W. Wise	26,201
Louis Ricci	26,075
H. S. Jewett	26,049
Kenneth McClanahan	26,007
R. Palla	26,007
Toretta Farms	25,964
Frank Franceschi	25,813
Ratzlaff Bros	25,765
Robert K. Long	25,654
Donald Molatore	25,642
Vista Farms	25,548
E. M. Taylor	25,532
Ervin Baublitz	25,412
Neffs Ranch	25,344
Maple Ranch	25,233
Rose Ranch	25,112
Total payees in county (218)	15,055,536

KINGS COUNTY

J. G. Boswell Co	4,370,657
South Lake Farms	1,788,052
Salyer Land Co	1,637,961
Westlake Farms	697,360
Vernon L. Thomas Inc	392,790
Gilkey Farms, Inc	295,415
J. G. Stone Land Co	266,968
West Haven Farming Co	238,201
Borba Bros	196,986
Boyett Farming	179,401
R. A. Rowan & Co	178,975
G. W. Nickel, Jr	140,768
Schwartz Farms, Inc	139,075
Newton Brothers	130,120
South Fork Ranch Inc	116,202
Peterson Farms	115,130

KINGS COUNTY—continued

Wesley Hansen	$106,312
H. L. Yocum & Sons	105,332
Jones Farms	98,468
P. Hansen Ranch	97,631
Harp & Hansen	90,860
Inco Farms, Inc	83,834
Lone Oak Ranch	75,339
W. W. Boswell, Jr	72,610
Tule Ranch Apts	61,629
R. S. Barlow	61,433
L. E. Culp, d.b.a. Culp Ranches	55,182
Avila Bros. J. L. C	54,886
Murray Farms, Inc	53,569
Couture Farms	51,427
Eastside Farms	51,396
Verburg Brothers	49,993
Grant W. Squire	48,822
Chatom Co	46,074
S. L. Newton, d.b.a. Newton Farms	44,169
R. Gonsalves	43,280
M. S. Simas Est	42,854
Barcellos & Wolfsen	42,812
M. Murray Farms, Inc	42,532
Costa & Quintel, Inc	41,432
C. Elmer Spafford	40,705
Wedderburn Bros	37,159
G. E. Brewster Est	36,884
Dufur & Castadio	35,849
Ralph Marshall	35,365
Dunlop Farms	35,357
Gregory Stanton	33,986
J. B. Long	33,588
John Victoria, Jr	32,198
Double O Ranch	32,164
Franna Farms	30,744
Gilkey Farms Delta	30,258
John Hild	28,830
Fagundes Bros	27,422
Joseph R. Fabry, Jr	27,079
Kenneth G. Walker	27,024
S. P. S. Farms	27,016
L. E. Hansen Farms, Inc	26,773
Giacomazzi Bros	26,705
Basin Farms, Inc	26,517
Ralph Gilkey	25,765
Mussel Slough Farms	25,694
George H. Meyer	25,303
Total payees in county (63)	13,114,322

LASSEN COUNTY

Clyde Grafe	36,388

LOS ANGELES COUNTY

John Fuson	100,121
Kurt F. Ullman	29,012
Healy Enterprises, Inc	25,881
Total payees in county (3)	155,014

MADERA COUNTY

Newhall Land & Farming	258,555
Schuh Bros	122,642
Dave Mendrin & Sons	117,539
Hooper Farms, Inc	99,413
Larry Chapman	81,400
Johnny Deniz	65,556
Baker Brothers	53,011
Fred Toschi	51,919
Van Curen Farms	51,235
Bill G. Clay	50,828
Henry Watson	50,716
Sherman Thomas	49,886
El Peco Ranch	49,252
Logoluso Farms	47,691
A. K. Baker	45,665
Norman Kuhr	44,349
H-M Farming Company	43,326
B. A. Watson	42,688
Triangle T Ranch	40,574
Forrest Clayton	39,943
R. C. Weaver	38,749
Frank J. Martin	37,973
Red Top Ranch	37,146
Burkhart Farms	36,506
Howard Glantz	35,814
L. D. McRee	35,115

MADERA COUNTY—continued

Wm. E. Roberts	$32,452
Curran Ranches	31,196
Wesson Farms	30,754
Ben Curutchet	30,441
George Andrew	30,395
Buffington Agri Ent	30,345
Dan Branco	29,774
Roger Beldon	29,672
Sam Mariani	29,579
Adobe Ranch	28,769
Willard Haynes	28,537
Florence Averill	28,452
Brittons Eside Ranch	27,101
J. A. & T. R. Hawkins	26,459
Hake Ranch	26,401
Sagouspe Brothers	25,772
Total payees in county (42)	2,093,590

MERCED COUNTY

Sam Hamburg Farms	183,380
Wolfsen Land and Cattle	154,466
Bowles Farming Co	95,808
San Juan Ranching Co	90,248
Carl V. Grissom	69,021
Vernon Porter	62,224
Favier Bros	59,661
Lindemann Farms Inc	59,503
Brights Nursery Inc	54,815
Bisignani Bros	43,492
Joe G. Machado, Jr	41,695
Lewis Maiorino	37,161
Clay Farms, Inc	36,750
Santa Rita Ranch Co	36,597
Findley M. Upton	35,664
Woo Bros	32,272
Sorg Bros	31,240
James Maiorino, Jr	31,197
F. Serrano	29,512
Chas. E. Andrews	29,270
Vandenberg Bros	28,299
Cozzi Bros	27,750
Obanion Ranches	26,782
Total payees in county (23)	1,296,807

MONTEREY COUNTY

Martinus & Martinus	41,315
Porter Estate Co	28,046
Total payees in county (2)	69,361

PLACER COUNTY

Evans Bros	25,512

RIVERSIDE COUNTY

Wilco Produce	314,402
Riverview Farm & Cattle	262,114
Clarence Robinson	127,025
Kennedy Bros	126,458
John Norton Farms	121,803
Scott & Knappenberger	82,316
Delta Ranches, Inc	75,480
Schindler Brothers	64,059
George Arakelian Farms Inc	58,838
Pi-Land & Cattle Co	56,918
Fisher Ranch	56,403
High & Mighty Farms	55,282
Rummonds Bros. Ranches Inc	52,341
Verne Wuertz	49,257
Wayne Barrett	48,533
J & R Enterprises	46,485
Lawrence Chaffin	46,075
E. C. Apodac Est	45,801
Sunrise Farms	45,474
Joe H. Ulmer	43,544
Albert Keck Co	41,198
W. K. Kenworthy	40,299
Dale Hull	37,372
Harboe-Ensley	36,297
Hanna Farms Inc	35,542
G & S Farms	32,340
Ford Underwood	28,761
Peter Rabbit Farms	27,297
Motte & Sons	27,257

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—California— Continued

RIVERSIDE COUNTY—continued

Marshburn Bros	$27,096
Bud Antle Inc	25,442
Total payees in county (31)	2,137,509

SACRAMENTO COUNTY

Silva Farms	46,390
E. D. Willey & Sons	33,161
Morgan Johnson	28,738
Upham Ranch	27,783
Charles Coldani	26,041
Total payees in county (5)	162,113

SAN DIEGO COUNTY

Daley Enterprise	29,137

SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY

M. & T. Inc	39,464
O. Narducci	31,310
Dell Aringa Bros	30,072
Total payees in county (3)	100,846

SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY

Jackson & Reinert	55,378
Miller Brothers	54,355
William S. Alley	39,505
Mildred Hansen	37,689
John J. Pond	29,785
Claude Arnold	29,683
William P. Wreden	27,957
Total payees in county (7)	274,352

SANTA BARBARA COUNTY

R. L. Calhoun	65,585

SOLANO COUNTY

Peter Cook, Jr	44,618
Moore Bros	31,220
George M. Struve, Jr	27,524
Total payees in county (3)	103,362

SUTTER COUNTY

Broomieside Farms	32,572
Sutter Basin Corp	29,956
Roy C. Osterli	26,254
Agrivest Corp	25,734
Total payees in county (7)	114,516

TEHAMA COUNTY

Sutfin Bros	27,534

TULARE COUNTY

F. J. McCarthy & Sons	262,890
Nichols Farms	190,944
Roberts Farms Inc	178,408
S. K. Ranch	158,308
Marion Harris	154,156
Shuklian Bros. Inc	143,701
Correia Brothers	109,805
John Valov	103,442
G. L. Pratt	102,554
C. J. Ritchie	89,602
M. Curti & Sons	84,335
Rogers Farming Co	83,385
A. E. Panetta Farms	81,707
Don & Vern Thiesen	77,011
E. W. Merritt Farms	74,348
E. Batsch	73,563
Richard Berry & Sons	72,103
Morris Stuhaan	70,389
R. A. Hildebrand	70,116
T. V. Cardoza & Son	68,406

TULARE COUNTY—continued

R. E. Smith & Sons	$66,589
G. E. Paxton	65,753
Jack Phillips	64,891
Glenn Schott & Sons	64,259
Carl & Paul Shannon	62,402
Menezes Bros	61,997
Doe Cattle & Land Company	61,981
Bill White	61,879
Andy Wheat	59,297
J. D. Andreas & Sons	57,234
A. Caratan & Son	53,571
Atilio Belezzuoli	51,424
Mitchellinda Ranches	50,955
L. W. Turk	50,808
Clyde Quillin Jr	50,362
C. & W. Ranches	50,175
Edward L. Irwin	49,642
Baker Bros	49,358
Roy D. Murray	48,725
Sherman Land & Cattle Co	44,965
Robert F. Bowman	44,641
Vernon Hutsell	44,290
John Torrez Jr	42,653
Guthrie Farming Co	41,634
Doyle Ritchie	41,583
Hochuli Bros	41,055
W. M. & D. L. Colson	40,370
H. A. Vossler & Sons	39,812
George A. Efseaff	39,389
Nagatani Farms	38,902
A. T. & J. R. Villard	37,951
Glenn L. Cooper	37,182
Wilbur Ranch	36,955
Charlie Minoletti	36,620
Melvin Miller	35,270
Lawrence Taylor	34,684
Lapadula Farms	34,605
Louie F. Morris	34,361
Roy Kent	34,080
Fisher Bros	33,890
Benson Brothers	33,754
Nickell Farms	33,413
Robert Taggart	32,468
Hash Nursery	32,344
Sam W. Bell	32,327
Dick Anderson	32,315
Mary Rocha	32,310
Glenn Newsom	32,002
Richard Stuhaan	31,863
Earl Royer	31,439
Louie McQuay	31,142
Joe W. Ramos	31,122
Chas. E. Slaughter Farms	31,007
Harvey Lauritzen	30,890
J. X. Bettencourt	30,835
Galbraith Brothers	30,657
Don MacMillan	30,573
Amos Margosian	30,524
Don Eisner	30,465
Clark Bros	30,242
Edgar Schieler & Sons	30,061
Luella B. Hyde & Sons	29,849
Pradera Del Lago	29,781
C. D. Speer	29,462
Overholt Brothers	28,933
J. C. Ribeiro & Sons	28,929
Coy M. Daffern	28,522
L. Raviscioni Farms	28,504
Troy Huckabay	28,069
Watte Brothers	27,851
Frank L. Day	27,579
Schlitz & Twiford Farms	27,576
Nielsen Farms	27,545
Hank Anderson	27,386
James D. Cupp	27,225
Toomey Brothers	26,590
Manuel I. Rocha	26,372
A. W. Carlson	26,183
Geo. Shannon	26,178
Hercal Corporation	26,163
S & S Ranches	26,102
E. L. Beaver	26,025
Rollis Friend	26,013
Kirby Wyllie	25,920
Cowart & Moorhead	25,623
Manuel Martin, Jr	25,329
Larry Hawthorne	25,094
Total payees in county (107)	5,515,923

YOLA COUNTY

Heidrick Farms, Inc	$103,101
E. L. Wallace	80,429
C. Bruce Mace Ranch, Inc	77,358
Layton Knaggs	49,837
Kirtlan Bros	40,731
E. L. Wallace and Sons	39,583
L. H. Farms Corp	36,457
Total payees in county (7)	427,496
Total payees in State (783)	64,479,024

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Colorado

ADAMS COUNTY

Kalcevic Farms Inc	$64,624
Monaghan Farms Inc	49,752
Box Elder Farms, Co	41,455
Total payees in county (3)	155,831

ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Roland K. Cronk	31,793
Joseph Turecek, Est	28,731
Tom Bradbury	27,106
Ed Fischahs	26,357
Robert E. Carlson	25,536
Total payees in county (5)	139,523

BACA COUNTY

T. F. Arbuthnot	56,520
C. V. Cogburn	51,055
Russell Lofiin	43,908
F. M. Swanson	40,559
Wayne Orebaugh	36,214
Bernard Neill	32,184
Samuel Thompson	32,019
W. E. Tolbert	31,810
Brownie Farms	31,560
J. T. McEndree	30,345
Homsher Farms and Ranches	28,878
A. B. Hefley	28,565
Lewis Robbins	27,545
T. L. Tucker and Jesse Wade	27,020
Roy B. Hanes and Delano Alley	26,638
Total payees in county (15)	524,820

BENT COUNTY

George C. Camilli	41,080
Jake Broyles	37,276
Fred Rohlman	31,719
G. Swift, Est	30,089
Cordes and Oberlander	26,927
Total payees in county (5)	167,091

CHEYENNE COUNTY

Jeanne L. James	60,099
John Kriss	52,471
Dale Mitchek	40,005
James McCormick, Jr	35,994
Archie M. Lowe & Sons	34,345
Marvin Lowe	33,241
August Kern & Sons	32,612
A. D. Reed	29,626
Edwin Hendrickson	29,466
William L. White	29,322
M. K. White	28,317
White Woman Creek Inc	27,378
Henry Funk	26,774
Allen Bros	25,093
Total payees in county (14)	484,743

CROWLEY COUNTY

Crowley Land & Dev. Co	47,538

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Colorado—Con.

ELBERT COUNTY

Andy Kochis, Jr	$26,591

KIOWA COUNTY

Olive W. Garvey	103,726
James S. Garvey	95,113
Harold Wyckoff	52,020
George A. Jacobs	50,557
Wayne E. Tallman	47,002
M. E. Templer	43,599
Stum & Schuler	42,613
C. W. Schwerdfeger	42,216
Ruth G. Fink	41,884
Wayne E. Tallman Farms Co	39,410
W. Harold Tuttle	37,720
Woolfolk Grain Co	34,476
Gene Schwerdfeger	33,668
William J. Weber	32,269
E. L. Hatcher	30,512
Arthur C. Wilks	29,784
Aubrey Shotton	28,875
Clyde E. Buck	28,460
Bill Marx	28,369
Jerald R. Quindt	26,488
Charles E. Tallman	26,322
Total payees in county (21)	895,083

KIT CARSON COUNTY

Baughman Farms, Inc	310,255
Delmer Zweygardt	116,483
Penny Ranch	62,114
Hinkhouse Bros	61,784
Dannie Weaver	59,089
Leonard Feldhousen	55,875
Russell Scott	53,059
Iron Mueller, Inc	51,680
Marvin Grusing	50,764
Reed Ranches	46,155
Orville Chapin	45,678
Dale D. Hanna	45,420
Buol Farms, Inc	42,411
B. D. Hargrove	41,656
Raymond Schulte	37,373
George Andrews	37,251
Q. G. Demmit	35,013
William Paul Hornung	33,832
John R. Zurcher	33,610
Raymond Duell	33,319
Rex Hitchcock	33,235
Kenneth Harrel	32,801
Francis McCaffrey, Sr	31,254
Raymond Thomas Downey	30,930
Ernest Pottorff	29,254
Chester E. James	28,920
Mae Belle Crouse	28,777
Herman Ridder	28,733
Harold Pickard	27,596
C. E. McCartney	27,343
Bess Jones	26,722
Edwin Rainbolt	26,411
Kenneth Hitchcock	26,402
Virgil Unruh	25,707
Total payees in county (34)	1,656,906

LINCOLN COUNTY

Orval F. Parker, Inc	28,633
Harold Kuckartz	26,631
J. F. Elliston	26,116
Bill Poss	25,342
Total payees in county (4)	106,722

PROWERS COUNTY

Reyher Farms	72,770
X. Y. Ranch Co	67,603
C. H. Fletcher	61,153
C. E. Willhite	50,300
Howard A. Ragsdale	47,485
C. A. Barth and Robert Barth	44,745
C. Hart Farms, Inc	42,056
L. W. Bailey	40,988
Sun Vue, Inc	40,042

PROWERS COUNTY—continued

Curtis Duvall	$36,848
J. Willhite and Son	34,983
Gene and Claude Hammit	33,187
George E. Holmes	31,250
Eugene Rundell	30,441
Horsecreek Farms	30,290
Jack Herrin	29,874
Frank Duvall	28,188
Dorenkamp Farms, Inc	27,220
Creamer Ranch	27,133
Leonard Hart	26,540
John Gentz	25,601
R. L. Hatcher	25,089
Total payees in county (22)	853,786

PUEBLO COUNTY

R. Lewis Fillmore	53,772

ROUTT COUNTY

Gilbert Evans	27,070

SEDGWICK COUNTY

Wm. Stretesky	30,433

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Andrew Blake	46,545
Robert Thomas	36,680
V. V. Davie	35,179
Alfred Ward and Son	34,617
X Bar 4 Ranch, Inc	33,373
Ben Gay, Inc	29,897
Joseph Kejr Test- Tr. No. 2B	29,766
Earl Anderson	28,970
Donald Wright	27,739
Jay Hickert	25,808
Total payees in county (10)	328,574

WELD COUNTY

Jean Eichheim	40,168
Lyle V. Cooksey	35,689
L. J. King	35,054
John E. Epple	29,892
Dorothy S. Linnebur	29,856
Walter John Peters	27,200
Henry S. King	25,427
Total payees in county (7)	223,286

YUMA COUNTY

Big Creek Farms Co	52,519
Chester Whomble	32,178
Leonard L. R. Dutton	32,177
C. D. & Don Seedorf	28,047
George W. Wingfield	27,483
Carroll Josh	26,094
Total payees in county (6)	198,498
Total payees in State (151)	5,920,267

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Florida

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Pinckney Hill Plantation	$39,525

SANTA ROSA COUNTY

J. E. Golden	43,916
Lem Strickland	31,357
Total payees in county (2)	75,273

SUWANNEE COUNTY

Sid Allen, Jr	26,186
D. W. Stephens	25,540
Total payees in county (2)	51,726
Total payees in State (5)	166,524

BAKER COUNTY

Newberry Angus Farms, Inc	34,908

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Georgia

BARTOW COUNTY

J. C. Evans	$41,610
Smith Gin Company	33,585
W. P. Lanier	32,678
Joe G. Brandon, Jr	31,951
J. M. Maxwell/W. Smith	31,796
H. E. Harris	29,338
Glenn Nelson	26,813
Total payees in county (7)	227,771

BEN HILL COUNTY

J. H. Dorminy, Jr	37,626

BLECKLEY COUNTY

Stuckey Timberland, Inc	33,686
James E. Perry	25,487
Total payees in county (2)	59,173

BROOKS COUNTY

H. R. Crosby	28,922

BULLOCH COUNTY

H. S. Blitch and Son	42,942

BURKE COUNTY

Roy Barefield	64,358
Quinton Rogers	55,654
Kitchen and Land	51,172
B. G. Collins	49,464
R. L. Webster	47,317
James Beall	45,242
Jimmie R. Robinson	42,852
Eliz O. Barefield	42,423
T. R. Rowland	40,717
J. H. Rowland	39,769
A. H. Sandeford	39,458
Paul Shivers	37,801
H. W. Mobley	36,410
J. B. Walden	35,994
T. W. and R. W. Mobley	35,933
Percy Dixon	35,392
Frank C. Griffin	34,348
Ray Delaigle	34,077
R. L. Quick	32,655
Farris L. Wren	31,597
Porter W. Carswell	29,528
Lamar Prescott	28,784
Irvin Reeves	26,900
W. T. McBride	26,696
J. T. Cooper	25,368
Total payees in county (25)	969,909

CALHOUN COUNTY

David Bruner	32,185
Jordan Farms Partnership	30,303
R. M. Jordan	29,413
R. L. Perryman	25,330
J. S. Cowart, Jr	25,260
Total payees in county (5)	152,491

CHANDLER COUNTY

M. J. Bowen	44,279

CLAY COUNTY

Jack Hattaway	29,373

COLQUITT COUNTY

Samuel F. Brewer	29,979

COWETA COUNTY

W. J. Estes	48,226

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Georgia—Con.

CRISP COUNTY

Noel Williams	$69,381
L. E. Williams, Jr	43,349
Harold Jackson	28,728
W. H. Williams	27,604
Total payees in county (4)	169,062

DODGE COUNTY

James J. Mullis	61,770
Candler Farms	41,659
S. C. Cadwell	30,488
Guy Tripp	30,346
Total payees in county (4)	164,263

DOOLY COUNTY

Asbury Wright	123,156
Olen J. Burton	57,829
Eugene McCleskey	57,074
Van Peavy	57,046
Rha McCleskey, Jr	54,432
Madison B. Coley, Jr	53,434
Ike Everett	47,325
W. R. Jackson, Jr	45,993
W. H. and C. V. Cross	42,378
Millard Peavy	42,362
Warren Taylor	39,673
Ellis H. Davis	37,784
Lee Bailey, Jr	36,621
Otha Peavy	36,253
Ronney Ledford	36,143
Carl Bowen	36,113
F. H. Sparrow	35,057
R. L. Calhoun	34,314
Richard Doster	31,919
Ossie T. Spradley, Jr	30,940
Anderson Reed	30,573
John S. Williams	29,267
Raymond Davis	28,829
W. G. Joiner	28,439
L. L. Minor, Sr	28,439
Tippett Peavy	27,779
Marvin Capus Jones	27,367
Ben T. Ambrose	27,295
Total payees in county (28)	1,163,834

EARLY COUNTY

Singletary Farms	65,605
Leonard White	38,154
Sam Clinkscales	30,555
P. H. Clinkscales	27,400
Total payees in county (4)	161,714

EMANUEL COUNTY

Frank Flanders	55,725
D. E. Brown	35,697
Billie Walden	31,167
Total payees in county (3)	122,589

GLASCOCK COUNTY

John Everett Hadden	25,617

GORDON COUNTY

Gus G. Moore	31,383
Frank Erwin	27,945
Moss Land Co	27,251
Total payees in county (3)	86,579

HANCOCK COUNTY

Grover A. Walls, Sr	50,964
Herman Archer	25,183
Total payees in county (2)	76,147

HART COUNTY

Hubert Cheek, Jr	114,065
L. M. York	37,368
Total payees in county (2)	151,433

HOUSTON COUNTY

Charlie T. Kersey	$51,501
Gunn Farms	44,130
L. E. Hicks	42,562
John E. Richards	40,572
W. V. Brannen	28,738
S. A. Nunn, Jr	27,481
Total payees in county (6)	234,984

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Bryants Incorporated	65,717
T. B. Kelly Estate	52,897
G. C. and Johnny McGahee	52,717
Harry and A. P. Jones	45,283
Judson McNair	41,742
Lewis Alford	34,556
W. P. Smith and Sons	32,249
Paul and Larry Cobb	31,639
R. J. Jones	30,986
A. H. Braswell	26,313
Hugh L. Salter	25,195
Total payees in county (11)	439,294

JENKINS COUNTY

T. L. Black	42,407
Virgil H. Black	33,113
Buck Brinson	29,197
Lamar Black	27,789
Total payees in county (4)	132,506

JOHNSON COUNTY

W. R. & J. L. Jackson	50,687
T. E. Jordan, Jr	36,319
Total payees in county (2)	87,006

LAURENS COUNTY

W. A. Rountree	93,432
W. H. Lovett	69,403
Ed Roche	41,898
Jack Cook	32,343
H. L. Harper	30,503
A. L. Parker	29,500
B. Moorman and B. F. Watson	28,018
Estate of E. B. Claxton, dec	26,676
Total payees in county (8)	351,773

MACON COUNTY

C. J. Harp, Jr	32,831
Hixon Guest	29,610
J. T. Fullington	28,929
F. W. Smith	25,662
Total payees in county (4)	117,032

MADISON COUNTY

Whitehead Farms	35,670

MERIWETHER COUNTY

Gay and Keith	39,898
A. G. Estes, Inc	33,404
W. R. Arnall	28,583
Total payees in county (3)	101,885

MITCHELL COUNTY

Billy Hatcher	38,011
H. G. McGahee	36,660
Harry Frosteg	33,618
Dan Palmer, Jr	28,630
James & Harry Holton, Inc	26,710
Total payees in county (5)	163,629

MORGAN COUNTY

D. W. & B. H. Malcom	82,026
Otis Whitlock	61,027
Bonny Shepherd	42,616
Total payees in county (3)	185,669

OCONEE COUNTY

Fonnie F. Dickens, Jr	$59,176
Joe D. Murrow	32,151
Total payees in county (2)	91,327

OGLETHORPE COUNTY

Carl C. Culbertson	52,489

PEACH COUNTY

Marlon Maddox	25,773

PIKE COUNTY

R. D. Crawford	39,063
R. F. Strickland Co	35,007
Total payees in county	74,070

PULASKI COUNTY

John W. Dawson	69,299
Dunaway Brothers	45,504
Norman C. Hardy	37,894
B. E. Dunaway	28,137
Total payees in county (4)	180,834

RANDOLPH COUNTY

Edward Sanders	44,205
J. R. Curry	33,338
R. R. Rice	25,995
Total payees in county (3)	103,538

SCREVEN COUNTY

Millhaven Co	73,515
G. L. Rouse	56,747
Paul K. Newton	35,818
John L. Murray Farm	31,138
L. E. Pryor	28,553
C. M. Austin	27,028
T. V. Parker	25,548
F. F. Glisson	25,529
Total payees in county (8)	303,876

SEMINOLE COUNTY

Raymond Odom	48,149

STEWART COUNTY

W. C. Bradley Co	65,929
M. J. Lane	31,204
Total payees in county (2)	97,133

SUMTER COUNTY

Gene Reeves	69,810
Floyd J. Frazier	32,800
T. E. Stephens, Jr	32,553
Neill Hodges	29,164
J. C. Jones	28,301
Pat Crumpton	26,500
Harold J. Israel	25,124
Total payees in county (7)	244,252

TAYLOR COUNTY

D. W. Payne, Jr	35,298
Ed Richardson	27,904
William A. Simpson	26,054
Total payees in county (3)	89,256

TERRELL COUNTY

Don Bridges	56,560
W. K. Jones	50,588
Wilbur Gamble	45,373
Hugh Lee	36,917
W. B. Johnson	34,504
Huson Brim	29,710
McLendon Brothers	25,993
Total payees in county (7)	279,645

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Georgia—Con.

THOMAS COUNTY

J. G. Griffin	$39,556
Perry Bell Enterprise	25,925
Total payees in county (2)	65,481

TREUTLEN COUNTY

Manning Mimbs	25,843

TURNER COUNTY

Pirkle Farms	47,067
J. F. Gibbs	30,423
Total payees in county (2)	77,490

TWIGGS COUNTY

Sam Floyd, Sr	28,485

WALTON COUNTY

Garland Kilgore	31,763
Robert B. Chandler	26,625
Robert M. Hawk	25,122
Total payees in county (3)	83,510

WARREN COUNTY

Guy H. Shivers, Sr	105,031
Harrison Farms	28,238
Total payees in county (2)	133,269

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Eugene Cook	46,177
E. B. Price, Jr	44,855
Gilmore Bros	41,558
L. A. Garrett	39,374
Ernest C. Smith	31,245
Lonnie S. McDonald	27,372
Olen Price	26,630
Washington Ginning Co	26,125
Total payees in county (8)	283,336

WILCOX COUNTY

Whelchel & Whelchel	28,768
Jack Warren	27,584
Marcus Reeves	26,855
Total payees in county (3)	83,207

WORTH COUNTY

Taylor Farms	44,788
J. R. Odom	27,818
William Sledge	25,958
Total payees in county (3)	98,564
Total payees in state (211)	8,135,812

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Idaho

BANNOCK COUNTY

Dale Koester	$26,235

BINGHAM COUNTY

Lenard Schritter	49,221
Matsuura Bros. Co. Inc	37,402
Vincent R. Benson	31,250
Lloyd Stolworthy Inc	30,217
C. Leslie Williams	29,970
Total payees in county (5)	178,060

BONNEVILLE COUNTY

Jess Croft & Son	59,403
E. Bud Johnson	53,768
J. R. Hays & Son, Inc	47,236
Clements & Jackson	36,199
Karl Brown & Merle Brown	31,126
Schwieder Brothers	27,632
Weeks Brothers & Sons	$27,493
Elmer N. Jensen	25,365
Total payees in county (8)	308,222

CAMAS COUNTY

Gwinn F. Rice	30,927

CARIBOU COUNTY

Barker Brothers	62,861
King Creek Graz Assn	28,196
Total payees in county (2)	91,057

CASSIA COUNTY

Heglar Ranch, Inc	62,427
Paul Spanbauer	59,420
Parr Bros. Inc	49,666
Matthews Bros	36,552
Raymond H. Johnson	32,381
Cold Springs Farm	29,846
Gorringe Bros	29,393
Anderson Bros	28,851
Bell Bingham and Assc	27,055
Total payees in county (9)	355,591

ELMORE COUNTY

Tri C Ranch	25,631
Total payees in county (1)	25,631

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Evan O. Koller	28,871
Total payees in county (1)	28,871

FREMONT COUNTY

Max D. Parkinson and Son, Inc	25,570
Total payees in county (1)	25,570

IDAHO COUNTY

Green Bros	53,172
Total payees in county (1)	53,172

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Western Potato Co	41,964
Snake River Equipment	37,505
Total payees in county (2)	79,469

KOOTENAI COUNTY

Idaho Irrigation Inc	35,981
Drechsel Bros	27,056
Total payees in county (2)	63,037

LATAH COUNTY

Pfaff Bros., Inc	49,472
Total payees in county (1)	49,472

LEWIS COUNTY

Joe Lux	32,761
Aubrey Pratt	31,484
W. W. Riggers & Sons	27,978
Total payees in county (3)	92,223

MADISON COUNTY

Summers Bros	31,035
Ross Parkinson	29,365
Total payees in county (2)	60,400

MINIDOKA COUNTY

Vernon B. Clinton	89,125
Morgan Shillington Farms Co	54,404
Total payees in county (2)	143,529

NEZ PERCE COUNTY

Wagner Brothers Inc	78,236
McIntosh and Sons	69,147
Meacham Land and Cattle Co	55,975
Van Sullivan	$38,839
Stanton Becker Farms	32,957
Herndon Farms	32,647
McGregor Farms Inc	29,958
Edward Bozarth Estate	25,590
George Brammer	25,271
Winston Mader	25,229
Total payees in county (10)	413,849

POWER COUNTY

Fred G. Mayer & Sons	35,639
Jay H. Hulet	31,334
W. W. Hubbard & Sons, Inc	29,763
Wallace Hayes	28,300
Elmer Funk, Jr	26,214
Total payees in county (6)	151,250

TETON COUNTY

Rammel Brothers	29,440
Shayne Linderman	27,930
Total payees in county (2)	57,370

TWIN FALLS COUNTY

W. B. Savage Ranches	26,523
W. T. Williams, Inc	25,185
Total payees in county (2)	51,708
Total payees in State (61)	2,285,643

1960 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Illinois

ALEXANDER COUNTY

Dowco Land Co	$62,492
Elott Raffety Farms, Inc	38,759
Gerard Farms	28,751
E. J. Showmaker	27,204
Total payees in county (4)	157,206

BOONE COUNTY

Donald Clark	33,412

BUREAU COUNTY

Claude Bailey	31,819
Ronald Wolf	28,774
Clint Thomas	25,960
Total payees in county (3)	86,553

COOK COUNTY

Marvin Dunteman	33,546

DE KALB COUNTY

O. M. Johnson	41,895
Edward Weaver	28,155
Total payees in county (4)	70,050

DE WITT COUNTY

C. H. Moore Trust Est	105,428

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Ray Wax	36,435

FULTON COUNTY

Meadowlark Fms	118,973
Lowell Wier	29,072
Total payees in county (2)	148,045

GALLATIN COUNTY

Pat Scates, Sr	66,852
Lawrence Rollman	36,797
James A. Raben	28,275
Total payees in county (3)	131,924

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Illinois—Con.

GREENE COUNTY

James Gesarey	$37,402
Henry Vantuyle	26,492
Total payees in county (2)	63,516

HANCOCK COUNTY

Hancock Land Co	29,499
Total payees in county (1)	29,499

JACKSON COUNTY

Roger Novack	25,404
D. L. Heine & A. Behnken Ptrp	25,303
Total payees in county (2)	50,707

JERSEY COUNTY

I. Sringhausen L. & C. Inc	34,754
Total payees in county (1)	34,754

KANE COUNTY

Baert Bros. c/o F. Baert	30,505
Young Bros., Inc	27,184
Harry Schoger	27,034
John A. Gorenz	26,737
Leon Meredith	25,922
Total payees in county (5)	137,382

KANKAKEE COUNTY

Cote Farms, Inc	126,895
Tallmadge Ranch, Inc	84,498
Sunset Farms, Inc	26,449
Loitz Bros	26,035
Total payees in county (4)	263,877

KNOX COUNTY

James S. Thompson	34,456
Total payees in county (1)	34,456

LAKE COUNTY

Tempel Farms	29,713
Elza Gwaltney	28,749
Total payees in county (2)	58,462

LAWRENCE COUNTY

Earl Minderman	39,839
Total payees in county (1)	39,839

LEE COUNTY

A. H. Nicholas	49,931
Martin Ravnaas	25,636
Total payees in county (2)	75,567

LOGAN COUNTY

John L. White	28,413
Harold Park	27,949
Total payees in county (2)	56,362

MC HENRY COUNTY

Meyer & Schuring	49,169
George Raabe	29,405
Perfection Farms	28,474
Total payees in county (3)	107,048

MC LEAN COUNTY

G. J. Kruger	35,585

MERCER COUNTY

Scott Farm Co	25,120

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

W. Darrell Kilton	$59,596

MORGAN COUNTY

James O. Harris	36,369

PERRY COUNTY

Southwestern Coal Co	50,901

PIATT COUNTY

U. of I., c/o D. G. Smith	32,935

PIKE COUNTY

Bob Richter	29,049
Total payees in county (1)	29,049

RANDOLPH COUNTY

Behnken & Behnken	35,604
Total payees in county (1)	35,604

ROCK ISLAND COUNTY

Martin Bros	31,179
Total payees in county (1)	31,179

SANGAMON COUNTY

Vincent Braner	31,296
Dowson Bros., A Ptrp	30,505
Lillie E. Mayfield, Adm	29,186
Total payees in county (3)	90,987

SCOTT COUNTY

Karl W. Meisenbach	31,397
Total payees in county (1)	31,397

SHELBY COUNTY

Smith Farm, Inc	25,854
Total payees in county (1)	25,854

VERMILION COUNTY

L. J. Larry	29,904
Evert E. Berglund	26,331
Total payees in county (2)	56,235

WHITE COUNTY

Frank H. Ackerman	36,424
Wilburn Duvall	33,727
L. R. Brown, L. A. Brown	31,056
Ford Turkey Island	26,506
Total payees in county (4)	127,713

WHITESIDE COUNTY

Rosengren Bros	31,449
Hugh J. Hermes	30,091
William Mencarow	26,778
Total payees in county (3)	88,318

WINNEBAGO COUNTY

Dale F. Straley	36,720
Lester Gummow	28,005
Dwight Jewell	25,402
Total payees in county (3)	90,127

WOODFORD COUNTY

Martin Bros. Implement Co	52,288
Ben Hodel	31,691
Dorothy Bally, Adm	26,209
Total payees in county (3)	110,188
Total payees in State (73)	**2,711,225**

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Indiana

CASS COUNTY

Merl Homburg	$33,335

DAVIESS COUNTY

Graham Farms, Inc	59,330
Manos Evans	28,130
Aden Michael Sprinkle	28,128
Floyd E. Lee	26,226
Total payees in county (4)	141,814

FOUNTAIN COUNTY

Dr. Lee Maris	33,810

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Calvin Kolb	25,284

GIBSON COUNTY

John C. Blood	36,997

HAMILTON COUNTY

Dan Taylor	28,505

HENRY COUNTY

Marvin Luellen	29,906
Sam Goldman	26,119
Total payees in County (2)	56,025

JASPER COUNTY

James D. Green Tr	46,070
Fred & Austin Moore	43,782
William Gehring, Inc	39,671
Savich Farms	38,765
Savich & Green	36,210
Robert Schoon	30,570
R and D Farms	28,272
Stewart Farms	25,947
Total payees in county (8)	289,287

KNOX COUNTY

Thompson Farms, Inc	60,336
Schenk Farms, Inc	36,790
G.A. & E.C. Steckler	34,298
Ernest Vieke	31,423
William R. Huey	28,651
Robert Carnahan	25,549
George R. Wilson	25,010
Total payees in county (7)	242,057

KOSCIUSKO COUNTY

Creighton Bros	55,358
Herbert Fervida	26,577
Total payees in county (2)	81,935

LA PORTE COUNTY

R. and J. Gumz Farms, Inc	30,188
Wolff Farms	25,964
Frank Leroy and Sons	25,752
Total payees in county (3)	81,904

LAKE COUNTY

Verle Little	28,559

NEWTON COUNTY

Robert A. Churchill	51,029
Mark J. Mahan	34,915
Albert Molson, Jr	34,079
Everett Madison	32,658
James Printy, Jr	28,417
James L. Churchill	26,212
Total payees in county (6)	207,310

PARKE COUNTY

Adams Farm Company, Inc	43,932
Kenneth Ramsay	29,214
Total payees in county (2)	73,146

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Indiana—Con.

POSEY COUNTY

New Harmony Realty	$49,135
Edward C. Culley	30,760
Total payees in county (2)	79,895

PULASKI COUNTY

Overmyer Farms	128,586
Arthur P. Gumz	68,666
Total payees in county (2)	197,252

RANDOLPH COUNTY

Byron Baker	26,209

ST. JOSEPH COUNTY

E. Gumz, Inc	27,762

STARKE COUNTY

Richard Gumz	96,238
Wm. R. Solmos	33,321
Benjamin O. Bierly	26,693
Jerome Gumz	26,130
Total payees in county (4)	182,382

SULLIVAN COUNTY

John Gray Kelly	66,969

TIPPECANOE COUNTY

Watland Farms, Inc	34,497
James Kellerman	28,168
William Banta	25,860
Total payees in county (3)	88,525

VANDERBURG COUNTY

Donald E. Kolb	42,691

VERMILLION COUNTY

Harvey Estate	35,894

VIGO COUNTY

James Harlan	43,421
Burch Harlan	34,157
N. & N. Farms, Inc	29,660
Peter A. Farmer	29,252
Lyman Pendergast	27,445
Total payees in county (5)	163,935

WARREN COUNTY

Richard Clark	29,916
Total payees in State (62)	2,301,398

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Iowa

AUDUBON COUNTY

Melville Farms	38,038

BLACK HAWK COUNTY

Wellman Farms, Inc	29,554

BOONE COUNTY

George Uthe	30,339

BUCHANAN COUNTY

Charles Hoffman	26,897

BUENA VISTA COUNTY

Lanphere Farms	26,484

BUTLER COUNTY

Alfred McWilliams	29,997

CARROLL COUNTY

Garst Company	67,860

CERRO GORDO COUNTY

Wayne Van Duzer	29,010
Louis A. Kopple, Md	26,066
Total payees in county (2)	55,076

CHEROKEE COUNTY

John Heline	$33,337

CRAWFORD COUNTY

Leonard Heistand	26,043

DES MOINES COUNTY

Robert L. Gabeline	39,570

FAYETTE COUNTY

Agricultural Investors Inc	38,111

FLOYD COUNTY

Julius Huxsol	48,918
Leon Koebrick	30,571
V. Rottler Etal	30,088
Total payees in county (3)	109,577

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Lawrence W. Hamilton	36,720
Staley Farms Inc	35,394
Steven C. Stockdale	33,331
John H. Ricke	30,808
Total payees in county (4)	136,253

FREMONT COUNTY

Payne Valley Farms, Inc	81,656
Reeves Farms	44,615
Walter M. Doyle	29,844
Schaaf Farms	28,149
J. E. Good	25,906
Total payees in county	210,170

GREENE COUNTY

Delmar Van Horn, Jr	31,180

GUTHRIE COUNTY

Harold Griffith	27,633

HANCOCK COUNTY

Fraser Farms, Inc	47,652

HARDIN COUNTY

Thelma L. Warman	30,946

HOWARD COUNTY

Gerald Sovereign & Sons	26,220

IDA COUNTY

William Piper	26,484

IOWA COUNTY

Amana Society	149,172

MADISON COUNTY

Baur Farms, Inc	27,959

MILLS COUNTY

R. C. Good	39,898
Luther Gammon	27,150
Harry E. Paul	26,842
Herman Stortenbecker	25,713
Total payees in county (4)	119,603

MITCHELL COUNTY

E. B. Mohr	28,925

MONONA COUNTY

Charles Lakin	129,148
Franklin D. Seitzinger	44,216
Lakin Ranch, Inc	39,669
George Macclure	25,724
Hanson Bros	25,596
Total payees in county (5)	264,353

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Marvin Hunt	31,148

PALO ALTO COUNTY

Wegener Bros	27,564

POCAHONTAS COUNTY

Grinnel Shoe Co	$25,547

SAC COUNTY

H. J. Turin	29,934
Quirk Farms Inc	25,917
Total payees in county (2)	55,851

STORY COUNTY

Harold M. Britten	36,219

W. POTTAWATTAMIE COUNTY

Thomsen Bros	26,834

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Robert M. Flynn	28,670

WEBSTER COUNTY

Ltichfield Realty Co	25,572

WORTH COUNTY

Beverly Land	37,534

WRIGHT COUNTY

Joe Keller	29,353
Total payees in State (54)	2,001,725

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Kansas

ALLEN COUNTY

Harold Whitaker	$42,851

BARBER COUNTY

Junior Dumler	31,097

BARTON COUNTY

Schartz Bros	26,892
Richard C. Brining	25,420
Total payees in county (2)	52,312

CLARK COUNTY

Dwight D. Klinger	25,355
Muriel G. Gardiner	25,297
Total payees in county (2)	50,652

COFFEY COUNTY

Evans & Nee Ptr	32,501

COMANCHE COUNTY

Vernon Huck	28,181
Glen Woolfolk & Sons	26,384
Total payees in county (2)	54,565

DICKINSON COUNTY

Laurence Clemence	28,274

EDWARDS COUNTY

David Britton	31,089
McLean Bros	28,739
Slentz Bros	27,007
Total payees in county (3)	86,835

ELLIS COUNTY

Leo J. Dreiling	25,896

FINNEY COUNTY

Garden Cy Company	81,166
Andrew E. Larson	59,922
Leland L. Crist	59,217
John Miller	53,903
George L. Potter	44,841
G. R. Byrd	40,360
Tom Linville	35,166
William D. Foster	35,040
Leroy F. Cooley	33,510
Emanuel Doll	33,508

Carson J. Davis	$33,038
Clarence Gigot	31,224
Max Engler, Jr	30,850
Marion L. Russell	29,434
Lawrence Miller	29,395
Leigh Warner	28,963
Francis Schreibvogel	28,552
Frank McClure	28,299
C. C. Spikes	26,942
Roger Ramsey	26,277
Eugene F. Ware	25,994
J. D. Hewes	25,855
Raymond Crist	25,844
Brookover Feed Yard Inc	25,227
Total payees in county (24)	872,527

GOVE COUNTY

R. S. Coberly	27,785

GRANT COUNTY

J. David Sullivan	38,139
Tuttle & Tuttle & Mawhirter	37,898
H. N. Hobart, Jr	35,376
Wiebe Bros., Inc	32,089
Arthur B. Williams	29,739
Total payees in county (5)	173,241

GRAY COUNTY

Sidney Warner	58,091
Cecil Obrate	30,797
W. D. Brady	30,446
Diane Janof	25,644
Total payees in county (4)	144,978

GREELEY COUNTY

Dale Steele	77,573
Kleymann Brothers	61,177
Ervin Schneider	46,700
Smith Ranch Company	39,605
Lemon & Maness	31,271
Duane F. Schneider	31,255
Jay A. Hoffman	30,423
H. C. Wear	29,570
J. V. Kuttler	28,739
Myron E. Sell	25,845
Total payees in county (10)	402,158

HAMILTON COUNTY

Richard Plunkett	39,061
John Lewis	35,341
Forrest L. Smith	28,915
W. T. Hughs	28,851
Clarence Simmonds	27,606
Louis J. Eddy	27,537
Harold Guldner	26,299
Milford E. Zook	26,272
Richard Cheatum	26,154
Ray Jackson Enterprises	25,858
Total payees in county (10)	291,894

HARPER COUNTY

Williams Est	30,762

HASKELL COUNTY

Haskell Land Co	54,844
Paul J. Brown	33,567
Kirby B. Clawson	30,572
Ed Hall	29,093
Forrest Cox	28,728
Randall Bird	27,807
Leslie A. Alexander	26,650
Joe K. Augerot	26,192
Total payees in county (8)	257,453

JEWELL COUNTY

Neil Durham	30,117
Lauren J. and Bill J. Roe	$28,027
Total payees in county (2)	58,144

KEARNEY COUNTY

Ethel M. Martin	58,468
Raymond Dienst, Sr	40,835
B. E. Miles	38,838
D. E. Steenis	35,022
Max R. Miller	34,834
Gordon W. Crone	33,754
Elmer L. Taylor	32,306
Ray Rohlman	31,390
Vernon G. Kropp Est	30,875
Vernon E. Eberhart	29,553
Edward E. Wiatt	28,368
Charles Eskelund	26,525
Don H. Shaw	26,480
W. T. Rooney, Jr. Est	25,143
Total payees in county (14)	472,391

KIOWA COUNTY

Pleasant Valley Farm & Ranch	29,686

LOGAN COUNTY

J. Ernes Bertrand	47,401
John W. & V. A. James	42,191
Keller Bros	36,015
Charles Bertrand Tr	35,358
Delton W. Hubert	29,976
A. F. Hueftle	28,079
Total payees in county (6)	219,020

MARION COUNTY

Vestring Bros	37,506

MEADE COUNTY

W. R. Cottrell	58,915
Maud Collingwood Est	40,604
Holmes Cattle Co	30,379
Total payees in county (3)	129,898

MITCHELL COUNTY

Paul Mears	36,634

MORTON COUNTY

W. J. Light	46,835
J. E. Light	37,085
Ralph Breeding	35,785
Leon Jackson	30,695
Glenn Sipes	30,288
Gwyn Thrash	26,946
Paul Light	26,884
Total payees in county (7)	234,518

NEOSHO COUNTY

Wesley Kroeker	80,048

OSBORNE COUNTY

Adrian Schweitzer	31,224
Max D. Remus	26,555
Total payees in county (2)	57,779

PHILLIPS COUNTY

John B. Wyrill, Jr	45,975
Angie S. Wyrill	37,703
Cox Bros. Farming Trust	34,486
Total payees in county (3)	118,164

REPUBLIC COUNTY

Swen E. Carlson	28,690

RUSSELL COUNTY

Brown Farms	25,678

SCOTT COUNTY

Floyd M. Krebs	48,019
Hattendorf Bros	44,460
Marion Hutchins	33,877
Claude Hughes	33,751
Felt Farms	$28,347
Notestines, Inc	28,199
Total payees in county (6)	216,653

SEWARD COUNTY

Hitch Lnd Cttl Co	42,329
Kenneth Martin	41,700
Total payees in county (2)	84,029

SHERIDAN COUNTY

E. A. Baalman & Sons	47,197

SHERMAN COUNTY

Lloyd Kontny	61,696
Kenneth House	54,123
C. Wilbur White	49,895
S. Everett Dennis	46,628
Wm. A. Davis and Sons	45,953
Golden Wheat Ranch	45,759
Charles L. Silkman	35,401
Vernon Irvin	31,685
Robert J. Hayden	29,490
John Raile	29,013
Arnold Schields	28,756
Harold L. Bair	27,032
John H. Golden	26,752
Walker Briney	26,676
Jim Flanders	26,629
Fred H. Schield	26,139
Keith Cook	25,993
Iron H. Mueller	25,848
Everett L. Craft	25,824
Harland J. Taylor	25,419
Total payees in county (20)	694,711

SMITH COUNTY

Ferguson Bros	36,700

STAFFORD COUNTY

Carl McCune Sons	31,141

STANTON COUNTY

G. H. J. Farms Ltd	91,596
Clarence Winger & Sons	76,058
Paul E. Plummer and Sons	52,141
Guy Rorick	45,970
Walter Herrick	43,725
Kans. Univ. Endow. Assoc	40,692
Kendrick Farms	39,789
Theodore J. Julian	39,174
Edna E. Collingwood	34,995
John Shore	34,797
G. D. Troutman	31,314
John W. Baughman Trust Est	29,688
Herman Cockreham	29,327
Rozella M. Van Brunt	28,808
Charles Lucas	28,638
Lester Stanton and Son	27,456
Milt Graber	27,289
D. E. Cockrum	27,267
Lester Canny	26,890
R. H. Trostle	25,900
Hobert Stewart	25,400
Total payees in county (21)	806,914

STEVENS COUNTY

Warren Spikes	65,383
Carl N. Brollier	53,107
Lawrence J. Lightcap	47,784
Gerald L. Schmidt	43,091
Fred Walkemeyer & Son	28,090
James Ford	27,013
A. E. Kramer, Agt. Pelajo Prop	26,665
Charles Dudley	26,103
Wayne Persons	25,470
Total payees in county (9)	342,715

SUMNER COUNTY

Stewart Farm Account	31,989

THOMAS COUNTY

Willard W. Garvey	$53,448
Marshall Farms	39,453
B. A. Hutton	32,099
Harold Hills, Jr	26,796
Total payees in county (4)	151,796

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price supoprt loans and wool and sugar payments—Kansas—Con.

WALLACE COUNTY

J. E. Ely, Est., A. E. Larson Adm	$46,222
N. D. Sexson	31,601
Gareth J. McFadden	30,820
Arthur R. Mai	28,797
Frasier Farms	28,634
Wm. H. Akers	25,692
Total payees in county (6)	191,766

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Herman Bott	51,520

WICHITA COUNTY

Glee S. Smith	41,477
J. W. Zellner	38,998
Eugene Berning	26,062
Leo Harkness	25,500
Total payees in county (4)	132,037

WOODSON COUNTY

H. W. Pierpont	29,515
Eldon Kee, Jr	28,517
Total payees in county (2)	58,032
Total payees in state (199)	7,011,137

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Kentucky

BALLARD COUNTY

James Wilson	25,804

BRECKENRIDGE COUNTY

J. D. Tobin	27,405

DAVIESS COUNTY

William Miles	27,434

FULTON COUNTY

Robert Sanger	27,813
Sanger Farms, Inc	25,859
Total payees in county (2)	53,672

HARDIN COUNTY

Dixie Stock Farms	27,954

HENDERSON COUNTY

Reynolds Metals Co	57,930
S. S. Wathen	26,757
Total payees in county (2)	84,687

HICKMAN COUNTY

Larkins Bros	25,954

TRIGG COUNTY

S. D. Broadbent, Jr	37,530

UNION COUNTY

Aluminum Co. of America	48,414
Total payees in county (1)	48,414
Total payees in state (11)	358,854

1969 ASCS Program Payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Louisiana

AVOYELLES PARISH

Haas Inc. Co. Inc	55,784

BOSSIER PARISH

Scopena Plantation	60,685
C. E. Roemer III	60,685
L. H. Woodruff	56,393
Rosedale Plantation Inc	50,746
Elm Grove Plantation Inc	40,133
Curtis Planting Co	$39,401
Joe Clark	36,693
R. J. Viola	34,456
E. D. Barnett	28,353
I. W. Whittington Jr	28,042
R. T. Stinson	25,013
Total payees in parish (11)	460,600

CADDO PARISH

Mission Planting Co	78,144
Dalton R. Pittman	73,423
J. W. Lynn Plantation	60,368
Dan P. Logan	59,866
Sam W. Smith Jr	54,319
L. R. Kirby Jr	51,386
Stinson Brothers	50,535
G. A. Frierson	49,219
A. C. Dominick Jr	48,482
W. J. Hutchinson Sons	46,010
L. S. Frierson Jr	45,439
Webb & Webb	44,354
C. N. Frierson	43,155
Robinson Co	41,499
G. W. Vanhoose Sr	37,391
G. W. Van Hoose Jr	37,168
T. A. Tinsley	36,597
Paul Dominick Jr	36,366
Carroll W. & Malcolm W. Feist	35,202
Paul Dominick	33,994
E. R. Cupples	33,812
A. L. Sentell	33,607
M. A. Roberson	33,080
C. M. Hutchinson, Jr	32,636
Bryan Connell	31,787
R. L. Nance, Jr	30,412
Clifton Dodson	30,270
Tom P. Moore, Jr	29,512
C. C. Whittington	28,901
J. W. Glassell	28,451
Yearward Bros	28,046
W. L. Crain	26,468
J. L. Teer	25,674
W. M. Yarbrough	25,665
Total payees in parish (34)	1,381,238

CALDWELL PARISH

Rowland Bros	44,253
Lelon Kenney	38,684
Jack Keahey	28,068
Total payees in parish (3)	111,005

CATAHOULA PARISH

George Yarbrough	171,967
Jimmy Goode	43,076
Total payees in parish (2)	215,043

CONCORDIA PARISH

Harriss and Sons	51,563
Panola Land Dev. Co	50,192
Pittsfield Pltn	37,696
Vaucluse Pltn	30,155
Lucerna Planting Co	26,179
R. S. Rife, Jr	25,006
Total payees in parish (6)	220,791

DE SOTO PARISH

James E. McMullen	30,703
R. C. LeGrand	29,470
Total payees in parish (2)	60,173

EAST CARROLL PARISH

Epps Plantation	102,181
Hollybrook Land Co., Inc	94,701
Quitman Fortenberry	53,646
J. E. Brown & Sons	50,351
Gilfoil Farms, Inc	49,624
Keener Howard	48,858
Jack S. Hamilton, Inc	$48,728
H. D. Harvey	46,081
W. H. Bullock	40,249
J. P. Brown	39,504
Wendell Downen	39,265
J. B. McPherson, Sr	38,463
Clyde Robinson	37,911
Jessie M. Blair	36,893
W. H. Crews	36,362
Edward Burgess	35,876
John Hankins	34,202
Orville Coody	33,394
Bernard Rosenzweig	32,338
Shepherd & Shepherd	31,338
Philip Brown	31,189
Howington Bros	31,059
Doris Pltn	30,718
Oliver Baker & Oliver	30,701
Clinton Fortenberry	30,165
F. H. Schneider, III	28,480
H. H. Howington, Jr	28,222
Buckmeadow Plantation	28,107
Houston Condrey	27,610
Reese Coleman	27,299
Howell Pippin	26,616
J. H Crews	26,103
W. T. Presley	25,769
Total payees in parish (33)	1,302,003

FRANKLIN PARISH

Yarbrough Brothers	61,776
Riley H. Graham	46,130
Gerald Sadler	39,006
Carl D. Batey	33,576
C. J. Grayson	32,208
Earl Carroll	30,582
Total payees in parish (6)	243,278

GRANT PARISH

Louis E. Stevens	54,444
Gordon Randolph	38,251
Total payees in parish (2)	92,695

MADISON PARISH

Dudley Pillow, Jr	93,960
Ashly Plantation	65,629
Maxwell Plantation	54,157
Elton Fortenberry	42,627
Harrison Evans	38,192
Albert H. Paxton	31,610
Jim S. Folk	30,606
Jeff Marsh & Sons	29,554
Robert Graves	28,319
James B. McPherson, Jr	27,564
M. C. Sevier	26,076
Total payees in parish (11)	468,294

MOREHOUSE PARISH

Barham, Inc	105,702
James U. Yeldell, Jr	66,562
H. A. Pipes, Jr	56,167
Davenport Bros	49,454
Duke Shackelford	47,194
Mott & Mott	44,890
N. W. Mott	43,650
F. Earl Hogan	42,366
Erle M. Barham	41,902
Kelly Bros	37,687
Wesley Bunch	36,502
Max Brodnax	36,420
C. L. Clark, Jr	34,447
J. B. Newman	33,312
Kimball Est	33,136
Joe S. Carter, Jr	32,038
Herbert Johnson	30,422
G. L. Shepard	29,131
C. E. Shepard	28,759
Bob Erle Clark	28,749
John F. Shackelford	28,095
John S. Barr & Son	27,816

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Louisiana—Con.

MOREHOUSE PARISH—continued

W. C. Norsworthy	$27,685
David Doles, Jr	25,736
Don Sims	25,574
Warren White	25,554
Pipes Planting Co	25,548
John Knox Nunn	25,145
Total payees in parish (28)	1,069,643

NATCHITOCHES PARISH

J. H. Williams	158,174
J. Alton Lambre	50,308
Prudhome Bros	49,700
Murry Lambre	47,848
Est. of H. Cohen & Sons	33,672
Riverside Plantation	32,175
Est. Sarah J. Hertzog	31,936
Charles E. Cloutier	31,789
G. C. Messenger	29,908
Starlight Plantation	27,733
Bayou Camitte Plantation	27,038
Est. of J. C. Carnahan	25,462
Deloy Blewer	25,250
Total payees in parish (13)	570,993

OUACHITA PARISH

Mason & Godwin	80,437
W. A. & T. A. Calloway	78,835
George P. Smelser	50,600
J. A. Moore	49,437
Travis Howard	48,422
J. M. Pratt, Sr	47,028
J. B. Johnston, Jr	43,071
A. C. Ransom & Son	42,220
Fred W. Huenefeldt	34,123
C. M. McMullen	28,953
Frank Mardis	28,430
Bruce F. Gregg	26,809
J. W. Perry	26,503
R. Z. Johnson	26,280
Total payees in parish (14)	611,148

RAPIDES PARISH

Christophe Keller, Jr	41,744
John H. Robert	31,542
Henry C. Boone, Jr	30,504
Weil Company, Inc	29,981
Frank J. Dautremont	28,711
Lucian A. Branch, Jr	26,897
Woodrow Dewitt	26,707
Total payees in parish (7)	216,086

RED RIVER PARISH

F. I. Waltman	36,060
J. T. Bierden, Jr	32,882
Wyche T. Coleman	32,392
Woster Anderson	26,979
Larry Bundrick	26,549
Paul Bundrick	26,355
Total payees in parish (6)	181,217

RICHLAND PARISH

C. W. Pardue	52,175
Geo. B. Franklin & Son, Inc	51,325
Goldmine Plt	43,265
C. L. Morris	38,339
Robertine R. Cobb	35,633
Jane R. Oliver	33,317
Noah W. Robinson	31,338
Earl Patrick	28,944
Ralph Powell	28,863
Charles D. Ware	27,996
John Carrol Rice	26,611
Clyde Cartlidge	26,456
Edward E. Holley	26,174
W. F. Finley, Jr	26,079
Total payees in parish (14)	476,515

ST. LANDRY PARISH

J. A. Pickett	$62,506
Nick D. Dubuisson	35,614
Lee Bert Fontenot	32,203
Lee Bert Fontenot	32,203
Hudspeth Bros	27,618
Total payees in parish (4)	157,941

ST. MARTIN PARISH

Willis Brothers	28,203

TENSAS PARISH

E. R. McDonald & Sons	91,355
Panola Co	75,547
Somerset Pltn	51,912
Frank Burnside	46,674
Cypress Grove Pltn	34,626
H. C. Miller III	33,647
G. C. Goldman	31,837
J. C. Crigler	27,011
Lakeplace Pltn	26,691
Wade Vinson, Jr	26,348
Jim Huff	26,223
R. E. Lancaster, Jr	25,721
Russell Ratcliff	25,086
Total payees in parish (13)	522,678

WEST CAROLL PARISH

Larry Crowe	25,225

WEST FELICANA PARISH

Louisiana State Penitentiary	36,971
Total payees in State (213)	8,507,524

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Maryland

KENT COUNTY

Edwin C. Fry	27,729

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

E. Brooke Lee	29,556

TALBOT COUNTY

I. R. Swann	34,957
Total Payees in State (3)	92,242

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Michigan

CASS COUNTY

Donald McKenzie	31,081
Gerald Wright	29,360
Total payees in county (2)	60,441

INGHAM COUNTY

Diehl Fields	31,817

LENAWEE COUNTY

Leland Bush & Sons	39,229
Mueller, Inc	30,390
H. H. Driggs Dairy	28,510
Richard Walters	26,268
George Vanhaerents	26,606
Total payees in county (5)	150,003

MONROE COUNTY

Albert Health	39,878
Total payees in state (9)	282,139

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Minnesota

BLUE EARTH COUNTY

Dale Duncanson	37,606
Kenneth Hiniker	28,562
Total payees in county (2)	66,168

BROWN COUNTY

Lester B. Krueger	$27,339

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Leland Holder	30,874

FARIBAULT COUNTY

Pirsig Bros	37,191
Thomas Legred and Sons	30,783
Dehy Farms, Inc	27,155
Bailey Blair	26,076
Total payees in county (4)	131,205

FREEBORN COUNTY

Homer Jensen	30,307
Arnold Hensche	26,607
Total payees in county (2)	56,914

GOODHUE COUNTY

Kenyon Farms Co	46,142
Gerald F. Ryan	29,882
Total payees in county (2)	76,024

JACKSON COUNTY

Hans Nielson	29,322
T. E. Barkeim	26,737
Total payees in county (2)	56,059

KITTSON COUNTY

Prairie Farms	35,517
John Bogestad	28,603
Kiene Farms, Inc	27,402
Total payees in county (3)	91,522

LE SUEUR COUNTY

George Weaver	27,692

LYON COUNTY

Edward Delanghe	32,590

MARSHALL COUNTY

E. G. Melo	58,398
Art Howard	32,586
Harry Howard	29,906
Lee Selnes	29,088
Thomas E. Kuznia	27,991
Total payees in county (5)	177,969

MARTIN COUNTY

Robert W. Luedtke	32,074
Marlo Maschoff	31,724
James P. Scholl	28,220
E. & R. Redenius Partnership	25,754
H. Boler Farms	25,170
Total payees in county (5)	142,942

MOWER COUNTY

Martin Bustad	30,551
Raymond Ratcliff	26,589
James Bell	25,548
Total payees in county (3)	82,688

NOBLES COUNTY

Jack C. Boote	31,717

RENVILLE COUNTY

George Rauenhorst	31,368
Frank Farms, Inc	26,472
Vernon Hoffman	25,969
Jerome Green	25,092
Total payees in county (4)	108,901

SIBLEY COUNTY

J. W. Easland and Son, Inc	29,567
Big Stone Canning Company	26,376
Total payees in county (2)	55,943

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Minn.—Con.

STEELE COUNTY

Cashman Nurseries, Inc	$30,863

SWIFT COUNTY

Minn Farms Co	43,698

WEST POLK COUNTY

Keith and Raymond Driscoll	34,128
James and Joe Fanfulik	28,133
Angus Acres, Inc	27,746
Total payees in county (3)	90,007

WILKINS COUNTY

James J. Walton	56,409
Total payees in state (45)	1,417,524

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Mississippi

ADAMS COUNTY

Ivanhoe Assoc., Inc	$65,936

ATTALA COUNTY

H. S. Smithson, Sr	38,189
Gideon W. Atwood	33,311
Charles Donald	28,652
Clyde S. Hester, Jr	25,794
H. S. Smithson, Jr	25,646
Maurice Crowder	25,145
Total payees in county (6)	176,737

BENTON COUNTY

Leake Brothers	27,538

BOLIVAR COUNTY

Delta and Pine Land Co	731,772
Allen Gray Estate	155,976
J and M Planting Co	138,757
J. A. Howarth, Jr	103,325
Charles A. Russell	96,743
J. G. Gourlay	91,021
McMurchy Farms	88,062
Dossett Plantation, Inc	86,733
Lewis Barksdale, Jr	82,527
Sunrise Dairy	79,344
Carr Planting Co	77,727
Robbins & Long	66,139
Maryland Plantation Inc	63,942
Zumbro Planting Co	63,817
A. D. Murphree, Jr	63,313
T. E. Pemble Farms, Inc	56,949
James House	55,546
D. A. and J. E. Williams	55,489
L. B. Pate and Sons	54,994
Charles J. Wilson	54,307
H.H. Lawler	53,863
R. C. Malone	53,175
L. & R. Plantation, Inc	53,071
R. N. & E. C. Tibbs	51,629
Rainbow Plantation Inc	50,646
H. B. Hood	50,068
B. E. McDearman, Jr	49,482
Shelby Farms	48,614
A. & B. Farms, Inc	48,234
Rogers Hall	47,787
M. J. Dattel	47,401
W. H. Howarth	46,881
W. F. and W. H. Hardin	45,792
Max Dilworth	44,030
Allendale Planting Co	43,839
Charles Speakes	43,608
E. M. Walton	41,742
S. D. Long	41,485
James L. Maxwell	41,862
William Peacock	40,338
Cowan & Franklin	39,853
Warfield Brothers Farms, Inc	39,299
J. R. Parkinson	39,288
Denton Mfg. Co., Inc	38,570
Boyd Lane Plantation	37,440
Alfred Butler	$36,881
J. R. Dodson	36,263
Clear Lake Farms, Inc	36,176
Elmer Prewitt	36,141
L. E. Murphy	36,060
Ralph W. Ray	35,947
Sidney Levingston	35,641
F. R. Trainor	35,114
J. P. Riley & Son	34,740
J. W. Reynolds	33,937
Rudolph Massey	33,150
James B. McGowan	32,744
F. H. Nance	32,676
M. A. Bell	32,568
R. P. Herbison	32,420
Hiter Farms	31,766
A. J. Cowart	31,425
W. C. Brown	31,151
George B. Noland	31,059
J. & V. Aguzzi	30,947
B. H. Bass Jr	30,783
Dalton Taylor	30,519
Parks Place Inc	30,501
Triumph Farms	30,453
C. T. Stanford	30,420
Norman Brown	30,359
E. E. and D. T. Jones	30,056
W. J. Sumrall	29,997
J. E. Dedford	29,958
Carl T. Harkins	29,800
M. L. and W. M. Payne	29,651
Andrew Sanders	29,446
Hillard Plantation	29,435
W. W. Denton III	29,366
Albert Day	29,157
J. A. Harris	29,084
The Wolfe Co	29,068
J. R. Taylor	28,879
W. A. Welshans	28,657
F. R. Armstrong	28,464
Patterson Planting Co	28,342
Huddleston Farms Inc	28,337
Carl M. Prewitt	28,229
John C. Hendon	28,171
Allen L. Edwards	27,714
W. S. Coleman	27,643
G. W. Litton	27,593
I. C. Rayner Jr	26,920
Myles Looney	26,818
A. R. Mann Jr	26,719
J. H. Avritt Jr	26,373
W. S. Adams	26,130
F. B. Alyward	26,108
J. W. Parker	26,023
W. F. Ervin	25,993
S. I. Gregory	25,942
Dr. D. Tuminello	25,910
J. B. Lowe	25,871
A. & N. Fioranelli	25,447
J. R. Turner	25,076
A. D. Murphree Sr	25,000
Total payees in county (106)	5,235,198

CALHOUN COUNTY

Grady Easley	61,707
Russell P. Shipp	27,724
Total payees in county (2)	89,431

CARROLL COUNTY

B. B. Sanders	39,797
J. W. Hobgood	38,045
M. B. Whitten	28,224
R. C. Colvin	27,943
Wilton L. Nash, trustee	25,183
Total payees in county (5)	159,192

CHICKASAW COUNTY

Coleman Farms	96,423
W. J. Linn	54,682
J. Q. Demoville	33,171
Y. B. Gore	29,054
Samuel E. Wade	28,455
Total payees in county (5)	241,785

CLAY COUNTY

J. T. Brand	$42,255
John E. Judson	32,588
Total payees in county (2)	74,843

COAHOMA COUNTY

John B. McKee, Jr	271,743
Roy Flowers	221,228
Oakhurst Company	153,734
Roundaway Planting Company	137,286
Kline Planting Company	126,082
King & Anderson, Inc	122,117
Fred Tavoleti & Sons	118,228
J. H. Sherard & Son	102,695
W. S. Heaton, Jr	84,669
Leon C. Bramlett	79,254
Garrett & Son	79,136
Graydon Flowers	78,021
Fox Brothers	77,912
Dan Crumpton, Jr	77,879
McHead Planting Co	74,380
H. H. Twiford	74,299
Carr-Mascot Pltn., Inc	73,612
Maryland Planting Co	67,154
Weeks Plantation, Inc	63,654
Flowers Brothers	62,939
Johnson Brothers	61,306
Wheeler-Graham	59,009
Viney Ridge Farms	58,629
Kirk Haynes	58,500
J. H. Pruett	58,457
P. F. Williams & Sons	56,854
Connell & Company	56,435
C. E. Presley, Jr	55,423
J. F. Humber, Jr	54,764
J. W. Henderson	54,538
R. W. Jones & Sons, Inc	54,408
Allen & Ritch	51,438
Oscar Connell Farm	51,173
H. M. Haney Estate	50,874
Fant Brothers	50,683
T. M. Luster	50,000
R. L. Perryman	49,529
Simmons Planting Co	49,507
Dulaney Farms, Inc	49,157
Eastover Plantation	48,877
M. C. Stovall, Inc	48,203
King & Anderson Ent	47,347
W. H. Maynard, Jr	47,065
A. L. Brady	46,709
Prairie Planting Company	46,325
Quinton Rives	45,559
J. L. Stribling & Son	45,031
Stribling Planting Co	44,844
J. B. Laney	44,765
Stribling & Smith	44,171
Omega Planting Co	44,016
G. L. McWilliams, Sr	43,780
Lucille & C. W. Fyfe, Jr	43,295
Wilbur Welch	42,958
R. N. McWilliams	42,726
David B. Mullens	42,592
David S. Manker	41,945
L. S. Powell Estate, Inc	41,842
R. M. Aust	41,513
M. J. Commer	41,354
W. C. Luckett Farms	41,207
Robert G. Johnson	40,757
L. B. Shipp	40,338
Allen C. Evans	40,225
J. T. Longino, Jr	39,914
Edwin J. Mullens	39,182
John H. Garmon, Jr	38,794
Travis H. Taylor, Jr	38,716
John T. Hays & Son	37,376
W. W. Cooper, Jr	37,006
Ellendale Planting Co	36,925
Weakley Brahan	36,734
Morris Eason	36,547
Russell Planting Company	36,332
Andrew J. Donelson	36,309
Eaglenest Pltg. Co	36,242
Lea Planting Co	36,015
B. B. Smith	35,262
John C. Taylor	34,675
Massey Farms, Inc	34,391
E. V. Catoe, Jr	34,216
Rocco G. Morris	34,045
Mattie B. Boone	32,852

Charles Monty, Jr	$32,828
Preston P. Bennett	32,805
Dana Haynes	32,716
Harry L. Black	32,638
L. T. Payne	32,204
Graham Bramlett	32,171
T. Earl Johnson	31,775
Parolli Farms, Inc	31,556
Robert A. Boyce	31,267
Richard Russell	30,942
John P. Pelegrin	30,401
H. J. McMillian	29,618
Carson Pelegrin	28,581
Marlon Farms	28,570
W. E. Meredith	28,407
Tony Morris	28,167
Ellington Massey	27,981
Monty Planting Co	27,809
William P. Howell	27,750
Montgomery Farms	26,905
C. M. Allen	26,728
W. T. Salmon	26,551
Belmont Inc	26,531
Jennie W. Haynes	26,293
Elsie W. Heaton	26,124
R. B. Lyon	26,054
W. J. Brady	25,814
Lake Roberson Jr	25,673
John F. Rodgers	25,497
Clinton Bailey	25,431
Total payees in county (113)	5,831,470

COPIAH COUNTY

W. S. Reed	39,748

COVINGTON COUNTY

Toxie Allen	32,825

DE SOTO COUNTY

Topanga Caine Farm	193,671
Banks & Co	106,176
Sarah P. Sanders Extr	97,472
Howard & Blythe Plt	88,188
Herman Koehler	62,884
Warren W. Sullivan	60,655
Red-Bud M. W. Jefcoat	56,735
R. S. Jarratt	56,221
Tract-O-Land Pltn	49,316
E. F. Crenshaw	48,211
M. C. Sparks & Son	46,822
C. E. Clifton	41,762
J. E. Dollahite	40,545
Pidgeon Roost Ranch	37,668
Dudley Bridgeforth	35,481
J. R. Summers	32,166
Ulrich O. Bibb, Jr	31,497
Richard Leatherman, Jr	31,053
J. A. Earnheart	28,722
A. A. Whitten	28,507
Total payees in county (20)	1,173,752

GRENADA COUNTY

Kraetzer Cured Lumber Co	44,548
B. A. Little	41,138
Paul L. Gray	28,969
Thomas A. Ligon	27,172
Reginald E. Forrest	27,057
Total payees in county (5)	168,884

HINDS COUNTY

Gaddis Farms, Inc	102,502
Gilkens Farms, Inc	90,247
C. C. Floyd	51,793
C. D. Noble	49,282
B. H. Virden	46,324
J. A. Tucker, Jr. & Sr	43,148
Gaddis & McLaurin, Inc	40,543
Ward Carraway	25,359
Total payees in county (8)	449,198

HOLMES COUNTY

Egypt Planting Co	99,876
Lynchfield Planting Co	$79,438
Stonewall Planting Co	77,585
Pluto Planting Co	63,356
Wayne Watkins	60,671
W. J. Waits	57,224
J. E. Cunningham	68,827
Bardin, Reddett	57,166
George D. Wynn	56,079
Paul Wilson	54,117
J. E. Hays	52,803
Shotwell Plantation, Inc	51,442
Byron B. Sharpe	51,274
J. P. Love	50,761
Charley Wade	48,100
E. W. Hooker	47,289
Donald Parrish	47,167
R. T. Hardeman	45,198
Graves Planting Co	43,122
Mark Farms	42,891
R. L. Peaster Co	41,176
Gum Grove Planting Co	41,145
H. F. Flemming	38,353
Humphrey Farm	37,564
J. A. Killebrew	37,119
M. K. Shute	35,521
H. H. Howard	34,723
Bonanza Plantation	32,396
S. J. Foose, Jr	30,266
D. C. Conn	30,230
J. A. Barrett	29,805
C. R. Logan, Jr	28,789
W. G. Gwin	28,764
J. R. Peaster, Jr., Estate	26,924
H. E. Mathias	26,657
Frank A. Jones	26,175
Total payees in county (36)	1,679,993

HUMPHREYS COUNTY

The Delta Co	120,165
James E. Coleman	106,035
C. B. Box Co	97,613
O. B. Nerren	77,159
R. D. Hines	67,278
B. W. Smith, Jr	64,566
S. U. Smith	64,566
B. A. Holaday Company	60,028
Halbrook Farms	59,313
A. B. Jones, Jr	59,154
Spencer H. Barret	57,410
T. M. Simmons, Jr	54,935
Stoner Farms	50,967
Wm. L. Dillard	50,336
Gammons Farm	49,662
R. P. Hairston	46,657
Gladstone B. Mortimer	45,678
Jack Cash	44,788
D. W. King	43,689
O. J. Turner III	43,273
B. W. Smith Planting Co	42,882
Seward & Harris	41,919
Rodgers Farms	41,199
Homer Martin, Jr	38,872
Blue Sack Plth., Inc	38,136
Irby Turner	38,125
Curtis F. Johnson	37,928
C. B. Aycock, Jr	36,836
R. R. Roberts	36,706
B. A. Seward	36,679
Edwards Farms	35,587
R. D. Bearden	35,371
T. J. Corley	35,313
T. N. Turner Farms, Inc	35,293
Reed Bros	34,907
Powell Farms	34,682
G. H. Hairston and Son	34,452
R. P. & Tom P. Ellis	33,720
Hillsdale Pltn	33,262
Rokeby Pltn	32,927
Jones Planting Co	32,759
O. M. Parker, Jr	32,727
G. H. Hairston, Jr	32,582
Bearden Bros	32,226
W. T. Turner	31,972
Crawford Brothers	30,877
Claude R. Gholson	30,754
J. D. Upshaw	$30,719
E. L. Nerren	30,493
James G. Outlaw	28,655
W. A. Pepper	28,379
Frank L. Gordon	27,788
Fred Champion	26,878
Hollowell Bros	26,489
W. A. Pearson	26,411
E. L. Parker	25,181
Total payees in county (56)	2,472,958

ISSAQUENA COUNTY

W. T. Touchberry	122,327
Bear Kelso Plt., Inc	71,877
Levee Plt., Inc	50,190
Harper R. Myres	47,459
Loyd M. Heigle	44,992
W. C. Woodruff	33,791
Rudy Plt	33,452
Cordell and Cordell	28,004
Charles Leon Delaney	27,471
Esperenza Plt	25,990
Total payees in county (10)	485,553

JEFF DAVIS COUNTY

Hubert Rutland	36,266

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

Walker E. Downs	41,536
R. B. Anderson	39,311
J. T. Smith	34,026
Total payees in county (3)	114,873

LEAKE COUNTY

Grady Williams	28,209

LEE COUNTY

H. M. Scruggs	27,273

LEFLORE COUNTY

Buckhorn Planting Co	180,440
Wildwood Plantation	144,288
West, Inc	138,022
Annapeg, Inc	132,818
Four Fifths Plantation	128,878
The Brown Farm	114,179
Race Track Plantation	113,286
O. F. Bledsoe Pltn. Est	111,781
Roebuck Plantation	98,039
L. W. Wade Farms, Inc	92,276
Ruby Planting Co	85,945
Hobson Gary	84,441
D. E. Reynolds, Jr	84,139
Joe Pugh	78,654
King Plantation	76,901
Runnymede Plantation	76,467
Ray Tribble	73,579
W. H. Morgan and Son, Inc	69,284
F. T. Leavell	64,367
John M. Welch	63,688
Hugh M. Arant	61,839
W. J. Roberson	59,860
T. J. Carter	55,979
Dudley Pillow	55,301
Sturdivant & Bishop	53,404
B. B. Provine, Jr	53,311
R. L. Pillow	51,729
Holly Grove Plantation	51,500
B. G. McGeary	50,775
W. L. Craig	49,839
I. T. McIntyre III	49,544
J. Wayne Bush	48,379
Hugh A. Warren, III	47,610
Jeff L. Cole	47,609
W. D. Bradford	46,634
Lake Henry Pltn	45,714
E. H. Neill	44,492
French Bend Pltn	44,149
Fort Loring Plantation	42,190
Landrum & Leavell	41,633
B. C. S. Corporation	41,276
Ed Hunter Steele	40,820
Tupelo Pltn	40,529

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Minn.—Con.

LEFLORE COUNTY—continued

Pee Dee Pltg., Co	$39,976
James Morgan Jr	39,609
R. T. Wade	39,268
C. L. Patridge	38,292
L. L. Walker & Sons	38,086
Sam Balkin Trust Estate	37,530
Murphey Bros	36,941
W. G. Somerville	36,565
Shoe String Plantation	36,330
Hayward Jacks	36,153
Carrie P. Avent & Jones	34,654
Leo Murphree	34,625
J. E. Gwin, Jr	34,306
Bishop Cottonland	34,092
Robert L. Pillow Farms, Inc	33,385
W. P. Kimbrough, Jr	33,355
F. R. Morgan, Jr	32,630
M. C. Tillman	32,626
Lock Eleven	32,103
Glen Burr Plantation	31,782
E. D. Strain, Jr	31,688
W. E. Taylor	31,247
Black Cat Pltg. Co	30,733
Wier Bros	29,605
Lamar Makamson	29,264
C. J. Hammond	29,031
W. C. Haynes	28,732
Davis and Young	28,670
Kimble Makamson	28,489
Lundy Bros	28,117
Lake Side Plantation	27,119
W. H. Gillon, Jr	26,742
Mike Kelly	26,452
James Stowers	26,435
L. E. Rowland	26,187
Frank H. Coleman	26,165
John Ellis Williams, Jr	25,686
L. W. Wade	25,614
Loyce Makamson	25,402
Virginia Brumfield	25,185
Total payees in county (83)	4,404,459

LINCOLN COUNTY

C. C. Clark	33,424

LOWNDES COUNTY

James C. Richards	43,158
Saunders B. Carson	35,071
Gilmer Plantation	30,525
J. A. Hanson	25,945
Total payees in county (4)	134,699

MADISON COUNTY

J. D. Rankin	98,407
Bozeman Farms, Inc	77,972
George H. Moore	71,908
Thomas L. James	66,688
S. C. Dulaney and Son	58,934
E. D. Mansell	47,972
M. S. Cox, Jr	47,741
Ben Stribling	46,933
W. S. Patrick	44,246
E. K. Bardin	36,829
Julius Edgar	36,778
O. J. Sharpe, Sr	35,435
J. R. Tate	35,152
A. B. & W. Mansell	26,175
Roy E. Tate	25,190
Total payees in county (15)	756,360

MARSHALL COUNTY

Odell J. Wilson	58,049
Jennie W. Ash	56,029
L. E. DeVore	54,542
C. B. Robinson	39,114
Jack McClatchy	34,286
McClatchy & Son	32,431
Howard Carpenter	30,795
Wayne Briscoe	30,704
J. W. Cocke	$29,953
Tom C. Lacey	29,426
Artie Edlin	28,949
Russell G. Houston	28,218
Wallace Briscoe	27,359
Hugh McClatchy	25,823
C. S. Hurdle	25,749
Total payees in county (15)	531,427

MONROE COUNTY

Sid T. Sanders	53,342
Fay Nevins	33,013
L. C. Sanders	28,922
Richard S. Cole	28,363
Fred Bell	26,313
Delmer Holloway	25,375
Total payees in county (6)	195,328

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Sidney Branch	30,140

NOXUBEE COUNTY

E. F. Nunn and Co	158,423
Circle M Ranch, Inc	50,664
Valley Farm	35,698
Ralph Spurgeon, Jr	30,031
A. B. Stevens, Jr	27,755
Total payees in county (5)	302,571

PANOLA COUNTY

W. S. Taylor, Jr	64,381
Donald Bartlett	52,352
Robert McMillan	51,631
J. H. Magee & Sons	45,730
Hays Bros. & Hall	42,909
Joe L. Davidson	40,316
Crenshaw Bros. Inc	38,323
Raymond Birdsong	36,757
M. H. Sumner or C. N. Sumner	36,393
W. P. Lemaster	36,186
Steve Short	35,664
F. F. Lunceford Farms Inc	35,469
Clarence Taylor	34,445
Short Brothers	33,610
J. B. Wardlaw & Co	33,007
Alton Milam	31,624
Carlyle Whitworth	29,381
Leon Crigler	28,977
Mury R. Harris & Sons Inc	28,331
W. S. Hamer	28,279
Hosey White	27,107
Estate of Fred Taylor, Sr	26,369
Dave Pointer	26,254
Total payees in county (23)	843,500

QUITMAN COUNTY

Roger Davidson	115,597
John B. Ford	109,773
L. J. Barksdale	74,036
G. H. Barker	71,407
P. M. B. Self Estate	70,753
Self & Co	70,732
F. R. Trainor	66,138
Ben E. Pittman	62,774
Wise Bros	55,892
Garmon Farm	54,561
Posey Mound Planting Co	53,477
H. T. Pittman	50,548
T. C. Potts	48,025
Burl & Jearl Mahan	45,807
Fletcher S. Haynes	44,868
Belen Planting Co	44,301
C. W. Denton	43,869
E. M. Fedric Farms, Inc	43,799
E. Q. Vance, Jr	41,850
Buckskin Plantation	41,179
Joe E. Benson	39,857
Thomas B. Barnes	38,344
Noel Wilborn	37,072
McBride Planting Co	37,066
Echo Planting Co	36,732
Clifton Planting Co	35,777
Lent E. Thomas, Jr	$34,671
Shannon Planting Co	34,154
Bob Crenshaw	33,777
F. R. Wright, Jr	33,345
Starr Farm	32,870
L. P. Butler, Est &	32,328
B. O. Tedford & Sons	31,894
B. D. Mason	31,199
I. L. Henry	30,873
A. L. King, Jr	30,815
B. H. Cobb	30,473
Allen Est & T. G. Powell	29,728
Melton Brothers, Inc	29,536
H. W. Howze, Jr	28,507
Hubert Haynes	28,032
James A. Jackson	27,410
E. H. Anderson	26,919
Total payees in county (43)	1,960,765

RANKIN COUNTY

J. W. Patrick, Jr	43,890

SHARKEY COUNTY

Pantherburn Co	194,960
Murphy Jones	129,481
Cameta Plantation, Inc	108,294
H. G. Carpenter	100,000
Little Panther Plantation	84,440
Raymond Brown and J. M. Brown	77,663
M. C. Ewing Co., Inc	72,391
Carter Brothers	69,767
Moore Planting Co. Inc	68,285
Evanna Plantation Inc	62,494
Powers Company Inc	61,976
Baconia Plantation Inc	60,531
Reality Plantation Inc	57,719
Martin Planting Co. Inc	55,393
S. M. Montgomery	53,458
Lynndale Planting Co. Inc	53,084
James A. Boykin	52,052
G. C. Cortright	48,250
Council Bend Inc	45,153
Greer Incorporated	44,246
Darden Company Inc	41,466
Louise Planting Co	40,654
June F. Grundfest	39,804
Patton Planting Co	39,708
Charles Kline	39,550
Rebekah Fields, Billy Field	38,727
T. M. and Q. Farm	32,469
A. B. Williams Jr	32,135
Neff Farms Inc	31,755
T. W. Harris	30,679
Grosvenor Farms Inc	28,434
Pat R. Dunaway	28,071
Ben Lamensdorf	27,264
McKinney and Son	26,989
Dudley Moore	26,323
W. A. Chase	25,560
Total payees in county (36)	2,029,225

SMITH COUNTY

Homer Rutland	59,868
Clinton Phipps	41,649
Total payees in county (2)	101,517

SUNFLOWER COUNTY

William C. Maloney	184,630
Eastland Plantation, Inc	146,792
Duncan Farms, Inc	124,350
Billups Pltn., Inc	124,118
J. Levingston Est., Inc	121,349
Kelly R. Mahan	120,734
W. D. Patterson	100,854
Allen & Brashier Pltg. Co	91,823
Douglas Mallette	89,581
H. T. Bonds	77,318
Lipe Farms, Inc	75,091
W. P. Scruggs Est	69,490
Billy Joe Waldrup	68,026
William M. Pitts	67,468
J. B. Baird	66,242
Pauline V. Adair	65,102
Pecan Grove Pltn	65,016
Garrard Est	62,875
W. E. Austin	61,939

Dick Barrett	$60,111
Kay Planting Co	59,413
J. H. Hill	58,503
J. M. Montgomery, Jr	58,262
P. H. B., Inc	56,915
Poindexter Brothers	56,627
Rubye Morgan & Sons	55,937
Shurden and Owens	55,821
C. S. Simmons, Jr	55,317
Brewer Morgan	53,990
P. & C. Planting Co	52,776
Frank T. Brumfield	52,447
Phillip Fratesi	52,255
H. P. Watson	51,774
R. M. & C. H. McClatchy	51,504
J. P. Fisher, Jr	49,934
Ethel Lyon	49,456
N. H. McMath	49,446
F. L. Tindall	49,181
H. T. Miller Pltg. Co., Inc	48,709
F. E. Mitchell	48,595
Pitts Pltg. Co., Inc	48,489
A. J. Hill Estate	48,132
W. O. Shurden	47,684
Fletcher Brothers	45,951
Billy Brewer	45,523
A. K. Maxwell	45,282
J. S. Parker, Jr	44,907
W. O. Shurden, Inc	43,891
A. E. Schuyler	43,199
St. Rest Plantation, Inc	42,475
H. W. King	42,404
Bruce Brumfield	42,092
Dyche Plantation, Inc	41,661
R. K. Clark	41,453
J. A. Ely, Jr	41,016
C. W. Barrett	40,802
Allen Brothers	40,625
Brashier-Allen	40,151
Jones Brothers	39,752
James Bradshaw	39,644
W. E. Jefcoat	38,033
Robert Mullins	37,751
Louis Millen	37,141
W. E. Lamastus, Jr	36,571
Dar Bayou Pltg. Co	36,319
Peeples & Poss Farm	36,055
Lake O. Lindsey	35,956
F. T. Clark and Son	35,882
Glenn McCoy	35,795
J. B. Failing	35,769
J. T. McGregor	35,677
L. A. Safley	35,168
Will A. Price	34,842
C. A. McGregor	34,388
M. & F. Planting Co	33,910
John J. Hall, Jr	33,805
Kansas Plantation, Inc	33,802
V. E. Lester	33,564
George C. Scroggins	33,342
Hugh Medders	33,272
George L. & Charles W. Evans	33,094
Lakewood, Inc	32,525
F. T. Clark	32,497
Leroy Anthony	32,368
Hugh G. Fisher	32,249
L. D. McCoy, Jr	32,234
J. G. Prichard	32,117
Grittman and Adams	32,000
H. A. Recker	31,959
Parker Planting Co	31,750
Max A. Hodges	31,714
W. T. Timbs, Jr	31,680
G. D. Lyon	31,674
H. C. Eastland	31,471
W. H. Baird	31,444
McWilliams & Pyron	31,404
J. R. Dockery	30,921
J. W. Stowers	30,917
W. D. Marlow III & Son	30,771
W. D. Simmons	29,820
Miller Bros	29,765
Braswell Farms	29,253
Jessie Russell	29,236
Patterson Brothers	29,151
Hubert Robertson	29,014
George W. Bowles	28,732
J. C. Haney	28,241
Gorden Dement	28,138
Roberts Brothers	27,968
James L. Beckham	27,941
Norris Hill	$27,93
Jack Curry	27,685
J. B. Reed	27,638
Berryhill Bros. Pltg. Co., Inc	27,345
E. E. Shurden	27,296
Dodd Brothers	27,140
Robert Barnett	26,853
Jack Griffith	26,724
J. L. Hall	26,605
W. B. Lovett	26,375
George E. Baird, Jr	26,276
Fred V. Jones	25,962
Mrs. Nannie S. Parks	25,881
W. C. Lester	25,756
Joseph A. Oglesby, Jr	25,611
Total payees in county (125)	5,805,073

TALLAHATCHIE COUNTY

M. T. Hardy	104,792
Mike P. Sturdivant	104,261
Hoparka Plantation	95,203
E. C. Fedric	92,555
E. D. Graham	89,809
J. L. Hill & Co	83,689
A. A. Mabus	78,812
Cotton Dixie Inc	77,898
J. R. Flautt & Sons	75,575
Twilight Planting Co	72,052
Ralph T. Hand Jr	71,706
T. C. Buford	70,098
Equen Planting Co	69,244
Triple M Planting Co	67,993
Rainbow Planting Co	66,976
S. M. Fewell & Co	64,925
Evans Townes Plantation	63,222
Frank & Dorothy Sturdivant	62,993
Mitchener Farms Inc	62,673
Jerry Falls	60,592
H. T. Bond Jr	59,600
R. W. Mabry	57,923
Martha B. Lowe	57,436
Benford Brown	57,182
Frank Sayle	54,571
Herbert Rice	53,327
T. B. Abbey Jr	51,073
N. J. McMullen Est	50,249
James Brothers	50,160
Phil Thornton Jr	50,083
J. C. Hardy	46,575
J. Noel Reed	45,310
Stuart Denman	44,874
M. S. Dale	44,779
M. E. Foreman	42,768
Murphey & Hardy Inc	41,520
John W. Sherman	39,884
W. A. Worsham	39,799
M. L. McMillan	39,729
Dan L. Fedric	38,680
Murphey Plantation	38,473
Ray Roberson Farm, Inc	35,241
D. A. Tubbs	34,623
Bailey Brake Farm	34,372
William Tribble	33,867
C. E. Waldrup	32,764
C. S. Rankin	32,666
Don Allison	32,584
Casburn Brothers	32,359
A. E. Moody	31,693
Steve Worley	31,638
Margaret M. Norman	30,308
B. A. Marley	30,055
Paul Melton	29,565
Bilbo Pennington	29,266
Gene T. Fleming	27,862
Mike Fortenberry	27,814
Bend Plantation	27,760
Raymond Roberson	27,107
Ellett & Sandifer Farms	26,798
G. C. Trout	26,636
Greenfield Pltg. Co	25,957
Ernest Brasher Jr	25,811
Total payees in county (63)	3,205,809

TATE COUNTY

M. P. Moore	71,365
Jim Presley	54,592
E. E. Moore	$49,526
Tom Wilson	32,255
R. G. Roseborough	27,342
W. P. Veazey Jr	26,805
Thomas E. Smith Jr	26,509
J. V. Moore	25,992
Double J Ranch	25,621
Total payees in county (9)	340,007

TUNICA COUNTY

Indian Creek Planting Co	141,155
Abbay and Leatherman Inc	130,486
Carl C. May	119,144
H. R. Watson and Sons	104,202
Bibb, Inc	96,092
M. L. Earnheart Co	95,699
Owen Brothers	87,008
Paul Battle, Jr	84,069
R. W. Owen, Inc	79,514
S. A. Arnold, Jr	77,412
Arnold Farms, Inc	75,964
Oaklawn Plantation, Inc	68,541
Clinton P. Owen	64,614
D. C. Parker	62,973
S. C. Wilson & Son	62,333
Withers & Seabrook	61,846
A. S. Perry & Sons, Inc	60,771
T. O. Earnheart Co., Inc	53,687
McClintock Farms, Inc	53,546
Boyd Brothers	53,134
Hood Farms, Inc	52,423
W. C. McLean, Inc	52,100
A. C. Caperton	51,939
C. Buck Graves	51,459
Irwin Company, Inc	51,450
Austin Brothers	50,076
James Byrd	48,184
Youngblood Company	47,839
B. R. Smith	47,352
C. H. Block & Co	44,475
W. H. Houston, Jr	42,315
R. I. Abbay	39,852
Lloyd E. Ryals	38,627
Alterra Planting Co	37,346
Clyde J. Perry	33,952
Johnson & Frank	33,511
Swindoll Brothers	31,256
Flowers & Parker	29,772
Jack W. Perry & Company, Inc	29,662
C. E. Pegram and Son	27,436
Ransom A. Myers	27,384
Wayne McDonald	27,281
Jerry Lake Planting Co., Inc	27,039
R. C. Smith	26,579
A. T. Earnheart	25,769
E. J. Lake, Inc	25,720
Edgar Hood, III	25,661
A. T. Earnheart Co	25,368
Total payees in county (48)	2,684,017

UNION COUNTY

Hugh Stephens	82,850

WARREN COUNTY

Aden Brothers, Inc	92,566
B. N. Simrall and Son, Inc	44,804
W. O. Miller	36,265
Laura Brown	32,608
H. A. Downey, Jr	31,125
Ratliff Farms, Inc	26,716
Ferris Farms, Inc	25,897
Total payees in county (7)	289,981

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Potter Bros., Inc	248,244
Crowe Farms	202,041
R. A. Ingram	186,397
Trail Lake Plantation	174,602
H. K. Hammett and Sons	143,003
Husbandville Pltn	129,052
Torrey Wood and Son	127,835
Franklin Trotter	120,699
Hagan and Bruton Farm	117,999

1969 ASCS program payments of $25000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Minn.—Con.

WASHINGTON COUNTY—continued

Baker Planting Co	$101,471
I. D. Nunnery, Jr	97,963
Walker Farms, Inc	95,858
Gilnockie Pltg. Co	94,369
Fairfax Pltn	91,641
W. G. Trotter and Son	79,619
Lakeland Farms	77,769
Alex Curtis	75,880
Dan L. Smythe	71,762
W. C. Skates & Son	69,747
F. L. Gerdes, Jr	69,113
Ganier Brothers	68,674
J. C. Reed	67,765
M. H. Rich, Jr	66,673
W. E. Taylor	65,496
Faith Pltn	64,685
Arcola Planting Co	64,294
James Middleton	63,670
Refuge Pltn	63,342
Trail Lake Gin Co	62,058
John T. Dillard	62,008
Highland Pltn	61,442
Barton Ingram	60,022
Dean and Co	59,283
Arcola Plantation Inc	57,248
Deandale	55,221
Clyde V. Gault	54,662
E. J. Ganier	54,275
Cope and Neff	53,675
Stevens Brothers	52,166
Walnut Bayou Pltg Co	52,145
Mounds Pltn, care of Com Nat Bk	50,582
Word Planting Co	50,363
W. O. Hester	49,928
Robert N. Aldridge & Sons	49,266
Metcalfe and Weathers	48,812
Osceola Plant Co	48,701
H. T. Cochran & Son	48,338
Four C. Land Co. Gordon Crowe	48,306
A. G. Mahaltc	46,516
Ralph Owens	44,499
Isola Pltn H. W. Branton	44,479
Wilmot Planting Co	43,700
E. W. and G. W. Stone	43,361
Harris and Harris, Inc	43,065
V. L. & L. A. Nunnery	43,059
Glen Taylor	42,591
W. H. Neill and Sons	42,030
Marathon Pltn	41,778
J. R. Ross	40,023
E. E. Cooper	39,292
Munn and Morgan	39,234
Thomas A. Hollingsworth & Co	39,106
Saldorose Pltn	38,949
Gus Pieralisi	38,822
James A. Petty	38,336
David B. Flanagan	38,282
Walcott Planting Co	38,255
C. D. Verner	36,233
Montgomery and Grissom	36,050
Reggie C. Kellems	35,746
Ray F. Beckham	34,963
Winston Walker	34,941
Hampton Collier	34,036
O. R. Horton	33,946
J. P. Wilkerson	33,543
Delta Experiment Station	32,988
Park Farms	32,293
Chester Kellems	32,179
Raymond Clark	32,044
Don O. Baker	31,985
T. R. Pittman	31,019
Edward P. Vieh	30,849
Hiram W. Hill	30,318
Max Phillips	29,687
J. M. Brown Pltg. Co	29,541
D and S Plant Co., Inc	29,327
Sam Pendergrass	29,146
Henry Hemphill	29,121
Edward Trotter	29,118
W. A. Dunaway and Son	28,920
M. L. Gower	28,835
Everhope Pltn	28,527
W. B. Andrews	28,311
V. L. Sandifer	28,270
Tony and Larry Fratesi	$28,179
A. L. Andrews	27,868
Kirk Pltn	27,641
George F. Stock	27,617
E. A. Currey, Jr	27,603
Edward Shackleford	27,364
Wade Burns	27,078
Bob Ainsworth & Son	27,015
G. G. & G. W. McCool	26,567
Frank Rochelle	26,445
William E. Avis	26,334
Milam Planting Co	25,986
R. M. Pritchett	25,703
J. E. Bratton	25,568
D and W Jones, Inc	25,397
Total payees in county (109)	6,017,860

WILKINSON COUNTY

W. E. Stone	25,980

WILKINSON COUNTY

Lech Leven	27,599

YALOBUSHA COUNTY

J. C. Sides, Sr	101,110
W. C. Hall	50,549
John N. Covington, Jr	44,950
H. H. White	42,072
W. V. Moore	29,746
Total payees in county (5)	268,427

YAZOO COUNTY

E. T. Jordan & Sons	109,621
Lakeview Pltg. Co	109,338
Ruby Walker	86,882
H. S. Swayze	85,230
D. H. Dew, Jr	84,334
Coleman Planting Co	82,248
Ray Scroggins	65,865
D. H. Dew, Sr	62,312
E. T. Schaefer	60,602
Seward and Harris	60,552
Seward & Son	59,082
Ivanhoe Plt	51,714
Kinkead Plantation	50,986
John J. Peaster	47,251
Eldorado Planting Co	45,653
L. M. Phillips	42,576
Barrier & Barbour	42,035
John S. Howie	40,966
W. T. Clark, Jr	39,773
Frazier Thompson	38,849
Barrier Farms, Inc	37,360
J. V. Whitaker	35,994
J. N. Hart	34,493
Barrier Bros	34,171
D. H. Shipp	31,179
Thomas R. Stricklin	30,532
A. S. Nichols	30,480
Mary Lee Bridgforth	30,284
Buford Atkinson	30,261
Norway Plantation	30,149
James L. Dixon	30,014
Martin Farms, Inc	29,645
Jerry B. Barrier	29,043
Sam S. Fisher, Jr	28,717
F. W. Sharbrough	28,696
Leon W. Rice	28,617
Sam E. Dixon, Jr	28,122
W. F. Cresswell	28,060
Morrison Farms, Inc	27,948
Jack F. Phillips	27,863
T. E. Fouche	27,637
Stricklin & Lewis	27,535
M. S. Johnson, Jr	26,174
Williams & Williams	25,985
Burdette Boyd	25,166
Total payees in county (45)	2,009,994
Total payees in State (1,033)	50,736,564

1969 A.S.C.S. program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Missouri

ATCHISON COUNTY

Bass Farms	$49,414
Scamman and Co	34,930
Jimmie Low	34,003
Wm. M. Griffin	32,833
Orville Wolf	28,635
Dean Bolton	27,843
Charles C. Martin	26,257
Total payees in county (7)	233,915

AUDRAIN COUNTY

A. C. Farms, Inc	32,946

BATES COUNTY

True Beisly	26,275

BOONE COUNTY

Dorsey M. Bass	38,338

BUCHANAN COUNTY

Sonnenmoser Bros	31,976
Frederick L. Schuster	28,597
Total payees in county (2)	60,573

CALLAWAY COUNTY

Wise Bros., Inc	25,450

CARROLL COUNTY

Famuliner Brothers	45,412
D. N. M. Grain Co	38,860
R. E. Wiese Farms, Inc	36,713
Kipping Brothers	36,299
Total payees in county (4)	157,284

CHARITON COUNTY

Quinn Bros	56,244
C. S. Bramble and Sons	30,022
W. L. Dickinson	29,569
Total payees in county (3)	115,835

CLAY COUNTY

Woodrow Wren	25,517

DUNKLIN COUNTY

Albert Hall	29,903
J. F. Baker	27,273
Harris Farms, Inc	26,185
Total payees in county (3)	83,361

HENRY COUNTY

Labahn Sloan Corp	27,649

HOLT COUNTY

Patterson Farms, Inc	108,112
Donald E. Morris	67,964
Jack Windle	42,546
Haer Farms	29,566
Total payees in county (4)	248,188

HOWARD COUNTY

Roy J. Davis	53,237
Davisdale Farms	29,981
Total payees in county (2)	83,218

JACKSON COUNTY

Rlds. Church	80,034

KNOX COUNTY

James B. Washburn	31,993

LAFAYETTE COUNTY

Batman Farms Co	62,756

LAWRENCE COUNTY

Jackie L. Thomas	31,409

LEWIS COUNTY

J. Oren Reid	$25,744

LIVINGSTON COUNTY

Marshall Meservey	27,440
J. C. Neal, Jr	25,218
Total payees in county (2)	52,658

MERCER COUNTY

Alfred Ryder	25,386

MISSISSIPPI COUNTY

Dearmont Oliver	88,099
Marshall Lands, Inc	85,354
Wolf Island Farms	83,489
Burke Bros. & Giltz, Inc	63,313
William Love	47,855
Bryant Farms, Inc	46,710
Big Oak Farms	46,364
H. & D. Duenne Farms	39,074
Choate Farms, Inc	36,691
Lankheit Plantation	35,425
Stallings Bros	33,863
Thurmond Farms, Inc	32,480
Sam G. Jones	31,261
Jasper Miller & Sons	31,250
Pulltight Farms	29,619
Babb & Deline	28,607
Robert C. Jackson	27,354
Shelby Farms, Inc	27,273
Carl Simpkins	27,020
Harvey Drake	26,452
Moxley Farms	26,097
James C. Moreton	25,928
Sam Cox Goodin	25,808
Ray Hillhouse	25,545
Mt. Level Farms	25,268
Total payees in county (25)	996,199

MONITEAU COUNTY

Knipp Bros	37,323

NEW MADRID COUNTY

Swiney & Sons	59,711
Charles Pikey & Son	53,049
Byars Orton	52,394
E. B. Gee, Jr	51,560
Walter O. Swiney	49,225
F. S. Hunter	42,105
Ernest Carpenter	41,159
A. C. Riley	40,056
Fletchers Gin, Inc	38,479
Aubra Wrather	38,118
Raymond Ashley	36,324
David Barton	33,451
W. V. Riley	33,305
Nesselrodt and Campbell	31,342
Lorwood Plantation	30,228
George Dawson	30,085
Barry Richardson	27,891
Collis Maltbia	27,428
Robert Greene	27,162
James B. Crouthers	25,637
C. J. Stancil	25,422
Total payees in county (21)	794,131

NODAWAY COUNTY

Arressar Ranch, Inc	25,808

PEMISCOT COUNTY

O. H. Acom Farms, Inc	55,515
L. Berry Farms, Inc	46,761
R. O. Pierce	42,943
Dolphin Land Company	40,142
Watkins Farms, Inc	38,535
Mehrle Farms	37,428
Donald Rone	35,073
Coy Wilson	33,709
J. E. Ward	31,700
W. E. Smith, Jr	31,564
Orton and Toton	31,502
S. Crews Reynolds	31,142
J. R. Hutchison, Jr	$31,044
T. R. Cole & Sons	30,945
James O. Taylor	30,492
Gene Wingfield	29,774
John & Leroy Whitener	28,559
John R. Franklin	28,348
Lee Dorroh	26,688
Howard Fike	26,253
Ansel Underwood	26,095
J. D. Long	25,781
A. P. Kersey Jr	25,611
Total payees in county (23)	765,604

PERRY COUNTY

O. F. Gremaud	80,671
N. H. Bruckerhoff	57,104
Total payees in county (2)	137,775

PIKE COUNTY

Pike Grain Co	34,675
Dundee Cement Co	30,775
Marion Mackey	27,007
Total payees in county (3)	92,457

RAY COUNTY

Green Top Farms Inc	65,722
F. O. Handley	32,563
Total payees in county (2)	98,285

SALINE COUNTY

Eugene Elson	59,050
L. W. Van Dyke & Co	42,950
L. J. Rasse Est	31,915
Jim Franklin	31,748
Robertson & Swisher	26,416
Total payees in county (5)	192,079

SCOTT COUNTY

E. P. Coleman Jr	56,306
North Ridge Co	39,212
Wm. H. Deane III	30,584
Heckemeyer Farms	27,348
Total payees in county (4)	153,450

ST. CHARLES COUNTY

Saale Bros Farm & Grain Co	54,557

STE. GENEVIEVE COUNTY

Bartels Farms Inc	59,685
Loida Bros	36,387
Aubuchon Farms	28,288
Total payees in county (3)	124,360

ST. LOUIS COUNTY

Emil Hoechst	31,702

STODDARD COUNTY

W. P. Hunter	121,058
Mahan, Mahan & Radcliff	61,432
Taylor Bros	57,901
Hermon Smith	52,455
Claude Keasler	39,679
Gary Crump	38,755
Lane Brothers	28,547
Total payees in county (7)	399,827
Total payees in State (138)	5,372,086

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Montana

BEAVERHEAD COUNTY

Jones Ranches, Inc	$47,920

BIG HORN COUNTY

Campbell Farming	201,260
Floyd Warren, Inc	62,080
Pryor Land Company	47,252
Robert Formanack	$34,104
Erwin Schnad	25,495
Total payees in county (5)	370,191

BLAINE COUNTY

Rasmussen Farming, Corp	32,747

BROADWATER COUNTY

V. R. Cazier & Sons	45,987

CARTER COUNTY

Adolph Fix	37,042

CASCADE COUNTY

R. S. Oday, Jr	51,346
Donald Bowman	30,697
Sun Prairie Farm, Inc	27,639
Sylvia & Robert Gruel	27,040
Zoller Farms	26,118
Total payees in county (5)	162,840

CHOUTEAU COUNTY

Onstad Grain Co	54,965
R5 Ranch, Inc	37,892
Robertson Ranch Co	37,474
Juedeman Grain Co	34,415
Oscar A. Kalgaard	33,666
Wyley P. Good	31,986
J. G. Robertson Corp	31,823
George Gray	30,029
Morris B. Stewart	29,946
Birkeland & Son, Inc	28,656
Paul Onstad	28,535
Raymond Romain	27,681
Helland Land Co	27,011
Forrest Charlson	27,006
MacDonald Farms, Inc	26,506
Phil F. Schafer	26,374
Royce Applegate	26,017
Perry Farms	25,112
Fred A. Booth	25,037
Total payees in county (19)	590,131

DANIELS COUNTY

State of Montana	641,341

DAWSON COUNTY

Wolff and Sons, Inc	33,229
D. W.—R. D. Tague	28,866
Frank Klempel	25,695
Total payees in county (3)	87,790

FLATHEAD COUNTY

Paul Grosswiler	30,353

GARFIELD COUNTY

Al Ballinsky	35,732

GLACIER COUNTY

J. W. & Bob Smith	28,406
Stufft Farms, Inc	25,280
Warren Swenson	25,104
Total payees in county (3)	78,790

HILL COUNTY

Leo M. Kraft	37,866
Spicher Brothers	31,049
Dees Brothers	30,833
Miller Brothers	29,823
Lineweaver Farms	29,155
Marlin Spicher & Sons	27,585
Total payees in county (6)	186,311

LEWIS AND CLARK COUNTY

Diehl Ranch Co	28,740

LIBERTY COUNTY

Allen C. Kolstad	43,392
McNutt Brothers	36,086

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Montana—Con.

LIBERTY COUNTY—continued

Clarence Romain	$32,187
Dayton Kolstad	30,524
John Wanken	28,522
Gordon and/or John Kammerzell	28,444
Oliver Skari	28,154
Total payees in county (7)	227,309

MADISON COUNTY

Mariner Ballard	31,716
R. C. Rice	30,756
Total payees in county (2)	62,472

M'CONE COUNTY

Otis S. Waters	57,009
Bodray Hagestad	26,790
Total payees in county (2)	83,799

MEAGHER COUNTY

Springdale Colony	28,450

PONDERA COUNTY

John Keil & Sons, Inc	42,393
Ralph Bouma	31,782
Tom McCracken	31,187
Loren Warwick	29,596
New Miami Colony	29,477
Total payees in county (5)	164,435

ROOSEVELT COUNTY

Schnitzler Corp	52,168
MOE Farm Corporation	31,276
A. A. Werner	28,357
Total payees in county (3)	111,801

SHERIDAN COUNTY

Nash Brothers	62,256
E. J. Lander and Co	28,266
Total payees in county (2)	90,522

STILLWATER COUNTY

Yellowstone Grain Co	25,154

SWEET GRASS COUNTY

Donna J. Cremer	34,255
Leo J. Cremer, Jr	25,056
Total payees in county (2)	59,311

TETON COUNTY

Maurer Brothers	27,714
Van Horn Ranch Co	26,652
Total payees in county (2)	54,366

TOOLE COUNTY

S. A. Adaskavich	50,843
Bill McCarter	49,417
Kenneth Leck	39,333
Douglas Aklestad	28,364
Total payees in county (4)	167,957

VALLEY COUNTY

Francis Tarum	29,467
Ervin Fast	26,263
Arnold Pearson	25,013
Total payees in county (3)	80,743

WIBAUX COUNTY

Harry Begger	25,556

YELLOWSTONE COUNTY

Pearlie Lee	29,627
Total payees in State (85)	3,587,417

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Nebraska

ADAMS COUNTY

Ruth Hunt	$40,991
Mary Lanning Hosp. Tr	26,140
Total payees in county (2)	67,131

BOONE COUNTY

Dobson Brothers, c/o R. Dobson	39,092
Choat & Sons Inc	37,119
Wolf Bros. & Reich	30,549
Total payees in county (3)	106,760

BOX BUTTE COUNTY

Edward Jelinek	33,065
Jessen Farms Inc	26,512
Total payees in county (2)	59,577

BUFFALO COUNTY

Western Alfalfa Corp	25,973

BURT COUNTY

Hundahl Farms	49,971
John Tobin & Sons	47,134
Chatt Bros. Renters	31,666
Van Newell	28,652
Mariane Tobin	25,270
Total payees in county (5)	182,693

BUTLER COUNTY

John J. Prigge	29,112

CHASE COUNTY

Yaw Farms, Inc	41,800
Dudden Elevator	33,534
Maddux Cattle Co	30,487
Bernard Oneil	28,679
Leslie E. Smith & Sons, Inc	26,494
Total payees in county (5)	160,994

CLAY COUNTY

Albert J. Skalka, Sr	30,584
Woods Bros. & Ells	30,475
Delvin L. Dane	26,752
Total payees in county (3)	87,811

COLFAX COUNTY

F. J. Higgins Farms, Inc	82,593
L. and Wagner Co	30,802
A. Glenn Kluck	25,162
Total Payees in county (3)	138,557

CUMING COUNTY

Albers Dehy Co	31,279

CUSTER COUNTY

Reuben R. Squier	36,851
Pirnie Brothers Cattle Co	31,285
Harry W. Henry	25,163
Total payees in county (3)	93,299

DAKOTA COUNTY

Leo C. Andersen	51,328
Beermann Farms, Inc	47,715
Total payees in county (2)	99,043

DAWES COUNTY

William E. Colwell	57,329

DAWSON COUNTY

Central Alfalfa, Inc	$40,817
Dawson County Feed Prod., Inc	39,505
Noel Cover	35,926
Platte Valley Products, Inc	32,171
Total payees in county (4)	148,419

DEUEL COUNTY

W. H. Palser Farms, Inc	40,088
Grace Land and Cattle Co	32,982
Total payees in county (2)	73,070

DODGE COUNTY

Harland S. Milligan	52,043

DOUGLAS COUNTY

Tony Vencil	33,184
B. Johnson, Exec	31,256
Wedak Farms, W. R. Wedberg	27,807
Father Flanagan's Boys Home	26,855
Hans Neumeyer	25,245
Total payees in county (5)	144,347

DUNDY COUNTY

Dan Ellis	26,597

FILLMORE COUNTY

Dale Lovegrove	50,763
Robert Bettger	35,315
Lauber Seed Farms	28,997
Bruce Nedrow	28,130
O'Connor Brothers	27,903
Robert B. Waring, Jr	27,811
Karl C. Brinkman	26,899
Keith Burt	25,599
Glenn Kovanda	25,089
Total payees in county (9)	276,506

FRANKLIN COUNTY

W. J. Bach	31,112

FURNAS COUNTY

Johnson Bros. & Jones	71,077
Leuking Farm & Ranch Crop	28,639
Kenneth Carpenter, Sr	27,107
Total payees in county (3)	126,823

GAGE COUNTY

John Krause & Sons	32,407
Flo-Wal Farms, Inc	30,026
Total payees in county (2)	62,433

GARDEN COUNTY

Leo Jessen	69,005

GREELEY COUNTY

James H. Dugan	42,509
Marvin W. Dugan	30,079
Total payees in county (2)	72,588

HALL COUNTY

Wm. Packer and P. H. Packer Ptnrs	$32,279
Dobesh Farms, Inc	29,469
Total payees in county (2)	61,748

HAMILTON COUNTY

Farm Inc., W. Wilcynski Pres	44,230
Kreutz Bros Inc	37,518
Total payees in county (2)	81,748

HARLAN COUNTY

Bernard Lueking	$38,519

HOLT COUNTY

Fred Horne Jr	49,221
Wm. A Curry	26,901
Total payees in county (2)	76,122

JEFFERSON COUNTY

A. L. Rosener and Sons	55,582
Stanley A. Snyder	26,607
Total payees in county (2)	82,189

KEARNEY COUNTY

Wells Brothers	34,156

KEITH COUNTY

Walter Armstrong	28,216
Homer Shelburne	27,034
Total payees in county (2)	55,250

KIMBALL COUNTY

Raymond Jessen	32,171

LANCASTER COUNTY

Warner Hereford Farm	31,000
Loren E. Schwaninger	27,121
Total payees in county (2)	58,121

LINCOLN COUNTY

Miron Moore	33,656
Gothenburg Feed Products Co	25,915
Total payees in county (2)	59,571

MERRICK COUNTY

Dinsdale Bros., Inc	45,492

NANCE COUNTY

Johnnie Bruna	25,064

NEMAHA COUNTY

A. B. Ritchie, Jr	37,738
Lehr Farms	37,653
Wm. E. Rogge	25,864
Total payees in county (3)	101,255

NUCKOLLS COUNTY

A. C. Jones	25,772

OTOE COUNTY

Hammond Farms	51,946
Forrest Binder	28,552
H. Novak	26,160
Total payees in county (3)	106,658

PERKINS COUNTY

Svoboda & Hannah	59,461
Palser & Palser	37,494
Charles R. Cutler	29,231
Knipp Land Co	26,182
Total payees in county (4)	152,368

PHELPS COUNTY

Sam T. Schrock, Jr	47,025

POLK COUNTY

Albertus Larson	29,645
K. D. Strong	26,627
Total payees in county (2)	56,272

RED WILLOW COUNTY

Myers Bros	$41,628
Friehe Farms, Inc	28,278
Charles Barber	27,066
Total payees in county (3)	96,972

RICHARDSON COUNTY

Stalder Cattle Co	45,265
Keith Sherburne	28,541
Elmer Duerfeldt	27,242
Total payees in county (3)	101,048

SAUNDERS COUNTY

Walter E. Adams	42,995
Arthur Gifford	31,687
Total payees in county (2)	74,682

THAYER COUNTY

Albert B. Miller	27,251

THURSTON COUNTY

Willis Leinart	29,985

VALLEY COUNTY

Arvin Bredthauer	25,351

WASHINGTON COUNTY

Gilbert Potadle	27,886

WEBSTER COUNTY

Delbert Lewis	38,856

YORK COUNTY

Broadwell, Inc	62,628
T. W. Harrington	58,919
Logan Otto	40,624
Leroy Pettey	26,709
R. L. Kaliff Ranch Co	26,266
Total payees in county (5)	215,146
Total payees in State (114)	3,999,179

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Nevada

HUMBOLDT COUNTY

Rio King Land & Inv. Co	41,024

NYE COUNTY

Walter J. Williams	104,537
Tim Hafen Ranches, Inc	50,936
Total payees in county (2)	155,473

PERSHING COUNTY

Brinkerhoff Ranch	52,487
Herman Dennler	45,335
Total payees in county (2)	96,822
Total payees in State (5)	293,319

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments— Nevada

CHAVES COUNTY

A. W. Langenegger	81,531
H. C. Berry	61,264
Hal Bogle	61,135
J. P. White, Jr	49,392
Jack Patterson	40,120
R. and B. Co. care of Bronson Corn	39,456
Poe W. Corn	35,210
Rosendo Casarez	34,072
Clardy Farms, Inc	33,479
Willard Watson	32,815
James Norris	$30,866
Melvin Pearson	30,600
Crawford Associated	29,476
Weldon Wagner	27,513
Bonham Farms, Inc	26,075
Schrimsher Bros	26,050
James Grassie	25,366
Total payees in county (17)	664,420

COLFAX COUNTY

Roy M. Wood	30,583

CURRY COUNTY

John Garrett and Sons	179,598
Garrett Corporation	147,319
James E. and John Garrett	124,899
Lockmiller and Son	112,051
Lee Ross Hammond	106,863
George Hammond	104,926
Eldon Blackburn	104,069
C. Elton Green	83,262
John Garrett, Jr	79,893
John H. Spearman	77,535
Dale Elliott	76,548
Leon Marks	67,821
Hanes and Demaio	67,240
O. H. Pattison	66,280
Frank Wicks	62,964
L. R. Talley	60,112
D. D. Myrick	59,289
David Turner	58,405
Sid Pipkin	58,176
Harold House	57,531
J. W. Graham	56,537
M. M. Snell	56,398
Malcolm Garrett	56,282
Ronnie Mitchell	55,725
J. R. Shumate, Jr	55,303
Virgie Harrison	52,678
The Hecht Company	51,399
L. E. Davis	51,256
Cecil Porter	51,012
C. E. Christian	49,449
Golden West Seed Co	49,290
Haney Tate	49,069
Fern Castor	47,867
Frank Blackburn	44,346
John W. Gunter, Jr	44,004
Max L. Kelso	43,696
Leslie Pattison	43,391
W. W. Bomar	43,229
Willie O. Wall	43,160
Walter Kaltwasser	42,476
Vachrel Ridley	41,879
Edgar Campbell	41,182
Archie Baker	41,160
Fred Northcutt	40,889
Otha Lockmiller	40,574
John W. McIntosh	40,444
Calvin Stout	40,177
Tom Cobb, Jr	39,533
J. L. Wall	38,747
Francis L. Decker	38,452
Hershel L. Hughes	38,402
Lester Merrill	38,055
N. E. Thompkins	36,730
Wayne Martin, Jr	36,376
Donald R. Rucker	35,779
Michael Garrett	35,064
Elbert Mitchell	35,056
Joel Sealey	34,912
Bobby Wilhite	34,851
Gilbert Smith	34,308
A. R. Kleeman	34,294
Russell Downey	34,249
J. C. Eshleman	34,169
Four Lane Farms, Inc	34,123
Paul P. Harrison	33,065
George H. Trimble	32,666
Ray E. Castleberry	32,450
Jackie Roberts	31,969
Clinton C. Burnett	31,732
E. C. Murrell	31,718
L. Conrad Pippin	31,686
Gorman Hand	31,616
E. L. Smith	31,542
Jerry Paul	31,359
Oscar Fryar	31,292

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price supoprt loans and wool and sugar payments—N. Mex.—Con.

CURRY COUNTY—continued

Don Harmon	$30,652
Lane K. Goar	30,633
John Fury	30,251
Waymon Mitchell	30,048
Billy J. Dodd	30,044
Robert D. Martin	29,900
Jimmy J. Wallace	29,633
Dudley Bailey	29,661
Edgar H. Cooper	29,443
Joe Clark, Jr	29,243
Elzie Jones	29,199
James C. Woods	29,086
Joe Paul Cobb	29,010
Frank R. Meier	28,867
Buford Qualls	28,845
B. P. Davis	28,638
Herbert Jones	28,630
Williams Farm & Ranch Corp	28,622
Carrel Dennington	28,194
H. W. Harmon	28,173
Anson Bowers	28,050
Joe Byron Burford	28,048
James E. Garrett	27,866
Ray Starbuck	27,825
Robert Walker	27,085
Melvin Estes	27,634
Floyd Lofton	27,388
Howard Duncan	26,673
Edith A. Lewis	26,565
Jim Brooks & Sons	26,476
S. Wayne Snyder	26,225
Eddie R. Harrington	26,059
Clarence Meeks	25,902
Richard Lee Miller	25,874
Harold S. Holland	25,859
Phillip Tate	25,817
Leroy Bailey	25,757
John C. White	25,721
Sterling Lockmiller	25,694
Gibbs Rucker	25,663
Elmer White	25,477
Albert Matlock	25,438
James L. Moss	25,161
G. H. Laney	25,065
Total payees in county (119)	5,212,692

DONA ANA COUNTY

Stahmann Farms, Inc	47,320
Tharp Farms	40,553
Jesus Acosta	39,248
J. F. Apodaca Farms Co., Inc	33,958
J. K. Nakayama & Sons	33,698
Robert S. Hayner, Est	32,248
Clyde Simpson	29,987
W. G. Ikard II	28,102
Ernest Harris	27,973
W. E. Esslinger	25,481
Carl Wiley	25,414
Ralph R. Hackey	25,406
Chelton Farms Op. Co., Inc	25,186
William F. Hayner	25,073
Total payees in county (14)	439,647

EDDY COUNTY

Snodgrass and Carlisle	71,678

EDDY COUNTY

Roy Ingram	47,878
Draper Brantley	45,811
Bob Morgan	45,094
Alfalfa Dale Farms	32,508
Tom E. Vandiver	32,326
W. D. Bounds and Son	31,117
W. H. Waldrip	30,194
James Thigpen	29,797
Carter Farms	29,443
Quentin Rogers	29,162
W I. Johnson	25,110
Total payees in county (12)	450,118

HIDALGO COUNTY

Harriet Veck	$73,844
Richins Brothers Inc	42,764
Sidney O. Wright	36,254
Woodrow and Clark	29,390
R. H. Wamel	26,951
Massey Farms	25,835
Total payees in county (6)	235,038

LEA COUNTY

Emma Lawrence	184,580
Elvis Jones	70,057
C. O. Price	53,852
John Richardson	40,742
Taylor & Heidel Inc	40,152
W. G. Turnipseed	39,978
G. Bradford Feed Pens	33,696
McClish Farms	31,676
Dwain F. Woody	30,840
Brady Lowe	30,588
Boyd Bros	27,507
Total payees in county (11)	583,668

LUNA COUNTY

Jerry Lynn Hilburn	127,637
Edward Ray Hooper	62,219
L. G. Guaderrama	53,205
Darrell McCauley	33,607
Keeler Brothers	31,143
W. R. Johnson	26,573
Leo W. Koenig	26,567
G. X. McSherry	25,117
Total payees in county (8)	386,068

OTERO COUNTY

Truett L. Maddox	26,227

QUAY COUNTY

Odus Rush	60,897
Ivan Rush	48,502
D. F. McCasland	47,226
Jack Gunn	46,357
Charley Roy Best	44,332
Jennings Bros	36,642
J. V. Curtis	35,027
Bruce A. Runyan	32,625
Edward O. Sumrall	32,499
H. J. Lee & Sons Inc	30,762
Olen L. Yocom	29,878
J. L. Jordan Jr	25,296
Total payees in county (12)	470,043

ROOSEVELT COUNTY

Thetford and Massey	48,207
Harvey L. and Ava L. Balko	41,584
Brown and Brown	40,582
Glenn W. Thompson	39,391
Claudie W. Reeves	34,357
Sidney E. Pool	31,472
Allen Chapman	31,399
E. B. Robbins, Jr	27,008
Pete Field Estate	26,863
Damon B. Lieb	25,999
Harding Burris	25,807
Total payees in county (11)	372,669

SOCORRO COUNTY

Gerald Brawley	26,959

UNION COUNTY

Arthur Jernigan	39,164
Total payees in State (214)	8,937,296

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—New York

GENESEE COUNTY

My-T-Acres	$33,111

LIVINGSTON COUNTY

Myron Brady	$26,365

NIAGARA COUNTY

Holman O. Connor	30,753

ORLEANS COUNTY

Kludt Brothers	27,929

SCHOHARIE COUNTY

Shaul Farms, Inc	32,411
Total payees in State (5)	150,569

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—North Carolina

ANSON COUNTY

Edwin J. Wall	$33,233

BEAUFORT COUNTY

A. D. Swindell	66,692

CLEVELAND COUNTY

Edwin Y. Harrill, Jr	44,930
Morgan & Co., Inc	35,084
A. M. Boggs & Sons	32,016
Billy Wilson	26,367
Total payees in county (4)	138,397

CURRITUCK COUNTY

James H. Ferebee and Son	46,554

EDGECOMBE COUNTY

M. C. Braswell Farms	77,037
Peoples Bk	26,657
R. R. Brake, Jr	25,689
Total payees in county (3)	129,383

HALIFAX COUNTY

Bill Pickette	25,263

HARNETT COUNTY

First Nat. Bank of ENC	69,943

HOKE COUNTY

R. L. Gibson	42,034
W. S. Thomas	34,461
Dundarrach Trading Co	32,123
Earl Hendrix	27,171
J. K. McNeill Farms	26,041
J. G. Balfour	25,376
Total payees in county (6)	187,206

LENOIR COUNTY

Parrott Farms	27,517

MONTGOMERY COUNTY

Robert Chappell	41,515

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Henry Bennett	39,699
John G. Burgwyn	30,584
M. C. Dunlow	26,008
William R. Johnston	25,651
Total payees in county (4)	121,942

PASQUOTANK COUNTY

Henry Winslow	26,740

PITT COUNTY

F. L. Blount, Jr	25,176

RICHMOND COUNTY

Cecil Sikes	25,007

ROBESON COUNTY

McNair Farms	366,584
Southern National Bank	224,254
D. D. McColl	68,052

Allen M. Shook	$58,984
Waccamaw Bank and Trust Co	58,134
Maxton Supply Co	40,767
Bill Herndon	34,265
Bassil Gentry	33,546
R. E. Parnell	33,333
William A. Davis	31,394
Neil Watson	27,881
Tom McRimmon	26,671
W. A. Taylor	25,615
Pates Supply Co., Inc	25,426
Total payees in county (14)	1,054,906

SCOTLAND COUNTY

J. T. John Co., Inc	66,850
Z. V. Pate, Inc	61,835
John Carmichael	54,099
A. R. McMillan, Jr	48,236
Jesse Snead	46,802
James R. McKenzie	33,644
Evans Brothers	28,317
J. N. Gibson, Jr	27,211
Total payees in county (8)	366,994

WASHINGTON COUNTY

J. B. Bell	50,423
Total payees in State (50)	2,436,891

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—North Dakota

ADAMS COUNTY

Morris C. Merwin	$28,264

BARNES COUNTY

Paul B. Jornson	34,380

BOTTINEAU COUNTY

Ballantyne Brothers	47,396
Norman Glinz	36,154
The Witteman Company	31,207
Willis Glinz	30,428
Pearson Bros	27,495
Total payees in county (5)	172,680

BOWMAN COUNTY

Melvin Miller	25,660
William Stegner	25,616
Total payees in county (2)	51,276

CASS COUNTY

John S. Dalrymple, Jr	37,156

DICKEY COUNTY

Alamo Farms	33,466

DIVIDE COUNTY

David Jensen	35,422
Lawrence Hagen	31,368
Total payees in county (2)	66,790

EDDY COUNTY

Norman Birkeland	25,868

FOSTER COUNTY

Louis S. Reimers	29,037

GOLDEN VALLEY COUNTY

Lloyd Weinreis	39,681
Donald Kittelson	27,651
Total payees in county (2)	67,332

GRAN FORKS COUNTY

John W. Scott	30,623
Ryan Farms	29,308
Elk Valley Farms	25,728
Total payees in county (3)	85,659

HETTINGER COUNTY

Benjamin Schaible	58,979
John F. Swindler	57,156
Swindler Bros	54,602
Arthur Schaible	37,075
Milton Hertz	35,017
August C. Kirschemann	33,546
Marion Swindler	29,646
Total payees in county (7)	306,021

KIDDER COUNTY

Ward Whitman	37,007

LA MOURE COUNTY

Rott Bros	27,595

MC KENZIE COUNTY

Peter A. Nygaard	34,444
L. A. Powell	25,131
Total payees in county (2)	59,575

MORTON COUNTY

Wachter Ranch	49,796

MOUNTRAIL COUNTY

Otto Engen	53,736

PEMBINA COUNTY

Bert Johnson	44,235
Bert Olson and Sons	32,264
F. Kent Vosper	27,404
Laurence Gapp	27,156
Melvin Juhl	27,047
Stanley Metelmann	26,143
Ted Eagen	25,231
Total payees in county (7)	209,480

PIERCE COUNTY

Archie Lindseth	26,715

RAMSEY COUNTY

Herman Dimmler	33,367
Leo Langton	30,617
John F. Elsperger	25,611
Total payees in county (3)	89,595

RANSOM COUNTY

William R. Huether	25,521

RENVILLE COUNTY

Harry P. Anderson, Jr	27,314

RICHLAND COUNTY

Ivan Miller	34,794
Richard Ista	28,461
Dotzenrod Bros	28,215
Total payees in county (3)	91,470

SARGENT COUNTY

G. A. Klefstad	25,479

SIOUX COUNTY

Peter Sittner	28,687

SLOPE COUNTY

Frank Dilse	47,418
Maurice O'Connell	35,339
Harold Brooks & Sons	33,050
Stuber Ranch	30,715
Total payees in county (4)	146,522

STEELE COUNTY

E. A. Brag	25,985

STUTSMAN COUNTY

Eddy Farms	59,479
Arvel Glinz	56,506
Hoggarth Brothers	$47,540
Freddie Mutschler	26,000
Total payees in county (4)	189,525

TOWNER COUNTY

W. A. Schmidt	32,140

WALSH COUNTY

L. E. Tibert Co	27,064

WARD COUNTY

Earl Schwartz Co	46,695
C. Morris Anderson	30,704
Total payees in county (2)	77,399

WELLS COUNTY

Weckerly Bros	34,011
Carlton Larson	27,566
James W. Schaefer	25,458
Total payees in county (3)	87,035
Total payees in State (67)	2,275,567

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Ohio

CHAMPAIGN COUNTY

Maurice Earl Botkin	$25,723
Avery Linville	25,112
Total payees in county (2)	50,835

CLARK COUNTY

Michael Sons	29,678

CLINTON COUNTY

Midwest Farms John Goings	34,110

DELAWARE COUNTY

Charles Walton	25,680

FAYETTE COUNTY

B. B. Pettit	29,248

LUCAS COUNTY

Wolf Farms	25,509

MADISON COUNTY

A. G. Lands	37,436
Bill Miller	33,263
Orleton Farms Co	27,153
Carl L. Drumm	26,377
Total payees in county (4)	124,229

MARION COUNTY

Ward Walton and Asso., Inc	115,235

MEDINA COUNTY

Hall Growers, Inc	28,577

MIAMI COUNTY

Mark Knoop	29,463

PICKAWAY COUNTY

Jean Clow Crites	34,032
William J. Richards	32,182
Total payees in county (2)	66,214

SANDUSKY COUNTY

Gries Seed Farms	29,611

WYANDOT COUNTY

Norman Gottfried	26,817
David J. Needs	25,829
Total payees in county (2)	52,646
Total payees in State (19)	641,035

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Oklahoma

ALFALFA COUNTY

Bouziden Bros	$71,385

CADDO COUNTY

S. G. Stevens	32,283

CANADIAN COUNTY

Margaret Petree	31,829

CIMARRON COUNTY

E. C. Mingenback	49,394
Billy R. Gowdy	47,264
L. J. & Clovis Stafford	46,358
Lee D. Rice	35,904
Dayle M. Oyler	33,125
Clifford Hinds	32,712
E. G. Bearden	32,380
John D. Burrow	28,774
Mabry Foreman	28,608
Eugene Sizemore	28,250
Craig Pugh, Jr	27,561
Junior J. Heppard	25,865
H. E. Hammond	25,856
W. H. Spradlin, Jr	25,735
Harold J. Froning	25,473
Total payees in county (15)	493,259

COTTON COUNTY

Hertis Baber	30,705
Royce McGee	25,363
Total payees in county (2)	56,068

CUSTER COUNTY

Issac Fransen	38,888
J. G. Stratton, Sr	37,430
George Fransen	36,357
Total payees in county (3)	112,675

GARFIELD COUNTY

E. B. Mitchell & Sons	34,249
Eddie Zaloudek	29,888
Total payees in county (2)	64,137

GRADY COUNTY

Virgil Voigt	32,281

GRANT COUNTY

C. W. Leforce and Son	34,831

GREER COUNTY

Frankie Johnson	34,111
Milton Vaughan	29,513
Clinton Nesmith	26,397
Total payees in county (3)	90,021

HARMON COUNTY

Paul & Chas. Horton	51,750
F. E. Motley	48,754
Shelby & Kirby	39,627
Elmo Jones	35,916
G. D. Payne	31,932
Carrick Brothers	31,306
J. R. Scott	31,168
Arlis Motley	30,598
Beanland & Sons	28,636
H. E. Moore	27,790
Clay Whorton	27,099
Harold Nichols	26,538
A. C. Mayhugh	25,765
Total payees in county (13)	436,879

HASKELL COUNTY

John L. Horn	27,120

JACKSON COUNTY

Wayne Q. Winsett	70,605
Harold Worrell	59,599
Murray R. Williams	$54,002
Glenn Southall	47,275
Brewer Bros	42,681
Carthal F. Mock & Son	39,226
Gordon Thomas	34,953
Roy A. Holsey	33,241
Robert Robbins	32,968
Clayton Tinney	29,947
Earl E. Abernathy	28,845
John Boyd McMahan	28,543
Rodney Hughes	28,496
Elton Talley	26,546
Travis Walls	26,158
Total payees in county (15)	583,085

KIOWA COUNTY

E. F. Bunch	33,613
Glenn and Sam Pfenning Ptnrs	29,589
Charles & Gayl Portwood Ptnrs	29,376
Total payees in county (3)	92,578

MC CURTAIN COUNTY

Mike Columbus	29,040

MUSKOGEE COUNTY

Dick Sheffield	54,842
Pearson Bros	46,123
Total payees in county (2)	100,965

SEQUOYAH COUNTY

Sloan Farms	37,871

TEXAS COUNTY

H. C. Hitch, Jr	132,717
Walter M. Anderson	53,505
Irvin Clark	50,562
Worth Jeffus	42,165
R. Lee, Jr. & R. Lee, Sr	40,428
C. F. Webb	34,350
Fred R. Sweet	34,102
Long Brothers	33,437
G. G. Freeman	31,322
Gustav Dencker	30,259
Joyce H. Gray	28,916
Total payees in county (11)	511,763

TILLMAN COUNTY

Kenneth Kimmel	34,461
John Wade Kent	31,531
H. W. Campbell	30,596
Glen and Leroy Hargis	27,402
Clarence Adams	25,100
Total payees in county (5)	149,090

WAGONER COUNTY

Clifford C. Hatfield	26,953

WASHITA COUNTY

Ridling Brothers	35,636

WOODS COUNTY

Maxwell Brothers	37,824
W. C. Diacon	26,329
Total payees in county (2)	64,153
Total payees in State (86)	3,113,902

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Oregon

BAKER COUNTY

Clyde Ward and Sons	$27,871

BENTON COUNTY

Clarence Venell	26,015
Horning Brothers	25,216
Total payees in county (2)	51,231

GILLIAM COUNTY

Wilcox Investment Company	$47,763
E. Earl Pryor	30,886
Total payees in county (2)	78,649

JEFFERSON COUNTY

Haycreek Range & Cattle	42,916
Kenneth Binder	27,850
Total payees in county (2)	70,766

KLAMATH COUNTY

Tulana Farms	55,006
O'Connor Livestock Co	31,401
Total payees in county (2)	86,407

MARION COUNTY

Jensen Bros	27,340

MORROW COUNTY

Ralph S. Crum	51,905
Porter-Peringer Inc	42,046
Frank Anderson	37,716
Marquardt Ranch	32,400
Amanda S. Duvall	26,101
Harvey Smith	25,516
Kenneth Batty	25,513
Total payees in county (7)	241,197

POLK COUNTY

R. L. Walker Farms	37,287

SHERMAN COUNTY

W. F. Wallace	26,222

UMATILLA COUNTY

Cunningham Sheep Co	88,305
B. L. Davis Ranch Inc	68,388
Robert G. Bafus	59,748
Glenn Thorne	44,287
Johns Smith & Beamer	40,408
Barnett Rugg Inc	37,242
Don A. Woodward Farms Inc	34,572
McCormmach Bros	34,526
Hawkins Co. Inc	32,762
Hill Ranches Inc	31,769
Coppinger & Son Ranches	31,437
H. & L. Barnett Inc	28,881
H. T. Rea Inc	28,367
Timmermann and Co	27,785
Purchase Ranches	26,937
R. M. Thompson	26,305
T. M. Campbell	26,243
Richard Hampton	26,135
Hoeft Ranches Inc	26,134
O. L. Straughan & Sons	25,971
Raymond & Son Inc	25,945
Harold G. Kleinbach	25,685
Hansell Farms, Inc	25,558
Total payees in county (23)	823,390

UNION COUNTY

Robert A. Brogoitti	30,389

WASCO COUNTY

The Miller Ranch Co	33,422
Total payees in State (44)	1,534,171

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Pennsylvania

DAUPHIN COUNTY

Hyles Hagy, Jr	$40,603

LEHIGH COUNTY

James Delong	55,562

NORTHAMPTON COUNTY

Schoeneck Farms, Inc	69,453
Howard Seiple	44,425

Green Acre Farms	$31,120
Keystone Dehydrators	31,109
Total payees in county (4)	176,107
Total payees in state (6)	272,272

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—South Carolina

ABBEVILLE COUNTY

S. F. Sherard, Sr	$35,766

AIKEN COUNTY

K. L. Flanders	37,292
Mackey Scott & Sons	35,595
M. R. Warner & Son, Inc	28,027
Total payees in county (3)	100,914

ALLENDALE COUNTY

W. M. Terry	79,037
Kirkland & Best	74,412
J. V. Spigener	44,558
G. L. Rouse	44,455
Cecil L. Dunbar	38,527
W. Ben Oswald	33,372
W. R. Johns, Jr	30,402
J. C. Oswald	29,982
N. B. Loadholt	28,434
Robert E. Connelly	26,226
Total payees in county (10)	429,405

ANDERSON COUNTY

Lee Dobbins	46,142
Tommie Drake	29,004
Total payees in county (2)	75,146

BAMBERG COUNTY

H. W. Herndon	56,999
H. D. Free	43,275
H. L. Free	42,517
C. & S. Storage Co., Inc	31,657
Henry F. Bamberg III	25,210
Total payees in county (5)	199,658

BARNWELL COUNTY

Birt & Keel	37,140
Harold R. Lott	30,266
M. D. Martin	30,203
Total payees in county (3)	97,609

CALHOUN COUNTY

W. W. Wannamaker Seed Farms	53,403
F. M. Wannamaker	46,079
Wiles Farm	45,524
Blackwoods Farm	38,305
Robert L. Felkel	37,200
John C. Bickley	28,262
D. S. Davis	28,037
J. D. Rast and Sons	25,873
Total payees in county (8)	302,683

CHEROKEE COUNTY

Robert G. Scruggs	48,872

CHESTER COUNTY

H. H. Robinson	51,143

CHESTERFIELD COUNTY

T. R. and G. E. King, Jr	68,135
Burr Farms	42,166
Hector R. McLeod	33,428
J. Calvin Rivers	31,114
James Chappell Hurst	30,634
J. Calvin Rivers Jr	29,346
Total payees in county (6)	234,823

CLARENDON COUNTY

H. Fox Tindal	$66,854
Charles N. Plowden	57,433
Samuel E. Durant	54,571
Durant Brothers	47,700
W. D. Harrington	38,741
D. Leslie Tindal	37,108
L. E. Richardson	32,783
R. V. Elliott	32,586
Henry T. Everett	30,385
Rickenbaker and Sconyers	30,239
Felder Farms, Inc	29,718
J. R. Briggs	29,295
James H. Richbourg	28,779
Jack Witherspoon Farms, Inc	28,394
C. D. Smith, Jr	25,262
Total payees in county (15)	569,848

COLLETON COUNTY

W. H. Varn, Jr., Inc	33,087

DARLINGTON COUNTY

Cokers Ped Seed Co	75,293
A. R. Mims	46,972
William Howard, Jr	42,538
Gary E. Byrd, Jr	39,451
Posey D. Kelley	35,165
John Jay James	30,871
Raymond Amerson	26,649
Total payees in county (7)	296,939

DILLON COUNTY

L. S. McColl, Jr	54,351
R. L. McLaurin	47,234
Pee Dee Growers, Inc	42,894
T. C. McSwain Est	31,525
Henry C. Quick, Jr	29,888
Lloyd Page	26,998

DILLON COUNTY

A. M. McDonald	25,849
Brown and Marion R. McCallum	25,595
Total payees in county (8)	284,334

EDGEFIELD COUNTY

Cecil Yonce	40,348
Maurice Smith	27,414
Total payees in county (2)	67,762

FLORENCE COUNTY

E. S. Willis, Jr	55,336
Billy E. Graham	53,982
C. Allan Young, Jr	38,245
Total payees in county (3)	147,563

GREENWOOD COUNTY

Fred P. Henderson	29,034
Calvin W. Kinard	28,401
Total payees in county (2)	57,435

HAMPTON COUNTY

Hugh T. Lightsey	53,439
C. P. Barnes	27,124
Total payees in county (2)	80,563

KERSHAW COUNTY

Lugoff Farms, Inc	59,910
Robert M. Marsh	31,228
Total payees in county (2)	91,138

LAURENS COUNTY

J. T. Hollingsworth	38,181
Billy Deshields	35,599
Total payees in county (2)	73,780

LEE COUNTY

J. E. Mayes	78,979
C. E. Atkinson	62,450
C. B. Player, Jr	$56,760
E. B. McCutchen	54,493
M. N. White	54,215
H. W. Shaw & Son	48,037
R. Joe and Richard Hearon	47,903
R. V. Segars, Sr	45,641
Willis Woodham	43,357
Calvin Joyner	41,546
Marion J. Barnes	39,386
H. R. Colclough	37,902
John M. McCutchen	36,222
J. E. McCutchen, Jr	35,813
L. M. Chewning	35,242
E. Brad McCutchen	34,770
James W. Scott, Jr	34,443
S. McBride Rhodes, Jr	31,622
B. J. Barnett	31,605
Clyburn Bros. and Son	30,584
C. R. Woodham	29,852
J. E. Turner	28,302
Wallace Deschamps	27,945
Jack Woodham	27,745
W. A. Berry	25,833
Total payees in county (25)	1,020,647

LEXINGTON COUNTY

Don W. Jeffcoat	26,700

MARLBORO COUNTY

Claude P. Polston, Jr	119,570
Lawrence E. Pence	114,020
Hubbard W. McDonald	90,786
Charles E. Lynch	74,522
Thomas A. & Charles O'Neal	62,424
Frank B. Rogers, Jr	52,624
Ernest C. McInnis	52,308
Jimmy P. Wallace	45,498
E. M. Otuel	44,851
Richard M. Adams	43,866
F. M. Hinson	43,600
A. L. Calhoun, Jr., Co	42,241
Marion F. Wright	38,294
George B. Kerr, Inc	37,257
James Lytch, Est	36,019
John D. Kinard, Est	35,054
William C. Covington	33,704
Hugh Driggers	33,167
Leon Driggers	32,512
Brooks Odom	32,191
Jimmie C. Baker	32,159
Lawrence S. Norton	31,780
Rufus M. Pegues	31,347
Joseph P. Hodges	31,094
Walex Hinson	29,179
John F. Everett	29,084
Frank R. Quick	27,616
Jimmy B. Hinson, Jr	26,896
John W. Liles	26,158
Robert A. Vail	25,874
Julian M. Drake	25,813
Angus G. Newton	25,411
J. G. Hubbard	25,385
Total payees in county (33)	1,432,304

ORANGEBURG COUNTY

E. E. Gasque and Son	64,764
Edgar L. Culler	51,940
John David Clark	49,565
J. W. Williamson, Agt	43,095
Earl J. Smoak	38,680
Hugo L. Felkel	37,890
W. B. Bookhart	34,476
Woodford Gin Co. Inc	34,009
Thomas B. Jackson, Jr	33,809
Vallentines	33,303
T. W. Irick Est	32,132
J. Walter Whisenhunt	30,865
Rossie P. Hughes	30,830
Norman V. Hughes, Mgr	30,624
Magnolia Lane Farm	30,260
J. M. Russell, Jr	29,384
M. L. McIver	27,655
Julian C. Crum	27,126
T. J. Wiggins and Son	26,243
Total payees in county (19)	686,650

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—S.C.—Con.

RICHLAND COUNTY

Robert Lee Scarborough	28,152

SALUDA COUNTY

R. M. Watsons Sons	45,008

SPARTANBURG COUNTY

James W. Cox	32,265

SUMTER COUNTY

W. R. Mayes	185,089
J. E. Mayes	122,198
J. F. Bland, Jr	103,725
B. J. Barnett Inc	51,410
Marvell W. Goza	48,419
J. M. Edens, Jr	41,887
J. T. Brogdon III	31.943
H. C. & H. C. Edens, Jr	29,316
T. D. Keels	28,792
C. O. Gulledge	28,562
Clayton Lowder	28,285
W. A. Dabbs	28,014
I. W. Brunson	25,611
Eli E. Parker	25,454
Total payees in county (14)	778,605

WILLIAMBURG COUNTY

S. Wayne Gamble	54,622
Leroy S. Epps, Jr	47,125
T. V. Ligon	28,440
Total payees in county (3)	130,187

YORK COUNTY

Roy J. McFadden	32,629
Gene Daves	28,212
Total payees in county (2)	60,841
Total payees in state (184)	7,519,827

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—South Dakota

BENNETT COUNTY

Elkhorn Farm	$36,076
John Hippen	25,547
Total payees in county (2)	61,623

BROWN COUNTY

Hanson Farms, Inc	40,927
Clark Bros., Inc	38,118
Verl Cutler	25,559
Ott Brothers	25,076
Total payees in county (4)	129,680

BRULE COUNTY

Helen Christiansen	27,180

BUTTE COUNTY

McLeod, Smith Ranches & Farms	53,256
Goeringer Farm	25,596
Total payees in county (2)	78,852

DAVISON COUNTY

Doyle Aslesen	34,592

DAY COUNTY

Hansmeier & Son, Inc	33,148
Earl Morehouse	25,889
Total payees in county (2)	59,037

EDMUNDS COUNTY

Petersen Farms, Inc	27,115

HAND COUNTY

Bryce Sample	$32,032

HUGHES COUNTY

Leon Crain	27,985
John Spaid	$26,351
Total payees in county (2)	54,336

JONES COUNTY

Daniel M. Parish	25,126

LYMAN COUNTY

Leo J. Terca	25,763

MARSHALL COUNTY

Dalton Docter	43,226
Penrhos Farms, Inc	27,492
Donald Jarrett	26,734
Total payees in county (3)	97,452

PERKINS COUNTY

O. Theo Beckman	35,868
Ham Bros., Inc	31,083
Total payees in county (2)	66,951

POTTER COUNTY

Daniel Cronin	26,051
Joe Mangin & Richard Mangin	25,141
Total payees in county (2)	51,192

SANBORN COUNTY

Vernon Amick	30,770

SHANNON COUNTY

Orville Schwarting	30,860

SPINK COUNTY

Glendale Colony	29,234
Hammer Bros	26,377
Total Payees in county (2)	55,611

STANLEY COUNTY

Neil Clarke	32,425

SULLY COUNTY

William J. Asmussen	97,142
Dean Nelson	69,078
Stanley Asmussen	61,450
Ken R. Huse	32,503
Kenneth Kinkler	32,495
D. L. Anderson Corporation	31,881
John W. McSpadden	26,113
Total payees in county (7)	350,662

TURNER COUNTY

Bones Hereford Ranch	51,702

WASHABAUGH COUNTY

Donald Handcock Inc	34,666
Total payees in state (39)	1,357,627

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Tennessee

CARROLL COUNTY

John A. Shoaf	$34,207

CHESTER COUNTY

Jess Thomas	25,418

CROCKETT COUNTY

James F. Jordan	27,187
Joe H. Carter	26,967
Max Cates	26,603
Total payees in county (3)	80,757

DYER COUNTY

Moody Prop Inc	25,092
Tiger Tail Farms, Inc	25,043
Total payees in county (2)	50,135

FAYETTE COUNTY

Jerry Skelton	82,779
Cowan Bros	79,392
Ames Plantation	50,653
L. J. & J. A. Williams	$44,481
B. L. Davis	40,610
Fowler-Moore-Moore-Fowler	39,779
Hurdle & Valentine	38,690
Allien M. Nunn	38,087
J. W. Owen	34,215
Gordon Tomlin	32,385
Davis Bros	30,539
H. H. Farley	29,885
A. W. Blalock	28,554
M. D. McClanahan	28,453
A. K. Morrison	27,746
Total payees in county (15)	626,248

FRANKLIN COUNTY

David R. Owens	42,675
Emmett Owens	40,181
O. R. Collins, Jr	29,060
Total payees in county (3)	111,916

GIBSON COUNTY

Bobby Harper	29,905

GILES COUNTY

White & Witt	30,600

HARDEMAN COUNTY

J. L. Chambers	49,661

HAYWOOD COUNTY

Tommy B. Willis	56,846
Billy Frank Morris	46,064
Charles Haynes	32,745
Carlton and Claiborne	27,302
Allen King	27,091
Glenn Lonon	26,642
Total payees in county (6)	216,690

LAKE COUNTY

W. T. Jamison, Jr	70,047
Bruce D. Wyatt	51,467
Tipton Bros. and Sullivan	43,811
W. E. & Bruce Dunlap	39,894
Walter Delaney	35,479
Riley Bros	35,040
Nard Shull	38,871
George Dial	33,698
G. F. Parker	31,972
Fred A. Wortman	31,786
Bill Lindamood	28,966
James Mooring	28,953
Floyd Flowers	25,034
Total payees in county (13)	490,018

LAUDERDALE COUNTY

George Lawson Elder	48,796
Jim Fullen	42,306
Kenneth Harley Blackwood	39,120
Ft. Pillow State Farm	33,660
Odell Williams	29,961
William H. Moore	28,477
Jack Crutcher	27,440
Clyde Younger	27,134
Jimmy Fullen	26,589
Total payees in county (9)	303,483

MADISON COUNTY

Neely Robley	29,818

SHELBY COUNTY

Riggan Planting Co	82,339
T. A. Densford & Son	64,590
H. S. Mitchell	64,297
Horne Bros	43,748
Cedar Hill Farms	37,903
Aubrey Howell	28,018
Thurman Chapman	26,610
Madge M. Harrison	26,091
C. D. Thomason	25,491
Paw Paw Block Farm	25,131
Total payees in county (10)	424,218

TIPTON COUNTY

Charles L. Walker	$54,707
Horace E. Moore & Sons	45,304
R. W. Anderson	38,753
John A. McIntyre	35,659
Johnson Brothers	34,271
John C. Balton	33,865
Marshall C. Huffman	29,551
Austin E. Anderson	29,497
Total payees in county (8)	301,607

WEAKLEY COUNTY

Kermit Cates	41,142
Total payees in state (76)	2,845,823

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas

ANDREWS COUNTY

W. H. Vanlandingham	$44,560
C. C. Shortes	27,352
Total payees in county (2)	71,912

ARANSAS COUNTY

B. E. S. Co	26,662

ARMSTRONG COUNTY

Parker Cattle Co	45,410
James Bible	36,301
Robert L. Grigsby	34,768
Henry Finley	27,683
Troy F. Vance	25,027
Total payees in county (5)	169,189

BAILEY COUNTY

Carl C. Bamert	101,763
Horace Hutton	77,499
W. T. Millen	74,448
J. Bert Williams	71,445
Buffalo Farms, Inc	64,502
Bill Jim St. Clair	64,479
M. E. Little	61,984
Randy Johnson	60,619
B. J. Gable	57,083
W. M. Pool	53,387
W. B. Little	51,705
Ray Wood	50,547
J. G. Arnn	49,358
Homer Richardson	47,848
B. G. Free	45,740
J. F. Furgeson	45,326
Jack Schuster	44,674
M. A. Snider, Jr	44,051
L. D. Davis	43,990
John R. Young	41,593
Jee L. Smallwood	40,406
O. A. Jones	40,246
Wilbert Kalbas	39,512
C. J. Feagley	38,123
Lester Howard	36,005
Freddie Parkman	33,737
Wesley Warren	33,263
Van Rogers	32,195
A. P. Fred	31,845
Lewis Brothers	31,484
Jim Claunch	31,433
C. L. Saylor	31,250
Jesse Carter	31,203
A. R. McGuire	30,392
W. Lewis Scoggin	30,057
A. P. Childers	29,561
James Gore	29,385
Byron Gwyn	28,991
W. E. Latimer	28,892
Elmer L. Hargrove	28,856
Virgil Wood	28,848
Thomas W. Gregory	28,537
Weldon Avery	27,625
Houston Hart	27,544
Johnnie Prater	27,202
Karl Cayton	27,035
John W. Gunter	26,853
Marvin May	26,143
W. Q. Casey	$25,584
Austin Bros	25,563
J. R. Austin Jr	25,461
Robert Nunnally	25,412
Ben Roming	25,315
Levelland Compress Co., Inc	25,191
Total payees in county (54)	2,181,190

BAYLOR COUNTY

Megargel Drilling Co	36,068
Roy Butler & Son	33,945
Total payees in county (2)	70,013

BEE COUNTY

Amko Farming, Inc	32,571

BORDEN COUNTY

John Springer Stephens	43,713

BOWIE COUNTY

Three Way Land Co	198,879
Elwood Elkins	81,675
William H. Farris	48,798
Waymon W. Elrod	44,726
George H. Vance	42,289
Guy W. Farris	35,668
Ely T. Moores	27,042
D. P. T. Farris, Inc	26,343
Total payees in county (8)	505,420

BRAZOS COUNTY

Tom J. Moore	325,886
H. H. Moore and Sons	310,411
Brazos A. Varisco	120,624
Lee J. Fazzino	83,963
J. P. Terrell and Son	82,203
Vince Court	47,213
Don Angonia	41,822
Tony Varisco, Jr	39,751
Tony Joe Varisco	29,696
Matt Morello	28,543
W. J. Terrell	25,559
Joe Varisco	25,484
Total payees in county (12)	1,161,155

BRISCOE COUNTY

Joe B. Mercer	63,649
L. O. Weaks	63,255
G. W. Lee	55,832
Fred W. Mercer	51,949
Alva C. Jasper	43,396
Gordon Montague	42,717
Clyde Mercer	40,106
Ray Teeple	38,042
J. D. McGavock	34,023
H. F. Parker	32,387
Roy Montague	31,740
Troy Burson	31,384
George Long	31,357
Allen Kellum	30,610
Cook & Cook	30,272
Deanie Henderson	30,184
D. T. Northcutt	29,052
Harold Storie	29,048
Walter Graham	28,240
Theron Culwell	28,197
Dallas Culwell	27,097
Carolyn Self	26,590
J. D. Nance	26,368
Frank Mercer	26,137
Pat Northcutt	25,830
Don Garrison	25,593
Ben Whitfill	25,247
Total payees in county (27)	948,302

BURLESON COUNTY

Holland Porter	132,441
Est. Geo. C. Chance	122,724
Marion J. Malazzo	55,153
Pete J. Scamardo	$53,023
Phil. Scamardo	50,785
Marvin M. Porter	50,350
H. H. and Edgar Baker	48,462
A. and M. Plantation	46,832
Luke Restivo	44,822
Steve A. Scarmardo	38,341
Mitt A. Bush	36,599
G. R. Hutson	33,426
Cevil Giesenschlag	32,822
John W. Giesenschlag	32,084
Joe S. Campise	29,062
Sandyr Scarmardo	27,687
Total payees in county (16)	834,613

CALDWELL COUNTY

Terrell T. McGee	28,343

CALHOUN COUNTY

Roy Smith	71,900
Henry C. Wehmeyer	42,517
Total payees in county (2)	144,417

CAMERON COUNTY

James D. Russell	169,964
John A. Abbott	122,397
Oscar Mayfield & Sons	120,887
Simpson & Wilson	93,027
P & W Inc. & Santa Monica Fms	85,725
DBA D. L. Smith Farms	79,611
Rio Grande Equip Company	71,920
George L. Labar & Sons	68,665
Herbert W. Bode	65,744
Joe S. Wolf	65,398
Schmitt Bros. Farms Ptn	63,584
Robert F. Ashley	62,473
Rex L. McGarr	56,640
Elijah B. Adams & Sons	55,707
Henry V. Macomb	53,626
Scoggins Brothers	53,121
Rodolfo B. Samano	52,790
Herman Lynch	51,399
Shimotsu Farms	50,375
George Nixon	49,803
Taylor Grain Co., Inc	48,013
Ballenger & Ballenger	47,955
L. R. Cherrington	47,566
James A. McCarthy	47,357
Owsley Hill	46,197
Cholick Farms	44,977
Eubanks Brothers	44,895
Elmer E. Meek	44,665
William J. Bryan	41,683
P. Maurin & Jt. Maurin	41,394
Carl Otsuki & P. & W., Inc	41,147
Lamon & Lamon	40,555
J. L. & Bill Gray	39,875
Brocecky & Lomax	39,073
Crockett Groves, Inc	38,746
Est. J. Kelly Cain	38,182
Oval A. Martin	37,196
Robert L. Shuckman	36,902
Kenneth Shuckman	36,237
Bauer Brothers	35,237
F. H. Cherrington	35,215
Berg & Berg	34,789
Smith & Smith	34,619
Wolf Farms Ptn	33,160
M. R. Davis & Son	33,073
Johnson Brothers	32,986
McElwrath Farms	32,834
Elvin Pederson, Sr	32,722
Horace Wells	32,060
S. R. & C. D. Stone, Trs	31,846
Hollie C. Lewis	31,489
S. M. & W. M. Halbert	31,158
Jack Abbott	30,724
Pilar Cabrera	29,803
Lloyd G. Payne, Jr	29,788
Milton E. & Monica C. Wentz	29,771
Ross D. Waters	28,634
Clifford L. Smith	28,560
Lester Nixon	28,527
Billy N. Cantwell	28,368
Raymond C. Jones	28,245
Elijah B. Adams	28,244

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

CAMERON COUNTY—continued

Edward E. Billings	$28,188
J. G. Wreden	28,088
Ashley D. Youngblood	28,052
Sunny Ann Farms, Inc	27,947
Harry J. Garrett	27,626
Elward M. Smith	27,267
Nester Mack	27,123
Joe G. Ballenger	26,975
Adolph Thomae, Jr	26,966
Walter L. Clore	26,552
Charle L. Shofner	26,510
Oscar B. Gray & Sons Ptn	26,477
Joe W. Lane	26,415
Geo. & Sam Taylor	26,370
Robert Mathers	26,313
Jackson Est. & D. E. Jackson, Jr	26,180
Milan W. Nelson	25,945
Bob F. Morrow	25,839
Norman F. Willms	25,609
Charles J. Buchen	25,559
Kitamura Brothers	25,433
W. B. Mack	25,143
Total payees in county (84)	3,603,900

CARSON COUNTY

Frank Robinson	87,999
Texas Technological Research F	63,654
Sam Kotara	45,191
B. F. Urbanczyk	43,443
H. Freimel & Sons Ptn	40,539
Marvin Urbanczyk	36,820
John D. Kelly, Jr	35,001
Clinton Williams	33,601
H. L. Beddingfield	33,207
Frank Simms	32,591
Bob McBrayer	31,463
J. B. McCray	30,045
Geo. Rohan	29,399
Leo M. Britten	29,287
Rolla J. Sailor, Jr	28,387
Ralph Britten	27,678
Ronald Kotara	26,858
C. W. & Faye Herndon Ptn	26,785
John Kotara, Jr	26,755
Leonard Olson	26,535
A. L. Stovall	26,126
Jack Martin	25,416
Total payees in county (22)	786,780

CASTRO COUNTY

Jimmy Cluck	172,359
Homer Hill	130,979
G. L. Willis, Jr	123,572
J. F. Martin	82,004
Carl Bruegel	73,324
George Gabel	69,630
Otto Steinberg	68,602
H. D. Smith	66,336
Clements Corp	64,940
Donald J. Wright	64,450
Gilbreath Farm Co	63,329
Kenneth Heard	63,012
Jerry Cluck	60,941
Chas E. Armstrong	59,733
Homer A. Hill	59,329
Carl L. Kemp	58,785
E. L. Howard	58,211
Frank Wise	57,085
Dan J. Heard	53,777
B. L. Moore	53,732
R. E. McDaniel	52,130
Fred Bruegel, Jr	51,659
J. M. Wright	50,535
Margaret H. Ware	50,242
Woodrow Nelson & Sons	48,004
Henry W. Golden	46,557
S. A. Hodges, Jr	46,024
Geo. & Kenneth Frye Ptnshp	45,673
Lorenzo Lee	45,009
Clint B. McFarland	44,700
Dick Ellis	44,161
Chas Heck, Jr	42,952
Max Sageser	$42,016
W. O. Markley	41,932
Charles T. Noland	41,722
Truman Touchstone	41,429
Earl Harkins	41,105
Milburn & Eddie Haydon	39,660
George Sides	39,176
Leo Witkowski	38,335
James H. Bradley	38,107
M. L. McFarland	38,030
Melvin Barton	37,475
Tom W. Miller	37,194
George Heck	36,853
H. C. Nelson	36,782
Truvis Campbell	36,773
Jim Elder	36,365
Lamar Found	36,143
David Smith	36,086
Jack Miller	35,943
W. J. Giles	35,655
Floyd Cole	35,218
Jack George	34,592
Downing & Epperson	34,139
William Baldridge	33,888
A. D. Lee	33,721
W. B. Hammonds	33,705
Loyd Farris	33,603
Don Carpenter	33,448
David Nelson	33,093
W. W. Lemons	32,881
George C. Heard	32,745
Shirley L. Garrison	32,410
H. M. Boozer	32,258
Clyde Hancock	32,071
Clyde H. Damron	31,575
Harvey C. Davis & Sons	31,246
W. W. Gilbreath	31,255
M. N. Smith	31,086
Doyl Underwood	30,998
James Welch	30,739
Harlan L. Barber	30,730
Fritz Smith	30,345
Bill Rich	30,169
Joe M. Scott	30,116
J. D. Myrick	29,788
W. V. Struve	29,607
Ivan L. Block	29,532
Carl King	29,475
Geo. Ed. Bennett	29,359
Rayphard Smithson	29,182
E. Herring Est	29,121
Lonnie Bell	28,786
Jay Lee Touchstone	28,774
Kenneth Christie	28,770
Joe Nelson	28,652
Fleetwood Farms	28,585
M. L. Aven	28,526
Odus Hastings	28,496
Chas Veigel Est	28,465
Robert L. Hawkins	28,013
Ray Robertson	27,572
Andy Nelson	27,334
James Buckley	26,976
Jerry Tunnell	26,921
Madge M. Roberts	26,570
Charles Burks	26,541
Dud Winders	26,286
Ed Wilson	26,129
R. R. Rule	26,087
L. L. Shultz	26,067
Allan Webb	25,704
Dent Bradley	25,294
Roger E. Haberer	25,271
Maurice E. Powell	25,110
Total payees in county (106)	4,445,551

CHILDRESS COUNTY

Carroll Seal	38,192
Arthur Kane	27,566
Luther C. Hill	26,503
Derrill Nippert	25,204
Total payees in county (4)	117,465

COCHRAN COUNTY

J. K. Griffith	322,355
John A. Wheeler	193,645
C. C. Slaughter Farms	98,870
F. O. Masten	$90,792
T. K. Williamson	76,641
Jimmy Millar	67,309
R. L. Polvado	65,976
Erma Griffith	64,527
J. E. Polvado	64,236
H. B. Barker	63,134
Slaughter Hill Co	60,522
E. L. Polvado	57,722
Hub Baggett	52,525
D. E. Benham	49,212
James Greener	45,486
Ben & Edward Pinkert	43,719
J. C. OBrien	43,349
Max Bowers Est	41,532
Ike Williams	37,030
Leonard O. Coleman	36,044
Bobby Smith	34,827
W. B. Merritt	33,786
E. E. Silhan	32,953
Emmett E. Thomas	32,365
Ronald Coleman	32,361
Dalton Redman	30,247
George Smith	29,600
W. C. Eubanks	29,570
Raymon Hall	29,509
C. C. Harvey	28,824
Dan Valentine	28,495
B. H. Tucker	28,488
C. E. Buchanan	28,473
Ira Brown	28,437
H. Y. Christian	27,646
Danny Key	27,611
H. H. Kern	27,369
Clayton Stokes	27,050
J. W. Silhan	26,958
Jack French	26,518
Mrs. Dona Doughty	25,389
Don M. Lowe	25,353
A. R. Lamb	25,026
Total payees in county (43)	2,241,481

COLLINGSWORTH COUNTY

Carthel G. Lewis	32,317
James Doneghy	32,253
Wood & Wood	29,999
Elbert Watts	29,758
J. B. Killian	28,557
Louis E. Allred	25,784
Total payees in county (6)	178,668

COLLIN COUNTY

Welborn & Welborn	30,889

COLORADO COUNTY

T. Cattle Co	80,492
Mahalitc Bros	60,167
J. K. J. Mahalitc	33,276
Arthur E. Mahalitc	27,735
Total payees in county (4)	201,670

COTTLE COUNTY

Jack Parnell	38,803
R. D. Wall Jr	27,479
Donald D. Love	25,680
Jack Tippen	25,295
Total payees in county (4)	117,257

CROSBY COUNTY

Mitco, Inc	102,667
G. J. Parkhill Jr	88,994
Delton Caddell	81,618
Luis Garcia/Sons Inc	78,005
Lloyd Gambrel	61,022
Jean D. Smith	60,610
Lynn T. Smith	59,975
Donald Aycock	58,133
Jesse L. Reese	57,849
Lynn E. Campbell	54,386
H. N. Watson, Jr	53,819
Compton Cornelius	51,685
Bob Kimbrough	49,066

Elvis O. Martin	$48,282
The McLaughlins	47,002
Cleve Cypert	45,601
W. O. Lockwood	44,713
J. P. Beck	44,581
R. H. Farris, Jr	43,720
D. J. Moses	43,638
Marvin T. Heinrich	43,608
John L. Haynes	43,021
Tom F. Oats	42,464
Clyde Crausbay	42,275
Elton Ellison	41,685
Max Johnson	41,131
Billie McClaran	40,802
Marvin O. Greer	40,408
Bill N. Gilbreath	40,250
Arvis E. Moore	39,629
Bobby H. Kendrick	38,632
Dee Cash	38,379
Ross Cash	38,378
O. D. Moore	38,275
Darrell J. Dunn	38,126
Craig McDonald	37,810
Carroll Himmel	36,952
Claude Adams	36,524
I. B. Davis	35,649
Buster E. Smith	35,526
J. W. Jackson	35,476
James W. Holman	35,445
Ray Marsh	35,386
Rex Wheeler	35,374
W. T. Leon	33,989
David A. Prewitt	33,841
Kenneth Gray	33,463
Jack E. Robertson	33,401
Clyde Crump	32,898
Harold Hodges	32,734
Robert Fullingim	32,597
Kenneth Summerford	32,415
Harvey Hancock	31,767
Gene Fullingim	31,648
James A. Boydstun	31,562
Loyd B. Parkhill	31,551
Donald Wooten	31,297
W. Clayton Sellers	30,404
Arnold Ratheal	30,388
John R. Green	29,924
J. R. Terrell	29,892
B. L. Anderson, Sr	29,655
L. E. Littlefield	29,568
Eldred L. Mize	29,340
Dewey E. Wells, Jr	29,148
Roy Lee Ellis	28,997
J. J. Griffin	28,924
Charles E. Sanders	28,776
C. B. Gallimore	28,750
Billy Kirk	28,572
Arnold Hodges	28,547
T. W. Stockton, Jr	28,500
L. Don Anderson	28,147
James W. Sales	28,029
T. G. Kirkendall	27,859
C. B. Hendrick	27,540
Thomas A. Poulson	27,281
Jimmy R. Fullingim	27,238
F. Eugene Woodard	27,017
Wayne J. Parker	26,837
Dick Snodgrass	26,692
Roy Schluter	26,667
Vernon D. Wheeless	26,618
Donald H. Berry	26,482
Nelton Chote	26,281
Roy J. Warren	26,275
J. B. Prewitt	26,263
L. M. Powell	25,955
Byron E. Powell	25,817
Will D. Griffin	25,721
E. C. Simmons	25,707
Eubank/Searsy	25,679
Charles B. Gray	25,675
Billy Crump	25,473
George W Poulson	25,394
Donnie Powell	25,221
Harold Verett	25,025
Total payees in county (97)	3,630,011

CULBERSON COUNTY

Lee Talley	39,073
J. J. Taber	33,271
J. E. Beasley	$30,837
Olen Lane	29,748
Total payees in county (4)	132,929

DALLAM COUNTY

Elmer Heiskell	112,990
Hugh L. Gordon	68,252
James E. Crabtree	59,980
Raman L. Chandler	57,049
H. F. Beyer	56,549
Jimmie O. Brewster	56,072
Kerrick Land & Cattle Co	54,321
Leo H. Moore	50,807
George H. Noble	50,013
Melvin Przilas	48,433
Horace D. Estes	47,712
Carleton Davis	46,795
Tim E. Field	45,449
David P. McBryde	44,488
Alex Stafford	43,938
William W. Allen	43,171
J. T. McAdams	42,205
Wall & Sons	40,628
Roy Nall	39,931
Webb/Webb/Johnson Ptnp	38,276
R. L. McMurtry	37,626
Tommy Lovett	37,602
Curtis G. Chisum	37,399
Billy Chesnut	37,095
Glenn Johnson	37,031
Don W. Slaughter	36,702
Ell Dee Field	35,732
Circle Farms, Inc	35,649
Leo J. Field	35,338
James M. Field	34,982
Clancy Cummings	34,465
Loyd J. Pillans	33,793
L. A. Mathis	33,184
Tommy Gerber	33,159
Triple M. Farms	33,152
Charles Grice	33,137
Summerour Brothers Ptnp	31,819
Keith Green	31,418
James H. Warnken	30,619
Adolph Hill	30,524
Frank C. McDaniel	30,179
Ray T. Taylor	30,040
Billy G. Moore	29,725
Glenn D. Cummings	28,932
Russell C. Cummings	28,932
Marvin Gibbs	28,685
Donald A. Borth	28,515
Norval W. Bressler	27,802
Charles Vickers	27,619
H. B. Watson	27,32[illegible]
Delbert Butler	26,995
Edward Lethen	26,954
Feral Carruth	26,931
Bill Wedel	26,659
Meredith H. Brown	26,520
Vanus Byrd	25,609
Roy W. Wharton	25,061
Oscar O. Przilas	25,022
Total payees in county (58)	2,234,993

DALLAS COUNTY

Olin B. Curry	37,840
Roddy Brothers	36,192
Ralph B. Pickett	31,192
Total payees in county (3)	105,224

DAWSON COUNTY

Bill Weaver	140,462
Gordon V. Waldrop	77,143
Sam C. Jenkins	62,609
Henderson and Son	55,150
J. W. Gardenhire	53,558
Charles Warren	48,890
Woodward Farms, Inc	47,861
E. D. Adcock	45,327
George Eiland	45,174
Donnell Echols	44,070
Carson Echols	43,177
C. R. Taylor	42,633
R. M. Middleton	$42,193
Adcock Farming Co., Inc	41,535
B. L. Middleton	39,544
Eiland Crawley Palmore	39,518
Arlan Youngblood	39,512
E. E. Sumrow	35,881
Doyle Terry	35,813
Bobby Warren	33,592
Robert F. Hardberger	33,025
O. H. Preston, Jr	33,025
Donovan V. Phipps	32,936
Bill Treadaway	30,410
V. W. McGee	28,610
E. Bar Cattle Co	28,475
Lloyd Cline	28,250
S. N. M. M. Farm Corp	28,232
John D. Banta	28,055
David Hughes	27,756
David Franklin	27,532
Arther Nolen	27,089
E. L. Hendon	27,003
Leroy Holladay	26,820
Dennis Lamphere	26,581
Norris Barron	26,444
W. T. Pomroy	26,303
J. D. Bennett	25,505
N. B. Leatherwood	25,094
Ferguson Schneider	25,005
Total payees in county (40)	1,575,792

DEAF SMITH COUNTY

Hill Farms	221,359
Taft McGee	200,309
Perrin Bros	129,124
Delmar R. Durrett	118,789
W. H. Gentry	111,921
Virgil F. Marsh	96,915
White Farms & Cattle Co	95,383
Wm. J. Schulte	94,559
D. T. Reed	87,677
R. C. Godwin Farms, Inc	82,140
Billy Wayne Sisson	80,920
John & Ray Brorman	78,440
Forrester Ranch, Inc	77,081
Reinauer Bros	75,719
O. D. Bingham	71,418
Melvin May	71,032
Clarence D. Carnahan	70,106
Herbert Friemel	68,654
Vernon Denson	66,071
Quien Sabe Farms	65,781
West AC Farms, Inc	64,974
Joseph A. Meyer	63,219
Harry Brorman	62,580
A. R. Dillard	61,809
J. R. Durrett Trusts	61,697
James A. Bullard	61,337
W. F. Ponder	60,468
Joe Lyons & Lyons	59,574
Brorman Bros	58,961
Anthony Paschel	58,594
Jorde Farms	56,683
Hosea Foster Estate	55,716
Solomon Bros	54,977
Garrison Bros. & Nelson	54,020
McCathern & Heck Farms	53,493
A. C. Hays Jr	53,294
Higgins & London	51,681
John A. & Raymond Smith	51,424
Montgomery Farms	50,641
Morris W. Blankenship	49,912
B. C. Hodges	49,527
Edwin Axe Farms Inc	47,974
James Fangman	47,250
Iverson Leake	46,505
Billy J. Cleavinger	46,105
Brooks & Brooks	45,937
Oneway Farms	45,930
Donald Kimball	45,891
Johnny Jesko	45,349
R. M. Mason	44,784
Jimmy Brown	44,447
Harris & Thrush Sales Co	44,284
Meiwes Bros	44,129
L. J. Jones, Jr	43,903
Francis E. Barrett	43,615
Jim Monroe	42,603
B. T. Spear	42,558
E. C. R. Corporation	42,097

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

DEAF SMITH COUNTY—continued

Charlie & Kenneth Robinson	$40,312
S. A. Fangman	39,896
Ray Gerk	39,621
J. E. McCathern, Jr	39,153
Norton, Inc	38,839
Herbert E. Bippus	38,680
J. T. Gilbreath, Jr	38,283
Gerald McCathern	38,103
Glenn B. Allred	38,040
Edwin Morrison	37,837
Gary McQuigg	37,521
Matt Webb	36,791
Richardson Seed Farm	36,757
Luther Ellis	36,333
A. G. Flippin	36,120
D. Neumayer	35,872
Jimmy Brown	35,771
Madison F. Fields	35,163
Woodrow Whitaker	35,060
Helen Godwin	33,561
Hickman Farms, Inc	33,406
R. C. Godwin	33,138
W. E. Warrick	33,114
Bertram Jack	33,068
Frank V. Zinser, Jr	32,230
J. B. Haile	31,979
Samie West	31,921
Robert R. Lindsey	31,646
Norman Hodges	31,519
John Skaggs & Son	31,228
F. A. Marnell	31,073
Henry J. Kuper	30,599
Schlabs Farms Inc	30,586
Dan W. Berger	30,504
Walter G. Russell	30,477
Tom Robinson	30,330
Alton Fraser	30,284
Mrs. N. A. Brown & Sons	30,231
J. C. Price	30,162
Donald Hicks	30,131
Harold D Moore	30,107
Wm. A. Carter	30,050
Richard D. Friemel	30,020
Bob Veigel	29,833
Kenneth Walker	29,685
Glen Wagner	29,581
Bennie Newbill	29,513
Mary Inman Hipes	29,334
Jack Williams	29,109
Kenneth Artho	28,546
A. C. Brorman	28,510
Charles Hoover	28,401
Floyd E. Tomlinson	28,204
G. C. Brown	28,089
Koetting Bros	27,985
Luther Lesley	27,611
Carl J. Berend	27,593
Shepard Cattle Co	27,296
O. G. Hill Estate	27,273
Paul Wilson	26,937
Bridwell Ranch West	26,905
Ralph Rice	26,768
J. F. Brorman	26,693
Hall Bros	26,483
Alban Farms	26,297
Edgar Brown Est	26,178
James Overstreet	26,034
Charles Packard	25,983
Joe M. Zinser	25,846
Tom J. Boyd	25,814
Cecil Morrison	25,774
Donald J. Meyer	25,660
Josef C. Grotegut	25,634
Wilburn P. Axe	25,625
Sam A. Lynch	25,237
Herbert H. Miller	25,219
Lester B. Godwin	25,158
Total payees in county (135)	6,311,664

DENTON COUNTY

Elmo & Ernest Chesney	30,312
Bennett Griffin	26,463
Total payees in county (2)	56,775

DICKENS COUNTY

G. B. Morris	$54,640
Raymond Eldredge	36,201
Dumont Bridge	35,538
Paul Dale Hagins	35,014
Vernon Harris	29,515
Raymon Harris	29,259
Paul Braddock	27,112
D. W. Edinburgh	26,607
Rex Carlisle	26,347
Total payees in county (9)	300,233

DIMMIT COUNTY

Warren Wagner, Inc	37,008

DONLEY COUNTY

Hall S. Hardin	34,649
J. Melvin Asberry	30,012
Total payees in county (2)	64,661

EL PASO COUNTY

R. T. Hoover Farms	121,314
Lee Moor Farms	116,793
L. R. Allison Co	60,209
Mike Maros	54,315
Ralphs Farms, Inc	54,128
H. D. Hilley	49,935
C. P. Brown	40,726
Lettunich Farms	39,342
Jerry Rogers	38,484
George Eads	38,107
Fabens Prod., Inc	35,142
George B. Spence	34,972
Bills & Ellis Farms	33,685
James Strachan	32,459
Schuster Farms, Inc	29,814
W. C. Passmore & Son	29,456
Hiram Whitaker	28,883
Gulbant S. Gil & Sons, Inc	28,635
Jack H. Stallings	25,938
W. A. Rawls Ranch	25,934
Joe Hanson	25,514
Total payees in county (21)	943,790

ELLIS COUNTY

H. R. Burden	54,669
J. B. & Jas. Underwood	50,515
Jack B. Eastham	46,858
Ramon Armstrong	28,710
C. O. Nash	26,927
B. D. Wakeland	25,149
Total payees in county (6)	232,828

FALLS COUNTY

Basil Abate	112,932
Felix Tusa	51,927
Morris Scamardo	47,137
Jack Falco	45,130
Roman Gonzales	41,631
Falsone Brothers	35,763
W. A. Hudgens	35,204
Louis Corpora	30,166
Total payees in county (8)	399,890

FANNIN COUNTY

Riverby Plan	35,589
W. Frank Howell	28,980
Total payees in county (2)	64,569

FAYETTE COUNTY

John E. Morgan	28,356

FISHER COUNTY

Max Carriker	31,144
John D. Ferguson	30,789
Jim Obriant	30,599
J. E. McCoy, Jr	27,434
Total payees in county (4)	$119,966

FLOYD COUNTY

John C. Alford	74,190
Dorris Jones	68,798
R. I. Bennett	68,532
Hershel Carthel	59,817
J. S. Hale, Jr	58,756
Marvin Shurbet	56,030
Bigham Farms	54,186
Thomas Bros	53,444
Marble Brothers	53,173
L. N. Johnson	51,158
Watson Jones	48,701
Gene Belt	48,665
Ward Brothers	48,259
Ewald Quebe	47,697
W. L. Norman	47,631
Malvin A. Jarboe	47,307
R. F. & Robert Stovall	46,777
Fred Zimmerman, Jr	43,800
Walter E. Bloys	42,669
Johnney West	40,605
C. C. Whittle	40,594
Dougherty Grain	40,331
J. E. Franklin	40,272
H. B. Robertson	39,578
Robert L. Smith	39,315
Billy W. Fulton	38,533
Reed Lawson	38,470
J. A. Welch	38,298
K. E. Probasco	37,992
H. L. Porter, Jr	37,916
R. G. Dunlap	37,739
G. W. Smith	37,452
Louis Pyle	37,276
W. R. Ware	37,257
J. R. Turner	36,985
Tom Snead	36,811
Tri C Corp	36,560
Buren C. & Lucy Cates	36,284
Luther B. Brandes	36,136
Roy H. Tinsley	36,050
Kenneth Bean	35,982
R. Fred Brown	35,950
Paul Weiss & Paul Hrbacek	35,544
Everett Miller	35,363
C. L. Henderson	34,965
J. W. Taylor, est., ptnsp	34,636
L. T. Wood	33,353
Loyd Widener	32,678
Wayne Bramlet	32,471
Lane Decker	32,185
Walter W. Taack	32,146
Oscar Golden	31,996
Tate Jones	31,826
Early P. Pritchett	31,542
Bill Sherman	31,341
J. A. Miller	31,292
W. M. Staniforth	30,974
Eugene Gilly	30,800
Fred Jackson	30,617
W. S. Poole Estate	30,585
William E. Whitfill	30,379
G. C. Cattle Co., Inc	30,365
Travis Jones	29,905
W. H. Simpson	29,680
George H. Willis, Jr	29,637
Don Marble	29,559
Bruce W. Davis	29,393
Lewis Reddy	29,226
Donal Akin	29,165
Weldon Hammonds	28,907
G. Taylor & T. Fortenberry	28,905
J. R. Belt, Jr., Farming, Inc	28,757
L. L. Rhodes	28,372
Charlie Boedeker	27,712
Strickland & Co	26,988
Frank D. Brown	26,801
S. J. McIntosh	26,623
Joe Appling	26,622
Chester W. Mitchell	26,596
Mack Hickerson	26,540
Leighton O. Teeple	26,174
Brock Farm	26,160
E. A. Noland	26,152
P. Keith Marble	26,125
Fred L. Marble	26,122
Johnnie Cates	26,087
Eldon Fortenberry	25,621
Lon Davis, Jr	25,461

R. C. Mitchell	$25,419
J. E. Rexrode	25,207
Joe N. Dunn	25,006
Total payees in county (91)	3,329,965

FORT BEND COUNTY

Tx. Dept. of Corr	343,654
Sugarland Ind., Inc	67,591
Foster Farms, Inc	51,563
Eppolito Bros	31,579
Total payees in county (4)	494,387

FRIO COUNTY

Bennett Bros., Inc	59,349
A. E. Schletze Farms	57,418
Clyde Cox	50,196
Al Klopek	43,043
Tony Mann	36,117
Eulan Cox	36,060
John Barkley	35,537
J. H. Woodward	35,094
Jay Kay Ranch	27,891
H and B Farms	26,446
Riggan & Neal Farms, Inc	26,045
Total payees in county (11)	433,196

GAINES COUNTY

Paul Morgan	61,968
E Bar S Ranch	60,072
H. L. Hill	57,200
Shamrock Farms	56,507
John Henry Jones	55,738
Jennie Lee Lands	55,380
Marvin Rayford Hays	52,677
Earl Layman	50,725
Thomas Michael Jenkins	48,962
Kenneth Hancock	46,133
R. I. Oliver	45,106
M and J Farms	43,273
Troy Martin	42,057
Leon Foote	38,789
Douglas Floyd	38,661
J. A. Grammer	38,236
Marion C. Bowers	38,050
E. D. Marion	37,906
Paul J. Condit	37,814
J. A. Benthall	37,796
W. E. Berry, Jr	36,945
Vernon Goodwin	36,726
Alvin Ward	36,559
Claude-Doak Hearne	35,645
Herbert Hicks	35,644
Ray Garrett	35,132
Keith Young	35,045
Kenneth Bass	34,869
Norman Hicks	34,735
D. G. Chiles	33,665
Robert Sneed	33,463
Billy J. Evans	33,414
Roy Apple	33,406
W. G. and G. R. White	33,046
N. B. Fields	33,043
Tommy Lacy	32,826
Tommy Billings	31,927
Alvin Childers	31,726
Charles Nance	31,644
M. T. McIlwain	31,121
Vester Smith	30,954
William Charlie Faulkenberry	30,931
Alton Billings	30,733
A. W. Byrd	30,651
Bob Moffatt	30,551
Moody Neeley	30,136
Marcus Crow	29,993
Noah Lemley	29,899
L. D. Mills	29,804
Rinehard Vogler	29,460
Don Sanders	29,364
Bill Moore	29,307
Joe Tarbet	29,190
Glenn Hillman	29,138
Harmon Mills	28,606
Alton Faulkenberry	28,580
B. J. Smith	27,986
J. E. Neeley	$27,981
Ewell Kenneth Scott	27,664
Cline E. Morris	27,483
Delmon Ellison	27,294
Tom Hunt	27,229
Charles Gay	27,159
Charles Medlin	26,858
Big Four Farm	26,843
Earnest Spradlin	26,761
H. Dale Cope	26,690
Jesse L. Smith	26,362
J. H. Flippo	26,535
S. M. Hanson, Jr	26,331
J. A. White	25,998
George D. Vaughon	25,795
Rueben F. Owens	25,764
W. O. Fortenberry Est	25,603
Kent Denson	25,502
Carlos Berry	25,417
W. D. Freeman	25,183
James R. Davis	25,008
Total payees in county (78)	2,684,192

GARZA COUNTY

H. V. Wheeler	44,513
Avery Moore, Jr	30,291
Clarence E. Basinger	29,035
S. C. Storie, Sr., Est	26,503
Total payees in county (4)	130,342

GLASSCOCK COUNTY

Bednar Bros	41,592
August M. Frysak	32,367
Fred J. Hoelscher	32,006
Edwards and Edwards	26,959
Alfred E. Perry	26,708
Sidney F. Hirt	25,171
Total payees in county (6)	184,803

GRAY COUNTY

Moody Farms	31,562
Paul Wagner & Sons	28,497
Total payees in county (2)	60,059

GRAYSON COUNTY

Bob Light	28,972

GRIMES COUNTY

Harris Farms	44,675
Roy W. Moore	32,220
Paul Keelan & Sons	28,522
Total payees in county (3)	105,417

GUADALUPE COUNTY

Frank P. Watson, Jr	36,806

HALE COUNTY

I. F. Lee	183,638
Ercell Givens	172,152
J. C. Mills	117,201
Ballard and Hurt	86,180
James Cannon	75,999
Jason H. Allen	74,759
Elmo Stephens	74,748
Warren Mathis	69,043
E. A. Houston	66,593
Elbert Harp	64,850
T. C. Clanton	63,423
Ralph Wheeler	61,141
W. D. Scarborough, Jr	60,995
John Trimmier, Jr	60,911
T. R. Joines	60,647
Frank Moore	60,613
Lonnie Cannon	58,833
R. Bruce Walker	57,719
Bradshaw and Meador	56,148
Horne Brothers	55,441
W. C. Harper	55,440
A. J. Givens	54,147
Swann Pettit	54,007
Walter Gilliam	$50,372
Winston T. Jones	49,714
John A. Bell	49,022
Jimmy McLaughlin	48,306
G. O. King	47,977
Clayton Terrell	47,569
Bob Riley	46,691
O. D. Rhodes	46,100
Charles Flowers	45,742
O. A. & C. E. Webb	45,671
C. R. Kay	43,853
John C. Carter	43,677
William Thomas Joines	43,649
Carl Phillips	43,255
J. H. Kirby and Sons	42,980
E. J. Pope, Jr	42,896
Edwin Adams	42,842
Leo Mathis	42,734
Heck Gin, Inc	42,632
Frank Megna	42,166
Benson Farms, Inc	41,998
Doug Ellison	41,992
W. M. Kurfees	41,749
John M. Norfleet	41,696
Harvey Lutrick	41,489
Lee C. Oneil	41,329
C. T. Minchew and Miller Trust	41,302
Jim Bob Curry	40,721
J. L. Browning	40,640
Terrell and Daniel	40,128
C. P. Smith	39,986
Ralph E. Davis	39,623
Virgal Pierson	39,462
Charles Noel	39,159
R. G. Russ, Jr	38,354
Heath Brothers	37,654
J. W. Pope	37,165
Earl G. Beach	37,129
Owen E. Jones	37,057
Burgess Farm Account	36,757
Warren Thomas	36,254
Neal and W. E. Burnett	36,181
Laura Faye McDougal	36,107
Jack Gonzales	35,774
Wallace Cannon	35,702
L. K. Gregory	35,623
Rae Groce	35,352
Joe Sherrod	35,112
Miller Farms	35,065
James E. Laney	34,931
Frank Stanton, Jr	34,694
Kenneth R. Wiese	34,677
Alton Leach	34,437
G. A. McWilliams	34,410
Brownlake Farms	34,092
Gordon H. Branham	34,006
Donald C. Ebeling	33,918
Witten Farms	33,688
Millard J. Hancock	33,582
Donald Lee Terrell	33,354
William H. Finkner	33,287
The Waters Trust	32,835
A. E. Lewellen	32,533
Raymond G. Miller	32,433
Paul Stukey	32,389
Marcus Breland	32,364
Joe Oswalt	32,127
B. L. Griffith	32,004
Raymond Akin	31,880
Jerry V. Young	31,872
Arthur W. Sorelle	31,838
Carl J. Marshall	31,734
J. W. Davis	31,656
Davis Cannon	31,534
Herman S. Tennell	31,470
S. R. Heard	31,421
Bill Riley	31,366
Irvan Rhodes	31,335
Rex Jordan	31,165
Jack K. Stephens	30,939
Earl M. James	30,884
S. J. Young	30,783
Don Cannon	30,566
L. L. Ray	30,564
R. L. Tullis	30,463
Mac Houston	30,383
James McDaniel	30,126
Ross and Thompson	30,022
Herschel Blankenship	30,010
Megna and Riley	29,886

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

HALE COUNTY—continued

Mrs. J. S. McBeth	$29,837
Wesley Davis	29,811
Wesley A. Schumachler	29,792
Jack Robertson	29,690
Wesley Webb	29,355
Joe Barton	29,338
Frank Schulte	29,244
John Joe Kirchoff	28,921
C. E. Hobgood Est	28,597
Orval Boyd	28,590
Quentin Redinger	28,380
W. E. McPherson	28,297
Austin O'Neil, Jr	28,164
U. O. Hobgood	28,152
J. L. Miller, Jr	28,073
Oliver Harmel	28,032
Owen Benn	27,984
True H. Rosser, Jr	27,852
Jerry K. Oswalt	27,782
Jason Justice	27,741
Ray R. Copeland	27,657
Clyde Benn	27,388
Henry Ahrens	27,354
Jake Q. Finney	27,176
Otey Shadden	27,002
R. D. Hoffman	26,975
Wilson Brothers	26,928
Jerrell Cate	26,886
Floyd Terrell	26,850
Loy Eldon Teague	26,820
C. E. Carter and Son	26,803
Melvin Kelm	26,764
Lafont Farms	26,668
Don L. McKenzie	26,583
Charles L. King	26,536
Robert E. Wilson	26,460
Forest Young	26,430
Kit McDaniel, Jr	26,221
Joe Sharp	26,190
Joe A. Evans	26,180
Elmer Koenning	26,102
Kathryn Raymond	25,951
J. E. Helm	25,920
Thrane Parsons	25,891
J. P. Barton	25,882
W. T. Settle	25,840
W. H. Rollow	25,730
Paul Robertson	25,720
Jack Connell	25,654
Kenneth W. Ashby	25,208
U. V. Helbert	25,107
Weldon Reed	25,085
Johnnie J. Maberry	25,068
Rhodes and Rhodes	25,022
Total payees in county (167)	6,554,377

HALL COUNTY

Jim Hutchins	36,537
Henry Sofoster	33,558
Clark Bros	32,392
J. A. McNear	31,639
Allen L. Monzingo	31,087
Clinton B. Halford	30,284
W. H. Reed	27,557
Billy J. Rothwell	26,823
Carroll Fowler	26,484
Loyd J. Becker	25,934
Tom W. Collins	25,478
Lonnie F. Widener	25,293
Total payees in county (12)	353,066

HANSFORD COUNTY

Collier Bros. Inc	77,226
Jack Hart	69,777
R. E. and Rue Sanders	63,192
Lynn and Jon Hart	59,061
R. L. Porter Est	55,566
C. H. Clawson	53,976
Bill Logsdon	51,907
Gus O. Birdwell	43,826
Williard McCloy	38,043
D. C. Dilley Est	37,815
J. P. Armes	$35,153
H. Vance Collier	35,034
Roy Roper	34,242
Lloyd Buzzard	34,189
Hez M. Frazier	34,005
Ward V. Nolder	32,250
Eva Holt	31,517
Don Hart	30,936
Ernest Wilmeth	30,734
J. L. Whitaker	29,989
Taylor & Gee	29,838
W. R. Murrell	29,437
Fletcher Bros., Inc	29,113
Betty Bros	28,851
Joel D. Stavlo	27,385
Dan E. Archer	27,111
Robert H. Novak	26,606
A. R. Bort	26,253
Coy M. Holt	26,146
Donnie Thoreson	25,543
Carl Archer	25,307
Total payees in county (31)	1,180,028

HARDEMAN COUNTY

Robert Nippert	45,170
M. E. Watson, Jr	40,870
Roy Hines	38,056
1st Natl Bk Trus C. G. Conley	34,686
Carl Vestal	29,847
Edward L. Turner	28,857
Nuckles & Gerald	26,703
Weldon Tabor	25,664
Total payees in county (8)	269,853

HARTLEY COUNTY

Carl L. Kuper	108,810
Harold H. Hogue	107,764
Thomas L. Moran	89,178
John W. Bookout	78,104
Framack Farms	77,904
First National Bank	69,415
Verlin O. Lasley	68,375
Frantz & Frantz	53,389
Hartley-Moore Farms	51,348
Leopold J. Schmidt, Sr	47,058
G. Malcolm Bryant	42,704
Mountain Potato Corp	41,983
Bobby G. Green	36,723
U Anchor Cattle Co	36,547
Doyce W. Franklin	33,359
Joe D. Keast	31,374
Wilbur L. Bryant	30,926
James R. Wilson	29,654
G. Ivory Edlin	29,087
Harold W. Hudgins	28,568
Howell L. McCleskey	28,445
James R. Reynolds	28,367
Exum Ranch	26,111
J. D. Hance, Jr. & Jack Clayton	25,067
D. B. Thompson	25,043
Total payees in county (25)	1,225,503

HASKELL COUNTY

Johnny D. Reid	40,994
Thomas J. Bevel & Son	40,923
Burson and Burson	39,102
John L. Grindstaff, Jr	31,237
E. H. Tankersley, Jr	29,265
Ray Carter	29,066
William G. Ellis	26,997
Amos D. May	26,963
Melvin C. Josselet	26,218
L. Weldon Norman	25,757
Arlos W. Weaver	25,232
Total payees in county (11)	341,754

HIDALGO COUNTY

Engelman Farms	162,222
Krenmueller Farms	141,971
Sam Sparks	105,737
Ben Estes Bearden	104,874
Geo. T. Helle	$104,309
Rio Farms, Inc	101,580
J. W. Wallace & Sons	92,580
J. B. Hardwicke Co., Ptn	92,093
C. B. Shields, Jr	90,028
Beckwith Farms	87,160
Davis & Gandy	80,244
Frank Schuster	77,244
Holcomb & Black	77,085
La Strawberry & Veg. Dist. Co	74,352
Sebastian Cot. & Gr. Corp	68,897
Knapp Farms	67,976
Byron Campbell Est	65,606
Carl Schuster	65,151
Guerra Bros	65,133
C. C. & Jack Harbison	64,497
Valley Acres	63,225
Jerry Block	63,023
Bell Bros	62,688
Fuller Farms	62,237
Edgar R. Smith	57,671
J. R. Russell	57,612
N. H. Kitayama	57,185
Bill Burns	55,044
J. R. Stump	54,875
J. B. Pollock	53,989
Turberville Farms	53,691
M. D. & N. J. Moore, Jr	53,056
Relampago, Inc	52,484
Shary Farms, Inc	49,229
Paul D. Moore, Jr	46,514
American Farm, Inc	46,213
Las Palmas Farms	44,060
Evergreen Farms, Inc	43,445
W. A. Odom, Jr	40,941
Everett Bell	39,044
Barr Ewing	38,900
Holmes Farms, Inc	38,848
J. R. Wade Farms, Inc	38,635
James Dyer	38,243
Geo. V. Harren	37,745
Bryan Hanks	37,542
Bradford & Eoff Ptns	36,888
R. O. Wade Farms Inc	35,208
Boyce Farms Inc	33,925
Mervin Headley	33,467
E. L. Good	33,331
Wyatt & Ware	32,974
Homer Ramsey	32,935
L. J. Krska	32,678
Mitsuru Sakai	31,840
Wm. T. Dudley	31,410
Dan Logan	31,385
E. L. Tyner	30,611
W. H. Drawe	30,177
Edith Tyner	29,944
Harold Decker	29,890
Alton Malone	29,879
Roy W. Barnes	29,806
L. H. Freeman	29,777
J. S. & Quinn McManus	29,763
Marvin A. Schwarz	29,758
M. A. Drewry	29,265
Keith Pollock	28,834
Shiba & Kakuda Farms	28,432
Ray C. Jones, Jr	28,041
T. E. Bottom	27,607
Lloyd Schwarz	27,160
C. A. Townsend & Sons	26,750
E. J. Blake	26,507
Granville Smith	26,148
B. W. Carlson	26,055
M. F. Klose, Sr	25,777
Franklin Dusek	25,764
H. M. Pitts	25,511
Earl F. Cohrs	25,073
Total payees in county (80)	4,087,448

HILL COUNTY

Ellison Bros	33,325
Daniel Pustejovsky	30,892
Seth Orr	29,965
G. Ray Sawyer	29,315
Gerik Bros. Ptnrs	26,477
Cecil & Delmer Sullins Ptnrs	25,473
Total payees in county (6)	175,447

HOCKLEY COUNTY

Post Montgomery	$87,106
White Face Farms, Inc	82,705
Aubrey L. Lockett	67,510
J. Walter Hobgood	61,671
Billy Ray McInroe	60,590
Neal Caswell	56,742
Marvin E. Green	50,130
Joe W. Cook, Jr	50,050
H. T. Chrenshaw	48,633
Barry Armes	44,701
Gordon McMillan	43,973
Fred G. Owens	43,710
Don Brazil	42,710
H. Joe Schwartz	40,994
Harry L. Fitzgerald	38,891
L. E. Mitchell	35,783
Spade Ranch, Inc	35,041
James T. Rackler	34,765
Chester Borders	34,645
Elwood Patterson	34,550
W. N. Halliburton	34,394
Erlan D. Gresham	34,191
William Clements	32,960
William M. Cain	32,674
Don Reding	32,366
Frank Karvas, Jr	32,319
W. L. Harris	31,515
Troy M. Overman	31,495
Walter S. Carter	30,711
Elbert C. White, Jr	30,590
Jim J. Hobgood	30,581
Sam Hoover	30,485
Carl E. Ratliff	30,480
E. W. Sanford Est	30,289
Jack Sherrod	30,288
Loyd Hood	30,272
William E. Carr, Jr	30,188
Cecil B. Helms	30,178
Douglas Kauffman	30,046
James Buford Chambers	29,447
Preston L. Lyda	29,397
George Wade, Jr	29,215
Earl D. Lewis	28,954
H. E. Mowry	28,936
Slaughter Farms	28,774
Catharine C. Whittenburg	28,767
Palmer & Dowell	28,488
Mallet Ranch	28,456
William J. Brazil	28,408
Richard Lawson	28,323
Acuff Farms	27,959
Ralph F. Wade	27,939
J. T. Stout	27,559
Chesley G. Hobgood	27,275
R. R. Hutcheson	26,931
E. B. Burelsmith	26,406
Kenneth Spradley	26,316
Talmage C. Ivey	26,128
George R. Martin	25,971
Billy Arnwine	25,937
J. E. Wisdom	25,794
L. E. Mitchell, Jr	25,651
S. J. Clevenger	25,416
Ford A. Carter	25,224
Martin Lawson	25,091
J. T. Hall, Jr	25,068
Total payees in county (66)	2,328,752

HOUSTON COUNTY

John R. Rials	44,468
Wade Minter, Jr	41,244
D. H. Arnold	33,353
T. J. Maples	28,799
Total payees in county (4)	147,864

HOWARD COUNTY

Edgar Phillips	36,109
James C. Barr	34,205
Harvey Fryar	32,659
Delbert Stanley	31,687
Robert V. Fryar	31,483
G. C. Broughton Jr	31,047
H. L. Adams	25,616
S. M. Haney	$25,363
Paul Adams	25,314
Total payees in county (9)	273,483

HUDSPETH COUNTY

C. L. Ranch	125,740
Grady E. Miller Jr	57,610
B. E. Walker	48,788
Dell View Farms	34,001
C. L. Machinery	33,429
Skov Bros	27,124
Gentry Bros	25,585
Total payees in county (7)	352,277

HUNT COUNTY

William H. Myre	40,520
Total payees in county (1)	40,520

HUTCHINSON COUNTY

Claude Higley	55,417
Henderson & Parks	50,145
McCloy Brothers	46,639
Jack Johnson Jr	45,485
John W. Bergner	30,718
Raymond Jarvis	30,412
Henry Reid	27,183
Charles Johnson	25,645
R. E. Womble	25,603
Total payees in county (9)	337,247

JACKSON COUNTY

Albert C. Randall	29,914
A. R. Vincik	27,269
Total payees in county (2)	57,183

JIM WELLS COUNTY

Don Boggan	30,897
Leon Eschberger	30,346
J. M. Dellinger, Jr	28,930
Total payees in county (3)	90,173

JOHNSON COUNTY

James E. Kemp	81,145
Total payees in county (1)	81,145

JONES COUNTY

Hoke Propst	75,807
W. C. Matchett	50,292
Chas. M. Herndon	45,356
Hollis W. Madden	35,272
Bill Pritchard	34,194
Herman B. Propst	33,970
H. L. Ford	28,382
Vernon Lovvorn	28,154
Willie L. Byrd	27,172
Weldon F. Walker	26,569
Thomas G. Nix	25,205
Total payees in county (11)	410,373

KAUFMAN COUNTY

Monty Clayton	45,341
Vernon Griffin	39,073
J. L. Helm	30,412
Star Brand Cattle Co	26,458
Jerry R. Maloney	25,913
Total payees in county (5)	167,197

KING COUNTY

Allen D. Goodwin	28,540
Total payees in county (1)	28,540

KNOX COUNTY

Eugene L. Thompson	48,510
William J. Goode	35,685
Floyd L. Reed	34,027
B. M. Farmer	$30,698
J. G. Hawkins	30,186
George L. Floyd	29,717
Vernal Zeissel	28,477
Marvin Zeissel	27,814
Total payees in county (8)	265,114

LAMAR COUNTY

Hicks Braves	78,284
Mashburn Farms, Inc	76,349
H. L. Schlottman	56,934
J. B. Jackson	25,286
Total payees in county (4)	236,853

LAMB COUNTY

Halsell Cattle Co	180,907
Busby Farms	111,711
J. D. Smith	75,078
Lonnie R. Smith	68,099
L. C. Hewitt	62,337
Billy W. Clayton	61,407
Parish Farms	59,671
J. A. Stubblefield	57,064
L. J. Welch	56,212
T. A. King, Jr	55,319
Gene Templeton	51,835
Leo V. Smith	49,740
F. M. Smith	49,034
Reginal Stephens	48,038
Royce Collins	47,822
H. M. Gable	45,899
W. C. Stout	45,864
John Bridges	45,812
Fred Welch	45,228
Barton Bros	43,944
D. R. Hopkins	43,931
Stephen Smith	40,068
J. B. James	39,821
Royce McFadden	38,822
L. B. Montgomery	38,518
Edward Wuerflein	38,431
M. P. Thedford	38,283
Charles W. Wiseman	38,177
Joe F. Miller	36,195
Donald J. Bryant	35,132
Gordon B. Timms	35,071
Jack Allcorn	34,218
Donald Street	34,066
Kenneth Hinson	34,008
Ernest E. Jones	33,996
H. M. Sheats	33,975
J. M. Farmer	33,770
Thomas Harris	33,535
Phillip Haberer	33,007
Raymond Durham	32,556
Edd Haley	31,392
Jearl James	31,386
Matt Nix, Jr	31,019
Charles Carpenter	30,711
D. W. Bawcom	30,587
Eddie Wallace	30,512
W. B. Jones	30,438
Daniel B. Heard	30,072
R. D. Nix	30,022
Wesley Neinast	29,730
E. O. Feagley	29,653
Don Joyner	29,603
Elmer Lewis	29,575
Royce Turner	29,508
James Sanderson	29,396
Dan Wood	29,387
F. D. Clayton	29,385
Harley Bussanmas	29,134
Fred A. Smith	28,937
Bobby Jo Harlan	28,839
James E. Steffey	28,461
Neil Wood	28,434
Willie Steffey	28,006
Wm. R. Morris, Jr	27,781
James A. Littleton, Jr	27,674
N. W. Emfinger	27,582
Randall Roper	27,582
J. L. Snider	27,437
W. M. Smith	27,381
Calvin Wood	27,205
Jerry W. Kelley	26,877

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

LAMB COUNTY—continued

J. R. Banks	$26,814
Tavie Lee Simmons	26,587
Kenneth Wiseman	26,319
Doug G. Sopher	26,163
Wayne McLarty	26,163
Paul Yarbrough	26,119
L. G. Watson	26,091
J. D. Melton	26,067
Douglas Giles	25,900
A. B. Roberts	25,258
Bobby D. Green	25,243
Total payees in county (82)	3,177,031

LASALLE COUNTY

H. Dudley Storey, Jr	30,834
Gerald Mann	25,696
Lloyd Hurt	25,335
Total payees in county (3)	81,865

LEON COUNTY

Oscar O. Brown	41,682

LIMESTONE COUNTY

Walter B. Honeycutt, Jr	33,111

LIPSCOMB COUNTY

Lazy S. Ranch	37,371
Marvin Born	32,460
Vernon G. Schultz	30,339
Alex Born & Sons	26,007
John L. Gadberry	25,995
Total payees in county (5)	152,172

LIVE OAK COUNTY

Fred Thoms	31,388

LUBBOCK COUNTY

William E. Armstrong	102,222
Dulaney Bros	91,353
Standefer-Gray, Inc	76,170
L. L. Lawson	72,560
James F. Davis, Jr	66,801
A. L. Cone	66,709
J. Carter Caldwell	64,398
Coyne E. Killian	60,845
R. E. Jones	59,560
Billy J. Robbins	57,022
George Oliver Jackson	55,391
Medlock Farms, Inc	51,727
John M. Clark	51,401
McFarling & Clark	51,200
Kirby Hobgood	50,922
Wendell D. Vardeman	50,310
Fred E. McNabb	50,075
Elijah M. Debusk	50,027
George A. Taylor, Jr	49,759
M. B.-R. B. Stanton Pts	49,296
Joe B. Lovelace	48,917
J. W. Furgeson	48,452
Howard L. Alford	47,437
Walter O. Heinrich	46,976
J. W. Shadden	46,604
Graham C. Holmes	46,425
Davis & Son Pts	45,902
Greenlee Farms	44,946
The Dunlap Co	44,831
B. J. Hutcheson	44,795
San Augstine Ranch	43,791
Jay Stanton	41,395
Hugh V. Newton	41,190
George H. Harlan	40,145
J. C. Heinrich	40,065
Clifford Hamilton	39,870
Leroy Grawunder	39,257
Edward S. Smith, Jr	38,721
Morris S. Smith	37,946
Johnnie Joiner	37,936
O. B. Chesshir	36,233
L. T. Foster	35,628
Max Barnett	$35,473
C. W. Teal	35,450
Doyce Middlebrook	35,363
Weldon M. Boyd	34,944
Medlock Inv. Co., Inc	34,546
Ferman R. Priddy	34,409
Sam A. Durham	34,244
Roy Hugh McKelvy	34,133
Frank W. Hancock	33,980
A. B. Enloe, Jr	33,375
Luther Lawson	33,334
Charles W. Wood	33,122
Davies & Davies	32,811
Debusk Enterprises, Inc	32,618
Clayton E. Enger	32,578
Herschel V. Newman	32,399
Farm Enterprises, Inc	32,185
Robert Melcher	32,027
R. W. Woodruff	31,944
Billy Meyers	31,807
Buddy Hettler	31,577
Weldon Ferguson	31,458
Alton L. Lawson	31,349
Albert C. Henderson	30,497
Sid Capshaw	30,349
Wienke Bros	29,628
Smith Brothers	29,465
Fred D. Bradshaw	29,350
John T. Patterson	28,782
Smith Keller	28,755
David S. Enger	28,252
Omer D. Lindsey	28,029
Edward Moseley	27,913
Bobby B. Jones	27,867
Felix H. Macha	27,843
Raymond R. Marshall	27,833
Valton V. Cox	27,651
Olan K. Dorsett, Jr	27,524
Gilbert H. Ragland	27,441
Willie C. Neel	27,392
Chester B. Gilmore	27,250
W. A. Bill Alspaugh	27,217
B. B. Hobgood	27,042
France Baker	26,851
Luther C. Childers, Jr	26,752
James T. McMenamy	26,706
Earl Reasoner	26,492
J. & J. Farms	26,489
William V. Halford	26,288
I. Arnold Chauncey	26,171
Roy C. Clark	25,858
Harold Campbell	25,693
Bennie L. James	25,662
Brodie A. Darby	25,556
Bruce Isom	25,525
John B. Lamb	25,367
Ward W. Carroll	25,336
Billy Bryan Boyd	25,210
Glen B. Payne	25,199
William B. Criswell	25,094
J. Frank Jones	25,077
Paul E. Crosnoe, Jr	25,046
Charles R. Hedges	25,024
Total payees in county (105)	4,011,812

LYNN COUNTY

Cass Edwards, II	89,341
W. C. Huffaker, Jr	76,070
Heirs Edwards, EST	54,439
Cecil Dorman	48,426
Wm. G. Lumsden	47,813
L. C. Unfred	47,546
Billy G. Gardenhire	40,757
C. T. Ingle	40,606
Dallas Vaughn	37,870
R. L. Thomas	37,811
Clarence Church	36,777
L. H. Nettles	36,113
Lynn West	35,722
R. L. Dulin	34,665
C. E. Roper	34,377
W. T. Kidwell	34,167
Charles Schniers	34,048
Natt Park	33,599
O. R. Phifer, Jr	32,838
J. T. Forbes	32,489
Carl Sanders	32,307
L. M. Mires, Jr	31,591
Othell Meeks	31,343
Jim Bob Smith	$31,252
J. Weldon Martin	30,893
Kenneth Davies	30,412
R. L. Warren	30,406
Oscar Lowrey	30,133
C. L. Mason	29,883
Draper and Sons Ptrshp	29,158
C. E. Thetford	29,024
C. A. Moore	28,629
Wayland F. Taylor	28,617
A. P. Edwards	28,420
Ray Cook	28,319
James A. Evans	28,090
Bryan Wright	27,635
David L. Hill	27,076
Wayne Carroll	26,981
Guy Bennett	26,863
W. E. Singleton, Jr	26,562
D. J. Bessire	26,066
Jack Webb	25,887
Charles Oliver	25,448
Weldon Bailey	25,394
Willis Pennington	25,368
Total payees in county (46)	1,607,231

MARTIN COUNTY

Glen Cox	61,613
A. C. Woodward	58,529
Eddie C. Cook	38,043
Woody Brothers	36,413
Holcomb Farms	34,414
L. D. Freeman, Jr	34,356
Billy Fryar	34,257
James Newman Biggs	34,218
James Ernest Franklin	30,984
E. & E. Farms, Inc	30,522
Raymond T. Kingsfield	29,759
Earl Vernon Hightower	29,611
Sam B. Parham	29,521
Floyd Martin	29,516
Ralph Wesley Williams	28,448
Charlie A. Nichols	26,855
Edmond Tom Ranch, Inc	26,758
John Wallace Kelly	26,171
Newell Wayne Tate	25,418
Lorenzo Freeman	25,172
Total payees in county (20)	670,578

MATAGORDA COUNTY

J. W. Jenkins, Jr	28,886
Carl M. Hansen, Jr	26,035
Total payees in county (2)	54,921

MAVERICK COUNTY

Roseta Farms	72,940
Jack Keisling	37,655
Total payees in county (2)	110,595

MCLENNAN COUNTY

James M. Warner	61,046
J. Weldon Youngblood	55,576
Jim Radle	29,398
C. M. Freeman	27,838
Total payees in county (4)	173,858

MIDLAND COUNTY

Alan Spinks	44,930
Eugene F. Jones	40,998
Ervin A. Baumann	34,102
Total payees in county (3)	120,030

MILAM COUNTY

Daniel D. McDaniel	83,120
Cobb Bros	59,681
Walter Pyle	41,949
Wilburn E. Beckhusen	34,361
Darrel Cobb	34,194

Mesa Cattle Co	$27,272
W. & Culpepper Est	25,897
Pete C. Gibson Jr	25,126
Total payees in county (8)	331,600

MITCHELL COUNTY

A. K. McCarley, Jr	41,308
Travis P. Turner	40,070
Chas N. Stubblefield	33,101
D. M. Smith	31,194
A. Preston Morris	30,786
W. H. Narrell	29,568
L. A. Browne	28,807
Raymond Watlington	27,357
Harold Hester	25,328
Warren Anderson	25,172
Total payees in county (10)	312,691

MOORE COUNTY

Marshall Cator	63,799
Morris L. Hunt	61,631
Joe Friemel	61,102
Schuman Farm, Inc	57,051
Wells Agricultural Corp	56,617
Gordon Taylor	51,541
Clearview Farms	50,269
Gossetts, Inc	48,571
Verdie & Lloyd Beauchamp	47,984
J. W. Huff	46,696
Stringer Farms, Inc	43,118
Rex Hall, Jr	43,103
Jesse C. Cooper	38,319
Jimmy C. Stokes	36,868
Edward M. Stallwitz	36,756
Jessie Glynn Burnett	36,632
Edward L. Stallwitz	36,398
McMurry Farms, Inc	36,149
H. D. Lewis	36,109
Linda & Howard Moore	35,720
Thomas E. Harbert	35,017
Arthur B. Stavlo	34,786
D. Rex Langley	34,682
Carl Beauchamp	33,625
W. M. Toliver	33,159
E. C. Britain, Jr	33,145
A. J. Harris	32,811
Harold N. Keisling	32,726
Frank Woods	32,593
Jack H. Mills	32,433
John H. Goodwin	32,384
Thurman E. Fisher	32,175
Lacy Meek	30,866
Dale M. Coleman	30,384
Claude Johnson & Son	30,370
Jerry B. Keith	30,249
Johnny M. Goodwin	28,637
Delmer W. Keisling	27,409
Robert J. Ownbey, Est	25,739
J. E. Bright	25,198
David McClellan	25,111
Total payees in county (41)	1,577,932

MOTLEY COUNTY

Claudie A. Matney	30,246

NAVARRO COUNTY

Fortson Farms	54,191
Drew Gillen	45,355
W. C. Adams	38,715
Webb Armstrong	33,009
William F. Mahoney	31,291
Bancroft Brothers	29,310
James Fortson	25,603
Total payees in county (7)	257,474

NOLAN COUNTY

D. S. Riggs	45,077
Philip V. Haynes	38,648
Ronda H. Whorton	37,840
Clifford C. Etheredge	35,616
Clyde H. Ater	33,665
Max Wright	$33,210
Joe G. Williams	31,200
Homer L. McLeod	30,799
Herbert L. Williams	30,505
J. B. Cooper, Jr	29,922
Lawlis Y. Sipe	27,552
T. D. Young	25,705
Total payees in county (12)	399,739

NUECES COUNTY

Walter Mattiza, Est	57,813
C. A. Lowman	51,326
W. E. Scarborough	42,688
W. W. Walton, Jr	39,760
Mack B. Norris	35,672
Hale & Hale	35,194
Harlan Bros	34,945
Caldwell Cattle Co	33,477
Driscoll Foundation	32,573
Alvin McNair	30,798
W. M. Bevly	30,112
W. M. Bevly, Jr	29,761
J. C. Mayo	29,400
Frank Moravek, Jr	27,818
R. L. Garrett	27,696
Mrs. H. C. Crook	26,360
Randy Farenthold	26,215
Wm. S. Gandy, Jr	25,064
Total payees in county (18)	616,672

OCHILTREE COUNTY

Earl Leslie	41,571
Jewell Pearson	29,680
Charles Morton Share Trust	27,413
Philo Butler and Son	26,084
Bob Urban	25,637
Total payees in county (5)	150,385

OLDHAM COUNTY

George B. Doshier	77,973
Herman Grusing	56,425
Vega Land Cattle Co., Inc	41,619
E. Duane Allred	36,323
Charles B. Short	36,150
Taylor Brothers	35,135
Roy Taylor	32,317
B. F. W. Grain Co., Inc	31,043
James Voyles	26,765
J. E. Davis & Sons	26,056
Total payees in county (10)	399,806

PARMER COUNTY

Clarence Martin	145,722
Ranza Boggess	94,120
Bruce Parr	86,881
J. C. Mills	74,944
Sloan Osborn	65,503
Dave M. Thompson	64,557
James W. Dixon	64,045
W. O. Chadwick	58,914
Fangman Farms, Inc	57,856
Verney Towns	56,087
Glenn Phillips	53,964
J. T. Ford	53,404
Walter R. Mabry	52,545
Roscoe Q. Silverthorne	51,522
J. D. Kirkpatrick	51,158
Van E. Nichols	50,320
Thomas L. Whaley	50,063
Keith Garner	48,471
Edward D. Chitwood, Jr	47,830
John Renner	45,511
Clawson Bldg. Co	45,188
James W. Barnett	44,842
Tom Caldwell	44,743
R. J. Renner, Jr	43,032
O. E. Williamson	43,012
James Readheimer	42,978
Edwinston Clark	42,710
Floyd T. Dyer	42,298
J. G. McFarland	41,805
Voges & Reisiger	41,598
Jack Moseley	$41,377
Robert G. Sparks	40,700
Melborn C. Jones	40,644
David W. Grimsley	40,276
Leonard L. Grissom	40,012
A. Dargin Kirk	39,258
Raymond K. Schueler	39,241
T. F. Taylor	38,179
Vernon C. Willard	38,020
John E. Bingham	37,546
Wyle M. Bullock	37,523
Gene Smith	37,475
Curtis W. Murphree	37,103
Herman D. Geries	37,073
John L. Ray	36,582
J. T. Mayfield	35,182
Joe F. Blair	35,171
M. A. Black	35,011
Thomas D. Ware	34,959
C. V. Potts	34,823
Thomas N. Browning	34,524
Billy J. Thorn	34,100
Ralph W. Shelton	34,081
James Ensor	33,848
Don B. Sudderth	33,460
J. B. Sudderth	33,325
Arlin L. Hartzog	33,138
Robert H. Schueler	33,035
Herbert I. Howell	32,992
Melvin G. Sachs	32,947
Adolf H. Haseloff	32,667
Henry Haselof	32,271
A. O. Dickson	32,200
Alphonse L. Reznik	32,178
David H. Carson	32,133
Richard & Jerry London	32,080
Eulynn G. Phipps	31,691
R. W. Jones	31,604
Richard B. Vaughn	31,602
D. E. Richards	31,266
Thomas W. Beauchamp	31,214
Gilbert A. Kaltwasser	30,978
John C. Miller	30,906
J. E. Knight	30,885
Jim R. Daniel	30,855
Grady W. Sorley	30,722
Gilbert E. Wenner	30,487
Bill W. Carthel	30,022
William L. Lee	30,006
Walter D. Howard, Jr	29,824
Donald Christian	29,473
Louis L. Welch	29,457
Billy L. Marshall	29,258
Marston G. Mars	29,091
Dalton K. Caffey	29,060
Lawrence Jamerson	29,041
Marion H. Carson	28,998
Eulan A. Parham	28,978
Troy Christian	28,708
J. H. Dunbar	28,202
Charles E. Trimble	28,157
Walter R. Riethmayer	28,051
Jimmie Heard	27,951
Herbert L. Schueler	27,802
Fred W. Foster	27,659
Elvin O. Johnston	27,640
Dean MacCallum	37,536
Roland D. Dale	27,262
Virgil Young	27,001
Durward K. Bell	26,967
John W. Hand	26,960
Clarence A. Johnson	26,544
A. W. Anthony Jr	26,429
Amos E. Steelman	26,350
John F. Dixon	26,348
John W. Littlefield	26,242
Russell D. Smith	25,921
Orbra A. Cole	25,819
Deon Awtrey	25,815
Royce G. Welch	25,796
James M. Procter	25,662
Ellis W. Tatum	25,491
Don Williams	25,250
Odell Cole	25,052
Billy E. Bourlon	25,049
Max C. Crim	25,035
Total payees in county (116)	4,402,874

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

PECOS COUNTY

Coyanosa Farms	$143,993
Belding Farms Inc	117,209
C and C Farms	110,372
Elvin Crow	108,758
Ranches of the SW	100,025
David C. McAteer	95,920
A. B. Foster	90,268
Albert J. Hoelscher	72,270
Mike A. Burkholder	69,570
Trans Pecos Farms, Inc	67,269
Ralph C. Dickson	63,227
Harrell and Harrell	51,513
Lakeside Farms	51,212
Melvin H. Mc Kinney	49,819
Luther C. Holladay	45,143
W. H. Riley III	42,728
Harral and Marable	39,405
Glen J. Ellis	37,687
Lelan D. Haren	31,778
S. F. Williams, Jr	31,702
Virgil W. Massingill	30,152
Harlan Black	30,130
Marshall G. Nevill	29,967
Gilbert J. Moore, Jr	28,932
Carpenter Farms, Inc	28,356
Total payees in county (25)	1,567,405

POTTER COUNTY

C. B. Emeny	48,237
E. B. Fite	34,457
G. A. Burrell	28,425
A. B. Bingham	25,971
Total payees in county (4)	137,090

PRESIDIO COUNTY

Valley Farms Co	48,822
Charles Spencer	40,296
Total payees in county (2)	89,118

RANDALL COUNTY

Simon G. Elliott	50,108
Earnest L. Barnett	48,862
Robert C. Sims & Sons	47,833
Jack R. C. Vincent	45,825
Paul Schniederjan	45,198
Fred Fegel	43,650
Eldon Durrett Trusts	42,876
Johnny Sluder	42,115
Clinton Glenn	41,480
Vernon Andrus	41,360
John A. Williams	35,540
Tom Henry	35,248
Pete E. Fischbacher	34,948
Math Albracht & Sons	34,609
Robert W. Foster, est	33,548
D. L. Allison	33,527
Gilbert Irlbeck	33,423
John L. Butler	32,725
Walter A. Graham	31,555
Albert F. Fischbacher, Jr	30,108
W. T. Smoot, Jr	29,792
Ross Elliott	29,680
McRoberts & Jacobsen Bros	28,777
John E. Frost	28,247
Charles Wright	28,027
Howard Fuqua	27,955
Leo Zimmerer	27,943
Kuehler Farms	27,931
Gary Wagner	27,524
John F. Robinson	27,018
F. S. Strohmeyer	26,414
David K. McGehee	26,185
Total payees in county (32)	1,120,031

REAGEN COUNTY

Alfred J. Schwartz	25,082

RED RIVER COUNTY

Barlow & Willis Planting Co	$40,588
First American Farm Inc	35,945
Doug Alsobrook	27,477
Total payees in county (3)	104,010

REEVES COUNTY

Worsham Bros	222,487
Kenneth Lindemann	170,334
Kesey Bros	151,294
Clark and Roberts	144,458
W. A. Sullivan	128,375
Smallwood Farms	107,664
Cedarville Corp	104,447
Lattner and Mills	101,834
Reetex Farms	99,582
W. W. Hill	93,428
Winterrowd Bros	92,045
Joe Lee McMahon	88,883
W. W. Clem	85,959
Loy Kilgore	85,190
Rowe and Turnbough	82,628
Frank Bounds	77,463
Raymond Beauchamp	73,935
G. G. Passmore	70,975
T. J. Wilson	66,866
Davidson Bros	65,468
Tom Passmore	65,000
J. W. Bryan	62,817
Broyles Pecos Farm	62,769
Weinacht Bros	54,694
David D. Davis	51,890
Coy Fraley	51,546
Dale Toone	47,144
J. T. McKinney	46,471
Jack Duke	44,590
B. C. Kesey	44,279
William R. Ramsey	43,860
Peppy McKinney	43,814
Jerry Jenkins	42,778
H. R. Hudson, Jr	41,391
F. F. Bradley	41,054
Dingler Farms, Inc	39,860
Robert M. Owen	38,539
J. T. Moore and Son	37,812
Don Watkins	37,662
L. Barrett Johnson	37,420
W. W. Hill, W. R. Sage	36,913
Clem Crowley	35,842
Cherry Draw Co	35,286
C. S. Hess and Son	34,392
A. J. Carpenter	33,931
J. F. Crews	33,385
B. V. Shaw	33,279
Herbert H. Toone	32,954
Charles Spence	31,471
Ronald Miller	31,284
Chocolate Flats Farm Co	30,952
Roy Blahosky	30,457
Metz Rowe	29,535
James L. Sears	29,498
Cherry Creek Farm	29,481
Ennis B. Tudor	28,968
Jack Davis	28,685
Hermosa Farms, Inc	28,305
Robert G. Davis	28,273
Kenneth Staniford	28,252
Bettye W. Ivey	27,762
J. B. Hopkins	27,607
W. B. Evans	27,013
Richard Hoefs	26,181
James C. Passmore	25,972
Duncan Farms, Inc	25,396
McKinney and Taylor	25,257
Evans Butler	25,082
Total payees in county (68)	3,890,118

REFUGIO COUNTY

Wright Bros. Farms	37,960
Voges and Boenig	35,378
Hartmann Farms	32,166
T. G. and R. L. Jackson	31,145
G. H. Frazier	30,143
J. M. Tatton	27,670
J. C. Ermis	27,483
Charles J. Schindler	$26,709
W. F. Abney	25,871
Total payees in county (9)	274,525

ROBERTS COUNTY

W. R. Holland	36,174

ROBERTSON COUNTY

James H. Jones	110,069
John W. Nigliazzo	96,650
Vence Corpora	95,331
Goodland Farms, Inc	93,909
Anthony Denena & Son	91,640
William P. Scamardo	90,733
Joe Reistino, Jr	75,088
John C. Reistino	67,687
Sam Degelia, Sr	61,586
Louis Muse	57,349
Ned Fachorn	55,363
Barton Farms	53,386
Joe Reistino	51,093
Fred J. Ferrara	49,296
Thomas D. Wilson	48,281
Gathan Reistino	48,042
Joe Scarpinato	45,879
J. W. Foster, Jr	42,657
Anthony L. Scamardo	38,056
A. M. Lampson	36,997
Pete L. Scamardo	36,862
Pauline Doremus	35,903
Ross Cash	34,100
Sam Destefano	33,909
3 D Farm & Ranch	33,374
N. R. Lutz	33,172
A. H. Judkins	32,819
Frank Sam Loria	30,418
James & Tony Cortemelia	30,288
Frank Destefano	29,482
Ben Perrone	29,482
Frank B. Seale Est	29,179
Rose F. Denena	29,019
Luke Scamardo	27,841
Carl Cotropia	26,627
Sam Morello	26,367
Charlie P. Briggs III	25,860
Total payees in county (37)	1,833,794

ROCKWALL COUNTY

Glynn Dodson	43,179
A. R. Seabolt, Jr	38,118
Henry Zollner	37,397
Total payees in county (3)	118,694

RUNNELS COUNTY

Bennie W. Wilde	29,865

RUSK COUNTY

Otho Morris	36,963

SAN PATRICIO COUNTY

Vahlsing Christina Corp	142,088
Heirs of Jos. F. Green	79,493
Williams & Burkhardt	75,353
R. E. Hart	65,694
Charles H. Mayo	63,223
McKamey Farms	57,532
Floyd Webb Jr	55,460
H. G. Ritchie Jr	49,102
Chester B. Brittain	37,977
Floerke Bros	37,274
H. G. Ritchie Est	37,250
R. C. Dillon	36,785
Thomas Ardel Setliff	33,897
W. L. Shelburne Jr	33,740
W. C. McDaniel	33,553
Daniel P. Moore	33,196
Howard H. Webb	29,008
L. T. Porter	27,951
C. P. Rosson Jr	27,282
Adams Brothers	26,881
Edwin C. McDaniel	26,467
Dave Odem	25,851
W. O. Hart	25,778
George J. Ermis	25,685

Bevly Bros	$25,083
Total payees in county (25)	1,111,603

SCURRY COUNTY

Billy Huddleston	50,868
J. B. Autry	36,317
Clements Bros	32,824
C. A. Daugherty	29,433
Emil Schattel, Est	26,620
Henry G. Gafford	25,216
Total payees in county (6)	201,278

SHERMAN COUNTY

McClellan & McClellan	68,102
Paul Hays	66,928
Ezra F. Fisk	57,989
R. M. Buckles, Ind. Exec	49,708
R. M. Buckles	45,814
Wood, B. Craig	44,718
Jack Heil	43,880
Cartrite Bros	43,538
William R. Murrel	41,463
Morris & Morr, Inc	37,725
Dietrich & Gurley	33,364
Frank Berry, Jr	33,018
Judd Cattle Co	32,587
Huber R. Tillery	31,564
Carter & Wegner	31,429
Vance B. Morris	31,100
Monroe Bros	29,799
Dick Diehl	29,226
Roy Browder	28,075
Leroy Robinson	27,960
Mrs. Latimer Murfee	27,817
Wallace Corse	27,692
Arnold B. Morris	26,688
Pat Holt	26,621
Sam R. Cluck	26,555
Verne W. Foreman	26,400
H. D. Meil	26,357
Bill & Glenn Reed	26,308
Elmo Fortenberry	26,139
W. L. Price	25,491
Total payees in county (30)	1,074,055

STARR COUNTY

Charles Roos, III	128,983
Valley Onions, Inc	73,994
Starr Produce Farm Acct	66,251
John Fish	57,309
H. L. Conger	43,695
La Casita Farms, Inc	40,347
E & S Farms	37,956
R. S. Margo	27,571
Total payees in county (8)	476,106

SWISHER COUNTY

Fowler E. McDaniel	160,849
Warner Reid	109,374
B. Raymond Evans	92,096
Miller Farms Company	86,462
Grady Shepard	73,058
Devin, Devin & Patterson	64,346
J. L. Francis	63,672
Tyline N. Perry	60,619
Lloyd M. Hale	60,311
S. A. Barrett	59,557
Hinton Brothers	55,393
Corliss H. Currie	51,547
L. G. Mahagan	50,352
Jack G. Foster	49,283
Lloyd Glenn	46,486
Craig Silverthorne	44,718
James Cruce	44,219
Tye & Son	43,846
James W. Cox	43,602
Emily Holmes	43,451
Buck Garrett	42,472
Jack D. Loring	41,565
Wylie A. Byrd	41,155
M. T. Glenn	40,308
Morgan Sturgess	39,754
Larry Nelson	$38,764
H. O. Thompson	38,522
Andrew Price	38,488
Allen Glenn	38,401
Otis Harman	38,209
Lonnie G. Todd	37,094
John Spilman	36,370
Daryl R. Dixon	36,283
A. B. Raymond	35,998
Street Brothers	35,516
R. H. Gayler	35,485
Carl M. Weathers	35,320
James Vineyard	35,036
Nelson Borchardt	35,005
Jim Doan	34,792
H. T. Copeland	34,537
Boyd & Boyd	34,147
Hoyet Burnam	34,059
Cone W. Johnson	33,566
Jack Middleton	33,066
Victor L. Harman	32,688
Doris L. Boston	32,572
Dr. Wm. B. Childress	32,338
Leroy & Hulan Hill	32,269
Harley L./Gene King	32,154
Curtis Latham	31,555
Delbert L. Devin	30,288
A. Emmet Pittman	29,709
R. W. McClure	29,217
Graham Brothers	29,045
L. F. Campbell	28,979
Billy W. Evans	28,808
Frank Bass	28,641
Ray Reiss	28,510
Don A. Nelson	28,426
Jake Jones	28,401
Victor Martin	28,320
Claude F. Harris	28,201
T. M. Lawson	28,063
Robert K. Brooks	27,893
Harold Ray Caraway	27,524
F. J. & David Burgess	27,458
Dayle Culwell	27,437
L. L. Armor	27,225
John Hays	27,017
John N. Simpson, Jr	27,013
T. L. Abernathy, Jr	26,902
O. H. Olson	26,811
Paul N. Irlbeck	26,696
Burle D. Byrd	26,520
W. Leroy Roberts	26,270
Leo W. Foster	26,050
Melvin D. Jennings	26,029
Holland & Sons	26,001
Glenn Jolly	25,992
Copus O. Boyd	25,726
Kathryn M. Benefield	25,612
Glenn Terrell	25,441
B. J. Holland	25,307
Total payees in county (84)	3,326,261

TERRY COUNTY

Howard Hurd	77,965
Muldrow Farms	70,834
Milton Addison	64,771
Bonard Stice	63,650
W. A. Fulford	62,943
Charlie Caswell	53,269
Graham Swain	53,257
Olane Caswell	52,678
Norman Caswell	48,938
H. L. King	47,624
Doyle Moss	46,334
Carter Farms, Inc	45,895
W. C. Cabe	45,854
Robert Beasley	45,313
Keith Vandivere	42,241
Troy Phillips	41,698
G. M. Newsom	41,628
W. M. Hunter	41,626
Don C. Day	39,785
Art W. Adair	38,859
Don C. Day	39,875
Kenneth Purtell	38,833
Davis Beasley	38,684
Odell L. Lowe	38,441
Val Garner	37,569
Tatum Est & Freddie Tatum	37,342
L. L. Banta	37,238
T. T. T. T. & L	$37,026
Foster Gin Fm	36,557
M. E. Hinson	36,318
Melton Briscoe, Jr	35,967
Robert Baumgardner	35,283
D. A. Kelly	35,209
D. S. Carroll	34,854
L. T. Hawkins	34,584
Cletus Floyd	34,572
Clarence Faught	34,309
Joe Joplin	33,483
Homer C. Hinson	32,924
Mack Wilmeth	32,474
N. R. Marchbanks, Jr	32,250
Charles Ray Smith	32,233
Tom Adams	32,049
Billy McCallister	31,929
James G. Davis	31,650
David Turnbough	31,429
Jess McWherter	31,088
Frank Ratliff, Jr	31,030
C. A. Winn	30,634
Bill W. Blackstock	30,315
R. R. McNeil	30,109
Rufus Dill	30,071
R. D. Jones, Jr	29,375
Thurman Skains	28,483
Elmo Adair	28,232
G. I. Sims	28,146
M. H. Wagner	27,971
Truman Hayes	27,744
C. R. Farrar	27,460
Billy Timmons	27,258
Donald Hancock	27,188
Russell Hendricks	27,186
J. C. Chambers	27,063
R. O. Webb	26,823
W. Wayne Lewis	26,718
R. L. Burnett	26,568
James J. Martin	26,501
G. W. Dill	26,374
George Weiss	26,312
C. J. Fails, Jr	26,243
Homer C. Barron	26,155
J. V. Riley	26,033
Billy R. Jones	26,018
Brown Farms	25,710
George Kempson	25,575
Billy H. Wilson	25,389
Jack Purtell	25,348
S. M. Dill	25,323
Merlin Speed	25,124
Total payees in county (79)	2,842,868

THROCKMORTON COUNTY

Francis D. Hamilton, Jr	27,000

TOM GREEN COUNTY

B. R. Weatherford	26,663
Edwin J. Wilde	26,600
Total payees in county (2)	53,263

TRAVIS COUNTY

Wilburn Burklund	26,520

VAN ZANDT COUNTY

Thurman J. Miles	27,346

WALKER COUNTY

Texas Dept. of Corr	82,155

WEBB COUNTY

Palafox Exp. Co	25,192

WHARTON COUNTY

W. D. McMillan	32,694
Robert D. Williams	28,993
Wendel Inc	28,517
Nilson Farms	26,905
Total payees in county (4)	117,109

WHEELER COUNTY

J. M. Tindall	36,288

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Texas—Con.

WILBARGER COUNTY

W. T. Waggoner Trust Est	$139,651
John H. Turner	34,023
Robert H. Belew	25,433
Total payees in county (3)	199,107

WILLACY COUNTY

Daniel Gustafson	73,392
K. L. & D. E. Morrow Ptns	67,061
Alazan Farms	61,059
Funk Farms, Inc	60,609
S. & S. Seed	58,892
B. W. Kirsch	51,667
O. L. & James Whitfield	46,831
Alden Johnson	46,099
Funk Brothers	45,680
Adele M. Schmidt	45,310
Wayne Labar	39,654
Chester A. Johnson	38,986
Emil B. Lagerstam, Jr	35,314
W. Don Stone	34,612
A. C. Durivage	31,591
Swanberg Twins	31,108
Lewis A. Oaks	28,420
W. M. Dreyer	27,823
G. M. & C. Ring	27,018
Total payees in county (19)	851,126

WILLIAMSON COUNTY

Stiles Farm Foundation	47,928
Telander Bros	29,118
Total payees in county (2)	77,046

YOAKUM COUNTY

Wheeler Robertson	63,507
Olen Edwards	55,517
R. G. Hartman	44,105
Don & Max Hawthorne	42,241
Alvin Joiner	37,466
Russell S. Faulkenberry	37,033
Truett F. Jones	36,387
Darwin Hobbs	33,387
Louis Eubanks	33,207
James W. Warren	31,984
Robert A. Long	31,685
Rayford E. Bearden	31,134
C. C. Perkins	30,144
W. R. Nelson	29,431
Morris Lowe	27,787
K. Lanse Turner	27,634
T. A. Elmore	27,089
Tom Warren, Jr	27,058
W. M. Nelson	26,798
Kent Welch	26,699
T. Edward Smith	25,708
Earl Kiser	25,236
Total payees in county (22)	751,237

ZAPATA COUNTY

Ralph Hinkle	25,258

ZAVALA COUNTY

Norment Foley	100,836
Leslie H. Laffere	60,945
Ritchie Bros	49,222
Evans-Wortham	46,066
Newden Farm	31,515
Batesville Farming	27,036
Malcolm A. Maedgen, Jr	26,560
Hardin Farm	25,019
Total payees in county (8)	367,199
Total payees in State (2,460)	100,348,765

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Utah

BOX ELDER COUNTY

D. Rigby Family Partnership	$41,101
Delbert Holmgren	31,296
Laurence G. Whitney	25,164
Dennis Petersen	25,142
Total payees in county (4)	122,703

UTAH COUNTY

Garn Holbrook	29,872

WASHINGTON COUNTY

E. J. Graff	59,898
Total payees in State (6)	212,473

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Virginia

SOUTHAMPTON COUNTY

C. E. Moore	$30,125

VIRGINIA BEACH COUNTY

Frank T. Williams	45,797
Malbon Brothers	36,737
Total payees in county (2)	82,534
Total payees in State (3)	112,659

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Washington

ADAMS COUNTY

Leonard & Henry Franz	$81,156
D. E. Phillips	73,400
Donald Damon Est	66,141
Richard L. Kagele	55,551
Robert V. Phillips	49,764
Ralph Gering & Sons	49,272
Hutterian Brethren, Inc	49,099
Robert A. Franz	47,727
Arthur Johnson	34,497
J. Boyd Phillips	32,425
Rex T. Lyle	30,166
Elwyn Lyle	30,166
Gene Kagele	30,145
Dwayne Blankenship	28,646
Melvin L. Kleweno Est	28,302
Nick Selvers, Jr	27,209
Walter E. Franz	27,760
Baumann Farm, Inc	27,551
Williams and Williams	27,255
Gilbert Brothers	26,691
Total payees in county (20)	822,923

BENTON COUNTY

Bi County Farms	55,206
Vollmer-Bayne	47,028
Gould Brothers	37,596
Bateman Bros	35,079
Horrigan Inv. Co	33,619
Wirth Brothers	32,998
Horrigan Farms	32,966
Emerson L. Eby	28,490
Total payees in county (8)	302,982

COLUMBIA COUNTY

Broughton Land Co	141,688
Mead Ranch	33,173
Wilfred Thorn	29,958
Eslick Farms	28,746
Dallas W. Long	27,849
Ferrell & Luvaas	25,934
R. F. Young	25,176
Total payees in county (7)	312,524

DOUGLAS COUNTY

State of Wa	$171,781
Ben Nelson	31,188
Russell Hunt	30,109
Loebsack & Sons	28,053
Josh Barnes & Son	25,531
Total payees in county (5)	286,662

FRANKLIN COUNTY

Herron Bros	45,777
J. H. Klundt & Sons	31,389
Melvin Moore and Sons	29,766
Kenneth Owsley	28,402
Harold Thompson	26,244
Total payees in county (5)	161,578

GARFIELD COUNTY

Geo. D. Brown—Sons	48,772
Klaveano Ranches, Inc	36,458
John and Herman Herres	30,260
John E. Elsensohn	29,594
Wayne Beale	26,249
Total payees in county (5)	171,333

GRANT COUNTY

David Stevens	51,073
Lourence Dormaier	40,982
Kelley Brothers	35,835
Harold Isaak	32,327
Higginbotham Brothers	30,912
Paul H. Landis	28,494
Total payees in county (6)	219,623

KLICKITAT COUNTY

Robert Imrie	32,579
Robert Andrews	29,062
Total payees in county (2)	61,641

LINCOLN COUNTY

The Sheffels Co., Inc	58,124
Tanke Farms, Inc	37,827
Timmco, Inc	34,480
L. Sheffels & Son, Inc	31,048
George H. Ellis	30,578
Carl E. & George W. Mielke /P/	29,630
Rockdale Farms /P/	29,194
A. Bodeau and Sons	29,040
S. and E. Barr Ranch	27,495
Wilbur Security Co	27,445
Pfeifer Brothers /P/	26,053
Total payees in county (11)	360,914

SPOKANE COUNTY

Osborne Belsby	41,286
Bell & Bell, Inc	30,005
Cornwall Farms	26,030
Total payees in county (3)	97,321

WALLA WALLA COUNTY

Grote Farms, Inc	56,980
Kent Land Co., Inc	53,132
Robison L and L Co	44,775
Kenneth Smith	41,723
John H. Rea	39,001
Dwelley Jones	38,936
Twain Bodmer	36,512
Matt Lyons	32,262
Schwerin Farms, Inc	30,644
Foundation Farm, Inc	30,623
Fred Sherry	30,410
John E. Hair	29,630
Gar Ran, Inc	28,304
Robert E. Anderson	27,620
Emeral Duncan	27,298
Henry V. Zuger	27,214
Tucker Farms, Inc	26,701
Harold V. Gorham	26,446

Houstan H. Marshall	$26,075
Martin Farms, Inc	25,750
Total payees in county (20)	680,036

WHITMAN COUNTY

Glen Miller	123,532
McGregor Land & Livestock Co	73,930
Dippel Bros	49,207
Harold Boyd	42,946
Urgel Bell	36,779
John G. Schlomer	36,419
Bennett Land Co	33,689
Boyd & Sons	32,705
Clarks Farms % Asa Clark	31,012
Jackson W. Smith, Inc	31,007
Maley Land & Livestock Co. % AR	29,627
Carl Boyd	29,313
James R. Davis	29,216
Richard E. Despain	29,077
R. Paul Cocking	28,781
Ira Scott	28,767
Glorfield Bros., Jack & Benny	28,581
James Knott	28,509
Joe Myers	28,082
Robert Whitmore	27,498
E. C. Hay & Sons, Inc	25,793
William H. Evans	25,763
Dan Hood	25,603
Henry Fisher	25,180
Filan Bros	25,173
Palouse Grasslands, Inc	25,056
Total payees in county (26)	931,245

YAKIMA COUNTY

Ralph Mains	29,772
Harold R. Clayton	28,998
F. T. Gamble	26,606
Total payees in county (3)	85,376
Total payees in State (121)	4,494,158

1969 ASCS program payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Wisconsin

COLUMBIA COUNTY

Fall River Farms, Inc	$25,690

DANE COUNTY

Stoughton Farms	42,916
William F. Renk and Sons Inc	35,497
Vasby Farms	28,621
Total payees in county (3)	107,034

DODGE COUNTY

Willard Nehls	47,223

FND DU LAC COUNTY

Flying Dollar Ranch	25,847

MILWAUKEE COUNTY

Norbert Verhalen	26,618

RACINE COUNTY

Charles H. Kuiper	48,187
Kenneth Vyvyan	34,390
Total payees in county (2)	82,577

ROCK COUNTY

Stuart Rahberg	43,751
K. E. Sherman	38,675
Stuart Shadel Jr	30,859
Total payees in county (3)	113,285

WAUKESHA COUNTY

Bishop Farms, Inc	32,803
Total payees in State (13)	461,077

1969 ASCS programs payments of $25,000 or more excluding price support loans and wool and sugar payments—Wyoming

CARBON COUNTY

Anderson Farms, Inc	$47,668

LARAMIE COUNTY

Leroy Goertz	26,166
Total payees in State (2)	73,834

GARY CARLSON—A TRIBUTE

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the sad duty of attending a memorial service for one of the finest young men it has been my privilege to know, Capt. Gary W. Carlson. I knew Gary as a neighbor in West Bridgewater; I saw him grow up from a youngster to a young man; I appointed him to West Point, and took added pride in his achievement there. And when he died in his country's service, it was my own personal loss as well as the Nation's.

Recently the Distinguished Service Cross, the Purple Heart, and the Bronze Star were presented posthumously to Gary, for "extraordinary heroism" and devotion to duty.

No medals can do anything to add to the luster of this man's memory among those who knew him—or knew of him. But they are a grateful Nation's only means of expressing its profound appreciation for what Gary Carlson was, and what he did. And so I am proud to place in the RECORD a story from the Brockton Enterprise about Capt. Gary Carlson. I trust that his example of courage and patriotism will serve as an example and an inspiration to others.

The article follows:

WEST BRIDGEWATER HERO POSTHUMOUSLY AWARDED NATION'S SECOND HIGHEST MEDAL

WEST POINT, N.Y.—The Distinguished Service Cross, the nation's second highest award for combat heroism, was recently presented posthumously to Capt. Gary W. Carlson of West Bridgewater, in ceremonies held at the U.S. Military Academy.

Accepting the award were his wife, Mrs. Dhana Carlson, daughter, Jennifer, and Mr. and Mrs. Carl Carlson of 491 West St., West Bridgewater.

Also awarded were the Purple Heart and Bronze Star Medals.

Capt. Carlson, a 1967 graduate of the academy, was killed in action in Vietnam in June, 1969. At that time he was a Troop Commander for Troop C, 3rd Squadron, 4th Cavalry, 25th Infantry Div.

A portion of the citation accompanying the award read: "When the troop came under fire from a well-concealed enemy force, he immediately led his men in an assault on the hostile fortifications. Realizing that the crossfire was impeding the movement of his troop, he single-handedly assaulted and destroyed the most strategic hostile position. He then directed his fire against another enemy position, silencing it with hand grenades and rifle fire. Spotting a wounded comrade lying exposed to the enemy barrage, Capt. Carlson braved the fusillade to move the man to safety. He then returned to the center of conflict to evacuate another casualty.

"As he returned to his vehicle, he was knocked to the ground by a rocket-propelled grenade which rendered his command vehicle inoperative. Braving a hail of fire to reach another vehicle, he resumed control of his troop. It was while he was directing this assault on the enemy that he was mortally wounded by enemy fire. Capt. Carlson's extraordinary heroism and devotion to duty, at the cost of his life, were in keeping with the highest traditions of the military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army."

While attending the Academy, Capt. Carlson was active in the Baptist Student Union, Pistol Club and Goat Football Team.

Carlson graduated from West Bridgewater High School in 1963. Following graduation he was appointed to West Point and graduated from the academy on June 7, 1967.

Gary was a member of the Trinity Baptist Church. He was a member of the Christian Youth Fellowship. Gary married the former Dhana Lee Kent on July 1, 1967, in the Holy Trinity Chapel at West Point. He became a father on April 8, 1969 when his daughter, Jennifer, was born.

Following his graduation from West Point Carlson was stationed at Fort Knox, Ky., and Fort Benning, Ga. In November of 1968 he was sent to Vietnam. On Sept. 14, 1969, he was honored by his townspeople at a flagpole memorial with Cong. Hastings Keith presiding.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, several million people of Byelorussian national origin will be free to celebrate the 52d anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

The Republic established freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of association, freedom of assembly, freedom of worship, freedom of economic activity, freedom of election, freedom to hold property, freedom of travel, and an independent judiciary system to continue these freedoms.

On January 1, 1919, one massive crunch of oppression mashed these freedoms and replaced a system of justice with an organization called Cheka.

Cheka's surveillance was more intense than the Russian secret police. Operating under a law that defined a new crime—potential enemy of the Soviet Government—Cheka arrested, imprisoned, tortured and murdered en masse.

The father of Cheka, Vladimir Ulyanoff—Lenin—called for the takeover of Byelorussia after which he organized the lethal police organization. On March 25, instead of celebrating independence, Byelorussians on home soil are compelled to honor officially this man who assassinated their parents.

This perversion of patriotism reminds us that the U.S.S.R. does not maintain a

benign political posture. This enforced homage reminds us to hope for the liberation of Byelorussians so they may live again under the humane provisions they asked for five decades ago.

TO PROTECT AMERICANS FROM UNWANTED JUNK MAIL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak today about intrusion—intrusion into the privacy of my life and my childrens' life and your life—intrusion into all of our lives at one time or another.

Each of us is harassed, often dozens of times in a year, by many forms of intrusion into our homes and offices—salesmen; telephone solicitors, and interviewers. But one of the most insidious, and often offensive, sources of intrusion into our lives is unsolicited commercial advertising—junk mail.

Junk mail may seem like a petty aggravation to most recipients. We look at it; we may read it or take out the coupons; then we throw it way. But such a daily aggravation, taken over a year and across a wide continent of mail-receivers turns out to be not so petty an intrusion into our lives after all.

Ask your mailman. During 1969, mailmen carried over a million tons of junk mail on their backs.

Or look in your own mailbox. In 1969, over 19.6 billion pieces of third-class mail—most of it commercial advertising—were delivered to American homes and businesses. That is nearly 100 pieces of junk mail for every man, woman, and child in the United States. That is intrusion.

And it is not cheap. According to the cost ascertainment report of 1968, the Post Office Department that year lost $400,792,000 on the delivery of third-class mail—the mail that few of us want and most of us ignore.

I am introducing today a bill which would help curb this incredible flow of commercial junk mail and in so doing protect postal patrons from at least one form of annoying intrusion into their lives.

The first provision of this bill allows any postal patron to stop any specific commercial advertiser whose message he does not care to receive from continuing to mail to him. By filing a notice at the post office, the patron instructs the Postmaster General that he does not wish to receive any further mailings from a given organization organized for profit which offers for sale goods, matter, or services whose communications he may have found in any way annoying or unacceptable to himself or to him on behalf of his minor children. Upon this instruction, the Postmaster General is authorized to expressly direct the named sender of such communications to strike the patron's address from his mailing list and further, if the patron has so requested, to prohibit that sender from exchanging or selling that patron's name to any other mailer.

A second provision is even broader. By setting up a public register which mailers must consult before sending out any commercial advertising, it allows the postal patron to not only request his name be removed from the mailing list of a single advertiser, but if he wishes, from the mailing lists of all commercial advertisers.

The third provision of the bill I am introducing today establishes yet another form of protection against intrusion of junk mailers into the privacy of a postal patron's life—protection from having his name and address, individually or as part of a mailing list, sold for profit unless he has specifically authorized such a sale.

I think these provisions offer a definite protection for mail receivers who find themselves harassed by an onslaught of unwanted commercial mail. But the implications of the bill for particular types of unwanted mail go beyond that.

You will notice that no arbitrary qualifications have been placed on the postal patron or on his personal criteria of a given mailing's unacceptableness. By avoiding, for example, an age restriction, and any definition of or restriction to obscenity which is at best of questionable constitutionality, this bill may at last provide a truly workable law against obscene commercial mailings—to minors or adults—something which we have been seeking for many years.

This bill does not require a postal patron to justify his unwillingness to receive unsolicited commercial mail from a given source, or any source, merely to state it. It provides in law what is already being done in fact under the provisions of the 1967 Antipandering Act, where postal patrons may, by declaring they find a given mailer's communications erotically arousing or sexually provocative, instruct the Postmaster General to have their names removed from that sender's mailing list. Under the provisions of this bill, no such categorical declaration is necessary, only the decision of the postal patron that he no longer wants to receive a given type of mail—for any reason.

This bill is not designed to threaten the operations of nonprofit organizations who often depend on the privilege of sending unsolicited mail to postal patrons. Indeed, it expressly protects them. Nor should it threaten commercial operations whose communications recipients are unlikely to find unacceptable.

I urge my colleagues to consider the implications of this bill carefully. The important question of obscenity aside, because it is only a secondary target of this bill, I think this bill reestablishes a postal patron's right to the privacy of his own mailbox—to receive the nature of mail he wishes to receive, and to refuse to accept that mail which, for whatever reason he finds it objectionable, he does not wish to receive.

I am including the text of bill described above:

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to establish a procedure by which postal patrons may be relieved of the burden of receiving commercial advertisements transmitted in the mails, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 4009. Procedure for refusal by postal patrons of receipt of commercial advertisements transmitted by mail

"(a) Whoever for himself, or by his agents or assigns, mails or causes to be mailed any advertisement of an organization organized for profit which offers for sale goods, matter, or services shall be subject to an order of the Postmaster General to refrain from further mailings of such materials to designated addressees thereof if those addressees do not wish to receive such advertisements.

"(b) Upon receipt of notice from an addressee that he has received such mail matter, determined by the addressee in his sole discretion to be of the character described in subsection (a) of this section, the Postmaster General shall issue an order, if requested by the addressee, to the sender thereof, directing the sender and his agents or assign to refrain from further mailings to the named addressees.

"(c) The order of the Postmaster General shall expressly prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from making any further mailings to the designated addressees, effective on the thirteenth calendar day after receipt of the order. The order of the Postmaster General shall also direct the sender and his agents or assigns to delete immediately the names of the designated addressees from all mailing lists owned or controlled by the sender or his agents or assigns and, further, shall prohibit the sender and his agents or assigns from the sale, rental, exchange, or other transaction involving mail lists bearing the names of the designated addressees.

"(d) Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the order given under this section, he shall serve upon the sender, by registered or certified mail, a complaint stating the reasons for his belief and request that any response thereto be filed in writing with the Postmaster General within fifteen days after the date of such service. If the Postmaster General, after appropriate hearing if requested by the sender, and without a hearing if such a hearing is not requested, thereafter determines that the order given has been or is being violated, he is authorized to request the Attorney General to make application, and the Attorney General is authorized to make application, to a district court of the United States for an order directing compliance with such notice.

"(e) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which any mail matter shall have been sent or received in violation of the order provided for by this section shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to issue an order commanding compliance with such notice. Failure to observe such order may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"(f) Receipt of mail matter thirty days or more after the effective date of the order provided for by this section shall create a rebuttable presumption that such mail was sent after such effective date.

"(g) Upon request of any addressee, the order of the Postmaster General shall include the names of any of his minor children who have not attained their nineteenth birthday, and who reside with the addressee.

"(h) The provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 (relating to administrative procedure) and chapter 7 (relating to judicial review) of part I of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply to any provisions of this section.

"(i) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) mail matter, directed to a specific address covered in the order of the Postmaster General, without designation of a specific addressee thereon, shall be considered as addressed to the person named in the Postmaster General's order; and

"(2) the term 'children' includes natural children, stepchildren, adopted children, and children who are wards of or in custody of the addressee or who are living with such addressee in a regular parent-child relationship.".

(b) The table of contents of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof—

"4009. Procedure for refusal by postal patrons of receipt of commercial advertisements transmitted by mail.".

SEC. 2. (a) Chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting immediately after section 4009 thereof the following new section:

"§ 4009a. Procedure for advance notification by postal patron of desire not to receive commercial advertising through the mails

"(a) Whoever for himself, or by his agents or assigns, mails or causes to be mailed any advertisement of an organization organized for profit which offers for sale goods, matter, or services shall, prior to the mailing of such advertisement, submit to the Postmaster General in writing, in such form as the Postmaster General by regulation shall prescribe, a certification with respect to such mailing which states—

"(1) that the mailer has, within the five days immediately preceding the date of mailing, consulted the register provided for by subsection (b) of this section; and

"(2) that none of the advertisements included in the mailing covered by such certification is addressed to any postal patron, whose name appeared on the register as of the date on which the mailer consulted the register, against the wishes of that postal patron as indicated by his registration in accordance with subparagraph (1) or subparagraph (2), as applicable, of subsection (b) of this section.

"(b) The Postmaster General shall establish and keep up to date a register containing the name of any postal patron who has indicated as provided in section 4009—

"(1) that he does not wish to receive commercial advertisements from any particular mailer, and

"(2) that he does not wish to receive commercial advertising through the mails from any source whatsoever, as well as any additional information which the Postmaster General determines to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Such register shall be maintained in such form as the Postmaster General considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this section, including a form which will permit (if the Postmaster General considers it necessary) the use of electronic data processing techniques, machinery and equipment. The Postmaster General shall maintain a composite register of all names in Washington, District of Columbia, and, in addition, shall maintain duplicate copies of such register in such other places as he considers necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(c) Whoever for himself, or by his agents or assigns, mails or causes to be mailed any commercial advertisement in violation of the certification submitted to the Postmaster General by the mailer with respect to such mailing, or without submitting such certification, shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $100, as a civil penalty, for each commercial advertisement so mailed.

"(d) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which any commercial advertisement shall have been sent or received in violation of the certification submitted to the Postmaster General with respect to such mailing, or sent or received without such certification having been submitted as required by subsection (a), shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to assess the penalty referred to in subsection (c) and, if the court considers it necessary, to issue an injunction to prohibit the further mailing by any commercial mailer for himself, or by his agents or assigns, without complying with the requirements of subsection (a). Failure to comply with the injunction may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"(e) The Postmaster General may issue such regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of this section."

(b) The table of sections of chapter 51 of title 59, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately below the item referring to section 4009 the following new item:

"4009a. Procedure for advance notification by postal patron of desire not to receive commercial advertising through the mails.".

SEC. 3. Part IV of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding immediately after chapter 51 thereof the following new chapter;

"CHAPTER 52—SALE AND PURCHASE OF MAILING LISTS BY COMMERCIAL MAILERS

"SEC.

"4021. Sale or purchase of mailing lists prohibited; exception.

"4022. Procedures; proof; defense.

"4023. Civil penalties; injunctions.

"4024. Exclusion; charitable organizations.

"4025. Definitions.

"§ 4021. Sale or purchase of mailing lists prohibited; exception

"(a) No commercial mailer shall sell or purchase, or offer to sell or purchase, any name or list of names intended to be used for mailing any commercial advertisement.

"(b) The fact that a name or list of names is sold to or purchased by any person usually and customarily engaged in the business of commercial mailing is prima facie evidence that the name or list of names was sold to or purchased by such person with intent that it be used for mailing of a commercial advertisement.

"(c) Notwithstanding the prohibition in subsection (a), a commercial mailer may sell or purchase, or offer to sell or purchase, the name of any postal patron who has specifically consented in writing to the sale or purchase of his name for use in the mailing of commercial advertisements.

"§ 4022. Procedure; proof, defense

"(a) A postal patron may file a complaint with the Postmaster General whenever he has reason to believe that the provisions of section 4021 have been violated. The complaint shall specify—

"(1) that the postal patron has received an unsolicited commercial advertisement; and

"(2) the circumstances of the incident and the nature and description of the commercial advertisement received, including the name and address of the commercial mailer mailing the advertisement, if known; and

"(3) the name and address of the person on whose behalf the advertisement was mailed; and

"(4) the reasons that the postal patron believes that his name, or a list containing his name, has been transferred in violation of section 4021.

"(b) Upon receipt of a complaint filed pursuant to subsection (a), the Postmaster General shall initiate an investigation to determine whether a violation of section 4021 has occurred. If the Postmaster General determines that there is reason to believe that a violation of section 4021 has occurred, he shall transmit to the Attorney General for action as provided in this section the evidence pertaining to the alleged violation.

"(c) The Attorney General may institute a civil suit in any district court of the United States which has jurisdiction over the alleged violation for the recovery of civil penalties, or for injunctive relief, as provided in section 4023. Upon a finding, based on a fair preponderance of the evidence, that a commercial mailer has violated the prohibitions contained in section 4021, the district court, sitting without a jury, shall award such relief provided for in section 4023 as it believes is warranted under all the circumstances of the case.

"(d) It is an affirmative defense to an action instituted under this section that the person alleged to have violated the prohibition contained in section 4021 had in his possession, at the time of the act alleged to constitute a violation, a written permission from the postal patron whose name was allegedly transferred in violation of section 4021, which permission authorized the sale or purchase of the postal patron's name for purposes of mailing commercial advertisements.

"§ 4023. Civil penalties; injunctions

"(a) Any person found to have violated the prohibition contained in section 4021 shall forfeit to the United States the sum of $1,000, as a civil penalty, for each name sold or purchased or offered for sale or purchase.

"(b) Any district court of the United States which has jurisdiction over any person found to have violated the prohibitions contained in section 4021 shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to assess the penalty referred to in subsection (a), and—

"(1) to issue an injunction to prohibit the use for commercial mailing by any person of the name of any postal patron which was transferred in violation of the prohibition contained in section 4021; and

"(2) to issue an injunction to prohibit the further transfer of any name transferred in violation of section 4021 by any person, and to prohibit the further transfer of the name of any other postal patron in such a manner as to violate section 4021.

Failure to comply with the injunction may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"§ 4024. Exclusion of non-profit organizations

"Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed to prohibit the sale, purchase, offer to sell or purchase, or other transfer or offer to transfer of any name or list of names to or by any non-profit organization for the purpose of informing the public or any person of the activities of such organization or soliciting financial or other support for such activities.

"§ 4025. Definitions

For purpose of this chapter—

"(1) the term 'person' means any natural person, corporation, partnership, association, organization, or other group;

"(2) the term 'name' means the given name or surname of any person, whether or not accompanied by a street address or city or town of residence, whether printed or written on paper, contained on computer card or tape, or in the form of addressograph plate or other mechanical reproduction or device;

"(3) the term 'commercial advertisement' means any advertisement of an organization organized for profit which offers for sale goods, matter, or services, or any advertisement which offers an opportunity to obtain

goods, matter, or services without cost in connection with a later sale of goods, matter, or services, or which offers an opportunity to participate in a lottery, sweepstakes, contest, or game of chance in connection with the sale of goods, matter, or services at some future time;

"(4) the term 'commercial mailer' means any person who usually and customarily mails, or addresses or prepares for mailing, any matter in return for a fee or for profit, or, which offers such services for profit to the public,

"(5) the term 'nonprofit organization' means any charitable, philanthropic, artistic, political, or other organization which is not intended to and does not make a profit.".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective on the sixtieth day following the date of enactment of this Act.

TRIPLE STANDARD FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in at least three areas of the world established countries are under terrorist attack by guerrilla warfare aimed at the overthrow and destruction of the target nation. In each of these instances the guerrilla troops are Communist indoctrinated, armed with Communist weapons, and pursue Communist aims. Yet, in each of these three areas the U.S. involvement or participation varies so distinctly that it must be said that we observe a triple standard in dealing with Communist aggression.

In South Vietnam the Vietcong and the National Liberation Front are well identified Communist guerrilla forces, armed with Communist weapons, and being exploited against their own people to further Communist aims. The target in South Vietnam is the Republican Government, but it is also American men and the U.S. policy of preventing Communist aggression. Our announced policy is withdrawal, no-win—which is tantamount to enemy victory.

In the Middle East, Israel is under repeated terrorist attack by the Palestinian Arab guerrillas, armed with Communist weapons, and being exploited for the Communist purposes of the Soviet Union and Red China. The apparent policy of our country with regard to Israel is a guaranteed survival, regardless of cost or participation by our Nation.

In Southern Africa, the Republic of Rhodesia and the Portuguese Provinces of Mozambique and Angola have for years been under unceasing terrorist border attack by guerrilla hordes from Tanzania, Zambia, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo bearing Communist weapons and operating pursuant to Communist warfare and ideology. U.S. foreign policy as to this threat from Communist aggression is declared for support the guerrillas and suppression of the right of self-defense by the civilized Christian anti-Communist people under attack.

There may be some kind of logic in distinguishing between good enemies and bad enemies, but it seems that in Africa we alwaye manage to give our support to the savages—the more Communist-controlled the better—against civilized people.

I include an article from the Washington Star in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 23, 1970]

PEKING ENCOURAGING THE BELLIGERENCE OF PALESTINIAN GUERRILLAS

(By Henry Bradsher)

HONG KONG.—While Secretary of State William P. Rogers was preparing to explain today the U.S. effort to keep the Middle East peaceful, Communist China fanned the bitter embers of a Palestinian war.

"Only through armed struggle is it possible" for the Arabs to recover territory lost to Israel, according to Peking.

As other big nations have skirted the brink of renewed Middle Eastern war with varying degrees of caution, China has uncautiously encouraged those Palestinian refugee organizations to see war as the only way of regaining lost land.

The contrast between Chinese and Soviet policy has been especially sharp. Peking has, however, refrained from the kind of direct attacks on Moscow's Middle Eastern policy that it makes on many other areas of Sino-Soviet policy differences.

Since the 1967 Arab-Israeli war, the Soviet Union has advocated a political solution to the Middle East problem, rather than a military one. Although its arms policy has sometimes thrown doubt on the sincerity of this stand, the Kremlin is assumed by Western observers to want to avoid the dangers of another war.

Its policy has been particularly strained by the refugee guerrilla organizations. Politically unable to denounce them, yet wary of the potential explosiveness of their activities, the Soviets have given them only cautious and limited endorsement.

The Chinese have felt no such need for caution.

Without any responsibilities or economic interests in the Middle East, without client states that might try to drag it into another war, without compunctions about seeing a distant part of the world aflame, China has encouraged the guerrillas.

Peking is now entertaining the leader of Al Fatah, the main refugee guerrilla movement, Yasser Arafat.

When he arrived in Peking Saturday, a full-scale official welcome was given Arafat. It was headed by Deputy Premier Li Hsien-nien, who is China's acting foreign minister.

At a banquet for Arafat, Li said the Palestinian people and peoples of Arab countries "understand ever better that perseverance in the people's armed struggle is the correct road for them."

Arafat expressed "love and respect" for Chairman Mao Tse-tung. "It is no secret if I say that Al Fatah, initiator of the Palestine revolution, received aid first from Peking," Arafat said, according to New China news agency.

Apparently referring to combined U.S.-Soviet-French efforts to arrange a peaceful Middle East settlement, Arafat said: "Our people are facing a monstrous intrigue aimed at undermining our revolution and stopping its advance from behind our backs."

The same day, New China News Agency distributed an Al Fatah statement from Algiers saying the Palestinian people reject any "political solution." Today Radio Peking quoted Al Fatah from Algiers as rejecting a U.N. peace plan for the Middle East.

Radio Peking also repeated in every newscast that Arafat and Li had had a "sincere and friendly" meeting yesterday.

The nature of Chinese aid to Al Fatah was not spelled out in connection with Arafat's visit.

It has been reliably reported in the past, however, that China has provided some weapons and training for Palestinian guerrillas.

The Chinese attitude has produced cool relations with some cautious Arab governments, but has been greatly appreciated by fiercely militant Syria.

Syria was the one Arab nation directly involved in the 1967 war which, although heavily dependent upon Soviet aid, refused to accept the Soviet "political solution" line.

When the Soviet Union became increasingly reluctant to arm Syria, for fear it would itself or through guerrilla fronts spark off another war, the Syrians turned to the compatible Chinese.

Last May a Syrian military delegation visited Peking after plans to seek more weapons from Moscow fell through. However, China lacks the ability to provide as much aid as the Soviets, and has only a limited capacity to supply the spare parts needed to keep Soviet-made equipment running.

Chinese relations with the United Arab Republic, where Communist parties are illegal, have had ups and downs.

In December 1965, China was accused at a Cairo trial of giving funds to set up a pro-Peking Communist party. Cairo asked for the recall of the Chinese ambassador.

After the 1967 war, China hoped to capitalize on Egyptian disillusionment with the failure of Moscow to prevent an Arab defeat.

Although herself buying wheat from Australia, China offered Cairo 150,000 tons of wheat, plus $10 million in cash. But when President Gamal Abdel Nasser accepted the Soviets' "political solution" line at the Khartoum Arab summit, the Chinese offer was withdrawn.

Last month Premier Chou En-lai wrote to Nasser reaffirming China's support for Arab revolutionary movements and attacking President Nixon on the basis of early reports Israel would get U.S. Phantom jets. Nasser's reply avoided agreeing with Chou's endorsement of "protracted struggle."

The Chinese letter seemed aimed not so much at Nasser as at others in the Middle East. Chinese propagandists gave wide distribution to favorable comment from Syria, Iraq and Al Fatah.

During the Chinese cultural revolution, Cairo was the only capital in which a Chinese ambassador remained. He went back to Peking in mid-1969 and has not yet been replaced.

At the same time last year, new ambassadors were being sent by Peking to Syria and Algeria. They are the only nations directly involved in the Middle East situation in which China now has ambassadors.

THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago today—March 25, 1918—the independence of Byelorussia was proclaimed in the following solemn and determined words:

A year ago (1917), the peoples of Belorussia, together with all the peoples of Russia, threw off the yoke of Russian tsarism

which, taking no advice from the people, had plunged our land into the blaze of war that ruined most of our cities and towns. Today, we, the Rada of the Belorussian National Republic, cast off from our country the last chains of the political servitude that had been imposed by Russian tsarism upon our free and independent land. From now on, the Belorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power. The people of Belorussia themselves, through their own Constitutent Assembly, will decide upon the future relations of Belorussia with other states.

Consider, if you will, what it would be like if in this country on July 4th there were no patriotic speeches, no mass assemblies to pay tribute to our Founding Fathers, no stirring news commentaries on the history of our independence, no public prayers in recognition of our spiritual heritage, and, in fact, no other manifestation of freedom by which we might choose as individuals to mark the occasion of our own Declaration of Independence. There would in sum be nothing more than the shallow ring of commemorations, however sincere, of the occasion in some far off land and the private and reflecting thoughts of individuals in silent remembrance of a dream that used to be.

Impossible? No. Implausible? Yes, but only if we are ever mindful that the once free peoples of other less fortunate nations have succumbed to the brutal and suppressive aggression of communism. I view the commemoration of Byelorussian independence today, as well as the anniversaries of the declarations of independence of other captive nations, as continuing and forceful reminders that the hope of these people for freedom, independence, and the recognition of individual liberties rests on the leadership of the United States and the strength of the conviction of our own people in these principles.

CHICAGO BAR ASSOCIATION ENDORSES HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF 1970

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on March 3, I introduced H.R. 16250, the Handgun Control Act of 1970. The purpose of this bill is to dry up the huge supply of freely available handguns in America. Crime statistics show over and over again that it is the handgun—as opposed to the rifle and the shotgun—which is the criminal's favorite weapon. If we are serious about stopping violent street crime, we must face up to the necessity of limiting the availability of handguns.

I am most gratified to announce that the Chicago Bar Association has endorsed the Handgun Control Act as a necessary step toward the reduction of violence and street crime in America. I insert at this point in the RECORD a copy of the press release issued by the Chicago Bar Association endorsing the Handgun Control Act of 1970.

The document referred to follows:

HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF 1970

The Chicago Bar Association urges the prompt enactment at both the Federal and State level of legislation imposing strict controls on the importation, manufacture, sale and purchase of hand guns. It supports the initiative of Representative Abner J. Mikva of Illinois in introducing Federal legislation for this purpose.

No arguments against such controls can, in our judgment, outweigh the urgent necessity of curbing the free availability of hand guns. We have just had another tragic killing of a policeman by a person armed with a hand gun. If we mean what we say about waging an unrelenting war against crime, we simply cannot tolerate the absence of effective gun controls. Possession of hand guns should be permitted only to the police and authorized security agencies.

It also follows that The Chicago Bar Association is strongly opposed to the effort to write into the Illinois Constitution a provision guaranteeing the right of citizens "to bear arms". The action of the Bill of Rights Committee of the Constitutional Convention in giving approval to such a provision is a serious mistake and we hope that it will be promptly corrected. If the provision is intended only to confirm what is already provided by the United States Constitution, it is completely unnecessary. If it is intended to go beyond the interpretation by the Supreme Court of the United States of the Federal provision, then we think that it is fraught with mischief and the possibility of abuse.

THE BOOKBURNERS ARE BACK

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, for years our people have been conditioned to accept filth, pornography, and socialistic doctrine in their schools under the cry of academic freedom. Any announced protest or opposition resulted in the cry of "bookburner," "censorship," and suppression of free thought and dissent. In fact, in many instances the decent people know better but have become tolerant of radically different thoughts and ideologies because they were sure that full, open, and frank discussion of all ideas, truth could never be hidden for long.

Now the bookburners are back again. This time the censors are not from the midstream of the decent societies, but rather a few extremists who would stifle any truth which might disagree with their radical views and goals.

In nearby Maryland, the Human Relations Council has removed from school libraries a book alleged to be racist. The offended family must suffer from reverse racist delusions, because the offense of the book was to show tolerant and kindly race relations.

At Yale, once considered a liberal institution of learning, even Tarzan has been suppressed as being "racist."

This hero of generations of young Americans can now join the other victims of history rewritten—"Amos and Andy," the wonderful Stephen Foster songs, the minstrel show, "Birth of a Nation," the Confederate flag, "Dixie," the State song of the Commonwealth of Virginia, and even decent English language have been convicted of "racist" overtones and abolished.

The bookburners are truly back. Americans, beware. Truth is under attack.

I include pertinent newsclippings in my remarks:

[From the Washington, (D.C.) Post, Mar. 13, 1970]

YALE BLACKS BLOCK TALK BY "TARZAN"

NEW HAVEN, CONN. March 12.—Tarzan of the Apes was forced to leave a speaking engagement Wednesday night at Yale University when a group of black student militants blocked the showing of his 1932 film, which they labeled "racist."

Johnny Weissmuller, 66 former Olympic swimming champion who rose to fame in Hollywood films as the jungle man, appeared at the Yale Law School auditorium as part of a "Tarzan film festival" sponsored by the Yale Record, an undergraduate humor magazine.

Weissmuller, on hand to discuss his 1932 film classic. "Tarzan the Ape Man," returned to New York City after members of the Yale's Black Student Alliance stood in front of the projector and prevented the film from being shown. A spokesman for the magazine said Weissmuller "took it well but was visibly hurt" by the incident.

About 200 students attended the festival. One was dressed in a loincloth and swung from a suspended rope. Invitations to the event said "black tie or loincloth" was the preferred dress.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Mar. 18, 1970]

PANEL TO SCREEN BOOKS OF MONTGOMERY SCHOOLS

The Montgomery County school system today announced the formation of a committee to review, and possibly revise, criteria and procedures for approving books and other school materials.

One of the group's main tasks will be to insure that any of the resulting guidelines provide "fair treatment" to Negroes and other minority groups.

Creation of the committee stems directly from the complaint of a Rockville couple, Mr. and Mrs. Ivan J. Wanless, Jr., about a book they considered to be "racially objectionable and offensive."

The Wanlesses objected to the dialect attributed to a Negro groom in the book, "The Little Fellow," and the "Sambo-type" expressions given him in the illustrations.

A 1945 edition of the book was subsequently removed from libraries in the county's elementary schools. A later edition, with the dialect removed but with the same illustrations, is still being used.

The five-member subcommittee of the school system's Human Relations Advisory Committee which recommended removal of the first edition, has now also called for removal of the later version because of the illustrations.

School officials have taken this recommendation under "serious advisement," a spokesman said, but are deferring any decision until the criteria and procedures are reviewed by the new committee.

"There are some personnel in the school system concerned about academic freedom and freedom of expression who have some concern about the banning of books," the spokesman said. He noted that removal of "The Little Fellow" from school libraries is "the first time in six years we actually have yanked a book off the shelves."

On the other hand, he said, "some of the rest of us have concern about literature that tends to stereotype any minority groups or cast certain segments of society in poor light.

"What we hope to do with the new com-

mittee is to look at the problem objectively and come up with criteria to use in reviewing any material."

The new committee will include the subcommittee which originally reviewed "The Little Fellow." These include a teacher, elementary principal, an area director, the director of the school system's operations division and the supervisor of social studies.

The group will be expanded to include a librarian and a senior high school principal.

LEGISLATION AFFECTING AUXILIARY PERSONNEL

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the very talented counsel for the House General Subcommittee on Education, Mr. John F. Jennings, recently delivered a speech on the legislative process which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues.

I believe Mr. Jennings has properly captured the intricacies of legislating in the complex field of educational legislation.

His speech, which appeared in the February 1970, issue of the Journal of Home Economics, follows:

LEGISLATION AFFECTING AUXILIARY PERSONNEL

(By John F. Jennings)

Legislation often is a major determinant in the financing and control of programs for training and using auxiliary personnel. This speech and the question and answer session which followed helped participants at the AHEA Workshop on Utilization and Training of Auxiliary Personnel in Home Economics to understand the many types of existing legislation related to auxiliary personnel and to explore the need for initiating new legislation.

Legislation which affects the use of auxiliary personnel is a recent phenomenon in federal legislation. Only within the last five years have there been federal laws encouraging the use of para-professionals. Yet this is a vastly growing area and a very timely one for study.

As you know, two out of every five workers around the country are women, and this ratio will grow in the next few years because of the demands of our economy and because of the willingness now of women to go outside the home to work. We find that even though two out of five workers are women, women are discriminated against in employment. The average wage nationally for women workers is one-half of the average wage for men. Only 7 percent of employed women make over $10,000 a year, whereas the number of men who make over that amount is 20 times greater. Many women work at jobs which are far below both their ability and training. Last year one-fifth of all women college graduates who had finished four years at an accredited institution were working in such nonprofessional jobs as clerks and secretaries.

I mention these facts to you because a major problem involved in the use of auxiliary personnel is the reluctance on the part of professional people to employ them. Some people feel as though they are threatened by the presence of auxiliary personnel in their job setting.

A LARGE RESERVOIR OF TALENT

Paraprofessionals, or auxiliary personnel, to use a more limited term, can be helpful to you as professionals. As you know, home economics and the demands being made upon it are changing. The Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress in 1966 concluded that within the next 10 years we could easily use 5.3 million new jobs in the public sector. Many of these jobs are in areas in which traditionally home economics has been involved. Even though home economists are about 100,000 strong, we are finding that demands for home economics personnel will not be met by institutions of higher education. At the same time economic and social conditions exist in our country which give us a large reservoir of unused talent—mostly the disadvantaged. We find that today in the slum areas of our cities we have two and one-half times the rate of unemployment that we have in other areas of the country. By the end of the 1970's we are going to have 50 percent more nonwhites in their twenties, and these are the people who are the least trained and least prepared for occupations in our society.

Although we will have this vast increase in the number of unprepared people, the number of unskilled jobs will go down to 5 percent of the total number of jobs available at the end of the 1970's. And even people with skilled jobs will find themselves outmoded. By 1980 professional and technical jobs are going to far outdistance skilled craftsmen. Even if a person has certain skills, he may, by the end of the 70's, be out of a job. What are we going to do with this large reservoir of talent?

ENCOURAGEMENT FOR PARAPROFESSIONALS

Some types of paraprofessionals which the federal government is seeking to encourage are child care specialists, teacher aides, family planning aides, clothing aides, and so forth through the whole gamut of professions.

In the fall of 1969 we had a deficiency of 222,400 teachers in our schools. Most of these, 164,400, were in the elementary schools. This is the area where we can use auxiliary personnel to the best possible advantage. Presently we have approximately 100,000 teacher aides, but with the shortage of trained teachers, we have a need for many more.

Child care is another vastly growing need. The federal and state governments are encouraging the growth of day care centers. With the Head Start programs, nursery school and other day care programs, and migrant education programs, there is a need for auxiliary personnel. Professional personnel cannot handle all of the tasks put before them.

We also need paraprofessionals in mental health and welfare areas. We need government aides—people who can serve as ombudsmen, who can help reduce the alienation present not only among the disadvantaged population but also among our middle-class population caused by the feeling that they are not influencing the government, that the government is somehow "out there." Paraprofessionals, if they are used in these areas, can help reduce this gap between government and citizens.

Paraprofessionals obviously can be used in clothing, interior decorating, food service, and other areas.

The federal government has seen this need and at the same time it has seen the large numbers of disadvantaged in our population who do not have jobs or a chance for a career because they have been excluded from the schools both by their own attitudes and by the schools themselves. So the federal government, since 1964, has enacted two major pieces of legislation which encourage the use of paraprofessionals. Under this legislation, five programs presently are funded and in operation today.

UNDER THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, three programs use paraprofessionals.

The new careers program

The major program under this Act is the New Careers program. Congress was impressed by the program's potential for twinning the need for professional personnel with our reservoir of unused talent. Since 1964, actually since 1965 when the program was funded, over 20,000 people have been trained in the New Careers program. These people include health specialists, dietetic aides, child care aides, and teacher aides.

As you know, the concept behind New Careers is that you place a person in an entry level job where the skills are relatively minimal. Then you build into that job components which will increase the person's sophistication both in general knowledge and also in the skill for the job so that he can advance up a career ladder until he eventually attains the professional level.

The New Careers program, the first major-scale program of this type, has had problems with confusing guidelines, with the reluctance of professional personnel to take nonprofessionals in, and with the disadvantaged themselves who have been very skeptical about the program. But it has been a success to a limited degree. Since 1964, New Careers has been known as the program most easily identifiable with federal support for paraprofessionals, and its type of approach has been written into many other pieces of legislation.

The Head Start program

Under the Economic Opportunity Act, the second major program which uses paraprofessionals is the Head Start program. This differs from the New Careers type of program in that it is not anticipated that all the people in the program will move up a career ladder and eventually become professionals. Many people who have been excluded by the normal job requirements are given an opportunity to get into a field and gradually advance as their own willingness dictates. Presently under the Head Start program, which is geared toward poor children in the early years before school and which seeks to give them some sort of compensatory education to prepare them for school, approximately 25,000 paraprofessionals are being used.

The community action program

Another related program under the Economic Opportunity Act is the Community Action Program (CAP). Under the Economic Opportunity Act, local agencies were set up for coordinating or for initiating or operating local antipoverty efforts. The Office of Economic Opportunity estimates that there are approximately 20,000 auxiliary personnel involved in various local programs conducted by CAP agencies.

UNDER THE EDUCATION ACT

The second major federal act which encourages the use of auxiliary personnel is the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Title I

The major program under this Act is Title I. This program which the federal government funds at approximately a billion dollars a year is meant for compensatory education—to concentrate in areas of greatest need within cities and rural areas, giving disadvantaged students an opportunity to compensate for their different types of backgrounds.

Approximately 100,000 paraprofessionals will be hired under Title I during the fiscal year 1970. It is estimated that by fiscal 1977, there might be 1.5 million paraprofessionals involved in these programs as teachers' aides. Most of these people—as in the Head Start program and the CAP agencies—are drawn

from the community itself and are put into the classroom to supervise the children, do clerical work, and otherwise provide a link between the school and community.

Title VII

The second type of program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the bilingual education program. Title VII. This program is geared toward poor areas where children, by reason of their ethnic backgrounds, are not conversant in English. Most schools by state law require instruction only in English. Only within the last couple of years have several states, such as California and Texas, sought to loosen their requirements for the use of English in the classroom. Teacher aides are used in this program to supervise youngsters in the classroom, grade papers, and do the tasks which detract the teacher's attention away from the major task of educating the child. There are not many aides under the program, but it also serves as a link between the community and the school.

Under these five programs which have been in operation only since 1965, three under the Economic Opportunity Act, two under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the federal government is supporting approximately 170,000 paraprofessionals. They range from auxiliary personnel who are solely attached to a professional to help with simple tasks, to the New Careers type person who is supposed to advance up a ladder and become an assistant teacher and then a certified teacher.

NINE NEW PROGRAMS

Besides these five major programs presently funded, Congress has authorized within the last three years nine new programs for the use of paraprofessionals. As I briefly described these nine new programs, bear in mind that all of these programs have been enacted within the last three years—especially in the 90th Congress in 1967 and 1968.

The first, the Health Manpower Act of 1968, provides the same type of program as the New Careers program under the Economic Opportunity Act. But it zeroes in on health professions, seeking to broaden training in areas such as dentistry, podiatry, medicine, and psychiatry. This program, just getting under way, is administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW).

The second new program is under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1968. This, too, is a program newly authorized last year by the 90th Congress. It seeks to use the same type of New Careers thinking to get handicapped people to advance a career ladder starting with an entry skill job so they can learn greater skills and more sophistication and eventually move up to a professional level.

The Housing Act of 1968 is the third new act which authorizes the use of paraprofessionals. Paraprofessionals under this Act are to be used in local, state, and federal government agencies. The reasoning behind this is that frequently people from the community can provide a better link between the government and the community.

The Higher Education Act of 1968 authorizes the fourth program. It also is concerned basically with the use of paraprofessionals in public service. The purpose of this program is to get people who are in college interested in government while they are in school so that they can take a job which would advance them up to a professional level when they gain their college degree.

The fifth new program is under the Social Security Amendments of 1967. As this Act has been interpreted by HEW, paraprofessionals will be required to be used in all states in this fiscal year which began July 1, 1969. Every state must use paraprofessional personnel in social welfare programs. As you know, the federal government is involved in seven public welfare programs such as old age insurance, disability, and Aid to Families with Dependent Children. It also seeks to involve people from the community in the programs and to provide a link between the community and the government.

The sixth new program is under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. This Act, passed by the 90th Congress, is a massive program to provide assistance to the states and to the local police departments for the control of crime. The paraprofessionals under this Act would be limited to community relations specialists, which I think is a euphemistic term for people from the community relationships and again provide a linkage between the community and one of the institutions, namely, the police department.

The Juvenile Delinquency Act of 1968 is geared toward providing a link between youth who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent and the institutions of society. These programs are for the use and training of paraprofessionals in the diagnosis, treatment, and rehabilitation of people who are delinquent or conceivably could become delinquent. This program, too, is administered by HEW and is just getting under way in this fiscal year.

The eighth program is the Handicapped Children's Early Education Act of 1968. It seeks to use auxiliary personnel as with the Head Start approach (but not limited to poverty youngsters) in programs for the early education of handicapped children.

The last program is under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 which authorize the use of subprofessionals in the basic state-grant program. In other programs under the Amendments the Office of Education and the states jointly administer the research and exemplary programs, both of which encourage the training of paraprofessionals.

EMPHASIS ON DISADVANTAGED

It may seem that the federal government is involved mostly with the use of paraprofessionals in disadvantaged areas. This is true. The 89th and 90th Congresses have been concerned especially with the problems of the disadvantaged in our communities, of trying to bring them into society's mainstream. Consequently, most of the social welfare legislation has sought to bring these people into our institutions, primarily through the use of paraprofessionals and programs aimed specifically at the disadvantaged.

This is just a starting point. The federal government now will begin to fund programs under some of these and other acts for the use of nonpoor paraprofessionals. Auxiliary personnel should not be stigmatized as the dropouts or as the "pushouts" of our society—people who are not able to cope because of their attitudes, backgrounds, or the hostility of the system toward them. The idea of paraprofessionals can be used in a broader sense. However, these have been the programs funded by the federal government. State, local and private industry funds also are being spent in other programs using paraprofessionals.

EDUCATION HAS FAILED MANY

This gets into the question of our educational system. Last year the House General Subcommittee on Education reviewed vocational education throughout the country and found that the educational system is failing many youngsters. Even though vocational education has 8 million enrollees ranging from children to adults, and even though many of these people are being adequately trained and well-placed in jobs through vocational education, the needs of a large part of our population are not being met. More importantly, their potential is not being used. This is why, in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968, Congress emphasizes the disadvantaged.

Under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, Congress had said that vocational education must meet the needs and tap the talents of disadvantaged youngsters. Yet Congress found that less than 1 percent of the federal funds since 1963 had been used on programs for the disadvantaged. Congress was quite concerned about this. Since three-quarters of a million youngsters drop out of school every year, and almost one-fourth of our 18-year-olds, our educational system must be failing these young people. We find that if these children are not taught in the schools, they will have to be picked up later under manpower remedial programs which spend up to $12,000 per trainee to remedy the impairments to employment which were not caught earlier by the schools or which were caused by the schools.

There is no sense in the federal government's being concerned with the employment of its citizens and yet not investing money in job training in the schools so that people can be taught before they become set in attitudes which preclude them from wanting to or being able to work later. Vocational education had been at fault because it had not reoriented its programs toward the disadvantaged. But Congress also found itself to be at fault because it was appropriating $14 for higher education for every dollar that it was appropriating for vocational education, and it was appropriating $4 for remedial education programs for every dollar appropriated for vocational education. It does not make sense to direct 80 percent of our resources nationally toward higher education and academic programs when only 20 percent of the student population will attain a college degree. What happens to the other 80 percent who drop out somewhere along the line? Only 20 percent of our resources are being used on these people. So Congress decided that in the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 it would turn to occupational education to meet some of these needs.

CHALLENGE TO VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Congress challenged vocational education, first of all, to put its house in order, which means to emphasize new job programs and concepts such as the "cluster concept," where you teach the child several related skills so that he will not be tied down later to one job.

It challenged home economics to get into the new area of training for the dual role of homemaking and wage earning. Traditionally, home economics has been challenged to train people for homemaking, but now it is being called upon also to train people for jobs.

In addition, home economists are now being asked, as are all those in vocational education, to address themselves to the problems of the disadvantaged. Congress said that in every state one-third of the money under the home economics section must be used for consumer programs in economically depressed area. That means that if states are not doing it now, regardless of whether there is new money or not, they will have to have consumer education programs in ghetto, slum, and other economically depressed areas.

But both Congressman Roman Pucinski and I have been much impressed by the fact that vocational educators are ready and willing to change. This last year, the House of Representatives increased the appropriation for vocational education from approximately $280 million to almost $490 million. Much of this is meant to be used for programs in new occupational skills and for certain groups of the population such as the disadvantaged and the handicapped. [*Note:* In the final appropriations bill presented by the Congress, vocational education was increas-

ed about $210 million over the $279 million President Nixon sought and in January the President vetoed the bill.]

PREPARE FOR NEW MONEY

Vocational educators are being told to change. They are ready to change, and yet the money is not there. If they do receive this new money, one of their tasks will be to decide how they are going to spend it in a relatively short time. But they must be prepared because there will be an accounting due for the money and if vocational education wants to keep Congress' confidence, it must be ready to move into new occupational fields and to serve all segments of the population.

I hope that from this conference, where you have considered the use of auxiliary personnel, you will start to think about how you can use some of this money from vocational education. I know that you are not all teachers in vocational education, or even in programs presently funded by vocational education, but under the new Act the categories of funding have been broadened to include many private and public institutions which were not eligible before. You are being challenged by Congress. I hope that this conference will help you to think about ways in which you can meet this challenge during the next school year and hopefully during the next decade.

WHY NOT COP MORATORIUM?

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lyn Daunoras, feature editor of the Summit Valley Times, Lyons, Ill., raises fascinating questions concerning the philosophy of the notorious radical, Jerry Rubin, in her column Wednesday, March 18 in the Times. This column is one of the most interesting and thought-provoking commentaries on the subject that I have come across and, therefore I insert it into the RECORD for whatever attention it may receive:

WHY NOT COP MORATORIUM?

(By Lyn Daunoras)

On a TV show recently Jerry Rubin, leader of the Yippies and a vocal member of the Conspiracy Seven, advocated, among other things, the release of all prisoners.

No one should have to sit in jail; this is the lowest form for man to live and there is no reason for such abominable treatment of our fellow man, he averred.

So we start thinking about a world without jails. We're always willing to conjure up the scene that would ensue if these radicals got their way. The first thing that came to mind was that we needed no policemen or judges, since we weren't going to worry about laws and their violation (after all, that is the main reason people go to jail).

So we release all the murders, rapists, thieves and vandals and let them know they can do whatever they want, kill whomever they desire and no one will put them back in that nasty old jail cell again.

Of course, under these circumstances, there will be little need for attorneys either. Close a motagage deal or make out a will, you say? Shucks, going to school six years just to do insignificant things, which won't make a decent living for a professional man, is hardly worth it. We can make our own wills presuming we have anything left to leave and as for mortgages—who will own property under Rubin? He wants no private property, only communes. So who needs lawyers?

Unfortunately, law men are not the only ones who will be unemployed. What man in his right mind would care to construct new buildings when there is no one to protect them and so many to destroy them? Throw out the carpenters, masons and sheet metal workers, too.

Think of the fun we can have with no one to stop us. We can shoot down or in other ways eliminate pesty visitors, unfriendly neighbors or noisy kids. We can run down pedestrians we don't like the looks of—especially if they look at all affluent.

This is freedom! It's Rubin's idea of freedom. Imagine the Sirhans and the Specks roaming the streets with no fear of jail? One thing we know for certain, if Rubin runs for office, he'll surely get the prison vote (after he releases them, that is).

In line with this thought, we propose a police moratorium day. The peace-lovers had their moratoriums, why not the police? How about 24 hours, without pay, of course, since "the taxpayers pay their salaries," without any police protection?

This means no arrests, no help of any kind. Let everyone have fun at everyone else's expense. They can break windows, beat up old and small people, rob people blind, break in homes and club, shoot or kill anyone who gets in their way. Let them speed at 60 in a 30-mile zone. It's one answer to the population explosion.

Perhaps when all the smoke dies down, the silent majority will have finally found their voices and will use them. It takes something drastic to move the spirit and a police moratorium day would be as drastic as things can get.

The idea of prisoners running free and others letting loose their restrained inhibitions may just arouse people enough to put someone like Jerry Rubin in his place.

The only way to show people who think "Rubin has a point" and those who feel sorry for the poor little smart boy who wants a new world is to give them a taste of that world Rubin advocates.

They might not be so sympathetic when they have to cope with it.

JOIN THE MARCH FOR VICTORY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, here in Washington, we have seen ad nauseam the parades, marches, demonstrations, and the other activities of those dupes in this country who are aiding the enemy in Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow.

We have witnessed the desecration of the churches of virtually every denomination, with the pulpits filled by those who would mislead our people down the paths of the new atheistic ritual called humanism—the cult of Lenin the butcher.

The International Council of Churches, representing the great silent, but awakening, majority of loyal Christian Americans has made arrangements for a parade on April 4, 1970, honoring—not mocking—the American virtues. Its full page, paid ad in the local newspaper is worth the attention of all of us, and I include it in my remarks, and invite our colleagues to join in this truly American venture:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1970]

JOIN THE MARCH FOR VICTORY, SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1970, PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE 4TH TO 15TH, MONUMENT GROUNDS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

ALL ARE WELCOME

This is an appeal to all who believe in God and who want the words on our coins, "In God We Trust," to be meaningful in our national life and in winning the war in Vietnam.

47,000 of our choicest youth have died in the war. Shall this continue for another ten years? Surrender is unthinkable. Retreat and defeat are unacceptable to patriots. Victory, and bringing the boys home with honor and a secure peace is the cry which is in our hearts and our prayer to the living God.

The new MOBE and the hippies who came to Washington on November 15, 1969, called our American society "a death machine," demanded withdrawal of all American troops now. Hanoi's radio on February 15, 1967, told the world: "It is clear that the American people's protest movement has become a real second front against U.S. imperialists on the very soil of America. It is the largest, most stirring, and best organized mass movement in U.S. history."

The Paris peace conference has been nothing but a base for Communist propaganda. The black militants, in the Black Manifesto, called our society the most "barbaric" and they want its destruction. Communism, with its repudiation of God and human freedom and dignity, is on its way to take over the world.

Lenin, whose birthday is April 22nd and whose 100th anniversary is being celebrated by the Communist world said: "We have never made a secret of it that our revolution is only the beginning and in order that it may be brought to a victorious conclusion, we will have to light the flames of revolution throughout the entire world. . . ."

The war could and should have been won long ago, Admiral U.S. Grant Sharp, USN (Ret.), in his article in the May, 1969, *Reader's Digest* said, "We could have won the war long ago—perhaps by the end of 1967. . . . Of all the things we should have done but did not do, the most important was to neutralize the port of Haiphong. . . . We should have destroyed the enemy's stockpiles of material on the docks at Haiphong and in the centers of the cities of Haiphong and Hanoi . . . vast amounts of ammunition reached South Vietnam where it was used to kill American and other Allied soldiers." The presence of 15,000 vehicles on the Ho Chi Minh Trail this month and the transporting of the largest contingent of supplies into South Vietnam since the war began, reveal the folly of our "no-win," appeasement policy.

Senator Barry M. Goldwater has just said, "We still can't bomb targets over there that would end the war. There is no reason in my mind for Haiphong (the major North Vietnamese port) being anything but a mud puddle." Our failure to make it a mud puddle has provided a puddle of American blood in South Vietnam, the blood of our beloved heroes, our sons. Those who are responsible for this folly and the loss of these lives must be held to account by the American public!

Daniel P. Moynihan, counsellor to President Nixon, in his confidential memorandum to the President 17 days before Nixon's inauguration, wrote: "At the risk of seeming cynical, I would argue that the war in Vietnam has become a disastrous mistake because we lost it." President Nixon's present plan is an attempt to conceal this defeat, and it will deliver to the Communists the victory of which they constantly boast.

General of the Army, Omar N. Bradley (Ret.), speaking before the National Press Club luncheon, said, "I can't believe that a country as large as we have could not win it

if we set our minds to it." "I think we are fighting as much for ourselves as for the South Vietnamese," and Bradley expressed the conviction that "our greatest danger is imperialist communism" and "those Communist countries which wish to spread their domination throughout the world under the guise of Communist utopia." (*Army Times*, March 18, 1970).

We must abandon the entire "no-win" approach and put victory back on the battlefield and back in the vocabulary of the President of the United States. We call upon the President, as the Commander-in-chief of all our Armed Forces to issue the necessary orders for the military to win the war in the quickest possible time with the loss of the fewest lives on all sides. If the President desires to bring the boys home, let him first bring home the 1,400 prisoners of war. And, if Hanoi will not honor the Geneva Convention, then he should give orders to go in and bring these American heroes out! Honor, self-respect, and the highest obligations of freedom dictate no compromise and no surrender.

President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam, in his interview with *U.S. News & World Report* March 16 said, "South Vietnam cannot defend itself against a rush from Communist China or from the whole Communist bloc. If you leave a vacuum here, if you withdraw all your troops, what will happen? Communist China will swarm in and exploit it. What happened when you left a vacuum in Europe? The Russians swarmed in. What happened when you left a vacuum in Korea? The North Koreans swarmed in."

The only language which the Communists know is the language of force. They have no God to fear and as our resolve weakens and we are surfeited with our comforts, they exploit every gain.

"The fear of man bringeth a snare." Proverbs 29:25. "The fear of the Lord is the beginning of knowledge." Proverbs 1:7.

Once this country asserts its strength because of our fear of God and our determination to preserve our heritage, the whole tide of battle, the whole world-wide conspiracy of the Communists, can be effectively exposed and met.

The March for Victory is a religious and patriotic demonstration. All are invited to participate in it. In Mainland China not a church is open. All missionaries are gone. In Russia the churches which are open are exhibits for deception. The Jews, too, are being destroyed. There is here now a spontaneous upsurge which has come by the stern realization that the forces of tyranny, riot, revolution, war, have organized to destroy the United States of America. And as this nation goes down then civilization will go into eclipse under the heel of a brutal slavery where man has no soul and all is the property of the state. "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God." Matthew 4:4.

Religious groups from every section of the nation, with patriotic, veteran, refugee groups and many others are joining to make this the largest manifestation, we believe, ever seen in the nation's capital in behalf of victory.

General Douglas MacArthur said there is no substitute for victory, and had he been permitted to bomb beyond the Yalu River and unite Korea, we would not have spent billions of dollars and even today have 52,000 United States men in South Korea. We must return to the spirit of World War I and World War II.

A dispatch from Da Nang, March 8, quotes retiring U.S. Marine Commander, Lt. Gen. Herman Nickerson Jr., as saying he is "disappointed in the silent majority" for failing to honor Americans who have been killed and wounded in the war. "There are relatively few places where they waved flags and honored our servicemen like they did in the great days when the boys came home with honor."

The tragedy is that President Nixon has forsaken the high and honorable position that he himself championed in 1964. His three articles in the *Reader's Digest* magazine were magnificent. In the January issue he called for the removal of the Russians from the captive nations. In the August issue he said, "We must recognize that we are in a life and death struggle that has repercussions far beyond Vietnam and that victory is essential to the survival of freedom." In the November issue he wanted Cuba to be liberated. This is the President millions thought they were electing.

The No. 1 problem and concern of every American must be, as long as a single American boy is shedding his blood, that it be not in vain and that the war be brought to a victorious conclusion. As soon as the Communists learn that this is our policy, they will soon sue for peace. We have spent multiplied billions for our defenses and all the strength of this nation—yes, the military-industrial complex for which we thank God—must be marshalled and with such power, victory will be ours.

"In the name of our God we will set up our banners" (Psa. 20:5) the greatest factor which the American people are now disdaining is the fact that "God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore will not we fear." (Psa. 46:1,2). And thus we pray, "Grant not, O Lord, the desires of the wicked: further not his wicked device; lest they exalt themselves. . . . Let not an evil speaker be established in the earth: evil shall hunt the violent man to overthrow him." (Psa. 140:8,11).

Had our nation refused to aid the godless power of communism, it would not have helped build our enemy in strength to plague us, to "hunt" us.

We came from the battlefields victorious in World War II, with strength to preserve the peace of the world and now have been victimized by a godless conspiracy causing us to retreat in the presence of their troops as they mass them against us in Vietnam and Laos. "And Ephraim being armed and carrying bows turned back in the day of battle." (Psa. 78: 9).

Could it be that the internal activities of the Communists are also responsible? J. Edgar Hoover reported to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, 87th Congress, March 6, 1961:

"The Communists, foreign agents and potential saboteurs operate behind a masquerade of stealth and deception. They are all-out masters in the art of tactical infiltration, a fact which has been clearly demonstrated by our investigative experience.

"Some 200 known, or suspected, Communist front and Communist-infiltrated organizations are now under investigation by the FBI. Many of these fronts are national in scope with chapters in various cities throughout the United States. They represent transmission belts through which the Communist Party furthers its conspiratorial designs.

"They have infiltrated every conceivable sphere of activity; youth groups; radio, television, and motion picture industries; church, school, educational and cultural groups; the press; nationality minority groups and civil and political units. . . .

"The Soviet intelligence services have reorganized, multiplied their contacts with the American people, and have become aggressively bolder in spearheading their espionage offensive against the United States. The intelligence organizations of the satellite countries, carefully co-ordinated under Soviet leadership and control, have gained increasingly in experience and ability. . . .

"While the Communists speak of peace, their intelligence setup is the most extensive in world history. . . .

"The espionage potential of the Soviet bloc is tremendous. The extreme security hazard inherent in their operations is indicated somewhat by the fact that in June 1960 our State Department estimated that Russian and Chinese Communists bloc countries have some 300,000 trained spies serving throughout the world."

Our March for Victory will be a breakthrough. At last the pressures which have been built up as a result of grievances—prayer and Bible reading thrown out of school; freedom of choice and education being denied; the liberal leftist program which corresponds to much of the Communist demand will be exposed; at last Washington will see on April 4th a gathering together of those who out of fear of God and love of country will be present to march, to pray, to sing, to listen to the patriots, and to join in that last verse of our national anthem:

"Oh, thus be it ever when freemen shall stand
Between their loved homes and the war's desolution;
Blest with vict'ry and peace, may the Heav'n-rescued land
Praise the Pow'r that has made and preserved us a nation!
Then conquer we must, when our cause it is just;
And this be our motto: 'In God is our trust!'
And the star-spangled banner in truimph shall wave
O'er the land of the free, and the home of the home of the brave."

The Palm Sunday march sent the Saviour into Jerusalem. Joshua's march around Jericho brought the walls tumbling down. May the March For Victory be used of God to help return America to the faith of her fathers.

Buses are coming to Washington from every section of the eastern part of the United States. Charter planes and private planes have been engaged to bring those dedicated to victory to the march. At last something has been done which challenges the mass media, the brainwashing, the pollution of our atmosphere, for victory. The cry for victory is breaking through!

The decision to hold this march was made November 11 and a most thrilling development is the manner in which the women across the nation have rallied to the leadership of this cause. Like the women of Brazil they are determined to save the United States from communism. Whole families are coming. Baby carriages will be seen on Pennsylvania Avenue. Expected are 2,500 Cuban refugees who will be marching in one delegation. An Indian chief from Wyoming is to be present. Every group will bring its own banners and signs. The Viet Cong flag was carried down Pennsylvania Avenue on November 15 and the U.S. flag was carried upside down. Now, in the March For Victory, it will be Old Glory, and the Stars and Stripes forever!

When the International Council of Christian Churches met in its Seventh World Congress in Cape May, N.J., August, 1968, the 3,000 delegates representing 140 denominations, voted unanimously for victory and called upon the free world to win the war and to win victory over communism. The resolution stated:

"Communism, which is anti-God, anti-Christ, anti-men and anti-freedom, is an instrument of Satan and as such must be challenged in the name of God, truth, righteousness.

"The ICCC opposes aiding the Communists in any way and especially when their agents and armaments are killing those who fight for freedom in Vietnam. Peaceful coexistence with communism is morally impossible.

"The ICCC identifies itself with the Christians in Russia who are worshiping in the underground.

"The ICCC exposes and opposes all use of the churches by the Communist conspiracy.

"Communism cannot be appeased; it must be exposed and opposed until it is defeated and its imperialistic policies ended. This Council of Churches summons all Christians to the conflict and warns the nations that even peace and peace conferences are strategies of war for the Marxists.

"This Council prays for the day of liberation of Mainland China, North Korea, Russia, the Eastern European lands, Cuba and North Vietnam, and calls upon world leaders to re-evaluate programs which give communism advantage.

"We commend South Vietnam, the United States of America, Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, the Philippines, and all fighting in Vietnam in the battle against communism. We declare that the struggle in Vietnam must not be relaxed until victory is won. The United States is not the aggressor in Vietnam as the Fourth Assembly of the World Council of Churches officially charged in Uppsala, Sweden, last month. The Communists have always been the aggressors with the world-wide Communist conspiracy promoting it.

"The ICCC calls upon the youth of the churches to give themselves wholeheartedly for freedom in the ideological struggle and repudiate the youth movements which are rebelling against serving their country against Communist tyrannies. To this end, the ICCC appeals to the living God, whose Son warned us: 'No man can enter into a strong man's house, and spoil his goods, except he will first bind the strong man; and then he will spoil his house' (Mark 3: 27). May God enable the free nations to remain strong and courageous, and may He answer the prayers of all of His people for mercy and help."

THIS IS OUR SPRING OFFENSIVE FOR FREEDOM

It is Easter and the whole Christian world is rejoicing in the victory that Jesus Christ won on the cross, His triumph over death and the grave by His resurrection. "If God be for us, who can be against us?" (Rom. 8:31) and it is the faith which the Christians have, born of victory in their great salvation, that enables us to fight and to ask all to join in this fight for victory in Vietnam. This magnificent march with thousands and thousands participating could be the last chance that free men have, or it could be the beginning of a great deliverance, a turning of the tide when free men shall be delivered of despair and confusion. We invite you to join us in the March for Victory. All you need to do is to be there, and with the Communist world watching, every man counts. We invite you on your own responsibility under God to be present with us in Washington April 4th. (*This statement was prepared by Dr. Carl McIntire, Chairman, March For Victory Committee, and President, International Council of Christian Churches.*)

The March is sponsored by the March for Victory Committee with headquarters at 838 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

National Co-ordinator, William Buckingham, four terms of duty as war correspondent in Vietnam; Southern co-ordinator, Wes Auger, Pompano Beach, Fla., God and Country speaker; Washington co-ordinator, Clifford Peterson; National Committee on Arrangements, Dr. James Shaw, Director, International Christian Relief, Cherry Hill, N.J. Sponsors of the March are hundreds from all sections of the United States, including the following: the Honorable Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives; Milton Lory, Sioux City, Ia., President Emeritus, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc.; George C. Wallace, Mont., Ala., former Gov. of Ala.; Dean C. White, New York City, Public Relations; Hon. Lester Maddox, Atlanta, Ga., Governor of the State of Georgia; John Stormer, Florrisant, Mo., Author, "None Dare Call It Treason"; Bob Wells, D.D. Anaheim, Calif., Evangelist; Bob Jones, D.D., Greenville, S.C., President, Bob Jones University; A. A. MacRae, Ph. D., Philadelphia, Pa., President, Faith Theological Seminary, Arthur Froehlich, D.D., Orlando, Fla., President, Central Florida Christian School, A. Graves Williams, Wilmington, Ohio, Industrialist; Hon. John Rarick, Congressman, Louisiana; Frank Gaydosh, Carbondale, Pa., Business Executive; Richard E. Coulter, Ph. D., Cape May, N.J., Dean Shelton College; E. E. Bradley, N. Hollywood, Calif., Public Relations; Sam Morris, D.D., "The Voice of Temperance," San Antonio, Texas, Owner, Radio Station KDRY; Pastor Theodore J. Floyd, Philadelphia, Pa., Director, Christian Hope Fellowship Hour; David T. Myers, Collingswood, N.J., President, International Christian Youth, Victor Sears, D.D., Englewood, Colo,, Editor, Western Voice; Hon. Strom Thurmond, U.S. Senator, South Carolina; Peter Koltypin, Chairman, Freedom For Russia, Bridgeport, Conn.; James W. Slaw, Broomall, Pa., Post Commander, General Douglas A. MacArthur Post No. 1507; Dr. L. Zabko-Potapovich, Chester, Pa., Editor, The Messenger of Truth (Ukrainian); Mrs. C. B. Johnson, Mesa, Arizona, President, Mothers' Crusade, Inc., for Victory Over Communism; Dr. R. R. Staub, Winona Lake, Indiana, Natural Science Research Foundation; Richard H. Roffman, Esq., New York City, Editor and Radio Commentator; Dr. Harris Greeley, Jr., Brooklyn, N.Y., author; Dr. D. M. Atterbury, New York City, author and international lecturer on Asian Affairs; Carl Mau, Media, Pa., Director Veterans Hospital Radio Network; John Kottis, Oxbridge, Mass., Attorney; Rev. Aaron Dumas, New Castle, Pa., Independent Gospel Mission; Paul Voronaeff, Indianapolis, Ind., evangelist and lecturer on Russia; Father George Grabbe, New York City, Russian Orthodox Church Outside Russia; Homer Hyde, San Antonio, Texas, author; Rev. Emanuel Peters, Nanuet, N.Y., Rev. S. W. Roberts, Roanake, Va.; Rev. James Blizzard, Knoxville, Tenn.; Mrs. John Murchie, Baton Rouge, La.; Rev. Melvin Perry, Nashville, Tenn.; Rev. James Andrews, Rockville, Md.; Mrs. W. Chapman, Culpeper, Va.; Rev. Robert Vandermey, Buffalo, N.Y.; Rev. Henry Campbell, Dexter, Mich.; Rev. William Briggs, LaGrange, Ill.; Rev. David Jones, Winston-Salem, N.C.; Rev. John Dekker, Baltimore, Md.; Mrs. Carlton Stoudenmier, Richmond, Va.; Rev. J. Chitwood, Winston-Salem, N.C.; Robert Hodges, Columbia, S.C.; Fred Fries, Atlanta, Ga.; David Rushton, Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Robert Gray, Westchester, Ill.; Rev. Dennis Leaman, Chattanooga, Tenn.; Thomas Meckes, Philadelphia, Pa.; Eusebio Mujal, Secretary General of Labor in pre-Castro Cuba; Dr. Portel Vila, Washington, D.C.; John J. Duncan, Congressman, Tennessee. Mr. and Mrs. Franklin Scudder, Claremont, Calif, Scudder Oaks Country School; Mrs. Bea Ziegler, Chairman, and Mrs. Nancy Harder, Executive Secretary, "Mothers of Servicemen," Pasadena, California; Dr. Roland Rasmussen, Canoga Park, Calif., Pastor, Faith Baptist Church; Mr. James Taylor, Woodland Hills, Calif., "Committee of Christian Laymen, Inc.; Mrs. Leota Brinkman, Mr. Frank Silcock, San Francisco, Calif., "Association of American Voters"; Nancy Perino, United to Serve America, Toluca Lake, Calif.; Sons of the American Revolution, Washington, D.C.

Assemble 11:00 a.m. at 4th and the Mall Parade begins at 12:00 noon—12:00 until 2:00, parade from 4th Street to 15th Street on Pennsylvania Avenue and over to Monument 2:00 p.m. until 5:00 p.m. assembly at Washington Monument to redress grievances.

March for Victory Headquarters, National Press Building, Room 838, Washington, D.C., 737–1133 and 737–1134.

(This ad paid for by International Council of Christian Churches. It is not copyrighted and may be taken by any groups who desire to use it and pay for its publication in any papers of the country.)

A MEMORANDUM ON THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I spread upon the RECORD a memorandum on the proposed equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution as prepared by a study group of the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT TO THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION—A MEMORANDUM

(By the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, Washington, D.C., March 1970)

This paper was presented to the Council by its study group on equal legal rights: Sarah Jane Cunningham, Chairman, Virginia R. Allan, Lorraine L. Blair, Rachel E. Scott, Irene Wischer; Mary Eastwood, Technical Staff.)

The proposed equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution would provide that "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex," and would authorize the Congress and the States to enforce the amendment by appropriate legislation.[1]

The purpose of the proposed amendment would be to provide constitutional protection against laws and official practices that treat men and women differently. At the present time, the extent to which women may invoke the protection of the Constitution against laws which discriminate on the basis of sex is unclear. The equal rights amendment would insure equal rights under the law for men and women and would secure the right of all persons to equal treatment under the laws and official practices without differentiation based on sex.

Joint resolutions proposing that the equal rights amendment be approved for submission to the States for ratification have been sponsored by 75 Senators and 225 Members of the House of Representatives in this (91st) Congress (as of March 11, 1970). Adoption of the amendments would require a ⅔ vote of both Houses of Congress and ratification by ¾ of the States. Thus there are already more than the necessary number of Senators who are committed to support the amendment for its approval by the Senate. These joint resolutions are currently pending in the respective Senate and House Judiciary Committees.

The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, at its meeting February 7, 1970, endorsed the equal rights amendment, adopting the following resolution:

The Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women endorses the proposed Equal Rights Amendment to the United States Constitution and recommends that the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women urge the President to immediately request the passage of the pro-

Footnotes at end of article.

posed Equal Rights Amendment by the Congress of the United States.

The Council's recommendation was transmitted to the President on February 13, 1970.

HISTORY OF THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Resolutions proposing an equal rights amendment have been introduced in every Congress since 1923. Hearings were held by the House and Senate Judiciary Committees in 1948 and 1956, respectively.[2] The amendment has been repeatedly reported favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee, most recently in 1964 (S. Rept. No. 1558, 88th Cong., 2d Sess.), and has twice passed the Senate, in 1950 and 1953.

Both times it was passed, however, with the so-called "Hayden rider," which provided that the equal rights amendment "shall not be construed to impair any rights, benefits, or exemptions now or hereafter conferred by law, upon persons of the female sex." [3] Both times the rider accomplished its purpose of killing the proposed amendment since, as the Senate Judiciary Committee has noted, the rider's "qualification is not acceptable to women who want equal rights under the law. It is under the guise of so-called 'rights' or 'benefits' that women have been treated unequally and denied opportunities which are available to men." (S. Rept. No. 1558, *supra*)

Since the proposed equal rights amendment has failed to pass Congress for the past 47 years, it may appear to be a loser, although admittedly it took women more than 50 years to secure the adoption of the 19th amendment. However, a revival of the feminist movement has occured during the past four years and it is greatly increasing in momentum, especially among younger women. Thus the demand for equal rights and support for the amendment is becoming more widespread, with a corresponding increase in likelihood of early adoption of the amendment.

LAWS WHICH DISCRIMINATE ON THE BASIS OF SEX

A number of studies have been made in recent years by the President's Commission on the Status of Women, the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, and State commissions on the status of women concerning the various types of laws which distinguish on the basis of sex.[4] Opposition to the equal rights amendment in the past has been based in part on "fear of the unknown," *i.e.*, lack of information concerning the types of laws which distinguish on the basis of sex and would therefore be affected by the amendment. Further delay in approving the amendment thus need not await any further study of the kinds of laws that discriminate on the basis of sex.

These studies have shown that numerous distinctions based on sex still exist in the law. For example:

1. State laws placing special restrictions on women with respect to hours of work and weightlifting on the job;

2. State law prohibiting women from working in certain occupations;

3. Laws and practices operating to exclude women from State colleges and universities (including higher standards required for women applicants to institutions of higher learning and in the administration of scholarship programs);

4. Discrimination in employment by State and local governments;

5. Dual pay schedules for men and women public school teachers;

6. State laws providing for alimony to be awarded, under certain circumstances, to ex-wives but not to ex-husbands;

7. State laws placing special restrictions on the legal capacity of married women or on their right to establish a legal domicile;

8. State laws that requires married women but not married men to go through a formal procedure and obtain court approval before they may engage in an independent business.[5]

9. Social Security and other social benefits legislation which give greater benefits to one sex than to the other;

10. Discriminatory preferences, based on sex, in child custody cases;

11. State laws providing that the father is the natural guardian of the minor children; [6]

12. Different ages for males and females in (a) child labor laws, (b) age for marriage, (c) cutoff of the right to parental support, and (d) juvenile court jurisdiction;

13. Exclusion of women from the requirements of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967;

14. Special sex-based exemptions for women in selection of State juries;

15. Heavier criminal penalties for female offenders than for male offenders committing the same crime.

Although it is possible that these and other discriminations might eventually be corrected by legislation, legislative remedies are *not* adequate substitutes for fundamental constitutional protection against discrimination. Any class of persons (i.e., women) which cannot successfully invoke the protection of the Constitution against discriminatory treatment is by definition comprised of "second class citizens" and is inferior in the eyes of law.

THE POSITION OF WOMEN UNDER EXISTING CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution provides that no State shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The Federal government is similarly restricted from interfering with these individual rights, under the "due process clause" of the Fifth Amendment.

During the past century, women have been largely unsuccessful in seeking judicial relief from sex discrimination in cases challenging the constitutionality of discriminatory laws under these provisions. As the Committee on Civil and Political Rights, President's Commission on the Status of Women, noted in its 1963 Report,

In no 14th amendment case alleging discrimination on account of sex has the United States Supreme Court held that a law classifying persons on the basis of sex is unreasonable and therefore unconstitutional.[7]

In 1874, the Supreme Court held that the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States, protected from abridgment by the States under the Fourteenth Amendment, did not confer upon women the right to vote, although the Court conceded that women were persons and citizens within the meaning of the amendment.[8] Similarly, the privileges and immunities clause was held not to confer on women the right to practice law.[9]

The constitutionality of State laws regulating the employment of women (but not men) was upheld in a number of cases brought between 1908 and 1937: maximum hours laws,[10] laws prohibiting night work for women,[11] and laws requiring a minimum wage for women.[12] In 1948, the Court upheld a Michigan law prohibiting (with certain exceptions) the licensing of women as bartenders.[13]

A Florida law providing that women not be called for jury service unless she registers with the clerk of court her desire to serve was held not violative of the Fourteenth Amendment in 1961.[14] However, more recently, a three-judge Federal court in Alabama held that State's law excluding women from jury service violated the rights of women under the Fourteenth Amendment stating:

The Constitution of the United States must be read as embodying general principles meant to govern society and the institutions of government as they evolve through time. It is therefore this Court's function to apply the Constitution as a living document to the legal cases and controversies of contemporary society.

The Alabama statute that denies women the right to serve on juries . . . violates that provision of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States that forbids any state to "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." The plain effect of this constitutional provision is to prohibit prejudicial disparities before the law. This means prejudicial disparities for all citizens—including women. *White* v. *Crook*, 251 F. Supp. 401, 408 (M.D. Ala., 1969).

In *Abbot* v. *Mines*, 411 F. 2d 353 (C.A. 6, 1969) the Court reversed a case in which the trial judge had dismissed women jurors from the panel because the evidence in the case required testimony concerning cancer of the male genitals. The Court of Appeals stated:

It is common knowledge that society no longer coddles women from the very real and sometimes brutal facts of life. Women, moreover, do not seek such oblivion.

The District Judge's desire to avoid embarrassment to the women jurors is understandable and commendable but such sentiments must be subordinated to constitutional mandates. 411 F. 2d at 355.

As recently as ten years ago, the Supreme Court declined to hear a case in which the Texas Court of Civil Appeals had upheld the exclusion of women from a State college, Texas A & M.[15]

In February 1970 a three-judge Federal court dismissed as "moot" a class action in which women sought to desegregate various all male and all female public institutions of higher learning in the State of Virginia. However, the Court had previously ordered the University to consider without regard to sex the women plaintiffs' applications for admission to the University of Virginia at Charlottesville and to submit a three-year plan for desegregating the University at Charlottesville. *Kirstein et al.* v. *The Rector and Visitors of the University of Virginia, etc., et al.* (E.D. Va., Richmond Div. Civil No. 220-69-R).

Although there are very few female criminals as compared to male criminals, some laws provide for longer prison terms for women than for men committing the same crime. Such laws in Pennsylvania and Connecticut have been held to be inconsistent with the equal protection guarantees of the Fourteenth Amendment.[16]

Thus, in at least two areas—jury service and criminal penalties—women appear to have made progress in invoking the protection of the Fourteenth Amendment. Although jury service is important as a practical matter it is hardly central to the lives of women. Criminal penalties are of real significance to only a very few women. Moreover, the court decisions have not wiped out discrimination even in these areas. The *Kirstein* case noted above represents some progress in an area vital to women—education, but the extent to which women may insist on equal educational opportunities under the Constitution still remains unclear.

Different treatment of men and women for purposes of computing social security benefits has been held not to violate the right to due process and equal protection of the laws. *Gruenwald* v. *Gardner*, 390 F. 2d 591 (C.A. 2, 1968), cert. denied, 393 U.S. 982. The Court of Appeals stated that "the trend of authority makes it clear that the variation in amounts of retirement benefits based upon differences in the attributes of men

Footnotes at end of article.

and women is constitutionally valid." The Court also stated:

There is here a reasonable relationship between the objective sought by the classification, which is to reduce the disparity between the economic *and physical* capabilities of a man and a woman—and the means used to achieve that objective in affording to women more favorable benefit computations. There is, moreover, nothing arbitrary or unreasonable about the application of the principle underlying the statutory differences in the computations for men and women. Notwithstanding the favorable treatment granted to women in computing their benefits, the average monthly payments to men retiring at age 62 still exceeds those awarded women retiring at that age. 390 F. 2d at 592. (emphasis supplied)

In a case involving a violation of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967, the defendant raised the issue of sex discrimination, charging that since men but not women are compelled to serve in the Armed Forces, his rights to due process of law under the Fifth Amendment were violated. *United States* v. *St. Clair*, 291 F. Supp. 122 (S.D. N. Y., 1968). The Court stated:

In the Act and its predecessors, Congress made a legislative judgment that men should be subject to involuntary induction but that women, presumably because they are "still regarded as the center of home and family life" (*Hoyt* v *State of Florida*, . . .), should not. Women may constitutionally be afforded "special recognition" (cf. *Gruenwald* v. *Gardner*, . . .) particularly since women are not excluded from service in the Armed Forces.

In providing for involuntary service for men and voluntary service for women, Congress followed the teachings of history that if a nation is to survive, *men must provide the first line of defense while women keep the home fires burning*. 291 F. Supp. at 124–5. (Emphasis supplied)

In two recent cases, women sought to enjoin State officials from enforcing special restrictions on the hours of work of women on the ground that such laws violate their rights to due process and equal protection of the law under the Fourteenth Amendment. The three-judge Federal courts (convened pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2281, 2284) held that the constitutional issue was insubstantial and that the three-judge court lacked jurisdiction.[17] The women argued that because of the State restrictive laws, they were deprived of opportunities for better paying jobs and overtime pay.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women stated in its 1963 report, *American Women*, that it was convinced that the U.S. Constitution now embodies equality of rights for men and women. . . . But judicial clarification is imperative in order that remaining ambiguities with respect to the constitutional protection of women's rights be eliminated. Early and definitive court pronouncement, particularly by the U.S. Supreme Court, is urgently needed with regard to the validity under the 5th and 14th amendments of laws and official practices discriminating against women, to the end that the principle of equality become firmly established in constitutional doctrine. (GPO, page 45).

The position of women under the Constitution remains ambiguous in 1970.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT AND EXISTING CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

It is, of course, possible that the 5th and 14th amendments will in the future be interpreted by the courts as prohibiting all sex distinctions in the law. Nothing in the proposed equal rights amendment would preclude this from occurring; the amendment would in no way cut back, modify, or qualify any protection against discrimination based on sex which may be afforded by the 5th and 14th amendments. As pointed out in Story, *Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States* (5th Edit. §§ 1938, 1939):

The securities of individual rights, it has often been observed, cannot be too frequently declared, nor in too many forms of words; nor is it possible to guard too vigilantly against the encroachments of power, nor to watch with too lively a suspicion the propensity of persons in authority to break through the "cobweb chains of paper constitution." . . .

Conceding, therefore, that if correctly construed, and applied according to their true intent and meaning, other constitutional provisions, State and national, might afford ample security for individual rights, we may nevertheless pardon the anxiety for further prohibitions, and concede that, even if wholly needless, the repetition of such securities may well be excused so long as the slightest doubt of their having been already sufficiently declared shall anywhere be found to exist.

The proposed amendment would secure the right of all persons to equal treatment under the law without any distinction as to sex. If the protection against sex discrimination provided by the equal rights amendment should prove to be duplicative of protections afforded by enlightened interpretations of the 5th and 14th amendments, no harm would be done.

Supporters of the equal rights amendment believe that the potential of the 14th amendment is too unclear and that women's constitutional rights to equality are too insecure to rely evclusively on the possibility of getting more enlightened court decisions under that amendment.

In a 1963 case, the Supreme Court stated: "The Fifteenth Amendment prohibits a State from denying or abridging a Negro's right to vote. The Nineteenth Amendment does the same for women. . . . Once a geographical unit for which a representative is to be chosen is designated, all who participate in the election are to have an equal vote—whatever their race, whatever their sex. . . . This is required by the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Gray* v. *Sanders*, 372 U.S. 368, 379."

This interpretation of the 14th amendment reinforced and made doubly secure the right to vote. There are numerous cases in which the Supreme Court has interpreted the 14th amendment to reinforce or to extend rights guaranteed by earlier or, as in the above case, later amendments to the Constitution. For example, the more general due process and equal protection concepts of the 5th and 14th amendments have been used to strengthen more specific rights of individuals to freedom of speech, assembly and religion guaranteed by the First Amendment; and the right to a speedy trial and the right to counsel guaranteed by the Sixth.

If the equal rights amendment is adopted, the courts might well subsequently interpret the Fourteenth Amendment as reinforcing constitutional equality for women. Certainly this possibility does not justify further delay in approving the amendment.

EFFECT THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT WOULD HAVE ON LAWS DIFFERENTIATING ON THE BASIS OF SEX

Constitutional amendments, like statutes, are interpreted by the courts in the light of intent of Congress. Committee reports on a proposal are regarded by the courts as the most persuasive evidence of the intended meaning of a provision. Therefore, the probable meaning and effect of the equal rights amendment can be ascertained from the Senate Judiciary Committee reports (which have been the same in recent years):

1. The amendment would restrict only governmental action, and would not apply to purely private action. What constitutes "State action" would be the same as under the 14th amendment and as developed in 14th amendment litigation on other subjects.

2. Special restrictions on property rights of married women would be unconstitutional; married women could engage in business as freely as a member of the male sex; inheritance rights of widows would be same as for widowers.

3. Women would be equally subject to jury service and to military service, but women would not be required to serve (in the Armed Forces) where they are not fitted any more than men are required to so serve.

4. Restrictive work laws for women only would be unconstitutional (e.g. maximum hours, night work and weight-lifting restrictions on women).

5. Alimony laws would not favor women solely because of their sex, but a divorce decree could award support to a mother if she was granted custody of the children. Matters concerning custody and support of children would be determined in accordance with the welfare of the children and without favoring either parent because of sex.

6. Laws granting maternity benefits to mothers would not be affected by the amendment, nor would criminal laws governing sexual offenses become unconstitutional (e.g. rape, prostitution).

Although the proposed amendment would specifically authorize the Congress and the States to enact implementing legislation, the amendment would be largely self-operative. The amendment is patterned after the 15th and 19th amendments, which required equal voting rights for Negroes and women, respectively. The 15th and 19th amendments did not render unconstitutional all State voting laws; they simply required the extension of voting rights to Negroes and women. The equal rights amendment would simply require that men and women be treated the same under the law. In some instances, like the 15th and 19th amendments, the effect of the amendment would be to strike the words of sex identification in the law rather than render it unconstitutional, thereby extending the rights under the law to both sexes. In other cases, where the law serves only to restrict, deny or limit the freedoms or rights of one sex, such restrictions would not be extended to both sexes; the law would be rendered unconstitutional. In still other cases, the law is partially restrictive to persons of one sex in that age limitations are imposed differently on males and females.

Following is a five-point analysis of the impact the equal rights amendment will have on the various types of Federal and State laws which distinguish on the basis of sex:

1. *Strike the Words of Sex Identification and Apply the Law to Both Sexes.*

Where the law confers a benefit, privilege or obligation of citizenship, such would be extended to the other sex, i.e. the effect of the amendment would be to strike the words of sex identification. Thus, such laws would not be rendered unconstitutional but would be extended to apply to both sexes by operation of the amendment, in the same way that laws pertaining to voting were extended to Negroes and women under the 15th and 19th amendments.

Examples of such laws include: laws which permit alimony to be awarded under certain circumstances to wives but not to husbands; social security and other social benefits legislation which give greater benefits to one sex than the other; exclusion of women from the requirements of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 (i.e., women would be equally subject to military conscription).

Any expression of preference in the law for the mother in child custody cases would be extended to both parents (as against

Footnotes at end of article.

claims of third parties). Children are entitled to support from *both* parents under the existing laws of most States.[18] Child support laws would be affected only if they discriminate on the basis of sex. The amendment would not prohibit the requiring of one parent to provide financial support for children who are in the custody of the other.

2. *Laws Rendered Unconstitutional by the Amendment.*

Where a law restricts or denies opportunities of women or men, as the case may be, the effect of the equal rights amendment would be to render such laws unconstitutional.

Examples are: the exclusion of women from State universities or other public schools; State laws placing special restrictions on the hours of work for women or the weights women may lift on the job; laws prohibiting women from working in certain occupations, such as bartenders; laws placing special restrictions on the legal capacity of married women, such as making contracts or establishing a legal domicile.

3. *Removal of Age Distinctions Based on Sex.*

Some laws which apply to both sexes make an age distinction by sex and thereby discriminate as to persons between the ages specified for males and females. Under the foregoing analysis, the ages specified in such laws would be equalized by the amendment by extending the benefits, privileges or opportunities under the law to both sexes. This would mean that as to some such laws, the *lower* age would apply to both sexes. For example: a lower minimum age for marriage for women would apply to both sexes; a lower age for boys under child labor laws would apply to girls as well. In other words, the *privileges* of marrying or working would be *extended* and the sex discrimination removed.

As to other laws, the *higher* age would apply to both sexes. For example: a higher cut-off age for the right to paternal support for boys would apply to girls as well; a higher age for girls for juvenile court jurisdiction would apply also to boys. In these cases, the *benefits* of paternal support or juvenile court jurisdiction would be *extended* to both sexes.

Thus, the test in determining whether these laws are to be equalized by applying the lower age or by applying the higher age to both sexes is as follows:

If the age limitation restricts individual liberty and freedom the lower age applies; if the age limitation confers a right, benefit or privilege to the individuals concerned and does not limit individual freedom, the higher age applies.

4. *Laws Which Could Not Possibly Apply to Both Sexes Because of the Difference in Reproductive Capacity.*

Laws which, as a practical matter, can apply to only one sex no matter how they are phrased, such as laws providing maternity benefits and laws prohibiting rape, would not be affected by the amendment. The extension of these laws to both sexes would be purely academic, since such laws would not apply differently if they were phrased in terms of both sexes. In these situations, the terminology of sex identification is of no consequence.[19]

5. *Separation of the Sexes.*

Separation of the sexes by law would be forbidden under the amendment except in situations where the separation is shown to be necessary because of an overriding and compelling public interest and does not deny individual rights and liberties.

For example, in our present culture the recognition of the right to privacy would justify separate restroom facilities in public buildings.

As shown above, the amendment would not change the substance of existing laws, except that those which restrict and deny opportunities to women would be rendered unconstitutional under the standard of point two of the analysis. In all other cases, the laws presently on the books would simply be equalized, and this includes the entire body of family law. Moreover, the amendment in no way would restrict the State legislature or the Congress in enacting legislation on any subject, since its only purpose and effect is to prohibit any distinction based on sex classification.

OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

Objection. The equal rights amendment is not needed because women already have equal rights under the 5th and 14th amendments.

Answer. The extent to which women may invoke the protection of the due process and equal protection guarantees of the 5th and 14th amendments is unclear. In fact, some recent court decisions have upheld sex distinctions in the law, in spite of these constitutional provisions. Even if the 5th and 14th amendments are in future cases construed so as to eliminate all sex distinctions in the law, the equal rights amendment would simply make the individual's right to equal treatment doubly secure.

Objection. If the amendment were adopted the courts would be flooded with litigation because the meaning of the amendment is not clear; e.g., what are the various "rights" that would be protected? What does "equality" mean?

Answer. The equal rights amendment would not cause excessive litigation unless there were massive resistance to compliance with the amendment's requirement of equal treatment of men and women. If that happened, it would only prove the great need for the amendment. The "right" protected by the amendment is the right to *equal treatment under the law,* whatever the subject of the law may be, without distinction based on sex.

Objection. The amendment would render unconstitutional a wide variety of State laws which now treat men and women differently.

Answer. Some State laws—those which *deny* rights or restrict freedoms of one sex—would be violative of the equal rights amendment and rendered unconstitutional. Laws which *confer* rights, benefits and privileges on one sex would have to apply to both sexes equally, but would not be rendered unconstitutional by the amendment.

Objection. The amendment would require sweeping changes in laws pertaining to the family.

Answer. The amendment would simply require equality. In States where the law provides for alimony only for wives, courts could award alimony to husbands as well, under the same conditions as apply with respect to wives. (More than ⅓ of the States now permit alimony to be awarded to either spouse.) Mothers and fathers would both be legally responsible for the support of their children, as is generally the case under existing law.

Objection. The amendment would nullify special State protective labor laws for women, such as those governing limitations on hours of work, weightlifting on the job, and prohibitions against night work, for women employees only.

Answer. This issue is fast becoming moot, because the Federal law (Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964) prohibits sex discrimination in employment and requires employers covered by the Act to treat men and women equally. A number of States have already conceded that special restrictions on women may no longer be enforced.

Objection. Women would be equally subject to the draft.

Answer. This is true. Women do serve in the Armed Forces now, but on a volunteer basis. The amendment would also prohibit more stringent eligibility standards for women than for men volunteers.

Objection. The equal rights amendment would require equal rights and responsibilities for women under the law.

Answer. True.

FOOTNOTES

[1] See, e.g., S.J. Res. 61, 91st Cong., 1st Sess.

[2] Hearings on the Equal Rights Amendment to the Constitution and Commission on the Legal Status of Women, House Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee No. 1, 80th Cong., 2d Sess. (1948); Hearings on Equal Rights, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, 84th Cong., 2d Sess. (1956).

[3] See 96 Cong. Rec. 872–3 (1950); 99 Cong. Rec. 8954–5 (1953).

[4] See especially, *Report of the Committee on Civil and Political Rights,* President's Commission on the Status of Women (GPO, 1963); *Report of the Task Force on Labor Standards,* Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women (GPO, 1968); *Report of the Task Force on Family Law and Policy,* CACSW (GPO, 1968). See also, Kanowitz, *Women and the Law: The Unfinished Revolution,* U. of N.M. Press, 1969.

[5] See, e.g., Calif. Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1811-1819; Nev. Rev. Stats., §§ 124. 010—124. 050.

[6] See, e.g., Code of Ga. Annot., §§ 49–102—49–104; Okla. Stats. Annot., tit. 10, § 5.

[7] GPO, 1963, p. 34.

[8] *Minor* v. *Happersett,* 21 Wall. 162, 168.

[9] *Bradwell* v. *State,* 16 Wall. 130 (1872). *In re Lockwood,* 154 U.S 116 (1894).

[10] *Muller* v. *Oregon,* 208 U.S. 412 (1908); *Riley* v. *Massachusetts,* 232 U.S. 671 (1914); *Miller* v. *Wilson,* 236 U.S. 373 (1915); *Busley* v. *McLaughlin,* 236 U.S. 385 (1915).

[11] *Radice* v. *New York,* 264 U.S. 292 (1924).

[12] *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish,* 300 U.S. 379 (1937), overruling *Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital,* 261 U.S. 525 (1923).

[13] *Goesaert* v. *Cleary,* 335 U.S. 464 (1948).

[14] *Hoyt* v. *Florida,* 368 U.S. 57 (1961).

[15] *Alfred* v. *Heaton,* 336 S.W. 2d 251 (1960), appeal dismissed and cert. denied, 364 U.S. 517, rehearing denied, 364 U.S. 944; see also *Heaton* v. *Bristol,* 317 S.W. 2d 86 (1958), appeal dismissed and cert. denied, 359 U.S. 230, rehearing denied, 359 U.S. 999.

[16] *Commonwealth* v. *Daniel,* 430 Pa. 642, 243 A. 2d 400 (1968); *U.S. ex rel. Robinson* v. *York,* 281 F. Supp. 8 (D. Conn., 1968).

[17] *Mengelkoch* v. *Industrial Welfare Commission,* 284 F. Supp. 950, 956 (C.D. Calif., 1968), three-judge order vacated, 393 U.S. 83, rehearing denied, 393 U.S. 993, appeal pending in the Ninth Circuit; *Ward* v. *Luttrell,* 292 F. Supp. 162, 165 (E. D. La. 1968).

[18] *Reciprocal State Legislation to Enforce the Support of Dependents,* Council of State Governments, 1964, page 20.

[19] See Murray and Eastwood, "Jane Crow and the Law: Sex Discrimination and Title VII" 34 G. W. L. Rev. 232, 240-241 (1965).

(NOTE.—Where the term GPO is mentioned in the text or in footnotes, the documents are available from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.)

EXECUTIVE ORDER 11126—ESTABLISHING A COMMITTEE AND A COUNCIL RELATING TO THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The President's Commission on the Status of Women, established by Executive Order No. 10980 of December 14, 1961, has in fulfillment of its responsibilities, submitted a report concerning the steps that should be taken to further the effort to achieve the full participation of women in American life.

Enhancement of the quality of American leife, as envisioned by the Commission's report can be accomplished only through concerted action by both public and private groups, through coordinated action within

the Federal Government, and through action by States, communities, educational institutions, voluntary organizations, employers, unions, and individual citizens.

In order to assure effective and continuing leadership in advancing the status of women, it is deemed appropriate to establish an interdepartmental committee and a citizens' advisory council on the status of women.

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States, it is ordered as follows:

PART I.—INTERDEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Section 101(a) There is hereby established the Interdepartmental Committee on the Status of Women (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee"), which shall be composed of the Secretary of Labor, who shall be the Chairman of the Committee, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Attorney General, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, the Chairman of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, and an Assistant Secretary of Labor to be designated by the Secretary of Labor, all ex officio. The Chairman may designate a Vice-Chairman of the Committee from its membership, and the Director of the Women's Bureau of the Department of Labor shall serve as Executive Vice-Chairman of the Committee, and shall be an ex officio member thereof.[1]

(b) When any matter especially related to the area of responsibility of any Federal Department or agency, the head of which is not a member of the Committee, is to be considered by the Committee, the Chairman of the Committee shall invite the head of such department or agency to participate in the deliberations of the Committee with respect to such matter and to be a temporary member of the Committee during such deliberations.

Sec. 102. The Committee shall—

(1) Maintain a continuing review and evaluation of the progress of Federal departments and agencies in advancing the status of women.

(2) Serve as a clearing house for information as to the activities being directed toward, and the progress being made in, improving conditions of special interest to women.

(3) Stimulate cooperation and the sharing of data, views, and information among Federal agencies, State and local governments, State commissions on the status of women, and public and private organizations having responsibilities and interests in areas of special concern to women.

(4) Encourage research on factors affecting the status of women in the areas of education, home and community activities, employment, social insurance, taxes, civil and political rights, labor legislation, and related matters.

(5) Exchange information with the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women, established by Part II of this order, on progress toward advancing the status of women and on new developments requiring consideration by the Council and the Committee.

Sec. 103. Annually the Committee, after consultation with the Citizens' Advisory Council, shall transmit a report to the President concerning the status of women.[1]

PART II—CITIZEN'S ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

Sec. 201. There is hereby established the Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women (hereinafter referred to as the "Council"), which shall be composed of 20 members appointed by the President, one of whom he shall designate to serve as Chairman. The Council shall meet at the call of the Chairman of the Committee, but not less than twice a year. Members of the Council shall serve without compensation from the United States.[1]

Sec. 202. The Council shall—

(1) Serve as a primary means for suggesting and stimulating action with private institutions, organizations, and individuals working for improvement of conditions of special concern to women.

(2) Review and evaluate progress of organizations in furthering the full participation of women in American life.

(3) Advise and assist the Committee in the evaluation of total progress made and recommended to the Committee, as necessary, action to accelerate such progress.

(4) Consider the effect of new developments on methods of advancing the status of women and recommend appropriate action to the Committee.

PART III.—FINANCING AND ADMINISTRATION

Sec. 301. The departments the heads of which are, under Section 101(a) of this order, members of the Committee and the Civil Service Commission shall, as may be necessary, furnish assistance to the Committee in accordance with Section 214 of the Act of May 3, 1945, 59 Stat. 134 (31 U.S.C. 691). To the extent practical and not inconsistent with the law, (1) all Federal departments and agencies shall cooperate with the Committee and the Council and furnish them such information and assistance as may be necessary for the performance of their functions, and (2) the Secretary of Labor shall furnish staff, office space, office facilities and supplies and other necessary assistance, facilities, and services for the Committee and Council (including travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence for members of the Council).

[s] JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *November 1, 1963.*

[1] As amended by Executive Order 11221 of May 6, 1965, 30 F. R. 6427.

[1] As amended by Executive Order 11221 of May 6, 1965, 30 F.R. 6427.

COLLISION WARNING

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, on January 8, 1960, two F–101B's collided approximately 60 miles from Lambert-St. Louis Airport under positive radar control. Both planes were lost, and two crew members killed. This incident sparked the McDonnell Douglas investigation of collision avoidance, which gave birth to the time resynchronization technology called EROS. EROS is an acronym that stands for "eliminate range zero system," for if range zero is eliminated, no collision can occur.

The McDonnell Douglas investigation followed the now traditional path of a detailed investigation. In a 2-year study, it was determined that none of the previous air safety devices provided the needed protection necessary to handle aircraft over a wide velocity spectrum and in all attitude maneuvering flight.

More recently the examination of this technology has led to a realization, that the same signal structure that provides collision avoidance warning, can also be used as a powerful tool to aid air traffic control.

Earlier this year I entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article honoring Mr. Frank C. White or as he is known in the trade, "Mr. Collision Avoidance." Today, I am entering an article by Mr. Joe Dobronski, chief test pilot for the McDonnell Douglas Corp. His article clearly explains the current technology of collision avoidance systems, and points to the urgent need for every aircraft to have such equipment. I am grateful to Mr. Dale May, one of the Nation's top spokesmen for general aviation, for calling this article to my attention.

Since coming to Congress in 1959, I have advocated such equipment be mandatory on all aircraft. Coverage for the entire United States is estimated to cost about $80 million. I urge all my colleagues to read this article very carefully and weigh the benefits and safety factors we are unmindful of. The article follows:

COLLISION WARNING

(By Joe Dobronski)

The test run began at 45,000 feet above the Missouri-Arkansas border. I had just pushed our F–4 Phantom to more than 1000 mph, and the foothills of the Ozarks were sweeping beneath our wings at nearly 20 miles a minute.

Ahead of us, another supersonic Phantom was closing straight for a tiny point in the sky—a spot we both would soon occupy at the same time.

The miles between us were dropping away so fast that I would be unable to identify the approaching speck on the windscreen before it became distressingly huge. The final mile would close in barely more than a second, and we would not see each other in time to take evasive action. Nor would we be warned from the ground.

But we would not collide.

A new concept in airborne collision avoidance was about to receive one of its toughest tests, a head-on pass at supersonic speeds. A slim package of electronic circuitry in the missile well of our airplane was sending and receiving precisely-timed signals that would allow detection of the imminent crash when the two planes were still 35 miles apart—or 60 seconds before we would fly to destruction.

As we held our course and speed, a rasping tone in the headset sounded the warning. On my instrument panel an arrow popped into view. "Fly up", it said. At the same instant an arrow was appearing in the cockpit of the other fighter miles away. "Fly down", it said. Seconds later he saw the sun glint for an instant on the wings of the other half of our potential catastrophe as it passed 1000 feet below.

This mid-air crash was averted by a new collision avoidance system, EROS, since proven on more than 14,000 operational flights. Configured to airline requirements, it may one day soon protect air travellers everywhere.

A CONDITION IN COMMON

The concept demonstrated above the Ozarks was developed as a result of a mid-air crash of two of our supersonic F–101 Voodoos in 1960. We studied backwards from the instant of contact, looking into every possibility for avoiding the accident. We compared it with other recorded mid-air crashes. And we found that, no matter what other circumstances exist, all air collisions have one obvious condition in common. The range between two colliding aircraft eventually closes to zero.

The name and purpose of the new device had emerged: "Eliminate Range O System"—EROS. In pursuit of this goal, engineers at McDonnell Douglas faced a challenge that had frustrated researchers in a score of companies for over a decade. The solution, easier to hypothesise than to achieve, was to avoid range zero by finding a way to measure the range and closing rate between aircraft.

If you know that an aircraft is 20 miles away and you are closing at 20 miles a minute, then you have 60 seconds to react, to maneuver your aircraft out of harm's way. But there was no existing way to determine range and closing rate for a large number of aircraft, all climbing, descending, maneuvering and speeding through a given airspace—at least not with an airborne system smaller than house-sized proportions. The necessity was to find a means for literally hundreds of aircraft to communicate with one another without interference.

The eventual solution was to develop a new technique, now known as "resynchronisation". In simple terms, it precisely divides the few seconds available for solving the collision avoidance problem. Inexpensive, lightweight, airborne clocks (crystal oscillators) are reset every three seconds by a signal from a ground station master clock. This maintains a time reference accurate to 0.0000002 of a second in each aircraft. The continuously synchronised clocks make it possible to allocate time periods, or "message slots," to EROS-equipped aircraft.

A TIME TO TALK AND A TIME TO LISTEN

Each aircraft is assigned a message slot: a time to talk. When the onboard clock reaches the assigned time period for broadcast, the EROS system transmits a signal that includes its identification and altitude.

All other EROS system listen. By measuring the delay between the instant transmission starts and the instant it is received, each EROS set can determine the range between itself and the transmitting aircraft.

In addition, because of Doppler effect, the radio frequency of the signal received changes according to the relative speed between the two aircraft. From this change, EROS logic can determine the time to closest approach, by electronically dividing the range by the range rate. When the flight paths become threatening, the system issues a warning. With the commercial EROS system installed, 2000 aircraft with a 140-mile radius could accomplish all of this communication, interpretation, and presentation every three seconds.

Admittedly, collisions could still occur between aircraft approaching each other at speeds too slow for the Doppler shift to be discernible. (The 1956 Grand Canyon collision between two airliners was at such gradual closing rates.) Consequently, the system warns of aircraft flying at the same altitude and within 1½ miles, regardless of the closing rate.

PROTECTION EVEN WHILE MANEUVERING

Altitude information coded in the incoming EROS signal is compared electronically with the altitude and rate-of-climb or descent in the receiving aircraft. If the comparison finds the paths of two aircraft crossing at the same altitude, a collision situation exists. The warning is sounded. But it doesn't help a pilot to find out he's in trouble if you don't tell him what to do. EROS does.

A buzzer—a loud one—tells him to look at his collision avoidance instrument. Lighted arrows tell him to fly up or fly down. In heavy traffic, where other aircraft occupy altitudes above and below, the instrument will direct a relatively small climb or dive to avoid the collision without disrupting other air traffic.

EROS is a "real time" device. That means it does not store or retrieve information. Its computations are fairly simple. All information needed to avoid a collision is evaluated once every three seconds. Information presented three seconds later is completely new and current.

It is "real time" in another sense. It is not a system dependent on new technological breakthroughs or a long development cycle. EROS, with 14,000 flights behind it, is a proven concept, a proven system, ready to enter quantity production. The system, electronically configured to airline requirements, has been studied and operationally tested by the Air Transport Association. The test programme, in which the McDonnell Douglas system and precise time-base CAS systems of two other manufacturers were evaluated, was sponsored, by a number of major US air carriers and included FAA paticipation.

WHY CAN'T WE HAVE IT NOW?

Various reasons for delaying the system's introduction are cited, but none of them convincing from a pilot's—or passenger's—point of view.

Naturally, there's concern about the cost of CAS equipment, a totally new installation serving chiefly as an adjunct to existing air traffic control systems. But such back-up systems are more common than not on airlines, and EROS also offers system growth potential beyond its basic collision avoidance role.

To extend the EROS system to smaller aircraft also requires a national network of ground stations. These would necessarily number in the hundreds, as compared to the handful needed for airlines (whose more sophisticated airborne equipment requires far fewer ground references). However, the equipment is already developed, and coverage for the entire US is estimated to cost about $80 million—which is hardly prohibitive when measured against the safety benefits offered.

The light plane operator is justifiably concerned about the cost of an airborne system frequently greater than his airplane. Under a contract with NASA's Electronic Research Center, McDonnell Douglas engineers are defining an EROS derivative system of a size, weight and price for the private and business market. This is a necessity; for without equipment on these aircraft, the safety advantages of EROS are denied to this major segment of the flying public, and the safety of the system serving the airlines is compromised. Big and small, all planes need collision protection and we're working to provide it.

The history of electronic system progress is promising. It is characteristic for such systems to drop sharply in price as they are introduced. VHF communication systems, when first developed in the late '40s, were limited in performance and as costly in the dollars of the day as is today's EROS. Yet now, tens of thousands of small aircraft operate quite successfully with lightweight VHF radios costing less than $500 and with a performance 100 times greater than the first sets introduced.

EROS AUGMENTS PRESENT SYSTEM

The EROS system works well with current air traffic control, providing a direct cockpit-to-cockpit backup to existing systems. Moreover, it has the seeds of growth and improvement necessary to accommodate increased air traffic in the decades ahead.

The heart of EROS, the precise time base, conserves radio frequencies. We've developed techniques to use the collision avoidance signal for communication, navigation, and identification, plus station-keeping on other aircraft. The time-frequency concepts of EROS can increase the amount and accuracy of information available to ground controllers. EROS reduces the air-to-ground communication burden, and permits a significant reduction in the airspace allotted to individual aircraft—effectively creating more room for everyone to fly.

I'm frequently asked why a company known for building large jetliners and high performance fighters got into a system like EROS.

In the early '60s, we were facing very high production schedules in our own Phantom programmes. The situation virtually demanded that we add some form of collision protection to our aircraft to achieve our flight test goals. Otherwise, we would become an excessive burden on air traffic controllers, and at our airspeeds we would require an inordinate amount of airspace in which to fly. The answer was EROS.

Today we consider it a requirement. We don't go up without it. And as far as airline operations are concerned, we feel we've discovered a genuine means for safer, more dependable transportation.

THE NATIONAL METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT BANK, H.R. 16448

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, new procendures are needed to amass credit to build the vast amount of community facilities required in the coming years. H.R. 16448, the Metro Bank Act, does that job.

One estimate of the expenditure needed to replace obsolete facilities, reduce backlogs and provide for an expanding population is $625 billion by 1978. The Institute of Public Administration places a $6 trillion price tag on housing and community facilities up to the end of the century.

Local governments traditionally have borne the burden of providing public capital projects—the infrastructure of community growth—by borrowing up to half the funds through local bond issues. This method of obtaining credit is preferred by many local governments and nothing proposed here diminishes their right or ability to use bond issues whenever they desire. This proposal provides an alternative method for local governments to borrow money—an alternative source of credit. It provides the opportunity to avoid some of the more cumbersome, expensive, and time consuming procedures of issuing bonds, and holds the promise that interest charges can be reduced.

This proposal recommends the creation of a National Metropolitan Development Bank with metropolitan subsidiaries that will issue bonds and debentures on the national investment market and relend these funds to local communities at rates from 30 to 50 percent below the prevailing rates on its bonds. The bank would be authorized to make long-term—40- to 60-year—low-interest loans for building basic community facilities but it would also be able to finance low income housing and community medical facilities and other projects which are, by their nature, public facilities. And equally important, the bank would be able to make soft loans for up to 20 years for economic development, if an area is classified as low income, or depressed, or where an increase in investment is de-

clared to be in the national interest. Such a declaration for the soft loans would come from the Council of Economic Advisers acting upon the advice of the various departments which have expertise in assessing economic conditions.

The Federal Government would pay the difference between the interest rates of the loans and the bonds in annual appropriations. This amount would not be a net budget cost because national bank bondholders would pay Federal taxes on interest income.

The bank would be capitalized at $6 billion. One-half would be borrowed from the U.S. Treasury over a 10-year period. The other $3 billion would be raised by the sale of common stock. Each borrower would be required to purchase a portion of this stock based on the number of people within its jurisdiction, or on some other relevant criteria.

The bank would be chartered by special act of Congress but it would not be a Federal agency. It would work closely with the Federal Government. Representatives of Federal agencies and departments would serve on the board of directors.

Metropolitan areas that are large enough to generate a level of activity sufficient to support the operation of a subsidiary will be serviced through metropolitan branches. The balance of the bank's activities will be available through regional divisions each of which would have an advisory committee representing governments and borrowers within the region. The regional staffs would be expected to develop expertise in regional affairs, city and community problems, and Federal regional policies and practices.

Almost as important as its money-lending function would be the bank's function as expert and information sources on both Federal programs including funding levels and availability of funds—and specific metropolitan area problems. This position would enable the bank to coordinate not only Federal programs but the activities of local units of government as well. There is no greater need in America today than to find a mechanism to coordinate the vast number of Federal programs with the vast number of local governments that use the programs.

The National Metropolitan Development Bank also provides an opportunity to adopt sensible procedures in funding projects at the Federal level. At the present time, if the Federal support for a particular facility is 50 percent, then 50 percent of the entire cost must be appropriated in a single year. Under annual contributions only 50 percent of the annual payment due would be appropriated in a single year. This procedure allows more projects for building facilities to be started rapidly rather than spacing starts randomly over a long period of time according to the vagaries of congressional appropriations. The consequence is that our air and water would be cleaner sooner.

Heretofore, local governments opposed this plan because they would have had to issue two kinds of bonds—one for their share and one for the Federal share—and finance the Federal share—artifically inflating local debt probably beyond the statutory limit—even though each year the Federal Government would pay a proportion of the annual payment.

The Metro Bank Act removes this objection by having the Metro Bank lend money to a local government to cover the entire cost of the project, accepting a note from them for only their share. The balance would be secured by a commitment of the Federal Government—a power the bank would be given in its charter from Congress.

The Metropolitan Development Bank as proposed here not only provides a wholly new alternative that local governments can use in financing facilities but it also opens up the possibility of new approaches for the Federal Government to increase the number of facilities it can support for local government.

The text of H.R. 16448 follows:

H.R. 16448

A bill to establish a National Metropolitan Development Bank to provide an alternative source of credit to State and local governments for the purpose of financing public and quasi-public facilities of all types, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "National Metropolitan Development Bank Act of 1970".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) (1) The Congress hereby finds and declares that population increases and rising demands for a safe and prosperous life have created an unprecedented demand for (A) basic community facilities, such as streets, schools, hospitals, housing, water and sewer facilities, waste disposal, mass transit, and parks and playgrounds, and (B) economic development in urban ghettos, disaster areas, and labor surplus areas, as well as in new towns and new cities.

(2) The Congress further finds that the existing institutional structure for providing funds—the municipal bond-Federal grant arrangement—cannot provide at reasonable cost the amounts necessary to satisfy these growing demands. The financial needs of our growing communities require the full mobilization of skills and resources in all levels of government, Federal, State, and local, as well as in the private sector.

(3) The Congress further finds that the most effective use of funds can only be made when information and technical expertise regarding engineering requirements, financial and economic factors, Federal programs and funding levels, and comprehensive area problems and planning are readily available at a single source.

(b) The purpose of this Act is to establish a National Metropolitan Development Bank system that will provide an alternative source of funds for community facilities and economic development, that will involve national investment markets and all groups of investors, and that will provide information to coordinate Federal, State, and local programs with local problems and governments.

CREATION OF BANK

SEC. 3. There is hereby created a body corporate to be known as the National Metropolitan Development Bank, which shall have succession until dissolved by Act of Congress. The bank, which shall not be an agency of the United States Government, shall maintain such offices as may be necessary or appropriate in the conduct of its business.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 4. (a) The bank shall have a board of directors which shall consist of fifteen members to be appointed by the President as follows: One member appointed by the President of the United States from the Federal Reserve System; four members appointed by the President from among the heads of the departments and principal agencies of the executive branch of the Government; two members who are Governors of States, selected from among nominees to be presented by the National Governors' Conference; two members who are elected officials of city government, selected from among nominees to be presented by the National League of Cities; two members who are elected officials of county government, selected from among nominees to be presented by the National Association of County Officials; and four members who are representatives of the general public, one of whom shall be appointed by the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall serve as president of the bank and chairman of the board.

(b) Those directors who are appointed by the President of the United States shall serve at the pleasure of the President and until their successors have been appointed and have qualified. Except as provided in section 5, the remaining directors shall be elected by the stockholders for terms of two years, staggered so that one-half shall be elected annually. Elective seats on the board which become vacant during their term shall be filled by the board, but only for the unexpired portion of the term. Any director who is a full-time officer or employee of the United States shall not receive compensation for his services as director.

(c) The board shall meet at the call of its chairman, who shall require it to meet not less often than once every two months.

(d) Subject to the general policies of the board, the management of the bank shall be vested in the president and he shall be the chief executive officer of the bank.

APPOINTMENT OF INITIAL BOARD OF DIRECTORS

SEC. 5. The initial members of the board shall all be appointed by the President (with those members who under section 4 are to be nominated by the National Governors' Conference, the National League of Cities, and the National Association of County Officials and elected by the stockholders being appointed from amongst the nominees presented by those organizations). The members who under section 4 are to stand for election but who under this section are initially appointed by the President shall serve until the second annual meeting of stockholders following the date of the first sale of the bank's stock at which time the remaining board members shall designate which of the members then elected shall serve for one year and which shall serve for two years so that thereafter the terms of the elected board members shall be staggered.

INITIAL EXPENSES

SEC. 6. In order to facilitate the formation of the bank, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay initial organizing and operating expenses. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $500,000 for this purpose.

AUTHORITY

SEC. 7. (a) Subject to the provisions of this Act, the bank is authorized—

(1) to make commitments to purchase, and to purcahse, service, and sell, on terms and conditions determined by the bank, any obligation (or participation therein) of a State or local government issued wholly or partly to finance the construction of basic community facilities or public works of any type;

(2) to make or guarantee loans to State and local governments to finance the construction of basic community facilities and public works of all types (including loans to nonprofit or quasi-governmental organiza-

tions and entities to finance the construction of housing, medical facilities, and other facilities which are supported by Federal or State programs and are determined by the bank to have the attributes of public facilities); and

(3) to make loans for the purpose of facilitating economic development in geographical areas designated by the Council of Economic Advisers as being low income, depressed, or labor surplus areas, disaster areas, or areas in need of direct investment to further the national public interest or other special help to stimulate economic activities within those areas.

(b) The bank shall develop criteria to assure that projects assisted by it are not inconsistent with comprehensive planning for the development of the communities in which they will be located or disruptive of Federal programs which authorize assistance for the development of like or similar categories of projects.

(c) A loan made under this section may not exceed the total capital cost of the project to be financed, and shall be made for a term determined by the bank; except that the term of a loan made under paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall not exceed the life of the project or sixty years, whichever is less, and the term of a loan made under paragraph (3) of subsection (a) to a private person for a project consisting primarily of profitmaking facilities shall not exceed twenty years.

(d) All obligations purchased and loans made pursuant to this section shall bear interest at a rate determined by the bank which shall be low enough to be competitive with municipal bonds.

(e) In any case in which the bank undertakes to provide assistance to a State or local government under subsection (a) for the construction of a project for which a department or agency of the Federal Government (under another law of the United States) will also provide funds—

(1) the assistance provided by the bank under subsection (a) may be in the full amount needed by the State or local government to finance such construction (including the amount of the funds which will be provided by such department or agency), with the funds to be provided by such department or agency with respect to such construction thereupon becoming payable (notwithstanding any contrary provision in the law under which they are payable) to the bank in lieu of being paid directly to such government, and

(2) the bank may accept in return (A) an obligation or obligations of such State or local government covering only the difference between such full amount and the amount of the funds which are payable with respect to such construction by such department or agency, plus (B) a commitment from such department or agency to pay the funds which are to be provided by it and are payable to the bank as described in paragraph (1),

in order to insure that such State or local government will not have to include within its debt limit that portion of the indebtedness incurred for the financing of such construction which is attributable to funds provided by the Federal Government.

(f)(1) The bank is authorized to charter a subsidiary metropolitan development bank to operate in any metropolitan area upon a determination by the board that the amount of borrowing and lending activity in such area is sufficiently large to support a full financial and technical staff. Each subsidiary metropolitan development bank shall be chartered for the smallest possible geographical area consistent with the required level of activity, to insure that it will reffect local problems and issues in its loan priorities and its technical and advisory services.

(2) Each subsidiary metropolitan development bank shall be authorized—

(A) to borrow funds from the bank;

(B) within its area of charter—

(i) to make loans to State and local governments, community nonprofit groups, and area development corporations to assist in financing the construction of public facilities, with the same maturities and interest rates as those prescribed by subsections (c) and (d) for loans made by the bank under subsection (a) (1) and (2); and

(ii) to make loans to individuals, quasi-public corporations, and business and commercial development concerns operating in the area of charter if such area or the part of such area within which they are operating is certified by the Council of Economic Advisers as a low income, depressed, or labor surplus area, a disaster area, or a new community requiring direct investment to further the public interest, with maturities of not more than twenty years and interest rates fixed at levels which will stimulate economic development but without being otherwise restricted by conventional lending practices or prevailing interest rates;

(C) to obtain certifications from the Council of Economic Advisers with respect to whether a particular area or part thereof is an area described in subparagraph (B) (ii); and

(D) to maintain a staff of financial, technical, and management personnel which is comparable to the staff maintained by the bank and which will provide information and assistance in planning and constructing public facilities and in aiding economic planning and activities.

To the extent permitted by its charter from the bank and not inconsistent with this subsection or with other provisions of this Act, each subsidiary metropolitan development bank shall have (with respect to the area in which it operates) the same functions, powers, and authorities as those vested in the bank by this Act.

(3) Each subsidiary metropolitan development bank shall have a board of directors elected by the holders of the bank's class B stock denominated for that particular bank. Such board shall consist of seven members, one representing local governments, one representing metropolitan councils or planning organizations, and the remainder broadly representative of economic and social groups within the area involved.

(4) The earnings of the subsidiary metropolitan development banks shall be applied to restore any impairment of capital, make up any losses in reserves, create and maintain a reserve account for bad debts, and purchase stock in the bank.

(5) Each subsidiary metropolitan development bank shall make an annual report to the bank and submit to an annual audit by the bank. At regular intervals each such bank shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in the same manner as is provided (with respect to the bank) in section 16.

(g) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, the bank may impose charges or fees for its services with the objective that all costs and expenses of its operations should be within its income derived from such operations.

REGIONAL OPERATING DIVISIONS

SEC. 8. (a) The bank shall establish regional operating divisions. Each division (subject to the exception in subsection (b)) shall be charged with responsibility for assessing borrower eligibility, making loans, and supplying technical and advisory personnel within its region or geographical area. To the maximum extent feasible, the boundaries of the regions or geographical areas respectively represented by the several regional operating divisions shall be the same as the boundaries of the areas respectively served by the regional offices of the various Federal departments and agencies.

(b) Each regional operating division shall transact all of the bank's business within its region, except that no such division shall exercise functions in any area for which a subsidiary metropolitan development bank has been established.

(c) Each regional operating division shall be supervised by a three member panel appointed by the board. In addition, an advisory committee of not less than eighteen nor more than twenty-five persons representing all governments and all socioeconomic levels within the division's region shall be appointed by the board to develop policies and guidelines for the division's activities.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

SEC. 9. (a) The bank shall have, in addition to a staff adequately equipped in the field of development banking, personnel qualified to give advice in the following fields (and any other categories of advice appropriately related to the bank's activities):

(1) The Federal Government, particularly its organization and operation relating to State and local governments.

(2) All phases of all Federal grant-in-aid programs.

(3) Methods of administering the development and operation of community facilities.

(4) Technical data and requirements in fields appropriately related to the bank's activities, including the following:

(A) roads, hospitals, schools, and airports;

(B) urban mass transit systems and bridges;

(C) housing, municipal buildings, and parks;

(D) courthouses;

(E) water and sewage facilities and air pollution controls; and

(F) commercial developments.

(b) The bank shall give any necessary technical assistance under this section to applicants for assistance under section 7. No fees for preliminary advice shall be charged; however, after an application has been accepted for processing, the bank may charge reasonable fees for continued assistance under this subsection.

(c) The bank is also authorized to undertake research and information gathering, and to facilitate the exchange of advanced concepts and techniques relating to municipal growth and development among State and local governments.

STOCK

SEC. 10. (a) The bank shall have two classes of common stock, both of which shall have voting rights and have a par value of $100 per share. Class A stock shall be sold to investors throughout the country. Class B stock, which shall be issued by the bank to provide local investment and control in the various subsidiary metropolitan development banks established under section 7 (f) and accordingly limited to and denominated as the stock of a particular metropolitan development bank, shall be sold only within the area of charter of the named metropolitan development bank to local investors, groups, and governments. Holders of class B stock shall have all the privileges of holders of class A stock, including a vote in the election of the board, and in addition shall have the right to vote in the election of the directors of the metropolitan development bank named on the stock.

(b) All moneys received by the bank in return for its common stock shall be accumulated in a capital surplus account. All net earnings from the operations of the bank shall annually be transferred to its general surplus account. Such dividends as may be declared shall be paid by the bank to the holders of its common stock and shall be charged against the general surplus account,

but in any one fiscal year dividends shall not exceed 6 per centum of the par value of the common stock issued and outstanding and shall be payable out of the net earnings of the bank for that year.

CAPITALIZATION OF THE BANK

SEC. 11. The bank's capital shall be limited to $6,000,000,000, of which $3,000,000,000 shall be raised by the sale of the bank's common stock and the remainder shall be provided as follows:

(1) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase obligations of the bank in the amount of $300,000,000 a year for a period of ten years. If the Secretary finds it is necessary for the successful operation of the bank to waive the payment of interest and principal for any given year such interest shall then be added to the principal of the obligation. The bank is authorized to include appropriate provisions in the instruments evidencing the obligations provided for in this paragraph. Each purchase of obligations by the Secretary under this paragraph shall be upon such terms and conditions as to yield a return at a rate not less than a rate determined by the Secretary, taking into consideration the current average yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturities. The Secretary may sell, upon such terms and conditions and at such price or prices as he shall determine, any of the obligations acquired by him under this paragraph. All redemptions, purchases, and sales by the Secretary of such obligations under this paragraph shall be treated as public debt transactions of the United States.

(2) The Secretary of the Treasury is additionally authorized to purchase debentures of the bank in the amount of $300,000,000 from public debt proceeds on emergency call of the bank.

(3) Each public borrower from the bank at the time of receiving loans shall be required to purchase stock until it holds an amount of stock equivalent to $2.14 per capita for each person within its jurisdiction or for each person expected to be served by the facility or facilities involved. The borrower shall purchase stock equal to one-twentieth of the amount of his loans until he reaches the $2.14 per capita maximum requirement.

(4) The amount of bank's indebtedness outstanding at any one time shall be limited to fifty times the bank's paid-in capital surplus.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE BANK

SEC. 12. The bank is authorized to issue and have outstanding obligations (including but not limited to the obligations and debentures described in section 11) having such maturities and bearing such rates of interest as may be determined by the bank. Such obligations may be redeemable at the option of the bank before maturity in such manner as may be stipulated therein.

FEDERAL PAYMENTS TO THE BANK

SEC. 13. (a) With respect to such amounts of loans of the bank as may be specified in appropriation Acts, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to make, and to contract to make, annual payments to the bank in such amounts as are necessary to equal the amount by which the dollar amount of interest paid by the bank on account of its outstanding obligations exceeds the dollar amount of interest received by the bank on account of obligations purchased or loans made by it pursuant to section 7.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Treasury such sums as may be necessary to carry out his functions under this Act, including such sums as may be necessary to make the annual payments required by contracts entered into by the Secretary pursuant to subsection (a) of this section.

FEDERAL INSURANCE OF OBLIGATIONS TO THE BANK

SEC. 14. (a) The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter in this section referred to as the "Secretary"), upon application by the bank, is authorized to insure any loan made by the bank under section 7(a) (including, for purposes of this section, any obligation purchased as provided in paragraph (1) thereof), and to issue a commitment for the insurance of any such loan prior to the date of its execution or disbursement thereon upon a determination that all of the applicable criteria established by or under this Act will be met with respect to such loan.

(b) The insurance of any loan under subsection (a) and any payments pursuant thereto shall be made on such terms and conditions, and in such manner and form, as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe, and shall provide for the payment in full to the bank of the outstanding principal balance of the loan together with any unpaid interest, upon default by the borrower, in accordance with procedures set forth in such regulations.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to charge and collect premiums for insurance under this section. Such premiums shall be fixed at the lowest possible levels which are determined by the Secretary to be reasonable and sufficient to keep the insurance program under this section in a sound and secure condition and maintain the fund established by subsection (d) at a level adequate to meet all anticipated losses, but in any event shall be lower for loans made under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 7(a) than for loans made under paragraph (3) of such section.

(d) (1) There is hereby established a revolving fund to be used by the Secretary in carrying out his functions under this section. All premiums charged as provided in subsection (c), and all other receipts under the insurance program, shall be deposited in the fund; and all payments with respect to insurance under this section shall be made from the fund. Moneys in the fund not needed for the payment of current operating expenses or the payment of insurance under the program may be invested in bonds or other obligations of, or bonds or other obligations guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

(2) There is authorized to be appropriated as initial capital for the revolving fund established by paragraph (1) the sum of $____.

(e) In the performance of, and with respect to, the functions, powers, and duties vested in him by this Act, the Secretary shall (in addition to any authority otherwise vested in him) have the functions, powers, and duties set forth in section 402 (except subsection (c) (2)) of the Housing Act of 1950.

GENERAL POWERS

SEC. 15. The bank shall have power—

(1) to sue and be sued, and complain and defend, in its corporate name and through its own counsel;

(2) to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(3) to adopt, amend, and repeal, by the board, such bylaws, rules and regulations as may be necessary for the conduct of its business;

(4) to conduct its business, carry on its operations, have offices, and exercise the powers granted by this Act in any State without regard to any qualification or similar statute in any State;

(5) to lease, purchase or otherwise acquire, and own, hold, improve, use or otherwise deal in and with, any property, real, personal, or mixed, or any interest therein, wherever situated;

(6) to accept gifts or donations of services or of property, real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible, in aid of any of the purposes of the bank;

(7) to sell, convey, mortgage, pledge, lease, exchange, and otherwise dispose of its property and assets;

(8) to appoint such officers, attorneys, employees, and agents as may be required, to determine their qualifications, to define their duties, to fix their salaries, and to require bonds for them and fix the penalty thereof; and

(9) to enter into contracts, execute instruments, incur liabilities, and do all things which are necessary or incidental to the proper management of its affairs and the proper conduct of its business.

AUDIT OF FINANCIAL TRANSACTIONS

SEC. 16. (a) The financial transactions of the bank shall be audited by the General Accounting Office in accordance with the principles and procedures applicable to commercial corporate transactions and under such rules and regulations as may be prescribed by the Comptroller General of the United States. The audit shall be conducted at the place or places where the accounts are normally kept. The representatives of the General Accounting Office shall have access to all books, accounts, financial records, reports, files, and other papers things, or property belonging to or in use by the bank and necessary to facilitate the audit, and they shall be afforded full facilities for verifying transactions with the balances or securities held by depositaries, fiscal agents, and custodians.

(b) The expenses of any audit performed under this section shall be borne out of appropriations to the General Accounting Office, and appropriations in such sums as may be necessary for this purpose are authorized. The bank shall reimburse the General Accounting Office for the full cost of such audit as billed therefor by the Comptroller General, and the General Accounting Office shall deposit the sums so reimbursed into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

AUDIT REPORT TO CONGRESS

SEC. 17. A report of each such audit of the bank for a fiscal year shall be made by the Comptroller General to the President and to the Congress not later than six months following the close of such fiscal year. The report shall set forth the scope of the audit and shall include a statement (showing intercorporate relations) of assets and liabilities; a statement of capital and surplus or deficit; a statement of surplus or deficit analysis; a statement of income and expense; a statement of sources and application of funds; and such comments and information as may be deemed necessary to keep the Congress informed of the operations and financial condition of the bank, together with such recommendations with respect thereto as the Comptroller General may deem advisable, including a report of any impairment of capital or lack of sufficient capital noted in the audit. A copy of each report shall be furnished to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the bank.

TAX EXEMPTION

SEC. 18. The bank, its property, its franchise, capital, reserves, 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 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 bank 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 AND SECURITY

SEC. 19. All obligations issued by the bank 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 bank 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.

PREPARATION OF OBLIGATIONS

SEC. 20. In order to furnish obligations for delivery by the bank, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to prepare such obligations in such form as the board may approve, such obligations when prepared to be held in the Treasury subject to delivery upon order by the bank. The engraved plates, dies, bed pieces, and so forth, executed in connection therewith, shall remain in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury. The bank shall reimburse the Secretary of the Treasury for any expenditures made in the preparation, custody, and delivery of such obligations.

UNITED STATES NOT LIABLE

SEC. 21. The United States shall not be liable for any debts, defaults, acts, or omissions of the bank.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 22. The bank shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each fiscal year, transmit to the President and the Congress an annual report of its operations and activities.

AMENDMENTS RELATING TO FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

SEC. 23. (a) The sixth sentence of the seventh paragraph of section 5136 of the Revised Statutes (12 U.S.C. 24) is amended by inserting "or obligations of the National Metropolitan Development Bank," 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 (12 U.S.C. 84) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(14) Obligations of the National Metropolitan Development Bank 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 (12 U.S.C. 1464(c)) is amended by inserting "or in obligations of the National Metropolitan Development Bank;" in the second proviso immediately after "any political subdivision thereof;".

(d) Paragraph (2) of section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 355) is further amended by inserting ", or any obligation of the National Metropolitan Development Bank" immediately before the period at the end thereof.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 24. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "bank" means the National Metropolitan Development Bank created by section 3, and the term "board" means its board of directors.

(b) The term "State" means the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or any agency or instrumentality thereof.

(c) The term "local government" means any county, municipality, or other political subdivision of a State, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, or any school or other special district created by or pursuant to State law.

(d) The term "obligation" means any bond, note, debenture, or local government which has sold its obligations to the National Metropolitan Development Bank pursuant to section 7(a)(1).

(e) The term "obligation" means any bond, note, debenture, or other instrument evidencing debt.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 25. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of the Act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances, shall not be affected.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 26. There are authorized to be appropriated, without fiscal year limitation, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

NOISE POLLUTION

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the problem of incessant and excessively loud noise has often been overlooked in the battle for a better environment. Today, the public is fortunately more and more aware that "environment" is not an esoteric term referring to a distant forest dotted with numerous lakes, but rather concerns the interaction of man and his surroundings everywhere. They are realizing that our dilapidated urban areas demand imaginative and resourceful action from those who seek a cleaner and safer environment.

The problem of intolerable noise, resulting mainly from urban industry and supersonic aircraft, is fast becoming a chief concern of urban ecologists. In the Bronx the residents of many apartment houses, most notably the Parkchester apartments, are subjected daily to annoying and possibly dangerous levels of noise resulting from aircraft.

The fact that this noise has gone from a simple annoyance to a possible menace makes it all the more disturbing. Recently some scientists have discovered evidence of possible damage to unborn babies from this noise pollution. I insert the following two articles from the New York Times and the Washington Post into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 29, 1969]

SOUNDS OF MODERN SOCIETY ENDANGERS ITS LISTENERS

(By Stuart Auerbach)

BOSTON, December 28.—The loud noises of modern society—from sonic booms to rock 'n' roll music—were listed today as health hazards potentially more dangerous than air or water pollution.

One scientist reported the possibility that sonic booms threaten the future health and mental stability of still unborn babies. Another said noises could cause heart attacks in people with existing cardiac conditions "by adding insult to injury." And an Australian pharmacologist noted that heavy thunderclaps made laboratory rats sick.

"We now have millions with heart disease, high blood pressure and emotional illness who need protection from the additional stress of noise," Dr. Samual Rosen of the Mt. Sinai School of Medicine in New York told a special section on noise pollution at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

He added that no one becomes indifferent to noise which inflicts "stress, tension and sometimes intolerable nervous strain. People become irritable, unsociable and more quarrelsome at work and at home.

"There seems to be little doubt that noise pollution is a health hazard," concluded Rosen, blaming loud noises for causing blood vessels to constrict, cutting the amount of blood that flows to key parts of the body.

Rabbits exposed to noise for 10 weeks showed higher levels of blood cholesterol and more clogging of the arteries than a group of rabbits not exposed to noise, he reported.

In another paper, Dr. Lester W. Sontag, director of the Fels Research Institute in Yellow Springs, Ohio, reported experiments showing that loud noises disturb unborn children in the late stages of fetal development.

He cited studies showing babies kick in their mother's womb in response to loud noises. And he said he found "a statistical relation between sudden movements before birth and "social apprehension" 2½ years later—a hesitation to join groups, for instance, and reluctance to go to nursery school.

It was enough, he said, "to justify concern about the possibility of fetal damage from such violent sounds as sonic booms."

Dr. Chauncey D. Leake of the University of California at San Francisco said that noise can affect the whole autonomic nervous system that regulates a person's blood pressure and heart beat.

It could be, Associated Press quoted Dr. Leake as saying, that stress from loud noise could affect the nervous system of a pregnant woman so that her unborn baby is affected, too, by stress chemicals of hormones that pass from her bloodstream through the placenta to the baby.)

Other evidence was offered on the adverse effects of noise to the health of humans and animals:

Dr. Francis M. Forester of the University of Wisconsin Medical Center said seizures in about one per cent of epileptics are caused by the brain's reaction to some form of noise—not always loud and sometime as innocent as a new piece of music.

Dr. Mary F. Lockett, an Australian pharmacologist, found that laboratory rats excreted abnormally high amounts of the hormone oxytocin from their pituitary gland after heavy thunderclaps. This increased the amount of water and salt in their bodies, and made them ill.

Another report estimated the noise in an average household at 40 decibels, a rock-and-roll band at 120 decibels and a jet plane at 115 decibels when it is 500 feet over an airport.

"We are constantly bombarded by noise, whether is it the background music at the supermarket or a supersonic jet breaking the sound barrier, and these increases in noise level have joined industrial wastes and the car as a major source of pollution in our environment," said Drs. Kenneth R. Henry and Robert E. Bowman of the University of Wisconsin.

"The adverse effects of noise, however, are not as readily apparent as smog or dirty water."

SCIENTIST ASSERTS VIOLENT NOISE MAY HARM BABIES BEFORE BIRTH

(By Sandra Blakeslee)

BOSTON, Dec. 28—Violent noise, such as sonic booms, may have permanently damaging effects on unborn babies, a scientist warned today.

The warning, presented to a noise pollution panel at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, was issued by Dr. Lester W. Sontag, director of the Fels Research Institute in Yellow Springs, Ohio. The paper by Dr. Sontag, who could not be present today, was read by a colleague.

Too much noise in the everyday environment—noise pollution—has been shown to cause health problems in adults. Loss of hearing, increased mental stress and heart disease have been linked to the assault of excess noise in daily living.

The human fetus, according to Dr. Sontag, is equally vulnerable to the noxious effects of too much noise. Forty years ago many people believed that the human fetus was protected from unpleasant conditions in the outside world in the comfort of the mother's womb, but recent experiments have shown that the fetus is not so isolated after all, Dr. Sontag said. The fetus seems to react to harmful environmental conditions just as the mother does, he said.

Supersonic transport jets may therefore pose a threat to the health of unborn infants in that the planes will be one more noxious addition to the total assault of an increasingly noisy environment. It is estimated that one such jet, crossing the United States, would cut a swath of noise 25 miles wide on each side, within earshot of up to 50 million people.

Experiments in recent years, Dr. Sontag said, have shown that the fetus is indeed not in a world by itself. Smoking mothers generally have smaller babies than do nonsmoking mothers. Fetal death is more common among offspring of smoking mothers.

Emotional stress in a mother can make an infant more active in late pregnancy. Severe stress can elicit up to five or six times as much activity in the fetus than is normal.

Children born by mothers suffering such excessive anxiety during pregnancy have been shown to cry more, have more problems of the gastrointestional tract and to be more active after birth, Dr. Sontag said. In early childhood such children, through statistical correlation, have been shown to experience greater anxiety than their peers.

Animal experiments, too, have shown the vulnerability of the fetus to environmental factors. Rats born of mothers that were handled frequently and lovingly in pregnancy differ from rats born of mothers that experience pregnancy in total isolation. Adolescent rats of "deprived" mothers were slow to leave their cages, for example, and were less prone to explore their surroundings.

It is difficult to isolate noise as a determining factor in the behavioral problems of children, Dr. Sonag said, because so many other factors play upon the development of a human infant after birth and the maturation process of humans is so long compared with that of other animals.

It had been shown in animal studies, however, that rats born of mothers exposed to noise pollution during pregnancy had more difficulty in learning maze patterns than rats born of unstressed mothers.

Human festuses do react to noise, Dr. Sontag said. Loud clapping, for example, will cause an unborn infant to stir in the womb.

In one recent experiment mothers late in pregnancy were asked to choose their favorite music and to listen to it for 10 minutes. Both fetal and maternal heart rates rose in response to the music.

Dr. Sontag said he thought the mother's psychophysiological response to the music was probably what caused the unborn infant to respond. Thus, environmental factors were transported to the fetus through the mother's emotional response to the situation. Both soothing music and annoying sounds, presumably, could affect the fetus in this way.

Dr. Sontag said he now felt he had mustered enough evidence regarding the vulnerability of the human fetus to environmental stress to "justify our concern about the possibility of fetal damage from such violent sounds as sonic booms.

"It seems not unlikely that adults are not alone in their objection to such noxious stresses," he said. "The fetus, while he cannot speak for himself, may have equal or greater reason to object to them."

LEAD, GASOLINE ADDITIVES, AND SMOG: 1961–70

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, air pollution confronts us as the most visible—and most potentially dangerous—of current environmental problems.

I think, also, it is the most easily solved.

Unfortunately, however, despite all the rhetoric, all the proposals, all the current laws and regulations, we do not seem to be making necessary headway.

There is no need for multiyear, exotic research projects to find the means of eliminating smog. I remain convinced that existing technology could clean all our air—if sufficient pressure were brought by citizens and public bodies upon polluters.

For example, today I would like to concentrate upon just one element of this crucial struggle—the place of motor vehicle fuels and the relationship between fuel composition and air pollution. Motor vehicle exhaust emissions still comprise the single greatest cause of smog, and significant changes in fuel composition can be a major component in lowering vehicle-caused pollution.

Nine years ago this week, as a member of the California State Assembly, I introduced a new bill, A.B. 2335, which proposed a gradual elimination of lead in gasoline to be sold in California. I now insert a copy of that bill in the RECORD at this point:

ASSEMBLY BILL NO. 2335

An act to add Sections 20784 and 20785 to the Business and Professions Code, relating to standards of purity for gasoline and diesel fuel

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Section 20784 is added to the Business and Professions Code, to read:

20784. It is unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, assist in the sale of, permit to be sold or offered for sale, or delivery or offer to deliver to any premises for the purpose of sale any gasoline which:

(a) Has a sulfur content in excess of one-twentieth of 1 percent by weight.

(b) Has an acid heat of reaction when tested by the American Society of Testing Materials, Designation D 481–39, in excess of 30 degrees Fahrenheit. On November 1, 1961, and on the first day of each month thereafter, the maximum heat of reaction permitted by this subdivision shall be reduced 1½ degrees Fahrenheit until the maximum heat of reaction allowable has been reduced to 12 degrees Fahrenheit.

(c) Contains any metallic additive, except tetraethyllead.

(d) Has a tetraethyllead content in excess of three milliliters per gallon. On November 1, 1961, and on the first day of each month thereafter, the maximum amount of tetraethyllead which may be contained in gasoline shall be reduced three-tenths of a milliliter until the use of tetraethyllead in gasoline is prohibited.

SEC. 2. Section 20785 is added to said code, to read:

20785. It is unlawful for any person to sell, offer for sale, assist in the sale of, permit to be sold or offered for sale, or deliver or offer to deliver to any premises for the purpose of sale any diesel fuel which has a sulfur content in excess of one fourth of 1 percent by weight.

Almost 7 months later, a special assembly interim committee conducted a 1-day hearing on the subjects of motor fuel composition, use of fuel additives and their relationships to smog creation.

I have recently gone through the transcript of that hearing, and I have picked out a number of excerpts which I think are relevant today. For, as can be seen, 9 years ago, the very serious dangers of lead additives were well known, the dramatic increase of lead and other additives were shown as key factors in smog formation, and viable existing solutions and remedies were available.

Here, for instance, is testimony on health hazards of lead in gasoline.

Mr. Charles Willard, Citizens' Anti-Smog Action Committee:

Any statement that is made to you that lead poisoning is not serious is untruthful. There is no other way to describe it.

Lead poisoning is in the ancient historical books of metallurgy and this poison goes back a thousand years or more. The French Government barred the use of lead paint some fifty years ago because painters became poisoned in the way that was known as painters colic, it was actually lead poisoning. A few years ago, maybe two years ago, our county medical department banned the sale of toys because they were painted with lead paint. And yet that same medical department came before you today and put up a long mixed conversation as to whether or not the lead was poisonous. In a conversation with a doctor of chemistry last week the subject of this lead poisoning came up, and he said, "If the people knew what goes on at the laboratory, they would immediately demand restriction in the use of the lead material in gasoline." His exact words or nearly exact words were, "The people should know how many men who are chasing butterflies up and down the river are on the pension rolls of this company." He further said, "Every so many days you will see a man with a little patch on his ear. He has been to the plant doctor and had a sample of his blood taken. And when they become loaded to a certain extent they very carefully are sent off to another department." And further, "If the public knew how many people that have worked in this business were loaded with lead to the point they had to be pensioned, people would no longer want this lead in the gasoline."

Mr. Chandler Phillips, Consulting Mechanical Engineer:

You will die just as surely from small amounts of lead poisoning inhaled over a period of time as you would if you swallowed the same amount of a less toxic lead.

Chairman THELIN. Mr. Phillips, are there any medical or scientific authorities who support the views that you have expounded relative to the condition of lead in our atmosphere in this area?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I have private communications that I was asked not to divulge where public health officials said that one of the symptoms of air pollution poisoning was an incipient or almost a chronic type of lead poisoning.

Chairman THELIN. You cannot give us the source of this statement though?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I can if I am required to.

Mrs. Clara McDonald, Citizens' Anti-Smog Action Committee:

Public Health Bulletin No. 253 shows that 47.4 percent lead of what we breathe into the lungs stays there until death.

On additives now used in gasoline, as well as in the lubricating oil, it further increases our pollution, creates intolerable health conditions and deaths, according to the findings of engineers, chemists, and the majority of the medical profession.

Mr. John Maga, chief, bureau of air sanitation, State department of public health:

However, there has been, and this is somewhat related to additional measurements in the area, a widening out or spreading out of the [smog] levels, so that areas which were not affected with this high value, such as Riverside, San Bernardino and the San Fernando Valley, are now having higher exposures, more frequent and higher levels of air pollution. This is probably a result of the growth in the fringe areas, the expanding out from the center of the population spreading people in cars throughout the area. It still is quite high. Quite high levels of air pollution are experienced, severe eye-irritation, of course, on frequent intervals.

Assemblyman RUMFORD. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman THELIN. Any other questions. Mr. Brown?

Assemblyman GEORGE BROWN. Mr. Maga, I want to ask you a few questions on this lead matter if I may. Your Table 4 on atmospheric lead does show that Los Angeles has the highest average concentration of any of the cities tested, is that right?

Mr. MAGA. That's correct.

Remember now, this hearing took place 9 years ago.

Dr. Robert Kehoe, University of Cincinnati:

Assemblyman BROWN. Yes. It seems to me that what you are saying is that a larger percent of the lead which is breathed is absorbed than that which is eaten.

Dr. KEHOE. Under equivalent conditions with reference to solubility and so forth, yes, this is distinctly true.

Assemblyman BROWN. Your testimony concurred with that previous witness that the level of lead in the atmosphere in Los Angeles is substantially higher than it is in Cincinnati or the average of other cities in the United States. Your figure was, well, two to four or six times as much, is that right?

Dr. KEHOE. No. Two to perhaps four times as much, depending on where you are centered. I was very cautious, however, if you will remember, in saying that in connection with these, such observations in which we have problems of analysis we have more particularly problems of sampling to get something that is characteristic. The difference between two and four here. This is something that causes you to elevate your eyebrows. Statistically there is a difference, but in fact there is not much.

Assemblyman BROWN. I'm just stating this to confirm the testimony that we had from the Department of Public Health which showed several samples that run from, well, in one case 3.6 for Los Angeles compared with 2 for Cincinnati which is about twice as much, and another study showed 6.6 which I presume would compare the two and Cincinnati which is about 3.3.

Dr. KEHOE. Well, our figures for Los Angeles in connection with the study that was carried out here during a period of inversion, gave us an average figure of about 6.7. Corresponding average in Cincinnati is a little under 2.

Assemblyman BROWN. Yes. That would be your range of 4 then.

Dr. KEHOE. But the question here is, what is the average throughout the year? And this I must confess I don't know.

Assemblyman BROWN. No one would know. The point that I'm leading up to is this, that under these circumstances with this considerably greater concentration in Los Angeles which is inhaled and gets into the respiratory system, how do you account for the fact that there is no observable trace of this in terms of a difference in your mean blood lead level.

Dr. KEHOE. I think this can be accounted for. And please don't hold me strictly accountable for my interpretation, because this is something in which I have to go on the basis of my judgment. What I would say is probably the reason that the amount which we actually absorb from the lungs is not as great as the calculated sum which we've made.

Next, on the increase of lead and other additives in motor fuels. First, this statement by Mr. John Maga:

With the information that is now available, it would not be possible to write standards for fuel composition which would prevent the formation of "smog".

Chandler Phillips:

This chart from Public Health Bulletin shows the increase in sulfur in our premium fuel from 1941 to 1954 by the petroleum industry and it is over threefold. Here is our prewar level, here is what it was after the war. Notice what happened in wartime? We can leave it in the fuel, so why not leave it in. It's cheaper than the cleaning up of gasolines and hauling of tars and slugs and gums out and dumping them in the ocean because the Fish and Game Commission doesn't like that. Now those gums and tars can be removed and the product can be sold at a profit because what the sulfuric acid treatment removes from the fuel by the prewar treatment was acidic oxygen groups, reactive hydrocarbons, and nitrogen compounds. You get a large amount of nitrogen compound. Sometimes as much as 50% in the gasoline is composed of nitrogen compounds and California fuel proves to have the highest percentage of nitrogen. By adding hydrogen in the cracking process you convert the nitrogen to ammonia. You convert the sulfur to hydrogen sulfide which can be burned to produce acid and you create the acidic oxygen groups which are converted to water.

Charles Willard:

I want to point out to you, gentlemen, and you members of this board, that we in this country submit to some ten or fifteen tons of this material a day being distributed on our ground and over the two hundred odd days of dry weather that we have, with no rain to bog it down into mud, it blows. They are quite truthful when they say to you, "Oh, well, there is lead over here in the reservoir and there is lead over here and there." Of course, it's over there, how can it be elsewhere? There is bound to be lead. We want the elimination of it.

No later than yesterday I was in the chemical conference with a Ph. D. and a doctor of chemistry who is employed by one of the large oil companies. Inadvertently the subject of lead got loose. He said the refineries have cleaned up all the smog; there is no smog at the refineries. He should go up to the observatory in the morning and see it boiling up out over the refineries and then he would know. He said it is all up to the automobiles. I said, "What are you going to do with the lead that comes out? You are a chemist. You know you can't destroy an atom. There is no way to destroy an atom. You can chase the poor little thing around a cyclotron until it gets dizzy and falls apart. But if you are way below the atom pieces that are left, possibly make allowance to the energy that has been lost, you'll find you have the same thing in the end as you had at the start. The matter is indestructible. What you put into the gasoline tank must come out of the tailpipe. Sulphur and lead." So he said these words, "Well, the oil industry is beginning to realize that in all probability lead will be outlawed in the not too distant future."

Mr. Howard E. Hesselberg, Ethyl Corp., Research and Development Department:

Chairman THELIN. As I heard your testimony, you would state that we do not have any higher concentration of the lead anti-knock elements in California than they have elsewhere in the nation?

Mr. HESSELBERG. In September we just had these data available and I thought since this was a current hearing, it was pertinent to the State of California. These were the best data that might be presented. This varies seasonally. There are times when certain areas of the State of California have higher average TEL concentration than other areas of the country. As I commented before, the use of anti-knock compound is subject to a lot of variables and by and large I think that in Los Angeles it is true that there is, because of the specific refinery situation here, somewhat more lead used than in certain other areas of the country.

Mr. Harry Morrison, assistant manager, Western Oil & Gas Association:

Gasoline, like other products in our modern society, is constantly being improved. It must be changed to meet the new requirements and conditions of use. This must be done at a minimum cost to the consumer as this commodity has now become a necessity.

Fifty years ago gasoline was an unblended, unsophisticated, straightforward, simple hydrocarbon mixture. Many a Model T Ford has been run right on the job at a well site from a completely unrefined product. The engines were simple, compression ratios were low, and the requirements were few.

However, the American society has required better engines and the oil industry provided the gasoline to meet its requirments. Current gasoline quality and quantity demands could not be met at a minimum cost to the consumer if present day use of additives were prohibited.

Mr. Lewis J. Fuller, Chief Deputy, Air Pollution Control Office, Los Angeles County:

It is very possible that the use of lead in gasoline adds to the smog as manifested in Southern California. Without the use of counteradditives, lead, used to raise octane, would cause fouling of spark plugs, thus leading to increased amounts of hydrocarbon losses. From an air pollution standpoint, unleaded gasoline of an acceptable octane rating would be preferable to leaded gasoline.

The hearing brought out that the means of eliminating lead from motor fuels already existed, but that there were severe hesitations by industry. Once again, Chandler Phillips:

Remember the heavier this gasoline, the higher the boiling point. This is like adding sugar to water. It boils at a higher temperature. So more heavy ends are in this fuel, this is the final boiling point. The cleaner the fuel, the lower this is. This is premium gasolines from Southern California in the summertime and this is premium gasolines in the winter. You see the same reports. This is the heaviest fuels, this is the lightest fuels. We see the same picture in the regular gasolines. Both summer and winter. We are getting now a gasoline that is heavier than our peak wartime condition. It was patriotic to burn it then; it is not today, gentlemen, it's deadly. Our lung cancer has increased at alarming rates. We have twice as many tooth cavities in our children as any other area. We have a limited air supply. Why should we release known poisons into the air and have to breathe them? Without proper study, they would release a new poison methyl. Tetramethyl lead. This is even more volatile than ethyl lead and without any—absorbing any tests of this in the air, they conclude because it does not kill rats, it kills rats not quite as quickly as tetraethyl lead, it is safe to release to the public.

My experiments have been proven, and I released them to the public in 1954. I took on my automobile a device to analyze the vapors that were being put out and this took two forms. I equipped my motor to run on either butane or propane, a clean burning fuel, and then I could turn on a sample of gasoline I wished to test. The chamber I had on the back of my car was approximately four feet long. It had a light beam that went between two prisms and went into a photoelectric cell. I could adjust the intensity of the light source and I would in burning a clean fuel set up the intensity of the light source so my photoelectric cell read 100 on my reference fuel. I would then turn on the electric pump and pump in gasoline and keep the motor at the same speed. These other fuels burned dirtier. I took that same gasoline and treated it by the refining method known as the 98% sulfuric acid treatment and it removed these impurities and the fuel when retested, burned clean and reduced light by the cleanliness was five or six times. I took the vapors out and passed them through a large plastic bag and irradiated them to see the photochemical reaction that would take place on the two fuels. The cleaned up gasoline produced very much less. I brought this up before the Air Pollution Control District and they performed part of my experiments. They checked the photochemical reaction of a cleaner fuel with one with a higher content. They reported that they could reduce air pollution two-thirds in the aerosols by this method. They also had the Bureau of Mines testing station at Bartleville, Oklahoma perform the test on the other half and using a regular motor gasoline compared the iso-octane, they reported a sevenfold reduction in air pollution by cleaning up the fuel. I claim that if iso-octane was available today for all the cars and the lead was eliminated from the air, we would have a substantial reduction in our air pollution problem.

And:

Mr. PHILLIPS. I think the answer to your question is this, that to have a cleaner fuel that won't knock in the motor, a large part of that fuel would have quite a bit of the reactive hydrocarbon removed. However, if you notice the bill proposed to you, we proposed the sulphuric acid heat of reaction to determine the reactive hydrocarbons in the fuel and control of this method because this is the most effective way to do it and this takes in those particular reactive hydrocarbons that Dr. Haagen-Smit is speaking about that create the smog effect by the chemical reaction with the presence of nitrous oxides.

Assemblyman CAMERON. Then it is your contention that a catalytic process or cracking process of some sort is available, that not only would it make it possible to remove but would make it possible to eliminate the necessity for all additives and at the same time would take from the fuel itself the reactive hydrocarbons. Is this correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Such a process is now available. It takes a reactive hydrocarbon and olefin and combines it with a saturated carbon hydrocarbon and produces a chemical known as iso-octane, which has a rating of 100 percent of 100 anti-knock rating. It contains no lead as used in the reference for checking the proponents of all fuels produced by the refinery.

Assemblyman CAMERON. Now, what about the further burning of this fuel in an internal combustion engine in the effect that this would have on the release of additional hydrocarbon compounds or olefin compounds that were not present in the refined fuel that are present in the combusted fuel.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Two studies have been made on that compared to my original research which proved that by cleaning up the fuel with a 98 percent sulfuric acid treatment that the ability of the fuel to pollute the air was directly related to its acid head of reaction. Now the air pollution control district with research of Dr. Matter has proved that a fuel not completely cleaned up but with a lower olefin content would not produce as many air pollutants by approximately two-thirds. The Bureau of Mines have also found out—and this was taking the fuel and combusting it in the engine then irradiating it for two hours with sunlight and bringing it back and checking it—and they found that a cleaner fuel did not produce this photochemical reaction. The Bureau of Mines also found out that using iso-octane, which I have just mentioned to you—as a motor fuel compared with present day motor fuels, that air pollution could be reduced on approximately an eight fold reduction.

Assemblyman CAMERON. And it is your contention that these fuels can be produced from the crudes that are available in the market area in Southern California with a great variance and specific gravities of the crudes available?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Yes, this will require hydro cracking process to remove these from the fuels. But the oil company receives an increased yield by doing such a process.

Assemblyman CAMERON. Increased yield in what sense?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Increased yield of more products. They combine hydrogen with it and the olefins become saturated hydrocarbons which do not have this ability to react and the impurities of nitrogen and sulfur are removed and can be sold commercially.

Assemblyman CAMERON. Is this the process that is being used by the American Oil Company you keep referring to?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I imagine it is partially being used by oil companies in this area, but not to an extent great enough——

Assemblyman CAMERON. This is not an answer to my question, sir—my question is what is the American Oil Company doing that makes their fuel so distinct and different from that that is available by other companies?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Well, I can't answer that question on what they are doing in their refineries, because I don't know, I've never been there.

Assemblyman CAMERON. Your favorable comment to the American Oil Company then is solely attributable to a 1954 advertisement in Life Magazine?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, not solely. There is no reason why if one company can do it that another can't do it.

Assemblyman CAMERON. You are not aware of what the specific gravity or the type of crude is that they are using from which they are producing this unleaded fuel.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am aware that they are producing it in Texas and I am also aware that the Shell Oil Company has some very high crudes from West Texas that they have sulfur removal plants and they are making competitive products with them now. So I would say that that could be done with any type crude if they are willing to hydrogenate it.

Assemblyman CAMERON. This is not based upon any specific technical knowledge, though, as to what American Oil Company is or is not doing, but this is rather an assumption that you are making based upon your engineering background, is this correct?

Mr. PHILLIPS. No, I know the quality and what the composition is fairly well of the American Oil Company's gasoline, but I do know they are making right in this area iso-octane which is even superior to the American Oil Company. We make it in Wilmington refinery. And this does not produce air pollution as proven by tests by the Bureau of Mines. So I see no reason why this process cannot be expanded and by a slow method of changing this that there is no big economic dislocation to the oil companies. It will cost maybe a half million dollars just to put devices on the tailpipes of cars, and hundreds of employees to check and you will have only at best a device that will save 50% average efficiency. If you can reduce air pollution eight fold or even two-thirds by a cleaner fuel at a cost to the oil companies that they have already estimated, it is about one-fourth the amount the public will have to spend for afterburners. It certainly seems that this is a better method to proceed or a way to proceed.

Then, Mr. Phillips noted:

There never has been a history of a pollutant put into the air that was voluntarily removed where it was more profitable not to do so unless it was by legislative action.

Now, Mr. Charles Willard:

No later than yesterday I was in the chemical conference with a Ph. D. and a doctor of chemistry who is employed by one of the large oil companies. Inadvertently the subject of lead got loose. He said the refineries have cleaned up all the smog; there is no smog at the refineries. He should go up to the observatory in the morning and see it boiling up out over the refineries and then he would know. He said it is all up to the automobiles. I said, "What are you going to do with the lead that comes out? You are a chemist. You know you can't destroy an atom. There is no way to destroy an atom. You can chase the poor little thing around a cyclotron until it gets dizzy and falls apart. But if you are way below the atom pieces that are left, possibly make allowance to the energy that has been lost, you'll find you have the same thing in the end as you had at the start. The matter is indestructible. What you put into the gasoline tank must come out of the tailpipe. Sulphur and lead." So he said these words, "Well, the oil industry is beginning to realize that in all probability lead will be outlawed in the not too distant future."

Mr. Howard Hesselberg commented on the industry's vantagepoint:

Chairman THELN. You apparently are convinced if you eliminated the anti-knock compounds that the price to the public would go up considerably?

Mr. HESSELBERG. It certainly is going to go up to the man that is going to have to make the gasoline, and I think normal economics indicate that a certain percentage of this increase would be expected to be passed on to the consumer.

Chairman THELIN. You feel that the factors of production and so on do have something to do with the price we pay for gasoline?

Mr. HESSELBERG. This is true in our business.

So did Mr. Harry Morrison:

Anything is economically possible. It depends upon what people want and what they'll pay for. I feel that there is no question but what at some kind of a price somewhere you could make gasoline that was unleaded. Let me come directly to the point and answer the question that hasn't been put yet. We ourselves, out here, ask ourselves, what would it cost to provide unleaded gasoline? And we ask all of our members. Give us a number. What—how do you think you could do it? I'm not trying to be at all light about this, but with fairly light hearts they went at it to see what they could come up with, and then I began to get telephone calls back, and they said, we can put numbers down, but we can't guarantee that we can meet the requirements in octane and the requirements in quantity day in and day out that we would be required to provide, because we can't segregate, there is no point in making unleaded gas for Los Angeles County and leaded gasoline for Orange County, aside from the very fact of the unfairness of it. And you can't stop at state borders. So that what they finally concluded to me was that they are unwilling to state as engineers and as chemical engineers that there can be provided at all times adequately unleaded gasoline at any price. That's the answer.

Chairman THELIN. Are there any further questions of Mr. Morrison?

Assemblyman BROWN. You heard the testimony earlier that the American Oil Company premium gas was priced at one cent per gallon higher than the competitive gasoline. Is that right? Presumably that represents the minimum differential that would be required?

Mr. MORRISON. Actually, Mr. Brown, although I don't know of my own knowledge, I have been told that subsequently that one cent was eliminated and that the gasoline is being sold at a price competitive with the others. I do not believe—I'm sorry, but I have to answer your question this way—I do not believe that the price at which Amoco sells its gasoline can in any way be considered to be a function of the difference in cost.

Assemblyman BROWN. In other words, you're lending credence to the testimony we also heard that there is no relationship between the market price and the cost of production. Is that right?

Mr. MORRISON. No, I'm not at all, sir. Because I believe that we have to consider that Amoco is selling three grades of gasoline and is competing in a market.

Assemblyman BROWN. Are you familiar with the statement made by the—by Mr. Griswold earlier last month to the effect that the cost of selling unleaded gasoline would probably run about two cents a gallon?

Mr. MORRISON. I heard that Gris said that.

Assemblyman BROWN. Do you have any knowledge of the economic basis on which he made this statement?

Mr. MORRISON. No, sir, I do not.

Assemblyman BROWN. It didn't come from your industry, then?

Mr. MORRISON. No, sir.

Assemblyman BROWN. You made the earlier statement here that the products of combustion resulted in the formation of carbon dioxide and water, which would be harmless. You are referring only to these particular organic additives that we are speaking of, not the lead additives. Is that right?

Mr. MORRISON. No, I'm referring only to these nonmetallic additives.

Assemblyman BROWN. The earlier testimony on the lead additives seem to indicate that the result was a substantial lowering in the lead content of the blood of the people in Los Angeles compared with other parts of the United States. So presumably, if the lead causes a reduction in the lead in the blood and you're—the organic components have no effect, then probably we would be unwise to remove either of them, since the only result could be unhealthful?

Mr. MORRISON. I'm sorry, sir. I lost you.

Assemblyman BROWN. I was trying to make a rather obtuse point, actually I'm quite a bit concerned about this economic situation as far as removing the lead from the gasoline is concerned. You state that American Oil Company sells their unleaded gas at no difference in price. Another witness said one cent higher. Griswold has stated in some testimony that unleaded gas could be produced at two cents higher, and we've also had evidences to the effect of lead on the exhaust devices which is somewhat inconclusive. The testimony from the Ethyl Corporation was to the effect that they had not road tested unleaded gasoline on their catalytic devices, so they had no evidence on its—as to its effect on the life of the catalyst. You are not prepared to testify on that, I presume, are you?

Mr. MORRISON. No, sir, not on the lead item.

Assemblyman BROWN. Well, I hope that the witness from the Air Pollution Control District can testify on that because the article which I read indicated that the lead had the effect of decreasing substantially the life of the catalyst. Now, you are not in a position to offer any testimony.

Mr. MORRISON. Well, I've read what Gris had to say on that subject in his report and have discussed this just as an individual with a number of people and it is my understanding that there has been a problem there. However, I was rather encouraged, I say, encouraged because from a personal point of view because the least expenditure called upon to eliminate smog the better off we all are was when Mr. Griswold, in his report, stated that one company had developed a catalyst which was showing good signs of not being affected by leaded gasoline and again, expressing a personal viewpoint, I would think that this is a field which should lend itself and it should require a great deal of additional work to find out what the answer is.

Assemblyman BROWN. Well, let me make this economic statement and see if you can concur with it. If it would cost, say, two cents a gallon to take the lead out of the gas, which would amount to around $16 per year for the average motorist, which is the figure that Griswold used, and that results in the ability to use a catalytic exhaust device which can be manufactured at an amortized cost of—which is $16 per year cheaper, then it would actually cost nothing, if we require a catalytic exhaust device within the near future which we apparently will, it would actually cost the motorist nothing, or it would cost the consumer nothing by virtue of the cheaper device if you were to take the lead out of the gasoline. In other words, the extra cost of the gasoline would be compensated by the lower cost of the catalytic device.

Mr. MORRISON. I'm familiar with that point, Mr. Brown, as I understand what you're saying is that it costs two cents to take the lead out and you could save a year of your catalyst, you would be saving "X" additional dollars and you'd be ahead and that would make good reasoning if the two cents were a proper figure. I'm not prepared to say it is. What I have already stated I stand on, that's the problem.

Assemblyman BROWN. Yes. I bring this out to indicate the importance of trying to get a figure here, because we can't make a judgment on this, speaking as a legislator, unless we do have some figures.

Mr. MORRISON. I can see your problem and we will do everything we can to give it to you. I talked to these engineers about this thing and, if you don't mind, let's put ourselves in their position. The boss says, or your folks request, how much will it cost to do this? They have to be pretty darned positive as to where this will lead them. Right now, they are not in any position to reach any conclusions at all.

Assemblyman BROWN. This would completely disregard the health effects of the lead because if it is economically more desirable to have an unleaded gasoline in terms of its total cost to the consumer considering gasoline and catalytic exhaust device, then economically it's better business to operate that way even if it has no effect on the health.

One final area discussed was the possibility of leaded gasoline reducing effectiveness of catalytic smog control devices. The witness, Lewis Fuller:

Assemblyman BROWN. I don't like to belabor this, Mr. Chairman, but I was very much interested in this question of the effect of lead on the catalytic devices. Do you have—are you able to testify on that subject?

Mr. FULLER. I have the report, sir, which you have in front of you. The relevant portions there are on pages 11, 12, and 13. This was the report which Mr. Griswold just made after his return from Michigan, where he visited those manufacturers.

Assemblyman BROWN. Well, he states here that the total life of the catalyst is substantially reduced. Some estimates indicate that the same catalyst could well perform for as well as 50,000 driving miles if exposed only to the exhaust from nonleaded fuels as contrasted to 12,000 miles if the vehicle is operated on leaded gasolines. In other words, it seems to me that we are saying that the device will last, well, we'll say essentially one year, which would be 12,000 miles in driving or it would last for four years, if it were on unleaded gasolines and if the cost of these devices runs around $75 each or somewhere in that vicinity, we could be saving somewhere in the neighborhood of $300 by—well, we could be saving in the neighborhood of $75 per year—we'll say, $60 per year, if we used unleaded gasoline and the unleaded gasoline would cost us $16 per year. In other words, we could save ourselves about $40 per year in the cost of devices if we used unleaded gasoline. That arithmetic is very rough, but——

Mr. FULLER. That is the report, sir, which Mr. Griswold made upon his return.

Assemblyman BROWN. Well, that, of course, assumes the two cents per gallon cost for removing the lead which is open for question because the industry hasn't been able to testify as to the cost.

Mr. FULLER. That's correct.

Assemblyman BROWN. This is the only point I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman.

Assembly bill 2335 never passed the California Legislature, and the next year I was elected to the Congress. Nevertheless, I feel that the October 1961 hearing raises many points which deserve current attention.

Many of us rejoiced when the major automobile manufacturers and the fuel companies announced within the past month or so that they were aiming to eliminate lead from gasolines. Their first notices indicated that such action was on slate for the near future.

However, if what the following article from the Los Angeles Times says is true, then we must be prepared to adjust our thinking once again. The article follows:

GM MODIFIES CALL FOR LEAD-FREE GASOLINE

(By Dan Fisher)

SACRAMENTO.—General Motors Corp. Thursday modified its call for lead-free gasoline, suggesting a low-lead content grade be permitted until the 1975 model year.

Edward M. Cole, GM president, said the modification would ease the changeover burden on the oil industry and reduce cost to consumers, yet permit auto companies to meet 1972, 1973 and 1974 emission standards.

He proposed a two-fuel system—paralleling the position expressed Wednesday by Fred L. Hartley, Union Oil Co. president, before a special two-day State Air Resources Board meeting here.

Cole said that for California, regular-grade fuel should be modified from the present 94 octane level to 91 octane, permitting a maximum of 0.5 gram of lead per gallon. Currently, regular leaded fuels contain about 2.5 grams per gallon of lead.

LEAD-FREE

Meanwhile, Cole suggested, a premium leaded fuel, containing up to four grams per gallon of lead, and registering 97 octane should be permitted.

That fuel would be available as long as old cars required it, but the 91 octane regular would have to be completely lead-free by the time 1975 models appear, Cole said.

The GM president revealed experimental cars running now that will meet 1980 federal emission standards, but must have lead-free fuel to operate.

The cars are so clean that GM's equipment cannot measure emissions from them, Cole testified. "I have no fear of our technological competence to meet the standards for 1980 if the proper fuel is available," he said.

The company is known to have antismog catalysts that will last for 60,000 miles or more as long as fuel is lead-free.

Cole said, however, that he was not asking for legislation to force removal of lead.

Hartley, meanwhile, told the board legislation is needed that would limit oil companies to producing only one grade of leaded fuel and at least one grade of leadless gasoline.

He suggested that the board require a low-lead or leadless fuel be available by Jan. 1, 1971. If it is a low-lead grade, he said it should be outlawed by Jan. 1, 1974.

REQUIRE MODIFICATION

Hartley's proposal, which would have a 97 octane, leaded fuel as well as the leadless 91 octane grade, would require many motorists to have their current cars modified to run satisfactorily on the lower octane grades. This would involve, Cole told the board, a minor modification in spark timing that would take "less than 20 minutes of labor" and could be done in any service station. If the change was made as part of a normal tune-up, it would cost nothing extra, Cole said.

Hartley suggested that before an owner could relicense his car he would have to show he had made the modifications.

The Air Resources Board's technical advisory committee will make recommendations on the lead issue at the board's March 18 meeting.

Contrary to Mr. Cole, I believe that it is possible to have all lead out of motor fuels within 2 years, and I plan to sponsor legislation which will accomplish that objective.

If it was possible to produce a lead-free gasoline in 1961, then it is certainly within our capabilities to do the same today. For example, the following "Smog-o-gram"—distributed by the People's Lobby, one of the most active environmental quality groups in the southern California area—discusses technical aspects of attaining leadless fuel:

SMOG-O-GRAM

Changes in refining methods during World War II brought serious health menacing air pollution to southern California and 1943 was the first year that widespread crop damage was reported.

Former method: *Thermal cracking.* We had cracked gasolines prior to World War II:

(1) The gasoline was cracked in tightly enclosed chambers where none of the dangerous gases escaped into our air.

(2) Then the gasoline was treated with 98% sulphuric acid which *removed* (a) Impurities of sulfur, nitrogen compounds, oxygen compounds (b) Certain reactive hydrocarbons which would have reacted in sunlight to create ozone. Less lead was needed because more impurities were removed.

Present method: *Catalytic cracking.* The change to this type of cracking process caused serious air pollution because—

(1) The gasoline is *not* cracked in tightly enclosed chambers and the dangerous gases are expelled from stacks at the refineries.

(2) The gasoline is *not* treated with 98% sulfuric acid treatment and our motor fuels contain (a) More impurities which make them dirty burning, producing greater amounts of pollution from *combustion* and (b) More reactive hydrocarbons that will react with sunlight when they escape *unburned* due to incomplete combustion, evaporation, loading operations, storage, etc. More impurities require more lead.

Modern method: *Hydrocracking.* Not used in the L.A. area. This cracking process is the most beneficial for all concerned because:

(1) It increases the yield (to repay the cost of conversion).

(2) Reduces air pollution by *removing dirty burning impurities* (a) Saturating the reactive hydrocarbons with hydrogen making them non reactive in sunlight, (b) Increases the heat content of the fuel causing more complete combustion, (c) Gasolines cracked in enclosed chambers eliminating large emissions of pollution now expelled from catalytic cracking process at refinery. Less impurities requires less lead.

HOW TO MAKE HIGH OCTANE GASOLINE FOR MODERN MOTORS

Remove the impurities, saturate the hydrocarbons with hydrogen and make a white, clean burning motor fuel which needs *no lead or other additive.*

American Oil Company, in the East, makes a 96 octane, unleaded white gasoline that will not knock in any modern high compression motor.

Gulf Refining Company, in the Midwest, removes a *Teacup* of dirty burning tailends from each gallon of their gasoline.

Lead is just one gasoline additive, and even a complete elimination of lead will not cause a full reduction of motor vehicle exhaust emission pollution. The following article about Dr. Agatha Magnus puts the issue into a somewhat broader perspective:

THE PUBLIC MAY LOSE BECAUSE IT DOESN'T KNOW WHAT SMOG IS ALL ABOUT: DR. AGATHA MAGNUS, WORRIED SCIENTIST

(By Leslie Berkman)

As Los Angeles County fights to retain a federal conspiracy suit against auto manufacturers for delaying smog control and citizens around the country sign petitions to put an anti-smog amendment on the national ballot, a senior citizen from Pasadena with a Ph. D. in biology and a lifetime working interest in practical science worries that the public will lose its case because it doesn't know what smog is all about.

Dr. Agatha Magnus, who was an electronic scientist at the Naval Ordnance Laboratory in Corona before becoming an independent inventor, says that for 10 years people have been misled to believe that hydrocarbons are the culprits in the production of nitrogen dioxide, commonly known as smog.

She said that ever since A. J. Haagen-Smit, professor of biology at Cal-Tech, proposed that smog was the product of a photochemical combination of hydrocarbons and ozone by ultraviolet light, the United States government and automobile manufacturers have spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to remove hydrocarbons from the atmosphere.

Much time and money were spent to develop automobile engines that would more completely burn—and thus eliminate—hydrocarbons during combustion, Dr. Magnus notes. But unexpectedly, she explains, the scientists and automobile manufacturers found that while the new engines reduced the emission of hydrocarbons into the atmosphere by 33 per cent, they increased emissions of nitrogen oxides by 66 per cent.

The premise that smog is caused by hydrocarbons in the atmosphere thus proved a fallacy, says Dr. Magnus. Instead, she adds, scientists learned that the more thoroughly any fuel is burned, the more nitrogen oxides are produced.

Dr. Magnus explains that the nitrogen and oxygen in the confined air of a combustion engine unite chemically when heated to a high temperature. A new nitrogen-oxygen combination — nitrogentetraoxide — forms when the nitrogenoxides from the engine spill out of the automobile's exhaust pipe to unite with oxygen in the atmosphere. The colorless nitrogentetraoxide on cooling rises into the air and splits into gaseous molecules of poisonous brown carbon dioxide.

Dr. Magnus proposes that although scientists and manufacturers discovered that hydrocarbons are not the chief cause of smog, they have concentrated on the elimination of these pollutants because they don't know how to begin eliminating nitrogen dioxide. She fears that the public will be overwhelmed by the manufacturers' success story in reducing atmospheric hydrocarbons and fail to see the seriousness of rising nitrogen dioxide levels.

"Hydrocarbons are smelly and unpleasant, as anybody who has been in a gas station knows, but nitrogen dioxide is poisonous," Dr. Magnus emphasizes.

The supervising engineer of the State Air Resources Board, John Chipman, says that Dr. Magnus's theory on the cause of smog is shared by other reputable scientists, but is only one of many theories. Chipman admits, however, that until now virtually total attention has been directed at ridding the atmosphere of hydrocarbons rather than the more harmful nitrogen dioxide. He also admitted that the process developed for reducing hydrocarbons has increased the amount of nitrogen dioxide in the air.

"There is no device to control nitrogen dioxide at this moment," says Chipman. He adds that the State Air Resources Board supports the findings behind the adoption of State Assembly Bill 357 that by 1972 requires automobile manufacturers to learn to reduce nitrogen dioxide emissions to the level of 1966. That was the year that new devices were required in automobile engines to clean the air of hydrocarbons.

Currently, controversy in California—and other Western States—rages over the value of a new additive, F–310, which was introduced in fuel marketed by the Standard Oil Co. of California earlier this year.

Standard claims that fuel with F–310 can reduce certain emissions by up to 50 percent—and they have a group of test reports showing it. At the same time,

other companies and some of the anti-smog citizens organizations contend that Standard's new fuel is not only not as effective as the claims say, but that the company has been employing false advertising procedures.

Last month I wrote to the Federal Trade Commission asking for investigation of the F-310 advertising, and I hope that the Commission finishes this study within the near future.

Another public body, the Hawaii State Legislature, has before it a resolution calling for a major study of F-310, and I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of that resolution, which was introduced by Senator Donald S. Nishimura, along with articles from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin and Honolulu Advertiser describing the furor over F-310:

SENATE RESOLUTION RELATING TO CLAIMS MADE ON F-310 BY STANDARD OIL COMPANY OF CALIFORNIA

Whereas, the adverse health effects of air pollution have aroused public interest and concern; and

Whereas, President Richard M. Nixon cited the automobile as the worst polluter of the air in his State of the Union address; and

Whereas, Standard Oil Company of California has introduced in Hawaii a new product, named F-310, a gasoline additive which has gained wide recognition through the popular media because of the many claims made by Standard's executives on the effectiveness of F-310, the most significant maintaining that F-310 is the first commercial product that will decrease pollution-causing exhaust emissions by half; and

Whereas, the opposing views of three knowledgeable and competent specialists representing three separate groups have been publicized: *Mr. Robert S. Nekomoto, chief sanitation engineer with the Department of Health, has said that F-310 will not do anything to cut down on air pollution; Dr. Sanford Siegel, University of Hawaii botanist and air pollution researcher, has stated that Standard's methods of testing F-310 are inferior and falls short of generally acceptable standards of research which results in unreliable and invalid findings;* and Mr. Robert Wenkam, conservationist, has reported that the People's Lobby, a California environmental organization, claims F-310 is actually more dangerous than gasolines without additives because it only reduces carbon monoxide and visible chemical pollutants but does nothing to eliminate the most dangerous pollutants of all—oxides of nitrogen and tetraethyl lead; and

Whereas, Mr. Robert L. Kunzig, head of the General Services Administration, recently testified at a Senate commerce environmental subcommittee hearing that trials with a natural gas auto fuel have been so successful in eliminating pollution that plans are under way to convert as many as 1,000 government cars to the new system by the end of this year; and

Whereas, it is the responsibility of the State to research and control atmospheric substances that may be injurious to the health of the general public as well as to protect the general public as consumers; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that the Senate Consumer Protection Committee investigate the claims made on F-310 by Standard Oil Company of California; and

Be it further resolved that the Senate Consumer Protection Committee, after consultation with the Attorney General and the Director of the Office of Consumer Protection, report his findings to the Legislature, Regular Session of 1970; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to the Chairman of the Senate Consumer Protection Committee and the President of the Senate.

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Mar. 6, 1970]

UNION OIL CO. SAYS F-310 DOESN'T IMPROVE ITS FUEL

(By Russ Lynch)

Union Oil Co. told the Consumer Protection Committee of the State Senate last night cars running on Union gasoline were not improved in tests with Standard Oil Co. of California's new F-310 additive.

Honolulu attorney Frank D. Padgett read to the committee, investigating Standard's claims for F-310, a statement by Union's planning and research manager, Dr. James B. Gregory.

Union 76 gasolines have contained "effective proprietary detergent additives" since 1956, Gregory's statement said.

"The present Union 76 gasoline detergent additive is an improved formulation . . . it contains a hydrocarbon amine different but chemically related to the polybutene amine announced as the basis for additive F-310," Gregory added.

His statement said tests in January and February by Scott Research Laboratories (the organization whose tests have been cited by Standard as the basis for most of its claims) showed that:

Operation of automobile engines using Union 76 gasolines containing Union Oil Co.'s proprietary detergent-dispersant additive cannot be improved by using gasoline containing F-310 additive from the standpoint of hydrocarbon or carbon monoxide exhaust emissions."

Gregory's statement said Union's own tests showed that miles per gallon in 11 test cars which had operated exclusively on Union gasolines from 26,000 miles to 66,000 miles did not improve after 1,700 miles on gasoline with F-310.

Eneas D. Kane, the Standard research chief here for the hearings, was given the right to reply to the Union statement by committee chairman Sen. Donald S. Nishimura, D-7th Dist. (Palolo-Hawaii Kai.)

Kane said he agreed with Gregory's general findings as to what happens in an engine.

"I do want to emphasize, however, that a carburetor detergent and F-310 are two different things," Kane said.

And he said Standard Oil itself produced the first detergent additive in 1954, 16 years ago.

"It's been successively improved until we developed F-310," Kane said.

Under questioning, he reaffirmed his belief that F-310 produces a better result towards clean air by cutting exhaust emissions than any other gasoline additive.

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, Mar. 7, 1970]

F-310 CLAIMS DISPUTED BY UNION OIL

A Union Oil Co. spokesman told legislators Thursday that Standard Oil's highly publicized F-310 gasoline doesn't do anything that his firm's product hasn't done for years.

Standard Oil Co. of California has advertised its new gasoline additive as a breakthrough in reducing air pollution and in keeping automobile engines clean.

The State Senate's Committee on Consumer Protection and Criminal Code Revision has held two nights of hearings on Standard's claims.

A statement was read to the committee from Dr. James B. Gregory, manager of Union's Planning and Research Department.

Gregory's statement said Scott Laboratories of San Bernardino, Calif.—the same lab which tested F-310 for Standard—also ran tests in which F-310 was added to Union's gasoline.

He said the tests showed that Union's product "cannot be improved by using gasoline containing F-310 additive from the standpoint of hydrocarbon or carbon monoxide exhaust emissions." These are major causes of automobile-produced smog.

His statement said other tests by Union show that mileage is not improved by adding F-310 to gasoline.

Robert Nekomoto, chief of the Air Sanitation Branch of the State Department of Health, told the Consumer Protection Committee that Scott Laboratories has the reputation of being "a top research agency."

Nekomoto said the Health Department does not have the necessary equipment to make its own tests of Standard's claims about F-310.

But he said that if the claims can be proved Standard will have made "a substantial contribution" to air pollution control.

Eneas D. Kane president of Standard's Chevron Research Co., told the Committee headed by Sen. Donald S. Nishimura. Palolo-Hawaii Kai Democrat, that F-310 was not the final answer to automotive smog prevention but was "a step toward the solution."

He said that Standard had taken a substantial step in reducing air pollution by adding F-310 to its gasoline and had presented its claims fairly in its advertising.

Of Union's claims that F-310 did nothing more for that gasoline, Kane said that was Union Oil's opinion, not that of Scott Laboratories.

He said Union was not using Scott's statements, but had made its own analysis of data submitted by the laboratory.

Improved motor fuels can contribute immensely to abating smog. However, we must have thorough knowledge of the effects caused by altering fuel composition, and we must urge—indeed, we must legislate—the petroleum industry to sell only fuels which produce the least amount of harmful pollutants. California failed to do it in 1961, and the smog which covers the State today is proof enough of this failure. We cannot afford such failure today—for California or for the Nation.

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, "law and order" has become a much-used phrase in today's world. But the essence of this phrase is the protection of the individual from those elements who violate the patterns of conduct and trust which are necessary for a stable society.

With the passage of the District of Columbia crime control bill, Congress has addressed itself to the most pronounced aspect of crime—street crime. This passage was needed. But there is another form of crime that is even more disastrous in its total effects that we must address ourselves to—white-collar crime.

White-collar crime has been described as a violation of trust between a dealer and a client. These violations fall into two main types: misrepresentation and duplicity, or the doublecross.

The Christian Science Monitor recently ran a 12-series article by Lucia Mouat, formerly of Janesville, Wis., of my district, that analyzed the problems involved in consumer protection, or the protection of the individual from white-collar crime that touches him as a consumer. Her articles do the best job I have seen of describing the problem and the efforts that are presently being made to correct it.

It is with real pleasure that I place Miss Mouat's article in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 24–26, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—I

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—For years business has said "the customer is always right." Lately the customer is beginning to believe it. A correspondent of The Christian Science Monitor has just spent two months tuning in on the consumer climate in all regions of the United States. This is the first of 12 articles on a buyers'-reform movement armed with more facts and greater persistence than ever before.)

It is afternoon rush hour in the New York subway's Essex Station. Across the tracks a young man drops 15 cents into a machine offering three kinds of ice cream bars. He makes his choice and expectantly lifts the lid. Nothing. He pushes the coin-release button. Nothing again. In desperation he lifts the lid on each of the three choices and slams it down with increasing impatience. He turns to complain to the passersby, but they are all intent on home and supper.

Such, in essence, is consumer frustration in the machine age. It's that feeling that you didn't get your money's worth and that, as one small voice in a world of millions, you're powerless to do much about it.

The poor have felt it. Ask the East Harlem man about the $500 he had to pay for a $200 TV set on Third Avenue—just to get credit—or the housewife from the Buffalo ghetto about how her neighborhood market resorts to air spray (and some don't even bother with that) to camouflage the odor of spoiling meat. In Detroit, it's a standing joke that patrons of one market have seen the same rabbit displayed in the freezer so long that they walk by and greet it with "Hi, Harold."

UNFINISHED SYMPHONY

The middle-class buyer knows that feeling, too. Ask the man in Seattle about the set of 21 Beethoven records he ordered and how he received the canceled check promptly but never the records. Ask the Washington career girl who had to send back her coffeepot four times before it was repaired to the point where it would work. Or ask the man in Birmingham, Ala., who was driving his new car down local city streets when a tremendous noise developed. Mechanics found a carburetor screw embedded in the head of a piston. They also found the air conditioner leaking—factory workers had placed a kinky piece of rubber in its drain.

Everyone has his story. Even Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs and a woman who looks confidently to the 1970's as "the decade of the consumer," has been having her buyer troubles. Her new sofa arrived last August with a broken leg. When she called to complain, the store promised a replacement by early November. As of early January, she was still waiting.

"If I had subpoena power, I'd call in the president of that company," she jokes.

Admittedly, the task of being a well-informed consumer has never been more difficult. The pressure to buy is intense. Discount and dime stores announce over loudspeakers that for the next 12 minutes—and only those—"fantastic bargains" are available in rubber-tree plants and vegetable cutters. Skilled door-to-door salesmen do not ask you whether you want their product but how you want to pay for it. All this, in a mobile society of self-service shopping where word of mouth is not the same consumer weapon or source of information it once was.

Moreover, the prevailing climate has not been conducive to consumer complaints. In this "age of approval," some call it, it is considered almost impolite (and certainly poor taste) to fully read the contract you sign rather than take the salesman's word or to admit to a desire to comparison shop.

A newly married New Yorker recently shopped with paper and pencil in her neighborhood supermarket in an attempt to get the best buy. The manager, noticing the practice was attracting the attention of other shoppers, told her: "Do me a favor, lady, and shop somewhere else after this."

A frozen-food salesman, on a no-obligation visit to a Virginia family, had the contract almost signed and sealed for a five-year supply of food. She left in a huff when the man of the house quietly asked what might happen if the family were not happy with the quality of food after two months time. Asked further for a price list, so the family could think it over, she icily replied that the company had none.

City weights and measures officials insist that a good share of their complaints about market shopweighting are anonymous. Complainants who must continue to shop at their local stores are concerned that they might be found out and penalized accordingly.

RETICENCE ON THE WANE

But this kind of consumer reticence now is fast on the wane. Spurred on by occasional success stories and their own rising indignation, a growing number of consumers are choosing to speak up loudly for what they see as their buyers' rights.

They are heartened by such examples as Ralph Nader, and his one-man crusade on auto safety, an effort that so challenged the billion-dollar auto industry that one model was forced off the market, seat belts and headrests became standard equipment, and designers began to look at the pollution problem.

It is an open question as to whether the American Bar Association report on the Federal Trade Commission would have been so sharply critical had not Mr. Nader's report, along the same line, preceded it.

Such examples prove that, even in the complex 1960's and 1970's, one individual well-armed with facts and figures can make a difference. To some degree this challenge to the establishment holds the same kind of excitement for adult shoppers, who see that the marketplace is not as it should be, as it does for student dissidents working on war moratoriums and helping the poor.

Measures of the increased consumer concern are many:

Mail. Letters often heavy with samples and tourn-out magazine ads now pour into Mrs. Knauer's office at the rate of 2,000 or more a month. Writers complain of everything from buying apple pies that have no apples to dresses with seams that unravel on the first wearing. "Often the letters are like legal briefs, with photostats of warranties and bills," says Mrs. Knauer. The letters also pile up at the offices of state attorneys general, independent consumer groups, Consumers Union (the nonprofit testing agency which puts out Consumers Report magazine), a wide range of congressional committees and federal regulatory agencies, and, of course, to individual consumer advocates.

Legislation. The handful of major federal consumer protection laws on the books have all been passed in the past two or three years. Currently in Congress well over 100 consumer-oriented bills have been introduced. The courts have shown a marked shift in favor of the consumer in the area of product liability cases.

State activity. Some 33 states now have consumer protection agencies of one form or another. Only a handful, however—Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Washington, California (attorney general's office) and a few others—are viewed as really strong. The will to help depends in large measure on strong protection laws.

Independent groups. The Consumer Federation of America, organized two years ago, now has close to 150 organizational members ranging from the Alabama Rural Electric Association to the Michigan Credit Union League. In the past few years volunteers have banded together in consumer groups in more than 30 states.

Involvement of the poor. As the consumer movement broadens to include buyers of all income levels, there is a noticeable increase in co-ops, buying clubs, and local organizations. Such groups as the Consumer Education and Protection Association in Philadelphia, which engages in direct picketing of businesses, are considered pace setters. The Office of Economic Opportunity-funded National Consumer Law Center, headquartered at Boston College and operating only since June, has nine full-time lawyers and 20 part-time law students working on legal reform steps for protection of low-income consumers.

Press. A number of newspapers now have full-time consumer writers. "Action line" columns are common and extremely popular. More newspapers are mentioning brand names. The Detroit News regularly publishes the names of merchants accused of impure food and weights and measures violations.

Certainly it's a big shift from the mid-1960's. Mrs. Esther Peterson, the first of the presidential consumer advisers under President Johnson and one who first suggested the merit of a national group such as the Consumer Federation of America, recalls: "I felt we'd never get anything done until we made people realize they were consumers, to start questioning things they'd been taking for granted." Today, she admits, she has "real satisfaction in that awareness."

ADVERTISING SHOWS

She also credits business with some strides forward since the days when industry made personal attacks on her and attempted to have her removed from office. Much of business still holds to the theory that all the "fuss" over consumerism is only a measure of society's affluence and that the consumer has really never had so much free choice. A number of prominent businessmen, however, are warning their colleagues they had better listen to consumer pleas or suffer the consequences of much more government regulation.

Some businessmen are putting out educational materials, running experiments in giving consumers more buyer information in grocery and department stores, and trying to get consumer input on their advisory boards.

Businessmen consistently argue that they, too, are consumers, but this concern often seems to show up most graphically in moments such as when a South Dakota retailer (interviewed for this series) pointed to a stack of defective merchandise he is returning to the manufacturer—"Workmanship just isn't what it used to be."

Perhaps advertising shows industry's keenest awareness of what bothers the consumer. Appliance and auto ads now stress safety and repairability. And it is noteworthy that Consumers Union (CU) is suing both Joseph B. Seagram & Sons and the Theodore Hamm Brewing Company for $500,000 apiece for capitalizing in their ads on CU copyrighted finds which put their products high on the preference list.

While even the staunchest consumer advocates do not lump all business in the "voltures" category (as some businessmen contend), they are convinced that business in general has not responded nearly as constructively as it should to the consumer movement.

"Much of what should be changed should be initiated by business rather than by legislation," says Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant, commission of consumer affairs for New York City. "Instead of fighting the bills and the rebellion of the consumer, business should start fighting the problem.

"Business keeps screaming about government intervention but it's been asking for it with this attitude of 'how much can I get away with and for how long?' The federal packaging bill is a perfect example. They knew they had to cut down on the number of package sizes and they didn't. If this attitude continues to prevail, there's going to be much more of a consumer revolt than there has been."

EXAMPLES RECEIVED

Ralph Nader is equally, if not more, indignant on the subject of business taking advantage of the consumer. In his view, the thousands of examples each day of illegal credit transactions, auto repair work never even done, of shortweighting, passing off low grade meat and high grade meat and of pumping water into poultry and hams ("The consumer is paying $32 million a year for all that water.") adds up to "unbelievable" and "very lucrative fraud."

"The whole process is systematic thievery on the part of corporations," he said in a conversation with this reporter. "Every day I get letters enclosing examples. The other day I got a piece of material that was four inches short of the four feet long it was supposed to be. And someone sent me a bottle of instant coffee that was supposed to weigh 16 ounces net—the whole thing weighed 16 ounces. . . . Corporations know with infinite precision what's going into their packages. All they've got to do is tell the consumer."

Mr. Nader characterizes the consumer movement as a "powerful, conservative" movement dedicated to such solid 19th century Sherman Antitrust Act ideals as fairness in the marketplace and more comparative information for the consumer.

Arguing that "price fixing is totally a way of American business" and that the base of competition has been narrowed to such details as games of chance and the color of bank checks, he says "the consumer movement will show that industry and commerce have been living a lie and that they're the greatest subverters of the free enterprise system there are. The leftist radicals don't even come close in terms of daily destruction of the system."

For at least the 1970's, consumer advocates predict heavy stress on environmental problems, with strong participation expected at the nationwide April 22 college teach-in. The scope of consumer concern long ago outgrew its early and narrow connotation of the housewife picketing a grocery store. Now it encompasses such diverse concerns as travel, interstate moving, taxes, and tenant problems.

MORE MILITANCY EXPECTED

More low-income militancy and direct picketing of business is expected. More of the professional and young poverty lawyers are interested. Class action court suits on behalf of groups of consumers with dollar returns will become more common.

Whatever momentum the consumer movement may have—and, as its critics allege, it may be due more to the zeal of the few than of the many—the fact remains that there is still a good deal of old-fashioned American apathy on the part of the much-discussed "silent majority."

One deputy attorney general tells of seeing a home improvement scheme in a television ad which he was sure was fraudulent. Since he had no pattern of evidence with which to build a case, he paged through the lists of contracts signed and wrote to the last 40 people on the company's list. Once contacted, more than 30 people indicated they had been cheated in some way but had not complained because they didn't feel it would do any good.

Some longtime consumer advocates, such as Rep. Lenor K. Sullivan (D) of Missouri, argue that such apathy has taken a toll in legislation.

"Congress has always been agonizingly slow in passing urgently needed consumer protection laws," she commented during a hearing last fall of the Commission on Product Safety. "The consumer drive to force us to act is still in low gear. . . . Most of what still needs to be done hasn't been done because the public hasn't cried out loudly enough."

GREAT POTENTIAL SEEN

Mr. Nader, a man who has proven that numbers don't mean everything, sees the potential of the consumer movement as the broadest-based the nation has yet seen.

"The rush is overwhelming—it's almost becoming a fad," he comments. "Other issues such as Vietnam and civil rights have divided the country into camps. Granted that sellers and buyers are opposed in the consumer movement, but there's no split at the grass-roots level. It's a 'people's movement.'"

This series stems from more than 200 personal interviews with leading consumer advocates, citizen leaders of the consumer movement, state law officials charged with curbing consumer fraud, poverty program workers, labor officials, educators, and businessmen. Some of the most common complaints in consumer mail will be explored—auto repairs, product safety, appliance warranties, food packaging, and credit problems. Also, assessments will be made of the growth of consumer education efforts, industry response to consumerism, organizational strength of the consumer movement, and the extent of legal protection. Concluding the series will be a few pointers on what the consumer may do to help himself.

From the Christian Science Monitor, Jan. 29, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—II: AUTO REPAIRS SPUTTER, MISS

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—Some 67 million Americans are married to their automobiles. They spend up to $25 billion a year on repairs to maintain the compact (as well as the station wagon, the family sedan, and so forth). But all is not bliss. Consumers face problems in the repair business that range from a shortage of mechanics—many of whom are untrained if not plain incompetent—to calculated fraud.)

TUCSON, ARIZ.—The gas gauge was nearing "empty" so the University of Arizona co-ed pulled off the freeway into the nearest service station. All went routinely enough until suddenly she noticed white smoke billowing out from under the open hood. The attendant, standing over it with a properly concerned expression, informed her that the car needed "a new accelerator in its generator" and that if she tried to drive out of the station without having it fixed, the car would be ruined.

One tank of gas and $119 later the student was back on the freeway, heading for the university campus. To confirm her growing suspicion, she took the car to her regular mechanic for a recheck. His verdict: Potassium powder had been used to simulate smoke, and she had been "conned" (a generator does not have an accelerator).

The case is not as exceptional as one might think. Despite stepped-up efforts by law-enforcement agencies and more widespread and vehement complaining on the part of car owners, deceptive auto-repair practices persist as a major consumer problem.

In California several gas stations near the southern border were suspected of pulling the same trick as the Arizona mechanic. But when the attorney general's office tried to amass a pattern of evidence, it found all 20 of its witnesses were from out of state. All had been carefully selected by their license plates. A suit was impossible.

DRIVERS LACK KNOWLEDGE

The American automobile, a complex machine of more than 15,000 parts, is regarded as an absolute necessity by most of the 67 million Americans who own one. But most motorists are in the weakest possible bargaining position when it comes to judging what, if any, repairs are needed, whether they have been done well, and what is a fair price to pay for them.

Yet each year motorists pay a whopping $20–25 billion—almost as much as a year's outlay for the Vietnam war—for auto repairs.

The consumer is a captive in more ways than one. Once his car's motor is disassembled and the trouble is found, there is usually little, if any, opportunity to shop around.

If the final bill shoots above the estimate the consumer again has little recourse but to pay—even after a hot verbal sound off.

Only if the estimate appears in print and is consistently violated can law authorities build a case for fraud.

Often it is hard to draw the line between fraud and honest incompetence. As cars have become more complex and mechanics more specialized, the varied causes of auto trouble are tested almost in isolation. It becomes a hit-and-miss process.

CHARGES COMPARED

Take the case in "Points and Plugs," part of National Educational Television's process (NET) consumer-oriented "Your Dollar's Worth" series. A woman driving a freshly tuned-up car with marked spark plugs made the rounds of several gas stations which had "mechanic on duty" signs. Each time, just before she drove in, a mechanic employed by NET adjusted the points slightly to cause stalling and rough running.

She was charged variously from $1.58 for opening the points (a fair price for the right work) to $32 for new spark plugs, points, condenser, and an adjusted carburetor (all unneeded). Other experiments run by auto clubs in Denver, Greater Atlanta, and Greater Portland, Maine, rate half of the minor repairs done by garages sampled as unsatisfactory.

Recalls Boris Holtzman, who wrote and produced the NET program: "There was very little attempt to repair instead of replace and to really define the cause of the trouble. . . . There is a great surplus of untrained mechanics who are essentially gas pumpers."

LICENSING THE ANSWER?

It is such random guessing and mistaken analysis that have led some consumers into paying for the same job twice.

Part of the problem is a nationwide shortage of mechanics. An estimated 50,000 a year will be needed over the next decade just to keep pace with population growth. The glamourless, grass-monkey image of the trade, held by many young men and their parents, has not helped.

Although licensing mechanics has been suggested as one answer to the quality problem (a few House bills propose it), the idea is rejected now by many on the grounds it would only tighten an already short supply of manpower.

Meanwhile, as Congress and consumers mull possible solutions, a number of motorists are turning to diagnostic centers as one answer. Here for $8 to $20 you can run your

car through a series of compresensive machine tests and pinpoint what ails it.

Diagnosic centers also have potential for those consumers who suspect repairs done have not been done well and for used-car shoppers.

American Automobile Association Affiliates in both St. Louis and San Francisco have launched such centers. Conceding its sampling is far from random, the Automobile Club of Missouri reports that of some 2,000 cars brought to it for a repair recheck over one chunk of time, one-third were found to be unsatisfactory.

One Arizonan, in the market for a used car, ran six specimens through a diagnostic center in Tuscon before deciding on the best buy. Chet Fullington, service adviser of this center at O'Reilly Chevrolet, says the diagnostic idea also holds strong potentials for those "oversensitive" to their car troubles.

"Some people are ready to believe anything," he reports. "We had one man drive all the way down that mountain over there at 15 miles an hour because he was convinced the idler arm was going to fall off. We found absolutely nothing was wrong."

There are those who argue an intensive course in auto repairs for every motorist would go a long way toward improving a bad situation. But many consumers feel that matching expertise in this field should be no more necessary than it is in barbering, plumbing, or in mastering the trade of the airplane mechanic. They argue that the consumer who pays has a right to expect some quality.

Prices and parts delays are as much of a concern to car owners as poor workmanship. It is estimated that parts prices are generally about 60 percent higher than a decade ago. With regional variations, the average labor and service charge is between $7 and $9 an hour now. The manufacturers' argument—that in fact repair costs are down because less frequent maintenance service is called for these days—is small comfort to most motorists.

Some suggest dividing repair bills into parts, labor, and service, since the mechanic only gets about half of the current "labor" charge.

"Even the unskilled laborer gets more than $3.50 or $4.00 an hour," comments Barry McNulty, executive vice-president of the Independent Garage Owners of America, with headquarters in Chicago.

OWNERS' COSTS STRESSED

"The assumption that garage people are getting rich on the poor consumer is a big joke. The public has no idea of the cost of equipment or space. If you were repairing watches, you would work in a place the size of my office. But with car repairs, it's a different story."

Some pinpoint the problem as the piecework basis for paying mechanics. The quicker they move on to the next repair, the more they make. This is encouraged, dealers argue, by the flat-rate manuals published by manufacturers, which set time and price for each type of warranty repair.

Interestingly enough, each facet of the auto-repair business—manufacturers, dealers and independent shops, insurers, and mechanics—all side with the consumer on one or another of his many complaints. Each is ready to blame the other for negligence in coping with the problem.

This point has come up vividly in the three sessions on auto repairs held over the past year by the Senate antitrust and monopoly subcommittee. Chaired by Philip A. Hart (D) of Michigan, the state which is home to three of the big four U.S. auto manufacturers, the committee began with an investigation into high auto-insurance premiums and quickly turned the spotlight to auto-repair problems.

Design, defects, and delays figured heavily in the hearings.

Robert D. Knoll, director of the auto-test division of Consumers Union, reported to the subcommittee, for instance, that he had found an average of 36 defects in 1969 cars (more than two times the numbers he found in 1967 models) and argued that delays in receiving parts for even current model cars were "appalling"—often one to six months.

Manufacturers, of course, retort that they do recall cars for defects whenever they discover them and that they are working toward faster parts distribution.

General Motors, for instance, has just launched a giant computer operation to better feel out the geography of supply and demand.

A General Motors spokesman in Detroit argues that the "confusion" of the "paperwork empire" set in motion when parts are ordered is more to blame for delays than the number of parts.

Ford Motor Company has set up a new distribution facility in Detroit which it describes as being as big as 53 football fields, including the end zones. Ford dealers now stock catalogs of 27,000 pages of parts listings. Officials concede that in a single year parts managers may have to replace as many as 26,000 pages just to keep their listings current.

INSURANCE MEN SPEAK UP

Consumers are currently urging manufacturers to consider ease of repairability in their new car designs. They cite bumpers that sometimes need to be removed to get at the directional signals and air conditioners in the way of spark plugs under the hood. They say that with more careful planning some of the most common repair jobs could be done by less skilled mechanics—so "you wouldn't need a Ph. D. just to adjust the window panel," as one consumer advocate charges.

In a very interesting turnabout insurance spokesmen have taken to befriending the consumer in his protest against the high cost of parts and the need for design change.

In testimony before the Hart subcommittee, the insurers argued that the most common repairs are often the most expensive. The most graphic illustration of this point came with the filmed test results of four standard medium-priced cars which were crashed into barriers at 5 miles an hour. The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, which did the experiment, reported repair bills in crashes averaged $200 each.

When one manufacturer revealed no repairs would be necessary if its cars were traveling at a 2.8 mile-an-hour speed, it brought a quip from the Rowan and Martin "Laugh In" that companies had "agreed to meet the problem by building cars that would go only 2.8 miles an hour."

For those who despair of a solution to auto-repair problems, there are signs of progress:

From the manufacturers, there is increasing emphasis on repairability in advertising. Ford has sold more than two million of its $15 home-auto tune-up kits and devotes 25 pages of the Maverick owner's manual to do-it-yourself repairs. With a new Volkswagen, a buyer gets coupons entitling his "bug" to four free diagnostic inspections for the first two years. Both Ford and General Motors have indicated bumpers on their 1971 models will be more crash-absorbent. Manufacturers are heavily involved in training new mechanics. The "big four" are at least talking of building more repairability into their designs, with parts in clusters which can be easily removed and replaced. One manufacturer has assigned an engineer to its senior stylist.

Insurance companies, no longer assured of virtually automatic rate increases and parts discounts, are considering adoption of a rating system which takes into account the varying costs of the same repair jobs in different models of cars. Consumer advocates are hopeful that this in turn might influence motorists in their choice of a car and in turn the manufacturer in his choice of design.

MORE TRAINING EFFORT SOUGHT

Dealers, service stations, and independent shops are trying with sporadic success to increase their training efforts. Just a few months ago the Independent Garage Owners of America, Automotive Service Industry Association, and the National Congress of Petroleum Retailers launched a voluntary certification program in which mechanics will be certified in accord with specific skills.

It is also worth mentioning that not all consumers put their auto-repair experiences into the "horror story" category. Consider the man from New York driving to Atlanta to visit his daughter and son-in-law. After an overnight stop in Spartanburg, S.C., he discovered his car wouldn't start. A gas-station mechanic tried for an hour to find the trouble and called in first a generator and finally an ignition specialist, fresh from his all-night shift at a nearby tractor factory. A few hours later the trouble was found—a missing piece of insulation in the ignition—and the motorist had to prod the men who had helped to take any money.

The government's role in improving the auto-repair situation (admittedly limited) is expected to be more regulatory than legislative.

The fourth and final set of the Senate subcommittee's auto-repair hearings will be held in March with representatives from the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, Labor, and Transportation on hand to testify. It is expected that they will be pressed to use the authority their departments now have to beef up federally aided mechanic training to develop a system of licensing garages and perhaps master mechanics with industry certification of the others, and to devise minimum federal standards for a more effective system of state motor-vehicle inspection.

WARRANTIES RESTUDIED

Changes are expected, too, in warranty regulations.

An increasing rift between dealers and manufacturer on this issue makes warranty clarification all the more imperative. It caused no small stir this month when Senator Hart released a letter, purportedly sent by the Chevrolet Motor Division of GM to its 7,000 dealers, asking that warranty repairs be restricted to defects affecting safety unless customers requested repairs.

Just this year manufacturers reduced protection time from two years or 24,000 miles to one year or 12,000 miles, whichever is longer. The five-year or 50,000-mile protection still holds on the drive trains and a few other specified parts.

Bills have been introduced in the Senate to encourage fuller and more responsible disclosure on warranties.

Also, legislative recommendations from the Federal Trade Commission, which held hearings on automobile warranties last February and has a scathing staff report on the subject, are expected to be released. No indication is given as to when—"I wouldn't try to second guess the commission," explains an FTC press officer.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 2, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—III: WILL THE REAL BARGAIN STAND UP?

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—When is a supermarket bargain really a bargain? Many see present pricing and packaging practices in the food industry as versions of the old shell game. A bill before Congress would enforce unit pricing, making comparative pricing practical.)

ST. LOUIS.—Needs of a supermarket bargain hunter: one free afternoon, an advanced

degree in mathematics, and an iron determination not to be impressed by the size of a package.

This puts the case rather strongly—but so do a number of housewives. It has been estimated that collectively the dollars they "waste" in guessing wrong on economy choices run into the billions every year.

The average supermarket stocks 8,000 items, displayed in a dazzling array of weights, sizes, and brands. Though most housewives consider quality as well as price in their decisions, some say modern packaging practices make comparative pricing almost impossible. Slide rules and cardboard calculators (dispensed glady now by many retailers) generally are not viewed as a great help.

In addition to a stated price per unit of weight, some shoppers want uncoded dating of perishables and percentage labeling of ingredients.

WATER WEIGHED IN, TOO

Mr. Ruth Vasterling, a St. Louis housewife, argues that listed net weights often are no real indicators of contents. In weighing canned vegetables, for instances, she has found that often water accounts for half the net weight.

"Why should we be paying all that money to ship water around the country?" asks Mrs. Vasterling, who began weighing canned goods in accord with an ounces-per-day diet plan. "It's grossly unfair to consumers."

She contends that the canning practice is costly and a sound argument for percentage labeling and stricter content control. Manufacturers she has contacted, she says, do not take the problem so seriously. One major company, prodded by a phone call and a letter from her, sent a representative to her doorstep one day to offer her two free cans of peas. "That was supposed to pacify me," she says.

Perhaps one reason housewives and consumer advocates have delved so zealously into the area of food packaging, pricing, and labeling practices is that they find the results both fascinating and personally useful. Some are hard pressed to draw the line between confusion and outright deception.

Among their findings:

Manufacturers package prices.

It's the old story of the nickel candy bar "shrinking" inside its spacious wrapper. Rather than raise the price of his product or reduce the size of the box, the manufacturer simply "packages" the cost by cutting down the quantity. It is estimated that hundreds of items, from chile to pancake mix, are so packaged.

HOUSEWIFE JUST GRABS

"It's deliberately deceptive, a hidden cost increase that you'd never notice in a casual glance," comments Mrs. Sarah Newman, executive secretary of the National Consumers League, who points to salted peanuts and crackers as examples of such price packaging. "If prices have to go up, you might as well let the housewife know. She's still going to buy."

Often many packages of different weights look alike. Sidney Margolius, veteran consumer columnist, tells of the day recently when he and his wife spotted three loaves of bread varying from 22 to 27 ounces, all looking alike.

"The average woman spends a little over three seconds buying her baked goods," he says. "She's just going to grab, and if she thinks she's got the biggest, she may be in for a shock."

The large "economy" size is not always cheapest. A Washington, D.C., supermarket employee tells of buying three packages of aluminum foil and getting more foil for less money than in the large "economy" size. Similarly shoppers have found in the course of price surveys that "house" brands are not necessarily cheapest.

Pictures often don't tell the story.

Witness the charge that Campbell Soup feigned thickness in its product by tossing in a few marbles for its picture ads.

In last October's issue of Consumer Reports, Consumers Union did a telling picture layout on frozen pies. It pitted the picture on the package cover, usually a succulent slice, against an actual picture of the contents.

In addition to the campaign for transparent packaging of meat, weights-and-measures and consumer officials are constantly on the lookout for short-weighting and other deceptive practices. In December the Nassau County, N.Y., Office of Consumer Affairs charged that cheaper meat cuts were being priced and labeled as better cuts (such as shank passing for beefsteak boneless chuck) in 34 of 40 outlets it checked.

"Specials" aren't always special.

Consider the Portland, Oreg., housewife who found a 13-ounce bottle of shampoo on "sale" at the front counter of her neighborhood store costing more than 16 ounces of the same shampoo on the regular shelf in the rear.

Or Mrs. Alberta Slavin, who heads a two-year-old St. Louis price-survey group called "Housewives Elect Lower Prices" (HELP). She noticed baby food at a "low discount rate" of 9 cents cost more than it did the week before in the same store. When she noticed a similar aisle-end "sale" on peanut butter, with the jars the same price they had been for the last month, she was told by a clerk that for every 10 cases the store purchased, it got one free.

"This is the kind of 'Mickey Mouse' we all have to put up with because we can't remember from week to week," says the attractive housewife. "When hundreds of thousands of items are advertised constantly, it's impossible to keep track—unless you take a survey."

FTC CONSIDERS RULING

The Federal Trade Commission (FTC), through its own surveying, has charged that advertised "specials" are often overpriced or unavailable. It is considering a ruling on the subject. The food industry is expected to rebut FTC findings during March hearings.

The high price of food is probably the one issue which most annoys the majority of this nation's shoppers. Yet without concerted organizational effort—a tall order for most consumer groups—they are powerless to do much about it.

Packaging and labeling reforms appear to some consumers to hold much more potential than changes in the pricing area. But many feel that so far there has been far more talk than action.

The Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (FPLA), aimed at cutting down the proliferation of sizes and making labels more informative and easier to read, passed in 1966 after five years of hearings. Many feel it emerged much the worse for the wear.

The most noticeable improvement to the average shopper is the larger type and standardized position of the net weight on labels. Some businesses, like Jewel Food Stores in Chicago, took advantage of the already expensive opportunity to add a few other points for customers. Miss Jane Armstrong, home economist and member of Jewel's packaging committee, reports that labeling on the stores' frozen-food line was changed to include information on where the product is grown and tips for cooking and proper storage.

FPLA regulations on slack-fill and cents-off practices have yet to be shaped and funded.

Some consumers feel that the progress made in cutting back the number of package sizes has been almost as negligible. The trimming was left to industry's voluteer efforts, with strategic prodding allowed from the secretary of commerce and National Bureau of Standards (NBS).

PROMISES VERSUS PRACTICE

Producers and trade associations in 21 product areas agreed to specific reductions, largely during 1969, in their size ranges.

David Edgerly, a weights-and-measures coordinator at NBS (and one of only two men there working on the proliferation problem), says that with the exception of spokesmen for the instant-coffee industry, which offered suggestions for improvement on its own initiative, NBS went "knocking on doors."

Weights-and-measures officials in 40 states have been checking the promises against practice. Mr. Edgerly, who stresses that progress could and should have been a good deal better across the board despite the problems involved, says the soft-drink industry (which agreed to trim its inventory size range by one-third as of last July) scored fairly high, while a few areas such as adhesive bandages (which had pledged to cut the number of its sizes from 33 to 16 by last January) ranked low. Presumably the time needed to get rid of old stock is longer for the latter product. Mr. Edgerly adds that, contrary to popular myth, it is the large manufacturers rather than the small ones which produce most of the "off" or fractional sizes.

Certainly there are problems, particularly with products which range widely in density.

"With cereals you've got puffed wheat at one end and grape nuts at the other," says Robert Thurston, vice-president of Quaker Oats Company. He says his company has eliminated all fractional ounces except on a few cookie and cracker products. "You're either going to end up with all packages of the same size and a tremendous variety of weights or vice versa."

IF COMPETITION IS LET OFF

Also, if the competition is not required to follow suit, motivation is hard to develop. Mrs. Mary Gullberg, a home economist with the Consumers Cooperative of Berkeley, Calif. (CCB), which has more than 48,000 member families, says that, though the CCB has standardized weights of several items such as dried fruits and rices, its products stand almost alone.

CCB peanut butter, for instance, is in pound jars, while competing brands are packaged in 18-ounce lots. Mrs. Gullberg, who considers standardization the best answer to the problem and suggests most food products can be boxed in one-half, one-quarter, or three-quarter pounds or multiples of these, reports there was little change in standardized weights on co-op shelves between 1964 and '69.

The average consumer, who may never have seen the full range of 50 olive sizes in her particular market, may not even have noticed (or felt her pricing problems eased) when the industry cut back to 20 sizes. The same would apply to products such as cookies and crackers, which slimmed down from 73 to 56 sizes.

The basic question now is "What next?"

Some want to toughen the packaging law as it stands. To date, Sen Philip A. Hart, (D) of Michigan, author of the bill, who concedes it was "pushed, pulled, and hammered fiercely" before final passage, has put his stress on more funding for the regulatory agencies charged with enforcing and watchdogging progress.

He credits the law with having cracked the "hard line" He feels business generally held against consumerism and argues there is nothing "intrinsically" wrong with business disciplining itself.

UNIT PRICING VERSUS PROFITS

At the moment the consumer push is strong to get retailers to calculate the price per unit of each product for the shopper. Sen Gaylord Nelson (D) of Wisconsin is the sponsor of such an amendment to the packaging act. The idea has been endorsed by the

Consumer Federation of American and Consumers Union, among others.

Retailers and manufacturers argue that unit pricing, particularly on the individual can or package, as the Nelson bill stipulates, would be prohibitively expensive. Industry spokesmen estimate $300 million at least to tag and update the 210 billion items on the shelves. They stress that their profit margin on sales is a slim 1.3 percent, though based on a capital investment figure that slides upward to 12.5 percent.

Several experiments are under way to find out more about cost and consumer behavior with respect to unit pricing. None so far involves stamping the new figure on the individual product itself.

New York is scheduled to begin enforcement of a citywide price-per-measure ruling Feb. 20 (more on this in a later article).

Safeway Stores in Washington has been conducting unit-pricing experiments in two stores in low-income neighborhoods for the past three months and, since December, in two more-affluent neighborhoods in Alexandria, Va. Some 70 percent of the stores' packaged products are affected.

A similar experiment in three Jewel stores in the Chicago area was begun in January.

Methods in both cases include a variety of shelf labels, posters, and cardboard and mechanical calculators. Evaluation of both projects is yet to be made.

The Berkeley co-op unit has been pricing a number of food items since 1960. Mrs. Gullberg counts the hours of labor involved in posting and updating the pricing as not worth the return in customer use.

"We've sold I don't know how many slide rules, and I've yet to see anybody use one," she comments. "If you want to calculate three things, you often forget the first by the time you get to the third. As for the information sheets we put up, people are usually pleased to see them, but they're too much work to use."

But the Berkeley home economist stresses that she thinks consumers do need more information than they get. "Arguing against that is like saying you don't need books in a library because nobody reads them; when somebody does need the information it should be there." She simply favors standardization of weights as the better method.

A recurring theme in any conversation with businessmen on unit pricing is use and the consumer's willingness to pay the cost.

"We need to be very careful we don't get boxed in with regulations that don't fill the needs and objectives of consumers," says Joseph F. Grimes, vice-president of sales at Jewel.

"Evidently there's a dearth of causes right now," adds the Chicago executive. "Consumerism has become like motherhood and the flag, with everybody jumping on the bandwagon. . . . We tend to think we're a little closer to the consumer and her thinking than many consumer advocates. We've done quite a bit of research [into unit pricing] land—we're not inflexible on this—but we find the great majority of consumers don't know what it's all about and don't want it, particularly if it's going to be very expensive."

"The danger of the consumer movement is precipitous action," says William Kagler of the Kroger Company, headquartered in Cincinnati, which has changed some 3,400 "house" labels in accord with the packaging law. "There are consumers and there are consumer advocates, but I'm not sure there's any broad-seated demand for unit pricing. . . . The problem is that nobody knows if it will really work. A cost-benefit ratio is needed to determine whether the system would be desirable or not."

CAMPUS RESEARCH PUSHED

Consumer Research Institute in New Jersey, run by James Carman, a business-administration professor on leave from the University of California at Berkeley, is digging into just such questions. Supported by trade associations for food chains, wholesale grocers and manufacturers, and food advertising agencies and magazines, the new institute manages some 20 research projects on university campuses in such fields as cents-off practices, European testing and grading programs (for comparison purposes in this country), and unit pricing. Consumer behavior receives a heavy emphasis.

Clarence Adamy, president of the National Association of Food Chains, cautions against being "absolute" on either unit pricing or standardized packages. He says the food industry can most successfully do "parts of both" and criticizes the proposed unit-pricing amendment as being too narrow in the scope of methods allowed.

In Mr. Adamy's view, the biggest problem, which he says cannot be solved by either suggested method, is that money comes in tenths and package weight in sixteenths.

"Nobody is approaching the honest problem, which is the complexity of our basic system," he says. "I believe with a great deal of integrity that the only answer is going to the metric system, and I think it's inevitable. Only three nations are left which don't have it."

In addition to the push for information that would make pricing comparison easier, there is also currently a move for percentage labeling of ingredients. Consumer spokesmen argue it is a fact that one knows more about dog food, with its thorough list of ingredients and nutrients by percentages, than about most human food.

PERCENTAGE LABELING QUESTIONED

George M. Koch, president of the Grocery Manufacturers Association, says he is quite sure that customers want and are willing to pay for the convenience of flip-top cans and the like, but he is not at all sure about percentage labeling.

"Whether that measure comes this year because of political reasons or five years from now may mark the difference between sanity in the consumer movement and regulation by panic and chaos," he says.

"We strongly support any consumer legislation that will really be helpful. But does the consumer really want this? We'd be adding a new dimension without a common denominator. If it put 2 percent more beans in my can than another manufacturer with a different pork-and-beans recipe, is the consumer further informed or more confused?"

Mrs. Esther Peterson, first presidential consumer adviser, sums up her consumer view: "The packaging bill is really a labeling bill. In some areas there are more package sizes than ever. We've either got to have forced standardization or unit pricing. If unit pricing, the simpler the better. All this gadgetry is what we want to avoid. . . . There's no reason why it can't be done. All these crazy arguments are the same ones we've run into on every possible social advance. It's always, 'It will cost too much' or 'It isn't needed.' "

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 5, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—IV: WHAT PRICE SAFE PRODUCTS?

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—Ten years ago consumers could rarely sue manufacturers when products were unsafe. But new laws and mounting court cases now are pointing the finger of liability toward business. Though voluntary reform in the field of product safety has gained, many see increased governmental action in the future.)

DETROIT.—"Everybody's in favor of safety, but it costs money," says Detroit lawyer Richard Goodman.

He and his colleague Paul Rosen, who work full time on behalf of injured consumers in product-safety cases, were showing this reporter their rogue's gallery of judicial evidence. Items ranged from an aluminum beer keg which had corroded enough to explode at a wedding to detailed photographs of a tractor-lawnmower whose loosely attached gas tank also had exploded.

Product-safety court-cases totaled some 300,000 last year, triple the number filed the year before. However severe the problem—and all admit statistics are badly needed—probably no field illustrates so well the decisive change in this nation's consumer climate over the past few years.

Court decisions are one major indicator. The responsibility for loss has been shifting gradually from the consumer to the manufacturer, even though the manufacturer may not be at fault morally. He now must anticipate possible misuse of his product by the consumer and, under the doctrine of "strict liability" being adopted in an increasing number of states, possibly accountability. He usually invests heavily in product liability insurance.

BREAKTHROUGH DESCRIBED

Prof. Thomas F. Lambert, editor in chief of the American Trial Lawyers Association (ATLA) Journal, describes this legal chance in the past 25 years as "the most dramatic breakthrough in the history of accident law."

Probably most responsible for this judicial change is ATLA, which operates a clearinghouse in the product-safety field at its Cambridge, Mass., headquarters. Here lawyer members can turn for records of similar cases to get tips on the most persuasive kinds of witnesses and testimony.

"Aggressive lawyers in the American Trial Lawyers Association have essentially changed the law by arguing and convincing many judges that manufacturers do have a responsibility for the safety of their products," comments Morris Kaplan, technical director of Consumers Union, publisher of Consumer Reports. "They've been accused of feathering their own nest, but the thrust of their actions is socially useful."

In the manufacturer's view, some consumers are simply "cashing in" on the favorable climate whether their cases really deserve it or not.

It is also true that even the threat of a court suit and even a case settled in favor of the manufacturer have been known to result in change on the consumer's behalf.

Witness the string of suits involving Corvair, largely, if not all, unsuccessful from the plaintiffs' view. Presumably the combination of these cases and the stinging publicity from consumer advocate Ralph Nader's "Unsafe at Any Speed" quashed sales to the point where General Motors took the car off the market.

Another key factor in the developing product-safety field has been the work of the National Commission on Product Safety (NCPS). Appointed by Congress two years ago and due to expire this June, it was set up to pinpoint dangerous products, review existing safety legislation and industry's self-regulation efforts, and to come up with some of its own recommendations.

Through the intensive work of its seven-member bipartisan commission, three task forces, and several contracted outside firms, the group has earned a reputation, by all measures, that few study commissions can match. Ralph Nader predicts there will not be an agency in the government in the next 10 years that will have more "impact" than the commission has had.

NCPS hearings around the country, research, and prodding are given a large share of the credit for:

Passage of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act of 1969, which has just gone into effect. To the narrow 1966 act on the same subject, this law adds possible banning by the Food and Drug Administration of toys

with thermal, mechanical, and electrical hazards.

Improvements in glass safety. The Federal Housing Authority (FHA) minimum property standard (to which almost everyone builds these days) now requires that safety glass be used in sliding glass door and in panels around doorways as well as in shower and tub enclosures in all FHA-approved homes. Legislatively, Florida, Maryland, and Oregon (and several individual cities) have stepped up requirements for the use of safety glazing in building and installation.

An across-the-board reexamination of the stringency of safety standards (which industry stresses it does periodically anyway) in such fields as ladders and lawnmowers by individual trade groups and by the American National Standards Institute (ANSI), a national standards clearinghouse. Certification groups also show increased concern.

Manufacturer action. In addition to standards revision, a few manufacturers have voluntarily recalled products. Rapaport Brothers, Inc., with its toy tunels (subject of one of the commission's hearings in Boston) is an example. Appliance manufacturers also voluntarily applied federal refrigerator safety requirements to freezers. Such groups as the Outdoor Power Equipment Institute feature TV spot commercials instructing viewers in the safe use of their equipment.

But consumer advocates insist many more manufacturers have been lax and, in fact, defensive. Technology is available, these advocates say, but safety legislation has been "piecemeal," usually passed in response to a crisis, and largely unimplemented.

The Flammable Fabrics Act of 1953, for instance, was aimed mainly at getting "torch" sweaters off the market. A federal standard was established as to what constituted too much flammability in the fabric. With 1967 amendments, the act was broadened to include upholstery, carpets, draperies, and the full range of fabrics. The secretary of commerce was authorized, after determining that any one of the materials presented a problem, to set a standard of flammability for it.

MANY AREAS NOT COVERED

So far the secretary has pinpointed rugs and carpets and children's sleepwear, underwear, and dresses as problem areas. But, red tape being what it is, the old standard of the 1953 act still prevails.

Arnold B. Elkind, the New York lawyer who is chairman of the National Product Safety Commission, describes the amended act as "an absolute farce."

Any further progress for the consumer in the product-safety field hinges on resolution of the standard problem and of whose responsibility it should be.

Of the 234 products that were to be reviewed by NCPS it was found that 48 areas, including playground, camping, winter sports equipment, and bicycles, had no standards at all. Many others were found to be very weak.

Standards have been compiled by industry on a voluntary basis. As a result, some have no teeth and most have no means of being enforced.

Industry, however, is making a concerted effort to prove that the voluntary system can work. The ANSI, for instance, in addition to a more aggressive role in telling industry where standards improvement is needed, is firmly enforcing its longtime rule that standards must be reaffirmed or rewritten every five years. Furthermore, the ANSI has been moving into the certification business, with independent third-party testing of products for compliance with ANSI-accepted standards.

Underwriters Laboratories, which has tested products for safety for 75 years and now tests about 28,000 a year, has moved toward more comprehensive "casualty testing." As of last year, for instance, UL drew a halt on allowing its seal to be used on appliance cords unless the whole appliance had been checked out for safety. Also, rather than test a product for one hazard such as the possibility of fire, UL expands its tetsing to include such other possibilities as mechanical, biological, and chemical hazards.

A tour of UL's Chicago testing lab, one of several scattered around the country, leaves the layman reporter with a convincing impression of thoroughness. One sees a maze of electric ranges, industrial switches, jukeboxes, electric guitars, and the like being tested for voltage, heat generation, and other safety considerations. There are explosion, hydraulic, and heat tests. UL also maintains a staff of 500 inspectors who keep an eye out for any changes in quality of production through periodic visits to factories.

GOVERNMENT STEP-UP PUSHED

The argument is building for a stronger government role in the field of standard-setting or at least in standard clearance and enforcement, even though industry and agencies like UL have employed most of the short supply of those with expertise to write product standards. Even some spokesmen for industry are willing to concede the need for more governmental involvement. Consumer advocates were somewhat stunned to hear the president of the Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers testify at an NCPs hearing last fall that though industry has the expertise, the government should decide which products need safety standards, pass on the adequacy of those standards, and enforce them.

Industry spokesmen, understandably inclined to think in terms of numbers and dollars, are by and large not convinced. Consider a comment at an NCPS hearing from a bottle manufacturer. He argued that 360 claims resulting from bottle accidents out of a total of 48 billion bottles sold over a four-year period is really not very much.

"The joke in that kind of response," says ATLA's Mr. Lambert, "is the calculus of numbers. It's trying to argue you have to show more probability than not. But safety isn't a question of majority vote. The gravity of the threat and the consequences are constant."

"In the consumer movement we should be working to give the buyer the maximum for his money," says Baron Whitaker, president of UL.

Consumers and industry also argue over the questions of "how safe is 'safe?' " Will it be carried to the extreme of no more kitchen knives? "There is no such thing as absolute safety as long as you've got people," comments UL's Mr. Whitaker.

Consumer advocates, however, say they are talking about products only where the risk is not apparent to the eye, and they insist many of these can be made much safer than they now are.

All sides agree that safety does not "sell" as it should and that for many consumers it is not a high priority in choosing a product. "There's a tired public attitude toward safety," concedes Mr. Elkind, who admits that he never has faced such a "difficult intellectual challenge" in his career as the chairing of the product-safety commission. "Accident prevention is something for the do-gooder, and nobody wants to be called a do-gooder."

But industry and the consumer divide again on the solution to this problem. "There are those who advocate consumer education as a solution to all these problems," says Mr. Kaplan of Consumers Union. "Our reply is that it's often easier to adapt the products than the people."

Further changes are expected on the court front in product safety. About half the states have adopted the strict liability ruling in which a manufacturer's "negligence" in producing a defective product is no longer a question. Mr. Lambert, who can recite a long list of legal defenses still open to manufacturers of unsafe products, counts it an "urgent necessity" that the remaining states follow suit. "It's a battle of the experts, and industry has the experts," he says.

CLASS-ACTION SUITS URGED

Increased use of class-action suits, in which one injured consumer can file suit and recover damages on behalf of many others, is expected. The technique is viewed as especially helpful for small damage claims which private lawyers cannot now afford to take on.

In all, a much stronger role for the government is expected, particularly in education and regulation. Some want to see the National Commission on Product Safety given permanent status. They view its potential role as an advocacy and study group as strengthening other consumer areas.

At any rate its final report, due in June, is expected to include recommendation for a strong government role in standard-setting (possibly requiring pretesting before marketing) and for uniformity in state product-safety law. In the months between, the commission will be paying particularly close attention to the revised standards of the glass bottle industry and to fireproofing of television receivers.

In crusading fashion, the commission has not hesitated to name brands of television sets its research shows most fire prone. Color-TV sets also are being watchdogged for X-ray leakage, in accord with a 1968 law, by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. HEW has authority to set regulations on minimum leakage rates and is expected to do so shortly.

A study done for the commission by an outside firm of technical engineers and released in late January showed that the following manufacturers, in descending order, exceeding the industry average of 0.120 smoke-and-fire incidents per thousand color sets: Lear Siegler (Olympic), Packard Bell, Magnavox, Sylvania, Philco-Ford, and RCA.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 7–9, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—V: WARRANTY WOES BUG BUYER

(By Lucia Mouat)

LOS ANGELES.—At the moment Mrs. Marie Briehl would not mind at all having her 20-year-old stove back. At least it worked. That's more than she has been able to say for her new two-oven, self-cleaning range during most of the eight months that she has had it.

"I never thought to say, 'Hook it onto the gas and see if it works,' " she recalls. "You just assume that with a warranty everything is well. I thought I was getting the best there was on the market."

Today she has no such illusions. Despite her heavy investment, she says she was sent "from pillar to post" in trying to get satisfaction under the terms of her warranty. Finally, the appliance store here where she bought the range grudgingly referred her to the Pennsylvania manufacturer's local service agency.

The repairman has made the trek to Mrs. Briehl's Hollywood home six different times. The range is still not working properly.

She strongly suspects she has either a secondhand or inherently defective model, but she has no way of finding out. The repairman insists that under the warranty his responsibility is limited to trying to make the repairs.

Actually Mrs. Briehl is better off in some ways than many appliance owners. Through letters to the manufacturer, she has at least won agreement to a one-year warranty extension.

NUISANCE HARDLY WORTH EFFORT

Hundreds of others with warranties have had trouble getting repairmen to come at all. Some have had to pay prohibitive prices to ship major appliances back to the factory or nearest service center.

Often they have been told they must pay for the repairs either because the defective part is not covered by the warranty or because they themselves have "abused" the product.

Couple these factors with the business hours of many service agencies (evenings and Saturdays, prime time for most working consumers, are rare), and a warranty sometimes adds up to a nuisance hardly worth the effort.

One Arlington, Va., man, owner of a $12.95 electric toothbrush in need of repair, reasons that in these inflationary times it is cheaper and easier to buy a new one than to take a day off from work to go 10 miles to the nearest agency.

Certainly warranties have never been easy to read. Most run heavy with fine print and legal jargon. And those consumers who have managed to decipher them have found that, like apartment leases, they are usually drafted with an eye to maximum protection and minimum liability for the seller himself.

Indeed, technically, the buyer without a written warranty often is more comprehensively protected by the simple act of purchase. With that he is at least legally entitled to the "implied" warranty of "merchantability" and "fitness."

Mrs. Shirley Goldinger, southern California president of the Association of California Consumers with a degree in consumer economics (and a mother of two), says most warranties are full of "unintelligent gobbledygook" which is "evasive" and "not worth the paper it's printed on."

COMMON COMPLAINT HEARD

As a former employee of a major appliance firm, her interest is the keener. She has testified at State Senate hearings on warranty protection and keeps handy a fistful of examples from her own appliances.

Among them: a warranty for her electric frying pan which leaves off the full identification of the manufacturer, and one for a TV antenna, guaranteeing one year of parts and labor. "I thought I was getting a terrific buy, but the company went out of business, and no one will service its equipment under the warranty."

One of the most common complaints is that warranties cannot speed up delivery on parts.

Donald DaDeppo of Tucson, Ariz., waited three months for replacement of a $1.46 part for his $850 stereo tape recorder. First there was the usual retailer-distributor-manufacturer shuffle, he reports, and then just the waiting. Eventually the part arrived, but Mr. DaDeppo is not much consoled. Is it worth suing for a $1.46 part? he asks.

In effect, explains Addison Mueller, professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles, the warranty in its present state is simply a promise by the company that the consumer is buying something which will work "sooner or later."

But sometimes there is no substitute for getting one's money back.

Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant, commissioner of New York City's Department of Consumer Affairs, tells of being in the department's touring mobile unit on the lower East Side one day when a woman came in with a $16 blender in his shopping bag.

She explained it was her second in a week, and it was still not working. The manager had refused to give a refund on the first but had offered a replacement of the same brand, adding perceptively, "It probably won't work, either."

This time Mrs. Grant agreed to accompany the woman to the store for a second try at getting her money back. The manager immediately recognized the commissioner and handed over the cash to the shopper. He insisted he had never told her she could not have her money back.

In Mrs. Grant's view, there is no "morality" left in the marketplace if people "deliberately" sell things they know won't last.

Some consumers contend—in a point that never fails to raise the ire of manufacturers—that today's products are designed more with replacement than durability in mind. Firm subscribers to the theory include a Wisconsin man who tried to replace a rubber part missing from his garbage disposal and was told, "Oh, that's four years old—we can't get that anymore."

"Nowadays we just accept the fact that it's cheaper to throw away a toaster than to get it fixed," comments New York's Commissioner Grant. "When my mother bought an appliance, she thought of including it in her will—it became part of the family inheritance."

Manufacturers insist the charge of "planned obsolescence" is ridiculous. Some point to a United States Department of Agriculture study, based on a Census Bureau sampling of more than 17,000 American households, which showed that as of June, 1959, the average product life of a sewing machine was 24 years, while the average electric or gas range would last 16 years.

REASONS FOR PROBLEMS

Obsolescence is caused more by the demand for new, more modern products than anything, argues William S. Comstock, an executive of the three-year-old Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers. He adds that "about 75 percent of the refrigerators we replace, for instance, are still working."

"Ideally," he explains, "all parts should wear out at the same time, but that's technologically impossible and prohibitively expensive. The manufacturer may put in a part he knows will wear out before the rest because it's cheaper to replace than to build to last longer."

Reasons for the growing number of consumer-warranty problems are many.

Industry now is churning out about 96 million home appliances a year, all with increasing gadgetry. This, after all, is the age of the self-defrosting refrigerator, electric can opener, and 16-speed blender. The Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers (AHAM) estimates the average household has a full 18 appliances. But consumers often have several of these out of working order at the same time.

Certainly a key factor in warranty troubles is the haziness of the relative responsibilities of the manufacturer, retailer, distributor, and independent service companies or factory centers. Rates of repair are another bone of contention. Sometimes the manufacturer sends a warranty-payment schedule to the dealer, indicating what he will and won't pay.

SERVICE AGENCIES SET UP

Rarely can the dealer return the product to the factory and get it replaced by a new one. If he gives the customer a replacement on his own, he must get the defective item repaired and sell it (under Federal Trade Commission rules) as "used." The market is slim.

At California Senate hearings on warranty problems last fall, appliance retailer Virgil Gaither told of having to sell a defective refrigerator to five different customers before the manufacturer would take it back and replace it with a functioning model.

These and similar problems have impelled some manufacturers to set up their own service agencies. General Electric Company, the nation's largest producer of household appliances and in the service business on its own for many years, has some 130 service centers around the country, including one for small household appliances in Grand Central Terminal.

The Whirlpool Corporation, which has been paying its dealers full out-of-warranty rates but found that customers were still charged for some items that were under warranty, recently opened a pilot repair agency in Rochester, N.Y., and plans several more.

Although the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) issued guidelines on warranty advertising almost a decade ago, problems of the content of warranties really have only been under bright lights for the past two years or so.

In his consumer message of 1968, former President Johnson set up a task force of the Secretaries of Commerce, and Labor, the chairman of the FTC, and the President's special assistant for consumer affairs to probe the warranty problem and suggest improvements.

After intensive discussion of the problem with industry and consumers and study of some 200 warranties and more than 1,000 letters of complaint to the White House and the FTC, the group issued its report the following January.

Just a few months ago in his consumer message, President Nixon reactivated that task force (with new personnel in the starring roles). That group is expected to report an administration position on warranty legislation by March.

Two major pieces of legislation currently are before Congress. Sen. Warren G. Magnuson (D) of Washington and Sen. Frank E. Moss (D) of Utah, two of the capital's longtime "consumer" legislators, refer to their bill as a truth in lending for warranties.

WORD ABUSE CHARGED

No manufacturer, under the bill's provisions, would have to issue a guarantee; but if he did, he would have to follow minimum standards spelled out in the bill. The word "guaranty," which Senator Magnuson says has been "too long twisted, abused, and debased," would be reserved only for performance of electrical, mechanical, and thermal parts of any product.

The bill further proposes that guarantors be encouraged to set up informal procedures for handling disputes and that consumers could seek justice in the courts and recover attorney fees as part of their judgment.

Another bill sponsored by Reps. James G. O'Hara (D) of Michigan and John E. Moss (D) of California would make a guaranty compulsory for any product costing more than $10. If a defective product were not repaired or replaced within a 60-day time limit, the consumer would be entitled to his money back, plus damages, court costs, and attorneys' fees. If the manufacturer were found guilty of violating the act, the consumer would be able to recover from $100 to $5,000.

There are also strong rumblings of action lately at the state level.

California has been considering legislation to force dealers to honor warranties and even perhaps require a bond to ensure their performance. In an unusual attempt to utilize legal expertise on behalf of consumers, a group of lawyers in this state (at the bidding of the Association of California Consumers) has been making a comprehensive review of existing legislation and of California's commercial code to see where fuller consumer-warranty protection is needed.

"You can try to solve client-warranty problems until you're blue in the face," comments Richard Elbrecht, chairman of the group and an attorney with the Legal Aid Society of Santa Clara County, "but if the law itself is unbalanced you can't win. . . . The ship has been leaning toward the seller,

and it's time it was put back on an even keel."

OTHER SUGGESTIONS MADE

California is also noteworthy in the warranty field for its six-year-old Bureau of Electronic Repair Dealer Registration. While Connecticut, Indiana, Massachusetts, Louisiana, and several cities now license repairmen in hope of ensuring competency, California is aiming at fraud by requiring registration of shops which repair radios, phonographs, and television sets and compliance with strict rules on advertising, parts, return, invoices, and estimates.

William Hayes, assistant chief of the bureau, points to a thick stack of revoked registrations and explains that the office relies heavily on consumer complaints for its tips. It can run TV sets with controlled defects through repair agencies to check out their honesty.

Estimates are that the bureau, which was nearly scratched in an economy move by Gov. Ronald Reagan at one time, saves Californians some $15 million a year.

Among other suggestions for improved warranty protection for the consumer are establishment of methods for dispute arbitration and a clearer policy on replacement of defective products.

The average consumer with a small appliance which doesn't work has little legal recourse besides "persisting and enduring," argues Professor Mueller. Author of a highly readable article on the subject—"Contracts of Frustration" in the March, 1969, Yale Law Journal—he suggests establishment of neighborhood fact-finding tribunals, preferably open at night, with enough leverage for action.

Simultaneously, Professor Mueller calls for an easing of the FTC definition of "used" in appliances. He distinguishes between actual use over a period of time and the brief time necessary to discover inherent defects.

Business representatives across the nation have been working night and day to ward off the prospect of any new restrictive regulation or legislation.

AHAM and the Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, which worked with President Johnson's task force, issued a joint response last spring to its suggestions for improvement. Among other things the two have pledged to make more and clearer warranty information available to consumers and to set up a major appliance complaint council of independent consumer "authorities" to audit and suggest improvements in industry treatment of complaints.

In addition, the manufacturing groups have been drawing up guidelines for warranty-advertising practices, for the definition of "authorized service," for the location of model numbers on products, and the like. AHAM also is compiling a directory of parts availability, which will include the whereabouts of parts for discontinued models.

There has been a noticeably strong effort on the part of several manufacturers (AHAM estimates at least three-fourths of its members) to simplify and clarify the meaning of warranties. Whirlpool, Maytag, Corningware, GE, and Sears are among those who have made changes for the better.

CONSUMER MOOD SENSED

Coverage has not necessarily increased—often parts and labor for the first year and parts alone for the second year—but warranties usually are more specific about which parts are covered, and many lack the disclaimer clause which in effect freed the manufacturer from any other obligation to his customer.

There are other signs that manufacturers are well aware of consumer exasperation on the warranty issue.

One of the most widely publicized and commended service efforts is the Whirlpool Corporation's two-year-old "Cool Line." Some 125 customers a day call the Benton Harbor, Mich., toll-free number.

Juel Ranum, chairman of the board of AHAM and Whirlpool's executive director of corporate and public affairs, has monitored many of these calls. He reports that about 50 percent pertain to the location of qualified service representatives. The rest are wondering by and large why they are having trouble with an appliance and what they can do about it.

Whether Congress and the FTC will count the warranty situation improved enough to forgo legislation and further regulation—as the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has urged—remains to be seen. Most estimates are that government action still will come.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 12, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—VI: CHARGE NOW, CRY LATER

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—As the cashless society approaches, the need for moderation and integrity in consumer credit faces both lenders and borrowers. This page details key problems as well as reform efforts.)

SEATTLE.—You don't have to listen long to learn why the clean-cut young man in the yellow sport shirt is shifting uncomfortably in the witness chair. It is 10 a.m. in Seattle's King County Courthouse and representatives of half a dozen finance companies are here to prove that he borrowed from them under "fraudulent" conditions. They are contesting his right to file for bankruptcy, charging that he did not list all his debts on the loan applications.

The defendant, a Boeing employee in his early 20's, protests that he was told by the companies to list only his monthly debts. Well, yes (leaning forward to inspect his signature on the applications), he apparently had signed a line below declaring he had listed *all* his debts, but that just wasn't the way they had explained it to him.

One could see how it all happened. Newly married, he had borrowed first to pay for the refrigerator and the range, using the mortgage on his furniture as security. Meanwhile, the obligations kept piling up: bills from the car-insurance company, the dairy, the Puget Sound Power & Light, the Internal Revenue Service. . . . The more he borrowed, the deeper in he got. Finally bankruptcy looked like the only way out.

MONEY ISN'T EVERYTHING

It's 1970—and the credit is easy. A downtown Detroit billboard, flashing the corner of a charge card, tempts: "Money Isn't Everything." No one misses the message.

From the District of Columbia's 14th Street, where a business school advertises "Everybody Has Credit With Us," to the "easy payment" signs of small-loan companies strung out along San Francisco's South Taylor Street, the theme is the same.

Deluged by mail with unsolicited credit cards, mail-order catalogs, and time-payment offers, the individual is urged to charge everything from his church contributions to his income taxes. With outstanding consumer credit totaling more than $120 billion, the cashless society described in Edward Bellanmy's "Looking Backward" no longer smacks of the impossible.

But for many of the nation's poorest consumers the price of the credit ease comes high. It matters where one lives. On East Harlem's Third Avenue, for instance, furniture and appliance prices are often 150 to 300 percent of what they are in the downtown stores because of credit costs.

On nearby 116th Street, Stephen Press, an articulate young lawyer for the New York Institute for Consumer Education and Development, found it almost impossible to get a loan for his office, even with a government guarantee behind him. "I finally had to go to a high official in Chase Manhattan Bank to get one," he says.

FTC STUDIES THROW LIGHT

The credit plight of the poor is pointed up further by Federal Trade Commission (FTC) studies and such books as David Caplovitz's "The Poor Pay More" and Warren Magnuson and Jean Carper's "The Dark Side of the Marketplace."

Inner-city businesses counter that they must charge more because of high risks and is a highly profitable business straight across income levels. All told, losses for gross consumer credit extended nationally average 2 to 3 percent.

Furthermore, the creditor who lends without fully checking his client's financial ability nevertheless has a strong arsenal of collection weapons at his command.

In most states he can both repossess the goods and sue for the balance of what the borrower owes. In most states a man is bound to pay in full once he signs a contract—even if he never received the goods, if they are damaged, or if he wants to change his mind five minutes after a high-pressure sales talk. Though the truth-in-lending law (federal Consumer Credit Protection Act) says no man may be fired if his wages have been garnisheed for the first time and that no more than 25 percent of his weekly earnings may be taken. Garnishment as a means of collecting debts has been flatly abolished only in Pennsylvania and Texas.

OTHER DEVICES SKETCHED

Some finance companies also resort to a number of other devices to keep the client a captive customer. One way is to refuse to share favorable information on him with credit bureaus. Another is to require weekly payments. Just one slipup could mean legal action which would mar the customer's credit rating for any other store.

Some finance companies do not insist that a borrower list all his debts on a loan application. Often there is space to list only five or six debts. The borrower, admittedly as eager to get the money as the creditor is to lend it, is happy to tailor his story accordingly. This laxness coupled with the creditor's ability to go after the cosigner of the application, results in a powerful tool for creditors to counteract the bankruptcy process.

"I blame easy credit," says Milwaukee attorney Jack N. Eisendrath; he handles many bankruptcy cases but counts bankruptcy by and large a failure in terms of solving a debtor's problems. In most cases, he says, the major debts are soon reaffirmed and/or the creditor uses one of the two legal means mentioned above to prevent bankruptcy.

"All this is such a drain on emotional and mental health," he says. "I find myself on innumerable occasions saying, 'Why did you make the loan?' Once I was told, 'Because we knew the cosigners were good.' The need for profit too often destroys concern for the social effect."

MARKET SOMETIMES MISSED

Some who befriend the nation's poorest consumers argue that credit needs are often most legitimate and that there needs to be a sharp reexamination of credit criteria by banks and other reputable sources.

William F. Willier, director of the National Consumer Law Center in Boston, a legal-service agency funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity, estimates Massachusetts banks miss a good 10 percent of the potential credit market. He tells of sending one ghetto resident, earning $3,200 a year in combined welfare and part-time maid pay, to make the rounds of Boston banks for a $150 loan. She had worked for the same family for 12 years and lived at the same place for nine years. Not one bank would risk lending to her. Her treatment varied from a torn-up application

to a lecture on why she did not really need the money.

The law center is currently researching the problem on a broad scale and drafting suggestions it hopes credit bureaus may adopt.

This nation's 2,200 credit bureaus have been under sharp attack recently for some of the criteria used in gathering information. They have been criticized for instance, for keeping an eagle eye out for names of people involved in court proceedings but not following up on the disposition of the cases.

William J. Mangan, general manager of the Credit Bureau of Greater Boston, concedes that this is something of a "flaw." But he says that to remedy it would cost too much in time and money and adds that any creditor can pursue disposition of a case if it is really pertinent to his decision to grant credit.

DIMLY LIT LOFTS DENIED

"Too many people think credit bureaus are dimly lit lofts where a bunch of men with shirt-sleeves, eye-shades, and quill pens decide who gets credit and who doesn't. We don't decide, and our purpose is to see that as many get credit as possible. Many in town on relief can get credit because our records show they can handle it."

Last June Massachusetts passed a strong law to tighten regulation of credit bureaus. Now any Bay State resident denied credit or fired because of his credit rating is to be so notified by the credit bureau, allowed to examine his record, and submit his own version of the story. Also no credit information more than seven years old—with the exception of bankruptcy—can go on his record.

An even stronger federal proposal along these lines passed the Senate last fall and awaits hearings in the House. Sen. William Proxmire (D) of Wisconsin, author of the bill, is also sponsoring legislation to make senders more responsible for issuing unsolicited credit cards. The bill would also increase the supply of reasonably priced credit available to low-income consumers by establishment of federally insured urban-development banks. (Mr. Willier of the National Consumer Law Center says of Senator Proxmire, "Every time I get an idea, he is six months ahead of me.")

CO-OP BUYING AND CREDIT UNIONS

Some consumers have found co-op buying and credit unions helpful in coping with the problem. James Armstrong, director of the South Dakota Credit Union League, reports most of the loans made by three new member unions on Indian reservations are used for medical, clothing, and school expenses. Repayment is often slow, he reports, but there are very few bankruptcies.

Existing credit law, sometimes archaic and traditionally favorable to the lender, varies widely from state to state. Often what protection there is for the consumer has been nullified by creditors' imaginative use of legislative loopholes.

Usury-law ceilings on annual interest rates, for instance, average a low 6 percent, but some credit experts estimate that in the strict sense of the law a whopping 75 percent of the nation's credit transactions are illegal.

Many feel that the disclosure aspect of the federal truth-in-lending law, aimed at sharpening competition in the credit field, is getting similar bypass treatment. Some creditors have tacked on finance charges where there were none before and discontinued old discounts for prompt payment, arguing it is "required" under the new law. The habit has been common enough to cause the FTC to issue a clarifying, condemning statement on the subject last October.

UNIFORM CODE DRAWS FIRE

The hottest point of credit debate in state legislatures at the moment concerns the 127-page Uniform Consumer Credit Code (UCCC), aimed at codifying and updating existing state credit laws. Four years in the drafting by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws, it was originally intended as a substitute for the federal law and passed virtually intact in Utah and, with major amendments, in Oklahoma.

Among other things, this highly controversial code would set ceilings on interest rates on small loans (such as 36 percent on the first $300), installment purchases, and revolving charge accounts (such as 24 percent on the first $500). Also, the UCCC would require fuller disclosure of rates, open the credit field to newcomers (in hopes of increasing competition), standardize credit forms, and tighten up on existing collection remedies (a creditor could not both repossess and sue for the balance).

The opposition stems in part from the Consumer Federation of America, the American Bankers Association, finance companies, and labor unions. Business interests are largely concerned about the increased competition expected from the free-entry provision. The consumer and labor groups are concerned that the admittedly high interest ceilings may become the norm and do not want to sacrifice the strength of existing laws in some states for the new.

EMOTION CHARGED

Interviewed in his office just as he returned from rebutting a TV editorial on the subject, William Warren, professor of law at the University of California at Los Angeles and one of the drafters of the code, said that he and his colleagues have been thoroughly surprised "at the kind of attack we've had."

"Emotion has been the key ingredient of the response," he says. "This is not an industry bill, but if anybody thinks they're not going to be in on the drafting, they're living in a dream world."

In his view, the interest ceilings are needed both to protect the man who doesn't realize what rate of interest he pays and also to protect creditors against bad risks.

Those consumer interests which do support the code (largely poverty lawyers) do so mainly because they see it as an improvement on credit legislation in their particular states and because they think it has some chance of passing.

"It's not a black-and-white situation at all," says Benny Kass, head of the ad hoc consumer committee in the District of Columbia and chairman of a new city commission there to study the code. "I'm not an advocate of the code. I'm simply supporting it politically, with amendments, because I think it's better than existing law here in the district."

CAN'T START WITH COMPROMISE

A section-by-section amended version of the code, known as the National Consumer Act, will be introduced in state legislatures this year. It was drafted by the National Consumer Law Center.

"If I've learned one thing from my work with legislatures, it's that you don't start with a compromise," explains the center's Mr. Willier. "UCCC does and it leaves you nowhere to go but backwards."

Credit counselors insist that, even with good laws, they still face a mammoth job educating clients who buy on impulse and think no further ahead than the next monthly payment.

Harry Strain, head of the Consumer Credit Counseling Service in Portland, Ore., one of the more than 100 affiliate counseling groups, nonprofit and industry supported, which have sprung up in the past few years, pins much of the blame on high expectations of his increasingly young clients.

"They look at dad and see he has a TV and two cars in the driveway and they get married and want the same thing yesterday," he says. "The only answer to this whole thing is education. We spend 16 years teaching children how to earn money but we don't spend 16 minutes to teach them how to spend it wisely."

There are also a number of middle-income people who just plain don't know where their money goes or how to shop at all economically. John Gohlston, manager of Milwaukee's Northside Community Credit Union, says a number of his businessmen clients don't know if they are making a profit or not. One contractor on his list so consistently underbids the cost of his jobs that he is often forced to quit at the halfway point.

COLLEGE TEACHERS OWED $28,000

Al Horner, president of Credit Counseling Centers, Inc., in Michigan, one of the most widely respected counseling groups in the country, tells of a college couple among his clients (one teaching economics and the other home economics) who were run out of the last town they taught in by creditors. When they left, they owed $28,000 to 78 creditors!

Mr. Horner says the couple now is on the road to reform, using the counseling service's credit forms in their classes and making no hasty judgments without the agency's advice.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 14–16, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—VII: BUYERS GET SMART

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—Consumer education today, in a step beyond home economics, involves development of intelligent buyers who are aware of the many choices that confront them in the marketplace.)

YONKERS, N.Y.—In suburban Yonkers a class of seniors in Lincoln High School bites into crackers spread with three different brands of grape jelly. A slight majority of the youngsters, who know neither the brands nor the prices, vote the least expensive jelly the most tasty.

"Aside from the fact that you're fed well in this class, what does it mean?" asks teacher Stephen Frey. The hands go up, and the point that price and brand names are not necessarily the clue to performance is driven home.

Meanwhile, in Room 707 of Detroit's rough and sprawling Central High School, where BB-gun holes dot the light fixtures and windows, a student at the teacher's desk details the many assets of a home life-insurance policy.

Linda and Dixon, taking the role of a married couple in the market for insurance, listen nearby. From the back of the room teacher Kathy Meagher, a petite blonde who is very much in control of her classroom, coaches: "Remember, you're working on commission."

Student "salesmen" for other policies take their turn until, finally, Linda announces the family decision: high premiums or not, she wants an endowment policy.

AIDE WARMLY WELCOMED

And in the southeast section of Portland, Oregon, Mrs. Bobbie Gary, a lively mother of four and a nutrition aide for the county extension service, makes her morning rounds of low-income families. First stop is a Mexican family of 10, newly on food stamps. She is warmly welcomed at the door with hugs and kisses. Then Mrs. Gary joins several of the children on the sofa in the sparsely furnished room. After catching up on the news of the family, Mrs. Gary soon tactfully shifts the conversation to a "wonderful" recipe she has for meatless patties—"only 19 cents a serving."

All three examples fit "consumer education," a term as narrow or as broad as anyone wants to define it.

Mrs. Gary's work is part of the relatively new urban thrust of the Cooperative Extension Service, with aides who have known eco-

nomic hardship themselves doing the teaching.

The Detroit course, called consumer economics, is hardly new. The vocational department's substitute for precollege economics, it dates back to 1933.

The Yonkers course, oldest (1962) and most widely publicized of courses arising out of the "new wave" of consumer education interest, is recognized as an acceptable elective by the high school's business education and social studies departments.

The new interest in the subject stems in part from the carrot of available federal vocational educational funds and from free-wheeling teen-age spending habits. Cars and charge cards are common.

"My students are amazed to find out how much it really costs to finance a car," says Mrs. Marian Woods, a home economist who teaches a family-living course in the Chicago schools. "They don't know from nothin' about these things. One of our girls was going to two dances a week, $2 each time, and was appalled to learn she was spending $200 a year."

A further prod comes from a look at the difficulties the youngsters' parents are having.

Mrs. Meagher, who maintains most youngsters don't know how much it costs to live, tells of one budgeting assignment in which many students asked their parents for "real-life" advice. It caused such chaos among families who didn't know where their money went that Mrs. Meagher was urged to stress that the assignment was strictly "pretend."

SUBJECT CALLED IMPORTANT

Consumer education in its newest sense is far broader than the traditional "stitching and sewing" of old home-economics courses. It is not, as its critics sometimes charge, intended as a forum for a teacher to point out the best buys.

Rather, its proponents insist, its aim is to develop an "intelligent consumer attitude" by exposing students to the range of alternatives he faces in purchasing and managing his money.

"Many home economists would say they teach consumer education because they teach about cooking and clothing," comments Dr. Gordon Bivings, a professor in the University of Missouri's department of family finance and editor of the American Council on Consumer Interests' scholarly Journal of Consumer Affairs.

"But knowing how much money you should devote to clothing and what you're giving up to get it is quite different from buymanship. It's hard to teach and much less tangible, but much more important."

Consumer advocates vary widely in the degree of importance they place on consumer education. Some see it as a good 50 percent of the battle for buyer protection. Others who see legislation as the primary goal argue that the curriculum is crowded enough already and the educational results to date are not that promising.

The Rev. Robert J. McEwan, past president of the Consumer Federation of America and a professor at Boston College, points out that deceptive dance-studio and magazine-subscription practices hit Massachusetts headlines hard a decade ago but that the problem is still present.

"The supply of gullible consumers for these rackets is relatively inexhaustible," he says. "For every one you reach, there are 10 you don't. My theory is that consumer education will pay off in 20 years, but we need some payoff a lot sooner. It could become a smokescreen to divert our attention from the need for immediate action."

David Schoenfeld, who used to teach consumer education at Yonkers' Lincoln High and is now director of educational services at Consumers Union, takes a more sanguine view:

"We need consumer education, if nothing else, for effective use of legislation. It isn't the whole pot by any means but it's one of the essential ingredients. . . . If consumers acted intelligently, the quality and level of competition in our society could be immeasurably improved."

An estimated dozen or more states now are involved in concerted efforts to increase consumer education. Joseph N. Uhl, head of a seven-man Purdue University team which has just finished a one-year study on the status of high-school level consumer education for the United States Office of Education, reports that separate courses are rare.

Most often the subject is woven into existing courses in home economics (most unusual), social studies, business education, driver education, and health classes, and it is most commonly offered to seniors.

ILLINOIS REQUIRES COURSES

The only state with a law making consumer education a mandatory part of the curriculum is Illinois. Passed in late 1967, it stipulates that students in grades 8–12 take courses which include but are not limited to installment purchasing, budgeting, and price comparisons.

Cecil Partee, author of the law and a state Senator who carefully courted consumers, businessmen, and school officials to get it passed, calls its language "abominably simple."

"School people, understandably, have a real aversion to being told what to teach," he says. "I wanted to give them as much latitude as possible, to give a feeling of opening new vistas rather than of pinning down."

The Illinois Department of Public Instruction has issued a curriculum guide but implementation is still very much in the pilot stage.

Indeed, consumer-education courses are far more common in New York State (an estimated 300 high schools are involved) where the state department of education merely smiles benignly on the idea and supplies anyone interested with a hefty 230-page curriculum guide.

Certainly a major stumbling block in the spread of academic consumer education is the dearth of qualified and enthusiastic teachers. The subject is often handed to a young teacher already trying to juggle two or three subjects other than her own specialty. Many feel overwhelmed by the scope of projects to be covered.

"Too many people assume anyone can teach this subject because everyone is a consumer," comments Dr. Thomas Brooks, a professor of family economics at the University of Connecticut. "Very few really know the ins and outs."

In Illinois, the teacher problem has led to a flurry of in-service workshops and a suggestion from state officials that schools turn to the specialization allowed by team teaching or call in outside resource people.

A bottleneck second only to teacher training in this field is the shortage of really good teaching materials. Probably handiest all-round reference as to what is available is the bibliography put out by the President's Committee for Consumer Interests.

Currently business provides the bulk of consumer-education material. An estimated 500 sponsors are involved. Some of the material is of fairly high academic caliber. Often the line is hazy between propaganda information, and education. Teachers, everwary of the distinction, will often assign the materials to the wastebasket if in doubt.

"Teachers haven't been articulate about what they want in industry publications," asserts a National Association of Manufacturers spokesman.

Most sought-after materials are those put out by trade associations and foundations (generally slim on brand names) and by individual companies, such as J. C. Penney's and Procter & Gamble, which play down their own involvement, relatively speaking.

"It's natural for enlightened business to want to provide information," says Thomas B. Hanchett, vice-president of the Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Company, a firm which discreetly mentions its name only once in a series on credit and budgeting it supplies free of charge to Chicago schools.

"We've tried to make ours as objective as possible. It's bound to have a certain bank flavor since that's the only place you can get checking accounts, but we point out such things as the higher return on savings available from a savings and loan institution than from a bank. We'd be foolish to hide it—it's in every ad in the papers."

In some cities business interests have taken the initiative to supply both the materials and the speakers in consumer-education programs.

EDUCATION PLANS PREFERRED

In St. Paul, Minn., for instance, the chamber of commerce, credit bureau, and better business bureau approached school officials in 1968 to launch a comprehensive five-topic program. Starting with three high schools last year, the program now reaches all nine in the city.

At a recent noontime class in the Johnson High School music room, youngsters did not appear too fascinated to have the 10 rules of buymanship spelled out for them, including such maxims as never shop when tired. But they perked up considerably when their turn came to ask questions about car insurance and warranties.

Another educational program started on business initiative is the National Foundation for Consumer Credit's eight-week course for low-income consumers. It began on a pilot basis for District of Coluumbia residents (largely welfare recipients) last spring. The free course covers the gamut from financial planning to comparative shopping and is only disappointing to some in that a graduation certificate is not a ticket to an acceptable credit rating at area stores.

When it comes to consumer protection, businessmen much prefer the educational to the legislative route. However, their definition of consumer education often differs from that of the consumer spokesman.

Businessmen can match every consumer "horror" story with one or two of their own. They can tell you about the ladies who write in to order new "felt mats" (lint residue) for their driers, who try to cook steaks in the storage drawers of their electric ovens, and think paprika "tenderizes" chicken.

Then there are some who return goods bought two years ago from a department store, and who call the serviceman when the only problem is that they forget to put in the plug or turn "on" the switch.

In such a context, consumer education can mean giving the buyer an appreciation of the complexity of the marketplace and some insight into how it operates. In that sense a movie or pamphlet (such as many businesses churn out) tracing the development of the tomato to catsup, for instance, becomes perfectly appropriate.

As some businessmen see it now, much of what currently passes for consumer education is really more mistrust than information. Some consumer advocates agree.

"When there's something to be taught, the schools should help teach it," says Robert J. Klein, economics editor of Consumer Reports. "Right now they're teaching mainly misinformation and skepticism—perhaps even cynicism."

One of the problems that most perplexes those interested in consumer education is getting through to the low-income consumer. Though prone to brand-name buying and probably the most victimized by deceptive practices, he often appears the least in-

terested and least affected by suggestions for improvement. Many say the resistance has its degree of logic.

"There are problems—like not having enough money to buy a two-pound sack of sugar even though it's more economical than the small size," says Robert A. Murphy, principal of Chicago's Hilliard Adult Education Center.

GREAT EDUCATIONAL POTENTIAL

Since statistics have it that low-income families watch twice as much TV as their suburban counterparts, that media is viewed as having great educational potential for this group. University extension division in Missouri, California, and Connecticut have been particularly active on this score.

The Connecticut Cooperative Extension Service sponsors closed-circuit TV programs in credit and consumer laws for close to 200 neighborhood poverty leaders in extension centers around the state. These, in turn, pass along the information to their own block clubs or other community groups.

Dr. Elsie Fetterman, associate professor of family economics at the University of Connecticut and the one who did much of the program drafting, counts it a strong success. She is gearing now to volunteer her time to work with factory workers, through closed-circuit TV, with the same message.

However successful the isolated examples, most who watch over consumer education shake their heads as to the best method for success with the nation's poorest consumers.

"We just don't know that much about motivation," says Karl W. Kepner, Purdue agricultural economist. "Maybe the final conclusion will be that you can't do that much in education for the blue-collar worker—that you have to put the emphasis on protection instead."

Popularity of consumer periodicals, such as Kiplinger's "Changing Times," U.S. Consumer, Credit Union National Association's Everybody's Money, Consumer Bulletin, and Consumer Reports remains as proof that there is a large group of consumers which does care and wants more information.

Consumer Reports, which combines product-testing information with strong editorial views on consumer legislation and its effects, has doubled circulation in the last five years, and Consumers Union (CU), its publisher, has recently opened a Washington office.

Many consumers would not think of making a substantial purchase without consulting this monthly magazine. Its strength is seen in its thoroughness. The visitor to CU's busy Mount Vernon, N.Y., laboratories is apt to see everything from raincoat swatches being tested for fiber strength, waterproofing and dozens of other criteria to a disposal grinding away on different ingredient mixes, from olive pits to 2-inch bones. Any product which fares poorly is usually tested a second and/or third time, using other samples.

"We can't afford to make a mistake," explains Frank Pollack, an assistant to CU's president. "The most important thing we have is our credibility."

As consumer periodicals continue to gain and consumer education makes new inroads in the schools, some consumer advocates now look to the establishment of local consumer centers at which any buyer with interest may pick up a wide variety of consumer-education materials. He may even get some impartial advice on which are the best—not just the least ethical—of the local service representatives to patronize.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 19, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—VIII: IS THE CUSTOMER STILL RIGHT?

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—Many businessmen look upon the consumer movement as a trumped-up issue. Yet in a number of ways business now courts customers more warmly than ever. Some see this response as one of enlightened self-interest.)

COLUMBUS, OHIO.—The tags dangling from the percolators, blenders, and steam irons drew passing glances from shoppers at Lazarus, a Federated department store. Some even paused to inspect them—learning how many speeds each blender had and how much liquid it would hold. But just how crucial the tags were in their buying decisions even the shoppers may be hard put to measure. Still, Federated Department Stores, Inc., which launched the three-month, three-appliance experiment in standardized point-of-sale information, is now doing its best by mail and telephone questionnaires to evaluate the results.

The Lazarus experiment, an adaptation of Britain's "Tel-Tag" system, is one of dozens of visible business efforts to respond constructively to the consumer movement—and to act before legislation forces it.

The head-in-the-sand approach is no more, even though some businessmen are still convinced that consumerism is largely a trumped-up political issue which will soon fade. Many would agree with the Californian who wrote Mrs. Virginia Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, that consumers have only their own "stupidity" to blame for their problems. He wrote her that he does not want the added tax burden of consumer protection legislation.

Most businessmen now are at least aware of the problem. Some have shifted noticeably from the automatic reflex of stepped-up public relations to a considerably more sensitive reaction.

RESENTMENT FELT BY SOME

Mixed with such positive efforts, however, is a tinge of resentment that those customers they have been serving well for years, thank you, have been suddenly "discovered" by "outsiders." To some, the very word "consumer" is objectionable.

"It has a dramatic, negative connotation," argues Richard Maxwell, president of the National Better Business Bureau. "The buyer is pictured as taken advantage of by the unseen, uncaring establishment. . . . To business, he is still a customer."

At the moment, many businesses feel grossly misunderstood. Somehow, they reason, they have failed to communicate to their customers and must now suffer the consequences, however unjustified.

Businessmen, almost to a man, are indignant about what they think consumerism has done to their image. They feel that good and bad have been blackened by the same, damaging paintbrush. Indeed, some consumer advocates concede that a failure on the part of many consumers to distinguish at least between the relatively good and the relatively bad is a prime factor in the unity of business ranks on the subject. It is well known that retailers and manufacturers, as well as the ethical and the dishonest in business, have their differences; usually, however, in the face of consumer criticism or impending legislation, they stand as a united front.

LAZARUS OPEN TO EXPERIMENT

Much of the new business effort is in increased and clearer point-of-sale information.

The Lazarus experiment, admittedly limited in scope, was prompted in part by discussions between Federated officials and Rep. Benjamin Rosenthal (D) of New York, who has a provision for a feasibility study of the "tel-tag" idea in his bill proposing a "Consumer Affairs Department." Another key factor was the receptivity of Charles Y. Lazarus, and president of the American Retail Federation.

Lazarus officials see tagging as primarily the manufacturer's rather than the retailer's responsibility. Their intent in supporting the project was simply to get something startled, perhaps encouraging a more scientific look at the concept.

There is activity on the manufacturing front. North Carolina's Southern Furniture Manufacturers Association is putting firm stress on its members for more wearability, serviceability, and cleaning information. The Association of Home Appliance Manufacturers makes specific similar suggestions in its new guidelines for members. Whirlpool, one of these, tags its products with yellow "buy guides" and has produced a 90-minute musical—called Care-a-Van—on how to buy and care for appliances.

SOME EFFORTS NOTABLE

Some companies are making modest efforts to help low-income consumers. Montgomery Ward & Co. had a two-month special fabric sale in Detroit's inner city (and claimed they lost money in the process). Also, in a new national program in several cities, Ward is preparing to extend credit to 3,000 National Welfare Rights Organization recipients on revolving credit charge accounts of $100 limits each.

Much of the new awareness is at the executive level. E. B. Weiss, vice-president of Doyle Dane Bernbach, Inc., considered one of business' more "progressive" thinkers on consumer matters, says consumerism is being accepted at the top as "a new dimension of corporate social responsibility." But he adds "that a tearful defense of the status quo" still prevails at the marketing level.

A Chicago legal firm, a group of 24 businessmen headed by Gordon Sherman, head of Midas-International, is being funded in the public interest by business. The three-man legal staff has filed air pollution suits against Commonwealth Edison Company and the United States Steel Corporation, among others.

Many businesses show their concern structurally by setting up special consumer departments and establishing consumer advisory councils. Some put out educational materials and sponsor research and TV efforts.

COMMUNICATIONS GAP TACKLED

Local chambers of commerce have been holding business-consumer dialogue meetings in the past year in an attempt to bridge the communications gap. Significantly, an estimated one-third of those attending the recent consumer assembly in Washington (a consumer-oriented meeting if there ever was one) were business representatives. Some of these have joined various state consumer groups.

Now that industry is so carefully avoiding confrontation, some consumers are becoming concerned that, if they are not alert, the consumer movement may simply be "co-opted" and absorbed by business interests. They point to consumer advocate Ralph Nader, who says he was asked by General Motors in January, 1966, to "come over and put some of your ideas to use."

Similarly, there is concern that in the rush to set up government consumer commissions at the local and state level, business is being overrepresented.

Mrs. Esther Shapiro, consumer affairs representative for the Michigan Credit Union League, who characterizes herself as a 'token' consumer on several such commissions, argues business has no place on a consumer committee. "There's just a difference in the philosophy of approach," she says.

REGULATION RESISTED

Now, more than ever, business resists government regulation and legislation. If not openly opposed, many businessmen simply remain mutely neutral. Although such legislation is aimed at the dishonest few, all others feel they are often hurt in the process.

As evidence that no more laws are needed, businessmen point to their own efforts at self-regulation.

Oldest and best known example is the national system of Better Business Bureaus which dates back to 1912. Some consumers turn to the BBBs almost automatically for help when trouble occurs.

Caliber of bureaus ranges widely from city to city. Many are understaffed and have short enough telephone hours to discourage some consumers from calling. This reporter had difficulty in several cities. Also, as bureau staffers readily admit, the BBB's strongest weapon is publicity (which some consumers feel they use with too much discretion).

"You can do a great deal in this business by just publicizing gimmicks," comments Lyle Janz, head of the BBB in Portland, Ore., one bureau credited with being frank in its radio, TV, and office bulletins about which businesses are not reputable. "We don't hesitate to name names if we feel it's justified. The best defense against libel is the truth."

ADVERTISING ROLE CRUCIAL

Although there is some feeling among bureau personnel that new governmental and voluntary consumer units are intruding on their job, most make it plain and clear that the bureaus were largely started by advertising clubs and that truth in advertising remains a prime goal.

Mrs. Knauer says she likes to spread the word of the good work some businesses are doing and to throw out a challenge for action to business groups she addresses. Soon after getting her way in restricting fat content of hot dogs to 30 perecnt, she issued such a challenge. She reports that John Morrell & Co. was the first to respond by putting out a whole sandwich line that was only 12 to 14 percent fat.

A number of factors keep business from doing more than it does:

Paramount is the fact that social improvement is just not that profitable and profit is business's No. 1 interest.

There is concern—though some critics assume it may be simply a convenient excuse for inaction—about violation of antitrust laws.

Also many businessmen say they are subject to the censure of their colleagues if they pinpoint unethical practices of others or try to upgrade standards on their own.

HEARING AIDS CITED

John B. Flowers, for example, owner of the Tri-State Hearing Center in downtown Columbus, Ohio, fought a lonely battle to tighten standards in the hearing aid business. Many people came to the center who had paid as much as $1,500 for hearing aids from door-to-door salesmen—far too high a price.

First Mr. Flowers complained to the local Better Business Bureau and says he was told that complaints from one dealer against another were not accepted. Next he wrote to the state attorney general's office and got a "political" reply.

Finally he got some help from the City Commissioner on Consumer Protection and began to work for a law to upgrade standards of the profession. The law was passed and will go into effect in July, but Mr. Flowers notes that one of his competitors spent $30,000 to fight it and the state trade association in that field remained firmly opposed until it was apparent the law would pass.

UPGRADING ETHICS

Some companies have tried to upgrade ethics in their field by direct visits to other companies.

In door-to-door selling, for instance, where many instances of consumer fraud occur, Avon Products takes the position that unethical practices are even more harmful to honest business than to the consumer. Robert R. McMillan, a lawyer who directs Avon's government and public affairs department, says company representatives have visited firms whose actions were detrimental to its own. Also, Avon has given a no-strings-attached $3,500 grant to a Connecticut educational TV experiment in consumer education.

There are those who think business has come a long way in the past year or two in responding to consumer concerns. One of them is Mrs. Knauer. On the whole, she says she is "impressed" with the "intelligent" response.

"To get them to do anything at all, it has to be enlightened self-interest," she says. "It's sort of the American way of life. I think they should have maximum encouragement and publicity."

Other consumer advocates argue that only the surface has been scratched. Consumer advocate Nader, conceding that some businessmen have "started making some interesting speeches," says that essentially "nothing has changed." In his view business is simply pouring more money into its lobbying efforts—"the whole theory is to keep one step ahead of the truth seeker," he says.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 24, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—IX: VOLUNTARY ACTION GETS RESULTS

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—"They kick up a lot of sand and get people listening," says one expert on the subject of voluntary consumer groups. If still short on members, these activist consumer organizations are proving more and more to be long on results.)

PORTLAND, ORE.—"Nobody ever dreamed we could fight the banks and win," said Mrs. Jan Rathe, executive secretary of the Oregon Consumer League, as she poured tomato sauce into the skillet on her kitchen stove. Tonight she was putting a little of her home-economics training to use by fixing her family of seven an economical—"but tasty"—kidney creole.

She was recalling the fight three years ago in this state over a bill proposed by the major banks to raise credit-card interest rates from 16 to 18 percent. League and labor-union members in all parts of the state let go with a concentrated letter-writing and legislator-buttonholing campaign that saw the bill defeated by a dramatic margin.

Such clear-cut victories are still rare in the annals of the more than 30 statewide voluntary consumer organizations around the country.

But the Oregon Consumer League, with its 300 individual and 50 organizational members, is typical of many in the character and scope of its efforts. Its activities range from lobbying and food-price surveys to newsletter publication and work with state officials on a consumer-education program for the schools. More unusually, the league has drafted (and received a $30,000 grant for) a model-city proposal to open a branch office in Portland's Albina section. And it holds a once-a-month "sound off" session for anyone who wants to air a grievance or share consumer information.

IT'S LIKE GOING TO SCHOOL

Like most of her counterparts, Mrs. Rathe gives heavily and freely of her time. Fortunately she likes it: "It's like going to school, an education in itself." Only a handful of executive secretaries in consumer groups are paid—largely by small matching grants offered by New York's Consumers Union. Headquarters of the Oregon League is high in the west hills of Portland in the Rathe family den. The latest addition on the desk piled high with papers is a green telephone specially installed to handle league calls.

State voluntary consumer groups range in age from the 70-year-old New Jersey Consumers League (formed to fight for fair labor standards) to an Iowa group which is less than a year old. Some sprouted three or four years ago under the direct prodding of Howard Frazier, then director of field operations on the staff of Mrs. Esther Peterson, first of the presidential consumer advisers. Many state groups are adding city chapters, while a few city groups (such as the Consumer Assembly of Greater New York) are slowly moving to statewide status.

These are the groups of citizen-consumers which Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, the President's special assistant for consumer affairs, refers to affectionately as "the climatemakers—they kick up a lot of sand and get people listening."

VOCAL MINORITY CHARGED

Some do not view them quite so charitably. Critics charge that members are few, yet act as if they had been tapped to speak for the many. Also, they argue, such groups are often stronger on zeal and righteous indignation than in their homework and in a sense of "political realism."

It is true that membership is a touchy subject. But several groups have more than 1,000 individual and 100 organizational members. "If you could get 25,000 members the legislators would really listen," insists James Webster, past president of the South Dakota Consumers League.

In the democratic spirit of consumerism several dozen members are often placed on the groups' boards of directors, a factor which encourages membership but sometimes inhibits action. All consumers are not necessarily united on the issues. The board of the Association of Massachusetts Consumers, Inc., for instance, reached an impasse not long ago on the subject of a beef boycott and on a stand on auto-insurance reform. One board member, who felt keenly on the anti-ballistic-missile controversy, managed to squeeze a short editorial on the subject into the group's consumer newsletter, much to the consternation of his colleagues, who learned of it only after the fact.

QUALITY VERSUS QUANTITY

"People on the board are selected with great care," says Miss Velia DiCesare, president of the group, "but everyone is an independent thinker."

In general, say leaders of these voluntary groups, the quality of the membership—lawyers, legislators, professors, labor-union members, housewives—makes up for quantity at this stage. All, they say, do the best that time and budget limitations allow.

However valid the criticism, these voluntary groups provide plenty of graphic evidence of the grass-roots, activist nature of the consumer revolt in 1970.

Drop in on Mrs. Sylvia Siegel, executive director of the Association of California Consumers, and you may find her deep in a telephone conversation with a woman who, following all the standard procedures, is unable to get her new car in working order. "Tell the dealer," suggests Mrs. Siegel, "you'll put a sign on the car saying, 'This is a lemon, purchased at. . .' You'll get some fast action."

Or, if you should drop in on Dr. Currin V. Shields, president of the Arizona Consumers Council and director of the Institute of Government Research at the University of Arizona, you may find him comparing the high price of milk in various Tucson supermarkets. Likely as not, in the process he may buy a carton of filled milk (still labeled "milk" and still in the dairy case despite new restrictive legislation) to take as an exhibit of violation to the dairy commissioner.

The scope of interests of any voluntary consumer group is vast. Even for the group that started on a single issue, interests now range from moving charges and health insurance to taxes and pollution. The idea is to keep those new members coming in and give the organization some lasting power after an individual issue has been successfully dealt with.

However, most groups are beginning to pinpoint priorities in the interests of concerted action. The Oregon League, for instance, divides consumer legislative issues into "push, pull, and praise" categories and lends its degree of support accordingly.

Certainly state legislation ranks high on any consumer group's priority list. The key issue last year and again this year is the Uniform Consumer Credit Code (UCCC), which the Consumer Federation of America (CFA), umbrella organization of the voluntary groups, strongly opposes. The federation keeps members apprised of the best rationale and tactics to use in work against such legislation. So far the code, also firmly opposed by labor groups, has passed in only two states.

MINNESOTA HEARINGS SCORED

Money and time are tight for lobbying and testifying for consumer legislation. Mrs. Tobey Lapakko, president of the Minnesota Consumers League and one who holds a full-time job in another field, points out that, in the last session of her state's Legislature hearings were limited to one hour each and few, if any, were held in the evening.

"It's unfair," she says. "Business can afford to send someone during the day, but most consumers have other jobs. And their point of view is just as important."

In legislative fights, well-established labor groups are fast becoming an invaluable ally for consumers. It was the Minnesota Federation of Labor (AFL–CIO), for instance, which last year worked hard—and successfully—to defeat the UCCC and to get an improved wage-garnishment law in that state.

"Years ago the labor movement was interested only in the wages and working conditions of its members," says David Roe, president of the federation, "but it soon found high interest rates and sales taxes could eat up any wage increase. Now if it's got anything to do with the consumer, we want to be involved. We're in it up to our ears."

Though labor groups have more clout than their consumer counterparts, most still cannot match the budget that business can put forth. Thus a consumer victory with labor effort is still impressive. The shock waves among business interests in the state of Washington are still reverberating from the referendum a few years ago which rolled back maximum retail credit interest from 18 to 12 percent.

It all started with a Washington State Labor Council petition for such a referendum. Joe Davis, red-haired council president, led the signature drive which netted 147,000 names. He reports that banks made dire predictions that they would be forced out of business and waged a $500,000 (compared to $50,000 from labor) campaign to defeat the move.

While Mr. Davis is not jubilant—"nothing is permanent, it can be changed back any time"—he points out that consumers (and any group with similar interests) have the referendum-initiative route open to them in 21 states.

Legislators have mixed feelings about the strength of consumer groups. One in California says he is far more interested in labor's position on a bill than in that of one of the "fly by night" consumer groups. Another in Illinois insists that the housewife who presses for action "doesn't even know you're up for reelection, but business never forgets."

LEAGUE SUPPORT WELCOMED

Certainly the consumer-minded legislator is happy to have some vocal support. Don S. Willner, first president of the Oregon League and a state senator who had frequently sponsored consumer legislation in the past ("usually passed in weakened version and with colossal effort," he recalls), was delighted to have league support against the bill to raise bank interest rates on credit in 1967.

"Admittedly this was kind of a negative victory; it's easier to defeat something than to pass it," he says. "But it had been awfully lonely being a consumer spokesman in the Legislature until then. And league members really worked their heads off to defeat that bill."

In the Arizona Legislature, Sen. Clovis Campbell, who happens to be a vice-president of the Arizona Consumers Council, credits that group with passage of a clean-bedding bill which stipulates that pillow stuffing from sanitoriums and convalescent homes be sanitized and accurately labeled for any resale. "The bill was sponsored by minority members of the lower chamber, and normally that kind of legislation just doesn't move," says Senator Campbell. "The bill was virtually dead until the letters from league members started coming in."

However weak some consumer groups may be and however feeble their lobbying efforts, most involved feel even their presence counts for something.

In South Dakota the telephone company planned to raise rates without a hearing. The newspapers and the South Dakota Consumers League got wind of it and publicized the facts. A hearing was announced shortly thereafter, and in the end the telephone company did not get its full request.

"We were the only people that objected, and if we didn't save people any money, at least we made them aware someone was watching," says Mr. Webster, past president of the group.

With an eye to compliance, members of the Illinois Federation of Consumers have sent questionnaires to school boards around the state asking them what if anything they have done toward enforcing the law which makes consumer education mandatory for grades 8 to 12.

There are those in the consumer movement who feel the legislative emphasis has been much too strong.

LETTER WRITING HARD TO SPARK

"The real higher-ups who could provide leadership are interested only in legislation," comments Mrs. Sandra Helmick, who edits the Missouri Association of Consumers newsletter and works with a chapter of the group in Columbia, Mo.

"It's pretty hard to get housewives fired up about writing their congressmen," she says. "They want to get out in the marketplace and confront the merchant. They want to picket and boycott and do all sorts of irrational things. I don't belittle the need for legislation, but there needs to be something else to get these people excited."

The reason that most consumer groups find themselves "goading the government" full time these days is because there is so much "catching up" to do, counters Mrs. Helen Nelson, vice-president of CFA and executive secretary of the Illinois Federation of Consumers. "There hasn't been anything done on the consumer's behalf for so long," she charges, "and the leadership understands it's in government that the rules of the game are made."

Nonetheless, in her view, consumer interests far outrange government concern and control, and she predicts that in the long run citizen consumer groups will prove much more valuable than government consumer groups.

Certainly one thing that interests all consumers is prices. Most groups engage in some price surveys, however sporadic. Rarely nowadays do they boycott as a follow-up. Part of the reason is the knowledge that the effects would probably be short term.

Other tactics are available. The Lousiana Consumer League frankly admits it builds its membership by making available a regularly published survey of drug and food prices. A St. Louis housewives' group, concentrating on food prices, has held "buy-ins" at stores with the lowest prices. Arizona's Dr. Shields, who perhaps is the only consumer with a 700-year-old saguaro cactus in his backyard, has had his league members embarked on surveys of both toy and food prices. He is convinced that supermarket chains are using Arizona as a test case to see how high they can administer the prices. Bread and milk prices, he says, have taken such a uniform jump he has been considering testing the state's strong antitrust statutes with a class-action suit on behalf of consumers.

TEN PICKETS AT A TIME

As low-income consumer groups become more common, however, boycotting may become fashionable once again. It is the prime tactic, once discussion with the merchant has failed, of Philadelphia's Consumer Education and Protection Association (CEPA). Using only 8 to 10 pickets at a time, the group has managed to recover more than $200,000 due consumers, according to Max Weiner, CEPA education director and editor of its newspaper.

As they grow, voluntary consumer groups are being pressed to handle individual consumer complaints. Philadelphia's CEPA exists for that purpose alone. To some extent groups in Virginia, Arizona, Wisconsin, and the District of Columbia, among others, are doing it. The potential for this function is much greater for a local chapter or a consumer group, particularly if complaints can be publicized. For a state group, Mrs. Erma Angevine, executive director of the Consumer Federation of America, likens it to "holding a finger in the dike." In her view most groups have neither the staff nor the power to do an adequate job.

For all consumer groups, membership and money remain critical problems. Every group this reporter visited was embarked on an intensive drive for new members.

"Our membership is growing fantastically and we aren't working that hard at it," reports Mrs. Diane Hostetter, president of the Flagstaff chapter of the Arizona Council. In addition to welcoming complaints and conducting price surveys, this group is considering prodding merchants to establish a code of ethics in hopes of improving the city's tourist reputation. Lasting power and some continuity of direction are considered crucial in gaining legislative respect.

"I think the immediate problem is with the political forces," says Mrs. Angevine. "They have to overcome the attitude that consumers aren't important—that they're 'just housewives.' Everybody's a consumer."

Some, like Senator Willner in Oregon, are convinced that the day of such recognition is fast approaching.

"The people crying against pollution are no longer considered antibusiness, as they were five years ago," he notes. "We won't see the same thing on consumerism until it becomes a 'good guy,' too. But it's making progress."

[From the Christian Science Monitor
Feb. 26, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—X: SHOULD CITIES "RESCUE" THE CONSUMER?

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—People on both sides of the consumer issue see New York City's Department of Consumer Affairs as a bellwether organization. It has power to get things done for the consumer. But some question the "balkanization" of consumer laws that results from activist city agencies.)

NEW YORK.—Behind-the-desk administration is not for Mrs. Bess Myerson Grant. She wants to be where the action is—and action at her New York City Department of Consumer Affairs is ample and everywhere at once.

Described as "a real can-do and does-do" person by former presidential consumer adviser Mrs. Esther Peterson, "the commis-

sioner" (as all of her staff calls Mrs. Grant) may be found on a typical day weighing chickens in a Brooklyn market (for possible shortweighting violation), cruising around Harlem to check on advertising and pricing practices, or perhaps leaving the department's "consumobile" on the Lower East Side with a resident who wants to show her a new rug that the seller refuses to take back.

Or, on a more legalistic day, Mrs. Grant might be in Washington testifying against the administration's class action bill or announcing in New York, at a hearing of her own department, new tightened restrictions on used-car dealers in the city.

"I don't think I could function and get the kind of nourishment I need in this work if I were in a stratum that had no contact with people," she commented during a luncheon interview at her Manhattan apartment last month.

Even there, as this reporter was let in the back door to the Grants' blue and white kitchen, the commissioner was busily taking notes and, with the indispensable help of the "hold" button, trying to juggle three or four phone calls at once.

She briefed a new employee on what his job would entail, checked in on a departmental hearing ("pretty dull, huh?"), explained to an old friend why she hadn't had time to get over to see her, and politely but firmly "turned off" the salesman for a bicycle exerciser.

In almost a year on the job, Mrs. Grant has proved to be far more intense and concerned about her mission than most of New York's eight million consumers expected from a former "Miss America" beauty queen. While she stresses she has not allowed her work to become a 24-hour-a-day job, she admits: "I've never worked so hard in my life."

Many observers of the consumer movement feel some of the most dramatic and innovative consumer action is taking place in the cities. A consumer-oriented city council, with the right kind of mayoral and grassroots support, can leave a conservative state legislature far behind in terms of consumer protection. New York city provides a prime case in point.

PIONEERING ENTHUSIASM

Currently only a handful of cities have such governmental units—usually an extension of weights and measures and licensing divisions and usually catering heavily to consumer complaints on the local level—but the potential in these urban times is viewed as great.

Commissioner Grant herself says she would like to see a network of such agencies around the country and would welcome "a web" of individual consumer divisions even within New York's city boroughs.

As the most talked-about governmental consumer unit in the country, next to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests, the New York department at 80 Lafayette Street, with 3,500 employees and a $4 million annual budget, has wasted no time in setting an exemplary record of action in its year and a half on the job.

Most of the staff is young and imbued with the same kind of pioneering enthusiasm as the commissioner, a fact which has led to some paternal criticism from longer established, slower moving agencies and, of course, from local businessmen.

Indeed, the department's official motto of "Wise up," a message to consumers stamped on thousands of yellow buttons, might be more aptly directed to local businessmen, who have been feeling the heat to the point of becoming the department's staunchest critics.

The City Council's passage of the Consumer Protection Act (CPA), which in effect elevates the department to a small-scale Federal Trade Commission, is viewed as the major accomplishment. "We were told it was never going to be introduced and would never get through," says the still slightly amazed commissioner.

Phillip G. Schrag, chairman of the department's consumer advisory council and the young lawyer who drafted the proposal, describes it as a combination of the Uniform Consumer Sales Practices Act and court class action bills—"Two of the best consumer proposals around." With the CPA, New York now can sue on consumers' behalf and recover collective damages.

"I think it's the strongest consumer-protection law in the country at any jurisdictional level," says Mr. Schrag. "Other cities will be looking to it as a model."

"Fraud has been against the law for generations," adds Simon Lazarus, young Yale Law School graduate who is executive director of the Department of Consumer Affairs, "but this law makes it also unprofitable."

MERCHANTS PROTEST

However, the department action which has brought the strongest business retaliation to date is its controversial decision to require unit pricing on more than a half-dozen grocery items ranging from carbonated soft drinks and paper napkins to cereal and bread.

The regulation was originally slated for effect last November, but a loud protest, largely from the New York State Food Merchants Association, led to a delay in the starting date to Feb. 20. The Mayor was bombarded with letters from supermarket executives and standardized postcards sent by 10,000 grocers in the city complaining that they would be driven out of business by the action and that the regulation "defrauds" the people it purports to protect.

"All of a sudden, everyone in the supermarkets was 'hard-core unemployed' and didn't know how to count or divide by two," says Mrs. Grant of the complaints and the delay.

Nonetheless, over the dire predictions of the Food Merchants Association that it will add $50 million a year to the grocery bill of New York shoppers, the regulation went into effect last week. Methods of posting the information are flexibly up to the retailer, and Commissioner Grant is confident that in the long run "everyone will use it."

"We don't say people have to buy cheaper but they at least ought to know which brands are cheaper," says Henry J. Stern, a lawyer who serves as the department's associate commissioner. "The advantage of unit pricing is that it will end package trickery—the whole panoply of false bottoms, slack fill, the shattered ounce, and the minidecimal."

The success or lack of it in the New York experiment will be closely watched. Even other consumer leaders are happy it is New York and not they taking the action. "Mrs. Grant really stuck her neck out on this one," says Sidney Margolius, writer and consultant on consumer problems. "Believe me, it was a very brave, pioneering thing for her to do. It's easy to say this is a federal or a state problem."

Handling consumer complaints is considered a most important function of the New York department. All new employees spend a week or two of their training handling them.

The "consumobile" rolls into low-income neighborhoods complete with loudspeaker and equipment for recording individual complaints. Some who turn out are given copies of the department's 25-page pamphlet on how to sue in small claims court.

Also, at the department headquarters, six specially designated telephones manned by volunteers take in about 400 calls a day. When lines are busy or after hours, the consumer can leave a name and number and be called back.

However, even Commissioner Grant, who would like the department to serve as a "people's lobby," is the first to concede that the consumer is not always right.

"I'm terribly conscious of the fact that it's easy to flail out and hit everybody," she says. "That's simple, and it's not the way it should be done. It would be terribly unfair. Whenever we've accused a particular area of business of less than ethical conduct, the evidence has been there."

But neither she nor her staff hold out much hope for voluntary self-regulation on the part of business.

"It leaves the best people in industry at the mercy of the worst," comments Mr. Stern. "The decent people who would respond can't afford to. It's no more sensible to ask for it in consumerism than in school desegregation."

And if one ever needs a little graphic evidence that some city policing is needed, he should step out for a day with Basil Capers and Hyman Hendler, two of the department's 160 inspectors.

A special team assigned to follow up on specific complaints of shortweighting and other grocery volations, the two set off one recent Friday for Staten Island wearing trenchcoats and carrying black satchels (containing weights and violation and certificate of inspection forms).

SUMMONS ISSUED

At the first stop on Victory Boulevard, the market manager was issued a summons on several counts. He had goods in front of the scales so shoppers could not see the tally, few prices were posted on any items (New York law insists that prices be visible), and fresh meats were in the freezer with prices only for the asking.

At the second stop Mr. Hendler checked the weight on five packages of chicken cutlets and found 11 cents difference between weight price and package price. Several more violations were issued by the end of the day.

"Often we're told 'a new girl came on yesterday' or asked, 'Don't you ever make mistakes?' " says Mr. Hendler. "If they made me a judge, it might be different. But we're just here to enforce the law. . . One of these days maybe everybody will become honest and we'll be out of a job."

Until that day, city consumer departments have their work cut out for them.

Mr. Stern, who would like to see a governmental unit in every city take in consumer complaints, argues: "The better the consumer protection agency, the better business will do in handling complaints themselves. The very existence of a department is a spur to businessmen."

Just what kind of a department is best is still an open question.

"I rather lean toward an agency not answerable in any department, which can kind of stand back and throw darts without getting defensive—sort of like the Federal Reserve Board with the money supply," says Marian Ego, president of the new Boston Consumer Council.

A few city departments are slightly in awe of their own strength. The two-year-old commission on consumer protection in Columbus, Ohio, for instance, is authorized among other things to investigate consumer complaints and to help enforce the new city ordinance (the state has nothing comparable that allows a three-day "cooling off" period to cancel a sale solicited in a person's home. The law, passed in September, already has been well used.

C. R. Mercurio, superintendent of weights and measures in Columbus, is critical of the local Better Business Bureau for opposing several proposed city ordinances that would strengthen the commission: "It's perfectly logical for business to want to protect itself, but the BBB is trying to wear two hats. It can't expect to be paid by business and still serve the consumer."

HASTY PURCHASE CANCELED

The Ohioan, who keeps a full display of phony cents-off offers on his bookcase, considers the handling of consumer complaints perhaps the most important function of his office.

Among those he has helped is Mrs. Donald Van Culim, who took advantage of a postcard offer of a free camera with "no gimmicks." When she called to ask for the camera, she was asked if her family likes music. One thing led to another, and after a home demonstration of a stereo tape recorder the Van Culims signed a contract for more than $800 worth of equipment. Although this was before the "cooling off" law, the family was able to cancel the contract through the city commission's help.

Chicago's Department of Consumer Sales, Weights, and Measures was established in 1966, well before that of New York City, but it does not have the same breadth of regulatory or licensing power.

Blond, miniskirted Mrs. Jane Bryne, who has been commissioner of the department for the past 1½ years, admits she would like more licensing powers. Not long ago work of her department netted 121 convictions of gas-station owners (a licensed business) who among other things did not post the same price for gas at the curb and on the pump. The commissioner points out that home maintenance workers and auto and appliance repairmen are not licensed.

"We have little regulatory power over anyone not licensed," she explains. "With licensing we have a bigger stick with which to protect the consumer."

Some watching the development of consumer-protection law are concerned about the constitutionality and the wisdom of having cities step heavily into this field on their own.

Should neighboring towns have different laws, such "balkanization" could be dangerous, they say. Also, if a practice is bad enough to warrant a law, why not one at the state level?

The problem, as some of the consumer guardians see it, is that the states don't always see the need. If city councils do, they say, why not take advantage of it?

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 28–Mar. 2, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—XI: GIFT HORSES THAT BITE

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—Deceptive sales gimmicks entice Americans to pay more than $1 billion a year—often for shoddy merchandise. Consumer officials warn: "If you hear you're going to get something for nothing, it's the time of your life to be careful.")

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—The ad for a side of beef—U.S. choice at 69 cents a pound—looked intriguing enough to the Elmer Dewings of Sacramento. But when it came right down to samples, the 89-cents-a-pound variety was obviously (as the seller emphatically pointed out) far superior.

The Dewings promptly ordered a 280-pound side at the higher price. When the beef arrived at their home, they double-checked the weight and found 100 pounds was missing. Assured by neighborhood butchers that waste should account for no more than 40 pounds, the Dewings called the seller and politely suggested that the remainder might still be in his freezer.

When they recovered from the belligerent outburst at the other end of the line, they had nothing more to show for their efforts than the original inflated bill for goods never fully delivered.

In Dallas, Mrs. B. S. Calvin was similarly intrigued but slightly skeptical when a teacher colleague offered her a deluxe $40 blender free. All she had to do was give away one blender a month for the next seven months and persuade the recipients to agree to the same conditions. In the unlikely event that she could not find agreeable friends within the time limit, she would pay $10 per remaining blender to the company.

Reluctantly, she accepted the "gift." In the end, she managed to give away only two and wrote a $50 check to the company, more than covering the cost of the $40 blender. Her two friends, who could find no recipient, ended up paying a full $70 each.

THOUSANDS TRY GIMMICKS

Such deceptive sales gimmicks are tried by the thousands every day. All are carefully designed to get the consumer to part with more money than he originally intended or than the goods are worth. Only an estimated 10 percent of white-collar fraud is reported. But even at that the loss in cash and goods runs more than a billion dollars a year.

"Most of us wouldn't gyp anybody, and it doesn't occur to us that somebody might do it to us," comments Miss Kay MacDonald, investigator in the consumer protection-antitrust division of the Washington state attorney general's office. She cautions: "If you ever hear you're going to get something for nothing, it's the time of your life to be careful."

Gimmicks are not necessarily new. Just last year a newly widowed Seattle woman was talked into $17,000 worth of dance lessons. A Maryland man, approached by a door-to-door salesman who said he was taking a survey, found in five minutes he had ordered $100 worth of magazine subscriptions. An elderly Pittsburgh couple signed on the dotted line for a $1,395 aluminum-siding job—the assessed value of their home was a mere $650 in comparison. And just last year Missouri clamped down on furnace companies at work in the Kansas City area that were using scare tactics to persuade homeowners that the time was ripe for furnace replacements.

OLD METHODS STILL WORK

Some firms are busy thinking up imaginative new ways to gyp people. But many are content to stick with the old, proven methods because they still work. Also the legal system, particularly at the federal level, moves in at a slow gait to crack down on consumer fraud.

It took the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) 30 years to work up to a $100,000 fine in the Holland furnace case. With 500 offices around the country, the firm had used scare tactics—its agents misrepresenting themselves as safety engineers—to sell people unneeded furnaces.

When the heat is really on, a business in trouble sometimes packs up and tries the same game (often successfully) in another state.

"The big-scale fraud operators know that to keep moving and changing corporate structures is the way to do it," says Kit Bond, a lawyer in the Missouri attorney general's office.

Some think they are more apt to escape detection by arranging contracts for delivery of goods and services in another state.

Donald Navoni, a Seattle lawyer and former assistant attorney general in that state, tells of a scheme used by a firm at the Seattle World's Fair by which anybody interested "won" a quarter-acre tract of land near water in New Mexico. All recipients had to pay were certain "closing costs" (worth more than the price of the land).

The water turned out to be 900 feet underground, and the "fertile, gently rolling hills" were described in the ensuing state attorney general's suit as "hills of granite which rise conspicuously above the lava-capped plateau."

As the relatively new field of consumer-protection law develops at the state level, some of the more blatantly deceptive and unfair practices are being singled out by legislators and judges as illegal.

Massachusetts, for instance, enjoys a rating of "consumers' paradise" from many who count its protective legislation the strongest in the country. Specifically, it legalizes the keeping of unsolicited gifts; provides a three-day "cooling-off" period in which a buyer may cancel any retail-sales agreement made in his home; and abolishes the "holder in due course" contract clause which minimizes any finance company's liability to the buyer.

"TIGHT LITTLE BATTLES"

Structurally, Massachusetts is well supplied with a Consumers Council at the executive level, a consumer division in the attorney general's office, a new city-government unit in Boston, and a voluntary state consumer association. Also, as a pioneer legislator in this field, Massachusetts has good reason to think twice about laws it enacts.

Both its truth-in-lending and credit-bureau laws have served as models for federal legislation. Neither, however, passed without a fight.

"We've had some tight little battles," recalls Dermot Shea, executive director of the Consumers Council. He says most of the laws have served as "deterrents."

The fight has been no less elsewhere.

"Business fought our 'cooling-off' provision tooth and nail," says Edwin Palumbo, executive director of the Rhode Island Consumers Council. "We were upsetting a relationship they thought had been fair for years."

Business finds it especially hard to tolerate state laws which are tougher than their federal counterparts. Armour & Co., Wilson & Co., Inc., and Geo. A. Hormel & Co., for instance, are suing the Michigan Department of Agriculture to try to keep it from enforcing its relatively stringent standards on the content of processed meat.

Currently 28 states have a law similar to the Federal Trade Commission Act. Five—Hawaii, Vermont, Washington, Massachusetts, and North Carolina—exactly duplicate the language, prohibiting "unfair methods of competition and unfair or deceptive acts or practices in business."

Much of the impetus behind state consumer-protection laws has come in the last few years with the increased threat of federal legislation. Minnesota, for instance, passed 21 consumer laws just last year.

Although consumerism remains a fairly bipartisan issue, politics has its role. In 1967 in California, for instance, Gov. Ronald Reagan appointed Mrs. Kay Valory, one of his county campaign managers, to the long-established post of consumer counsel. Promptly whittling the budget and the staff, she put the thrust of her efforts into consumer education and has conceded: "Perhaps I could accomplish more working for industry."

"It's become a political controversy as to whether the consumer counsel is protecting the consumer or not," allows Donald Livingston, head of California's Division of Consumer Affairs.

"Our concept of the office is dramatically different from our predecessors, and we don't walk away from that. They made a blanket indictment of all industry. We're not business apologist, but we start on the premise that the vast majority of businessmen are honest, and we're not just going out to harass them with overregulation."

Much of the enforcement work in state consumer legislation falls on state attorneys general. With New York leading the way in 1957, some 30 states now have separate consumer-protection divisions within that office. They commonly have at their disposal (though for limited use) the injunction weapon which the FTC now is trying to obtain.

PINPOINTING SPECIFICS

Most feel the broader their state statute of consumer-fraud authority, the better. The

courts, they say, are perfectly capable of pinpointing the specifics. In New York, for instance, courts often have liberally interpreted a provision in the Uniform Commercial Code (law, in most states) which restrains a creditor from making "unconscionable" agreements. In a case last year involving a welfare recipient who, with credit and insurance charges, was paying $1,235 for a home-freezer unit actually worth about $300, a New York court ruled that, fraud or not, the pricing itself was "unconscionable" and grounds for cancellation of the contract.

"The unconscionability doctrine is the most important weapon the consumer has today in the fight against white-collar fraud," says Stephen Mindell, New York assistant attorney general. "By it, courts can effectively cut through technicalities and combat the whole theory of 'let the buyer beware.' "

Flexibility is seen as key. "If you're solving modern problems, you have to be as sophisticated as the people committing the fraud," says Herschel Elkins, California's deputy attorney general. "You can't be hamstrung by antiquated methods."

Most attorneys general have found it good politics, though time consuming, to accept consumer complaints. Many have file drawers full and find them useful for building patterns of evidence on various cases if they can keep from getting bogged down in the process.

CUSTOMERS DISGRUNTLED

"A lot who write in are just disgruntled customers," admits Douglas Head, Minnesota Attorney General. "We're kind of caught because we want complaints, but we can't act as individual lawyers for people."

"Sometimes people think all they have to do is complain to the attorney general's office," adds Wayne Hoecker, assistant attorney general in Missouri's Kansas City office. "I had a lady the other day who wanted me to get her out of a health-club contract because the club had 'embarrassed' her."

A minute fraction of complaints actually end up in court cases, and that's the way state law-enforcement officials like it. They view mediation as one of their most important tasks.

The states are increasingly active in consumer-education work. Talk shows, educational pamphlets (often in Spanish and English), and school-assembly programs are common. In accord with a legislative mandate, the Rhode Island Consumers' Council is helping people meet out their income to pay the bills through credit counseling.

The Kentucky Consumer Affairs Commission was set up by the governor of that state in 1968 for the prime purpose of stimulating consumer education. Conveniently, Mrs. Oscar Sowards, whom the governor tapped as chairman, heads the 14,000-member Kentucky Federation of Women's Clubs, and she has put the women immediately to work developing teaching units on credit and food buying which they now are teaching in all parts of the state.

EDUCATION QUESTIONED

Those in the law-enforcement field who see the problems firsthand generally are not optimistic about education as a solution to consumer problems. Many would agree with Gale P. Gotschall, the FTC's assistant general counsel for federal-state cooperation, who told a Kansas City, Mo., audience last year that it is far easier to try to reach a few thousand businessmen and dissuade them from unfair, deceptive practices than try to educate 200 million consumers in the "myriad ways in which they might get cheated."

Auto repairing is a field where there is much abuse of the consumer. Some auto repair shops frankly admit they would be selling out to their competition if they advertised the actual price they will charge for work. Such firms invariably lure the motorist with a low posted price—then tack on "unforeseen charges."

Reaching such businessmen, however, is not an easy task, even after the deceit is committed. The offices of most attorneys general are understaffed and underbudgeted. If they can afford to handle consumer cases at all, they must concentrate on the very worst offenders and hope that the ripple effect of publicity will work on the rest.

Also the line between hard sell and fraud is hard to distinguish. Many of the most questionable sales and collection practices are still perfectly legal.

CONTRACT RULED INVALID

"Our legal machine is on the side of the exploiter," insists Howard Frazier, president of the Consumer Federation of America.

Many consider the Office of Economic Opportunity's legal-services program one of the best things that ever happened to the consumer movement. These poverty lawyers have been instrumental in fighting the uniform consumer-credit code. They have also taken on a number of borderline-gray consumer cases for the poor and have fared well.

Last year in Detroit, for instance, a judge ruled a contract invalid which involved an elderly lady and an upholstery job with the Famous Furniture Company. She thought she was signing the contract to get the job done, but when a dispute arose later, company officials maintained she had temporarily sold them her furniture while they did the job (according to a small-print clause on the back of the contract) and that they had the right to repossess it. She had neither seen nor been told about the clause.

"You can usually defend a consumer case and win," says V. Paul Donnelly, the consumer lawyer on the case and consumer-fraud coordinator for Wayne County neighborhood legal services. "Business has gotten by for so long without a challenge that it tends to be careless in drawing up its contracts."

Although technically prevented from lobbying, some of these poverty lawyers think the day is not far off when they will be able to do so.

"If there's one thing we're learning fast," says John H. Schlegel, attorney in Chicago's Legal Aid Bureau, "it's that legislation is lobbying."

For middle-income consumers, the right to a day in court at this point is less well established than it is for the poor. Until recently private lawyers have not bothered to steep themselves in consumer law because the profit involved in most cases is so slim.

Although lawyerless small-claim courts are slowly raising claim ceilings (some like Washington State are as low as $50) and are working toward more evening and Saturday hours (New York City has succeeded well), they are often used far more by business than by the consumer. Garnishments and default judgments are common.

It may be noted, however, that one Oregon professor, in tune with the "pollution" times and aware of his court rights, recently used the small-claims court in Eugene to sue a firm with a smokestack for $20 in paint damages to his house. He was not overly surprised that he lost the case.

Occasionally justice in such courts, in the words of one critic, "depends on whether the judge's wife burned the toast." Judge John Patrick O'Brien of Detroit's Common Pleas Court counters that the job is "tough on a judge because you get so much heresay evidence." He says the largest number of cases he is called upon to settle involve cleaners, and often no sales slip can be produced.

"There has to be some bit of evidence to make you believe one party rather than another," says Judge O'Brien.

Phillip G. Schrag, a lawyer for the National Assocation for the Advancement of Colored People's legal defense and educational funds, has conducted extensive test litigation in the consumer field. He describes the general court atmosphere toward consumer cases as less "hostile" than "indifferent."

GROUP ACTION URGED

Certainly the current proposal to allow group-consumer action (class action) in federal courts is seen as a valuable addition to consumer options. Through it, collection-dollar restitution would be possible, and more private lawyers would then be induced to take on consumer cases.

In the days ahead, consumers may also look toward increased state and federal protective legislation. So far, the development has been more hodgepodge than orderly.

"You have a few progressive states and many more that do nothing," notes Robert L. Meade, director for legislative affairs in the President's Committee on Consumer Interests and formerly a drafter of much of the successful Massachusetts legislation. "If all were the same there's no need for federal legislation."

To some, the dividing line between needed state and federal activity in the consumer field appears crystal clear.

"With individual grievances, it's logical that action should be at the state level," comments Miss Diane McKaig, executive director of the Michigan Consumers Council and formerly special assistant for consumer affairs at the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. "But there's a large area for federal action. Take product safety. What are we going to do—stand on the state line and reject every lawn mower that isn't safe?"

Given the mobility of business and the variation in state law, some, like California's Mr. Elkins, are pressing for expanded federal concern. The deputy attorney general points to a case in which individuals in New York signed contracts for delivery of cars in California and, only at the pickup scene, found them to be rundown taxicabs.

"The federal government has to get into this sort of thing," he says. "No one else has jurisdiction. . . . Many such out-of-state frauds we shouldn't have to get into."

So far, the FTC has resisted efforts of the administration and others to expand its province of concern from practices "in" interstate commerce to those "affecting" such commerce. FTC officials, argue that their tight budget would keep them from doing a good job. They urge the states to adopt legislation similar to the FTC act, and they encourage Congress to subsidize state enforcement efforts.

In any case, many state officials think the FTC should be taking a much stronger lead in coordinating the activities of the many states and serving as an informational clearinghouse. The commission has had a special office of federal-state cooperation since 1965, but it is virtually a one-man office. Also, although regional FTC manpower often exceeds an attorney general's staff in a city by 5 to 1, the federal employees need permission from Washington to take even the slightest action of investigation.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Mar. 5, 1970]

THE CONSUMER FIGHTS BACK—XII: CONSUMERS WANT A LOUD, PERMANENT VOICE

(By Lucia Mouat)

(NOTE.—A flurry of bills in Washington all seek to aid the consumer. The federal government already does much for buyers. But consumer advocates want to focus and tighten these efforts and open new ones.)

WASHINGTON.—In Washington this year, consumer efforts focus on building a loud and permanent voice in the name of the public interest. For the moment, spotty protective

legislation is definitely second in importance. What consumer advocates and Congress seem most eager to see is an organizational setup that would ensure firm consumer representation in government decisionmaking.

Just what form this voice would take—whether it should come from inside or outside the government and whether from one office or two—is being hotly debated. The only point on which virtually everyone now agrees is that it should not be a Cabinet-level department, an idea which has been kicking around Capitol Hill for a good decade. Some 39 agencies now shoulder the government's consumer protection burden, and it is considered a Herculean (and in many ways unwise) task to try to unite them.

President Nixon's "buyer's bill of rights" proposal would divide powers between a permanent "Office of Consumer Affairs" in the Executive Office and a new "Division of Consumer Protection" within the Department of Justice. The latter would advocate the consumer's position before regulatory agencies and enforce the administration's consumer protection act which pinpoints 11 areas of unfair and deceptive practices.

Rep. Florence P. O'Dwyer (R) of New Jersey, in a bill with widespread political support (66 Republican and Democratic cosponsors), would keep advocacy and enforcement functions within a permanent executive office of consumer affairs. That office on its own could conduct hearings, conferences, and surveys.

INDEPENDENT AGENCY WEIGHED

Still another proposal would establish a full-fledged independent agency—such as NASA for space affairs—as a central voice for consumers. Reasoning that the White House is the center of political pressure, Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal (D) of New York, chairman of the Democratic Study Group, consumer task force, and sponsor of the bill, wants an agency that can move with as much freedom as possible. Among many duties, it would intervene in the consumer's interest before regulatory agencies and conduct economic investigations and studies as it saw fit.

A fourth suggestion as to "who shall represent the consumer" comes from Sen. Philip A. Hart (D) of Michigan. He proposes an independent nongovernmental council with local units to receive complaints and arbitrate issues "too small for courts and too big to ignore." Supported by government and foundation funds, the council would serve as an ombudsman, dispense product information, and represent the consumer before governmental agancies. Senator Hart sees a number of "enlightened" business representatives on the council—a point which some consumer advocates criticize.

There is also strong interest in Washington in the government's role in product testing and information.

Thousands of products from raincoats to tires are tested for the General Services Administration, Department of Defense, Department of Agriculture, and the like, but few taxpayers ever know the results.

PRODUCT TESTING A POSSIBILITY

In addition to requiring release of all current government testing information, Mr. Rosenthal's bill, which has the noteworthy support of the Consumer Federation of America, Consumers Union, and consumer advocate Ralph Nader, would establish facilities to carry on more extensive product testing.

Mrs. O'Dwyer's bill would require release of current testing information and give the National Bureau of Standards increased authority to set up facilities to test any products voluntarily submitted. Industries would be free to advertise results. The administration's bill would put the emphasis on certifying methods used in private testing labs.

"We wouldn't put the government in the testing business," explains Mrs. Virginia Knauer, the President's special assistant for consumer affairs. "Standardizing of procedures is what we're after."

Mrs. Knauer is, quite naturally, a strong supporter of her employer's consumer policy: "I think President Nixon personally and the whole administration are sensitive to consumer problems," she commented in a recent interview. "The President's 'buyer's bill of rights' proves that without a doubt. It is the strongest message any president has produced."

However, the former director of Pennsylvania's Bureau of Consumer Protection did not hesitate to take issue—at a discrete distance—with Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stan's comment during a speech last fall that "the wave of consumerism [might] move too far and destroy the freedom of choice of consumers." She responded coolly but firmly to a question at a press conference later that "it won't get out of hand."

Mr. Nader, who credits her with some "very good speeches," describes her as in a "hostile environment" by virtue of the exbusinessmen in the administration to whom she must report.

Mrs. Knauer, who spent eight years as a member of the Philadelphia City Council and is familiar with the political realities of working in government, insists "we have to have the cooperation of business and regulate it with legislation where necessary." She counts it a victory that she got clearance from the White House to contact business directly on complaints received and sometimes writes company presidents to get the the action desired.

A LAWYER—FILING PAPERS

Reform of the nation's regulatory agencies is seen as crucial to some as a permanent voice for consumers. The bureaucracy, entangling red tape, and limited power of many of these agencies are well known to all. The Food and Drug Administration, for instance, has no authority to summon witnesses or require companies to divulge their records. In the Federal Trade Commission all five commissioners must be involved in the proceedings before a company can even be told there is a complaint against it, and cases normally drag on for years.

"Most of my cases were older than I am," says 26-year-old John Hayward, who recently resigned as one of FTC's attorneys. "More manpower isn't the problem. There's just not that much work to do. I spent all my time filing papers. A high-school graduate with a little knowledge of legal terms could have done it."

The administration's consumer proposals would help. In part, they seek the preliminary injunction weapon for the FTC which would add to its power. Also called for are a review of the Food and Drug Administration's internal procedures and a study of the safety of all food additives, regardless of how long they have been on the market.

Meanwhile, there are increased private efforts to establish consumer representation in such agencies. Concerned about a quiet "consent" settlement between the FTC and the Campbell Soup Company on a charge of false advertising, a group of George Washington University Law School students organized as Students Opposed to Unfair Practices (soup). They are working to establish a public right to intervene in all FTC hearings and agreements.

Similarly law students in the new Center for Law and Social Research in Washington (supported by charitable grants) are aiming to establish the same right on a broader scale.

Some consumer advocates think the day is coming when such public spokesmanship will extend directly to the marketplace.

"Today a Ford is a Plymouth is a Chevrolet," comments George Brunn, municipal court judge in Berkeley, Calif., and a member of the board of the Association of California Consumers. "All sell for roughly the same price, are equally unsafe, and expensive to maintain. A reasonable society doesn't have to put up with this. I'd like to see consumers have a direct voice in how cars are designed and manufactured and sold."

Most businessmen counter that competition is alive and well and that consumers do vote with their dollars for what they like. These are also skeptical of the government's increasingly "paternal" role in consumerism and wonder aloud how many consumers really want what's being pushed their way.

"The trouble with consumers is they're trying to put business out of business," snaps one. "It's either going to get the price out of sight or break down the whole distribution system."

Although business and the consumer are essentially tugging for the most in the same dollar, some observers think there are points of unity which both sides are missing. Some businesses could patch their image effectively in the eyes of some buyers by at least appearing to cater to consumerism rather than defiantly turning their backs. Similarly, some businessmen feel consumers are not doing their fair share in the effort to separate the good from the bad. Until the distinctions begin, they say, consumer mistrust of business will result in a united front.

It is fairly certain that consumers are not likely to be a well-organized group anytime in the immediate future. They will continue to lean on labor and other allied support, knowing full well there are points at which the interests diverge. But the interest is growing—with the inclusion of pollution, students are swelling the ranks—and if they stick with the facts, the cause of consumerism may very well make up for what they now lack in numbers and organization.

Some, like Judge Brunn, consider the movement at a critical juncture.

"The average citizen is getting more and more frustrated about the impact he has . . . The great thing about someone like Ralph Nader or Rachel Carson is that it suddenly gives people the feeling that one person can make a difference . . . If consumerism doesn't catch on and give people that feeling, they're likely to turn away or engage in unorganized or hostile behavior. We've seen it in race relations where hopes and expectations rose faster than any political system could deliver."

A GOOD CANDIDATE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, an editorial appeared in the Chicago Polish Daily News, the oldest and one of the largest American-Polish dailies published in Chicago, concerning the need to select an excellent candidate, namely, Lawrence F. O'Brien, to be chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

This editorial appeared on February 16, almost 3 weeks before Larry O'Brien was chosen for his present position. It placed into proper perspective the need for the Democratic Party to have someone of Larry O'Brien's stature to reunite the party and resolve the difficult problems facing it.

I agree with the editorial that with Larry O'Brien at the helm, the Democratic Party will again be victorious at all levels of government.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial follows:

A GOOD CANDIDATE

The former co-worker of President Kennedy and President Johnson, Lawrence F. O'Brien, who is considered to be an outstanding political leader, is being considered for Chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee.

He is an excellent candidate.

In the past, he has proven to be a great tactician as well as organizer and an outstanding political and Party leader. He has also shown impressive abilities as Chairman of the Democratic Party during the difficult period of Vice President Humphrey's race for the Presidency.

Mr. O'Brien has the kind of qualifications which are needed by the Democrats, from the Party point of view, because they need a person who is thoroughly familiar with the national political machinery; who is practical in his approach, and who can unite all the factions which form the Democratic Party.

The Party faces difficult times financially, is disunited, suffering from defeat; all these factors must be overcome to face the congressional elections this year and in two years another Presidential election.

If the Party is to rebuild itself after being weakened by the loss of the White House; if it wishes to recapture many of the gubernatorial seats it lost, and if it wants to retain its leadership in both Houses, it needs a man like Larry O'Brien, who is a truly great organizer and Party leader to head the National Committee.

It must be admitted that former President Johnson weakened the National Committee and lessened its role in the political life of our country. Since he insisted that he is the leading Democratic political leader, he permitted the National Democratic Committee to run down and limited its role among all factions of our country, including the nationalities groups, and thus made it very difficult for a candidate like Humphrey to win.

Thus, the Democrats again must become united, work together in setting up a strong, effective political organization from the Democratic National Committee down to the precinct level, and they again can expect victories in the races for the State Houses and Congress. They should assume firm leadership, strong position on issues and they can win even againt the functioning Republican "machine."

TRIBUTE TO DR. THEODORE BRAUN

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, tucked away in obscure corners of the world are some really "beautiful people." Only occasionally do their names come to our attention, and then we learn of an Ida Scudder of Vellore or an Albert Schweitzer of Lambarene. For the most part, they quietly love God with their lives and touch fellow men with healing.

One such model of love and healing is Dr. Theodore Braun, a Lutheran pastor's son from Wyerts, Nebr., whose career is briefly sketched in an essay by Wilson C. Egbert. I ask unanimous consent that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

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

ALL IN THE DOCTOR'S BAG

(By Wilson C. Egbert)

The Mandated Territory of New Guinea is a little more than twice the size of Louisiana and a little less than the size of Wyoming. Its tropical swamps along the seacoast will match the tidewater swamps of Louisiana and its mountains range to the heights of Wyoming.

In 1930 a medical graduate of the University of Chicago increased the number of doctors by 14% when Dr. Theodore Braun came to serve a mission hospital at Amele, eight miles inland from Madang, New Guinea. He was the eighth doctor in this sector of the world's second largest island. For three years he divided his time between the ALC hospital at Amele and the Finschhafen hospital of the German missions.

Malaria and yaws, battle injuries from arrow and stone axe, leprosy and tuberculosis were all in this medic's bag of work. And in some of those years Dr. Braun would top a thousand operations. When he came to the island, a lifetime of isolation was the lot of lepers, and natives thought it strange that the government would only punish murder with a six-year sentence while the leper got "life." Now new drugs and treatment patterns have taken the terror out of "Hansen's disease" and have as well controlled malaria and tuberculosis.

There was a nurse at Amele hospital who couldn't "see" the new doctor for sour apples. Her name was Hattie Engeling and she had already served in New Guinea for five years. "He seemed arrogant to me," she said. But Hattie Engeling became Mrs. Theodore Braun. She stayed with him as his operating room nurse, was imprisoned with him during the Japanese invasion in World War II, lived through the deadly strafing of the prison ship on which they were being moved to an ugly internment camp at Hollandia, and came back after the war's end for a four-year stint at Finschhafen while mission builders were building the Yagaum hospital near Madang.

Last summer Dr. Braun resigned as chief of staff at Yagaum, the 395-bed hospital he helped to bring into being. The leave-taking of this senior doctor in the territory was a gala affair. He was honored by churches and government, by nationals he had served and nurses he had trained. Lutheran and Catholic missionaries, legislators, and national pastors said, "Thanks—and be sure to come back."

On New Year's Day, Queen Elizabeth II announced the Empire's honors. To Dr. Theodore Braun, a pastor's son from Wyerts, Neb., came the "Order of the British Empire," Australia's prime minister, John Gorton, sent a telegram, "well-merited honor."

Dr. Braun has seen many changes in what was once a Stone Age culture. Now there are 160 doctors to serve the nearly three million people. He took part in the early training programs of national medical aides. "Our nurse's training program was the first (1950) coeducational institution in New Guinea," he said. In the years before World War II, the training of nurses was made difficult by tribal languages, and by the need for basic education in reading and numbers. But Dr. Braun is quick to point out that "these people are as intelligent as we are—they simply had chosen a different mode of life."

He said that while the tribal groups had no overall government, they had a lot of law rooted in their own culture. Two tribes, for example, fought a battle regularly once a year—trading battle sites from one to the other and never attacking the invader until they were rested from their journey. Dr. Braun became a "military surgeon" inadvertently in one of these tribal wars. Tribes in the central highlands, where the territory was just being opened to mission work, heard that there was a doctor on the ridge above the battlefield. He was soon treating casualties from both sides, and weapons were checked outside.

Over the years, Dr. Braun observed, "the medical work we had did have a good effect not only on the New Guinea tribes but also on the Chinese and white population." The national church would testify to that—it wants to keep medical work going as a church contribution to what may some day be a new nation.

In July, Dr. Theodore Braun, O.B.E., and Mrs. Braun will be heading home to New Guinea. Awaiting them will be Teddy, their New Guinean adopted son, now a pre-law student in Australia. And on a lot given them by a grateful national, they'll build a home.

Some years ago a missionary friend told me of his chance meeting with an Australian newsman who said, "You chaps have a Schweitzer up there in New Guinea—only nobody seems to know about it." It looks as though he were right.

FEDERAL BUDGET REDUCTION

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the American Farm Bureau has just released its annual review of the Federal budget with suggestions for reductions that would assure a sizable surplus in the next fiscal year. This is always a helpful analysis and, without endorsing any specifics of the document, I wish to insert it in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members, as follows:

FARM BUREAU'S RECOMMENDED REDUCTIONS IN THE FEDERAL BUDGET, FISCAL 1971

The Budget for 1971 has again created some confusion in that it projects a surplus for the year, yet the debt will rise. This comes about as a result of the new unified budget first adopted two years ago.

For the stated purpose of showing the full impact of the Budget on the economy the receipts and expenditures of the several trust funds are included in budget totals. During 1971 it is estimated that trust fund receipts will exceed trust fund expenditures by $8.6 billion. However, federal fund receipts will fall $7.3 billion short of federal fund expenditures. The difference between the $8.6 billion trust fund surplus and the $7.3 billion federal fund deficit is $1.3 billion—the announced budget surplus for 1971. Since the trust fund surplus cannot be used to cover federal fund expenditures, it will be necessary to borrow funds to cover the federal fund deficit if the Budget is adopted as presented.

Also, there is no certainty that receipts will be as high as estimated. The Budget estimate on receipts assumes that Congress will adopt new, and extend expiring taxes in the amount of $1.6 billion, adopt a $1.2 billion postal rate increase, and be able to sell some $1.3 billion of Farmers Home Administration loans in the open market.

In the area of federal spending, Farm Bureau policy for 1970 states in part as follows:

"Inflation is a serious threat to economic stability. Excessive federal government spending is the basic cause of our current problem of inflation. Deficit spending by the federal government and policies which

expand the supply of money and credit faster than production clearly lead to inflation. Both Congress and the Executive Branch of government must face up to this fact and bring expenditures into balance wtih income at tax rates which are not oppressive."

The following pages include recommendations for reductions in New Spending Authority of nearly $12 billion. These reductions could bring about expenditure savings of nearly $6.5 billion during fiscal 1971. If these recommendations are followed by the Congress and the Executive the prospects for a cash deficit would be nearly eliminated.

RECOMMENDED BUDGET REDUCTIONS, FISCAL 1971

[In millions]

		Expenditures	New spending authority
051	ABM research	$49	$132
	Military housing		116
057	Military assistance	600	454
058	Atomic weapons		143
151	U.N. Building		20
152	Foreign aid	44	1,116
	Pan-Am Highway	4	20
401	Corps of Army Engineers	133	110
	Waste treatment		3,400
405	Land acquisition	68	182
501	Supersonic transport, airports	439	583
502	Shipbuilding	30	90
506	Secretary of Transportation	12	20
507	Appalachian development	25	13
551	OEO	710	869
	Model cities	230	230
554	Planning and research		43
555	Low-rent housing	189	180
601	Elementary and secondary education		288
602	Higher education	101	5
604	New manpower training	714	677
701	Social security		204
702	Food stamps	425	400
908	Law enforcement	191	212
	Revenue sharing	275	275
	Other pay increases	1,400	1,400
	Contingency funds	800	800
	Total reductions	6,439	11,982

An explanation of each of the reductions proposed in the summary table follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE

051—Increase of $132 million of NSA and $49 million of expenditures for ABM research should be absorbed through reductions in other areas.

051—Increase of $116 million of NSA for additional family housing should be denied.

057—Since military assistance is difficult to distinguish from regular defense operations, Farm Bureau again recommends NSA of $454 million and expenditures of $600 million be transferred to and absorbed within regular defense appropriations without increases due to the transfer.

058—Increase of $143 million of NSA for additional atomic weapons should be denied.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND FINANCE

151—Proposal to donate $20 million to U.N. for new headquarters should be denied saving NSA of that amount.

152—In line with spending levels suggested over the years for foreign aid NSA of $541 million can be saved in development loans, economic assistance and Alliance for Progress. Another $575 million of NSA and $44 million of expenditures should be denied for new international banking ventures.

152—Proposal to build 250 miles of road in Panama and Columbia as a part of Pan-Am Highway should at least be delayed saving NSA of $20 million and expenditures of $4 million.

SPACE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Sharp budget cuts have already been made in NASA. Without more information than is generally available, it would be difficult to suggest further cuts.

AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Major expenditures under Functional Code 350, Agriculture and Rural Development, are made by the Commodity Credit Corporation. Since these expenditures are mandatory by law, there is no opportunity to reduce them through the appropriation process. Farm Bureau is supporting major changes in basic farm law which, if adopted, would greatly reduce Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures over the next five years by substituting less expensive land retirement and commodity loan programs for the annual diversion and income support payments now being made to producers of cotton, wheat and feed grains.

NATURAL RESOURCES

401—Corps of Army Engineering construction should be held to last year's level saving NSA of $110 million and expenditures of $133 million.

401—It is proposed that $4 billion be appropriated for waste treatment to be used over the next 5 years. This should be handled annually. By using previously unspent funds during 1971, an appropriation of $400 million will be more than adequate to meet needs saving NSA of $3,400 million.

405—Land acquisition should be held to last year's level saving NSA of $182 million and expenditures of $68 million.

COMMERCE AND TRANSPORTATION

501—NSA of $290 million and expenditures of $275 million for the super-sonic transport should be denied. Also, new airport development programs should be denied saving NSA of $293 million and expenditures of $164 million.

502—Maritime ship building should be held to general level of recent years saving NSA of $90 million and expenditures of $30 million.

506—Office of the Secretary nearly doubles in one year. Holding to 1970 levels would save NSA of $20 million and expenditures of $12 million.

507—Appalachian development program held to last years level would save NSA of $13 billion and expenditures of $25 billion.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING

551—The OEO Should be abolished, with essential programs being transferred to other agencies of government saving NSA of $869 million and expenditures of $710 million.

551—Model Cities program outlays should be held to 1970 level saving NSA of $230 million and expenditures of $230 million.

554—Requests for comprehensive planning and for urban research should be kept in line with spending plans saving NSA of $43 million.

555—Low-rent housing contributions should be held to last year's levels saving NSA of $180 million and expenditures of $189 million.

EDUCATION AND MANPOWER

601—Increase for elementary and secondary education should be denied saving NSA of $288 million.

602—Programs for higher education should be held to last year's level saving NSA of $5 million and expenditures of $101 million.

604—New Manpower Training Act calls for $677 million of NSA and expenditures of $714 million. This should be denied and if additions are needed should be provided under the Manpower Training and Development Act.

INCOME SECURITY

701—Farm Bureau opposes proposed increase in Social Security wage base saving NSA of $204 million.

702—It is proposed that the number of food stamps recipients be increased by about 40 percent, but costs more than double. Holding the costs to a level consistent with recipient increase would save NSA of $400 million and expenditures of $425 million.

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

908—Increased aid to states for law enforcement should be denied saving NSA of $212 million and expenditures of $191 million.

OTHER

Revenue sharing should be denied saving NSA of $275 million and expenditures of $275 million.

Recent government pay raises have placed government employees out of line with private sectors. Pay increases should be withheld saving NSA of $1,400 million and expenditures of $1,400.

A contingency of $100 million is adequate saving NSA of $800 million and expenditures of $800 million.

THE ABM ISSUE

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, shortly the Senate will again be asked to consider the issue of expanding the ABM program in light of the defense needs of the Nation and the best judgment of administration officials.

A cogent editorial published recently in the Cleveland Plain Dealer has, I think, a sufficient bearing on the issue to be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial writer notes:

Deescalating the arms race and reducing military expenditures is much easier said than done. That sad truth must be contemplated by Americans in their consideration of (Secretary) Laird's warning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Feb. 24, 1970]

NO ARMS LETUP

While there might be the temptation to dismiss it as only a pitch for expansion of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird's warning about Russia's continuing missile buildup should be taken seriously.

Laird reported to a joint session of the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations committees that the Russian buildup could place this country "in a second-rate strategic position" by 1975.

Much as the United States might want to reduce military expenditures by cutting back on costly arms programs, it cannot, in the face of such a warning, do so. In these turbulent world times, it cannot risk vulnerability. It has little choice but to maintain costly arms programs in the face of a threat such as that posed by the Russian buildup.

About the only recognized hope for slowing or stopping the arms race depends upon the outcome of strategic arms limitation talks which will be resumed with Russia in April. That situation is ironical, however, because if the United States and the Soviet Union are to negotiate from positions of strength, they must in the meantime con-

tinue doing the very things they intend to talk about not doing.

De-escalating the arms race and reducing military expenditures is much easier said than done. That sad truth must be contemplated by Americans in their consideration of Laird's warning.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I mailed questionnaires to 115,000 families, representing approximately 210,000 registered voters in the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, asking their opinion on some of the many urgent issues before the Congress.

Some 42,000 of my constituents have now responded to this questionnaire, and I shall make their responses a part of the RECORD.

I believe the opinions expressed by voters of northern Virginia are particularly significant, because they have for many years proven a very accurate reflection of national opinion, as is demonstrated by the fact that northern Virginia voters have, since 1956, voted closely in proportion with the nationwide vote in each presidential election; that is, in 1956 former President Eisenhower received 56.4 percent of the 10th District vote, and 57.7 percent of the national vote; candidate Nixon received 51.1 percent of the 10th District vote in 1960 as opposed to 49.9 percent nationally; candidate GOLDWATER received 37.8 percent of the 10th District vote in 1964, while receiving 38.4 percent of the national vote, and President Nixon received 46.6 percent of the 10th District vote as opposed to 43.6 percent of the national vote.

The overall results, as of March 25, are as follows:

OVERALL RESULTS

[In percent]

	Husband	Wife	Total
1. Do you think we should settle the Vietnam War by—			
(a) All out military escallation	20	16	18
(b) Seeking settlement through negotiation as President Nixon has proposed	51	50	51
(c) Unilateral withdrawal of our Armed Forces	26	31	28
(d) No response or invalid response	3	3	3
2. Do you feel the proposed ABM system as a part of our National defense structure is—			
(a) Necessary	60	57	58
(b) Unnecessary	35	36	35
(c) No response or invalid response	5	7	7
3. Which action do you feel is most important for the Government to take to fight inflation—			
(a) Raising taxes	5	3	4
(b) Reducing Federal spending	46	44	45
(c) Adopting wage and price controls	42	46	44
(d) No response or invalid response	7	7	7
4. Do you think the war on poverty for which more than $9,000,000,000 has been appropriated, has been successful in helping poor people—			
(a) Yes	13	13	13
(b) No	68	67	67
(c) Undecided	16	18	17
(d) No response or invalid response	3	2	3
5. Do you favor President Nixons proposed welfare reforms—			
(a) Yes	55	51	53
(b) No	20	19	20
(c) Undecided	22	26	24
(d) No response or invalid response	3	4	3
6. Do you favor lowering the legal age of contract responsibility and voting from 21 to 18—			
(a) Yes	40	39	40
(b) No	55	55	55
(c) Undecided	3	4	4
(d) No response or invalid response		2	1
7. Do you favor cutting off Federal loans and grants to students convicted of campus disorders—			
(a) Yes	85	85	85
(b) No	12	11	11
(c) Undecided	2	3	2
(d) No response or invalid response	1	1	2
8. Should students in good standing continue to receive draft deferment—			
(a) Yes	63	68	66
(b) No	30	24	27
(c) Undecided	5	6	5
(d) No response or invalid response	2	2	2
9. Should the Congress delegate complete control and rule of the Nation's Capital to those residing within its boundaries—			
(a) Yes	31	32	31
(b) No	62	59	60
(c) Undecided	5	7	6
(d) No response or invalid response	2	2	3
10. Do you favor a multibillion-dollar Federal ecological program for eliminating pollution of our air, water and land resources as proposed by the President—			
(a) Yes	86	85	86
(b) No	7	6	7
(c) Undecided	5	6	5
(d) No response or invalid response	2	3	2
11. Do you rate your postal service—			
(a) Good			40
(b) Fair			38
(c) Poor			17
(d) No response or invalid response			5

In order to obtain a more accurate reading on the quality of postal service, responses were tabulated separately for each postal mailing area. The postal patrons responding prior to the postal work stoppage rated their postal service as follows:

POST OFFICE COMPARISONS

[In percent]

	Good	Fair	Poor	No response
Burke	74	18	5	3
Annandale	45	36	15	4
Vienna	45	34	14	7
Springfield	44	39	14	3
Falls Church	43	38	14	5
Alexandria	42	38	17	3
Arlington	40	40	16	4
Fairfax	39	39	19	3
Merrifield	38	32	15	15
Fairfax Station	38	40	19	3
McLean	29	38	30	3

The separate tabulation by post office also revealed that the percentage response was uniform throughout the district, indicating that 10th District residents, regardless of their specific location, accurately reflect the views of the majority of Americans:

[In percent]

Question	Majority	Falls Church	Springfield	McLean	Arlington	Annandale	Fairfax	Alexandria
1	B	49	54	54	50	52	51	50
2	A	60	59	59	57	59	59	58
3	B	45	46	47	45	46	49	43
4	B	68	70	68	66	70	70	66
5	A	52	56	55	53	55	54	52
6	B	56	54	54	56	53	56	54
7	A	86	88	86	84	86	88	83
8	A	67	69	69	64	65	69	65
9	B	61	61	62	61	60	62	59
10	A	86	90	86	85	87	87	85

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to offer the views of 42,000 individuals who live in a congressional district with one of the highest educational levels in the United States. These citizens, both men and women, have perhaps greater knowledge and greater interest concerning Federal Government affairs than any other such group in the Nation. Their high interest is demonstrated by the huge percentage that responded.

The results of this questionnaire are worth careful consideration by anyone who is concerned with our Nation, because these people have shown continually that their views are in almost exact keeping with the national consensus.

In concluding, let me say that I am indeed proud that I have the honor to be chosen as the representative for constituents of such intelligence and perception with such interest in the problems with which our Nation is confronted.

OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty recently held a hearing on the Opportunities Industrialization Centers. The OIC's, primarily financed with private donations, are possibly the finest self-help, job-training programs in the Nation.

The session was attended by OIC representatives from across the Nation, as well as dozens of OIC trainees and graduates from Washington, Philadelphia, and other cities. Many more OIC supporters could not be accommodated in the hearing room to listen to testimony on the important work and accomplishments of this fine program.

To enable Senators and others across the Nation to gain a better understanding of the work of the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, I ask unanimous consent that a portion of the prepared testimony be printed in the Extensions of Remarks. Specifically, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the comments of the Reverend Dr. Leon H. Sullivan, the Philadelphia minister who is founder and chairman of the OIC's, and Representative SHIRLEY CHISHOLM, within whose Brooklyn, N.Y., district the OIC has established a very successful jobs program.

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

TESTIMONY GIVEN BEFORE U.S. SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER AND POVERTY ON THE MANPOWER TRAINING ACT—MARCH 19, 1970

(By Rev. Leon H. Sullivan)

New and restructured efforts towards training the unemployed and the underemployed in America must be taken in the immediate future, or the entire country will be covered by a sea of welfarism and a gulf of hopelessness. It is generally known that scores of millions of our citizens are prepared to perform only the most menial kinds of jobs; and that whereas often jobs are plentiful and available, requiring some minimal technical skill, still the jobs go unfilled even though the manpower supply is great, because there are not enough people amply trained to fill the jobs. This is particularly true among America's minorities of color, and the White Southern and Appalachian poor.

By the year 2000, the American population will have grown to nearly 300 million. By that time, due to technological developments, one-half the jobs being performed today will not even exist. This means that if meaningful manpower and re-training efforts are not successfully instituted and developed on a broad nationwide scale, by the year 2000, tens of millions of the American population, White and Black, will have to be subsidized to some degree by some form of welfare or income assistance, even if they are willing and able to work.

Especially, there is a need for successful massive training and re-training programs in the concentrated communities and rural areas where minority citizens of color are so numerous. In these areas, in addition to skill training, there is need for attitudinal and self-motivational training to assist men and women to qualify on a realistic and sustaining basis for employment opportunity in "non dead-end jobs," and to also help them to become a greater beneficiary, overall, within the national economy. For the needs of the poor and the unemployed and the underemployed are not only job related, but involve the training of attitudes and basic remedial communication and computational skills.

It is encouraging that the United States Senate is taking a hard new look at Manpower Legislation to see that new goals should be set and new methods utilized to fill some of the realistic needs of the unemployed and underemployed of America. Up to now, as far as the Black community particularly is concerned, federal manpower programs have failed utterly in reaching the real manpower and basic training needs of the masses. The effect has been tantamount to "a camel passing through the eye of a needle." The benefits of traditional manpower programs in the Black, Brown and Red minority communities in particular, have been so ineffective as to be "insignificant!"

Mechanisms have to be provided that will run the gamut of manpower delivery service to the employment market. These mechanisms will have to include recruitment, prevocational and attitudinal training, technical and skill education, job development, referral, and essential follow-up, once a person is on the job. It is essential, also, that the participation of the community be taken into account. Because, unless the people in the communities are involved in the manpower delivery and training services, any government sponsored, or privately sponsored effort, is doomed to failure.

The vast majority of the population in the concentrated community has lost faith in traditional manpower programs and services and is looking for other forms of programs and projects designed to adequately meet their needs.

In this respect I can see value in the Manpower Training Acts S1362, S2838 and it's proposed Amendment 440, especially in those areas where major emphasis is placed on a program's ability, public or private, to provide comprehensive employment services and job opportunities for low income persons who are unemployed or underemployed. Such services hopefully, too, must include recruitment, counseling, remediation, vocational training, job development, job placement and other appropriate services; and be such a program in which residents of the area to be served shall fully participate in the creation of, the operation of, and the development of the center; and where the business community in the area to be served is considered in its services and operation.

One program that fits these needed and essential requirements, that was begun six years ago in Philadelphia, and that has since spread into communities large and small across the United States, across the Ocean to African nations and to Latin America, is the Opportunities Industrialization Center (OIC). This is a program which fits into the true American tradition of the people finding a solution to their own problems.

The Opportunities Industrialization Center Program was founded in an old abandoned jailhouse in the City of Philadelphia in 1964, to provide attitudinal development and skill training (for available jobs), and placement and follow-up assistance, for the unskilled and unemployed and underemployed in the concentrated communities and rural areas of America.

The OIC has been phenomenally successful and makes taxpayers out of tax consumers. The program has developed a national reputation, particularly among industrial leaders, for its success in the development of manpower to meet the needs of industry and business.

The Philadelphia OIC prototype, since its beginning in 1964 through 1969, has trained and placed on jobs 9,600 men and women with new useful skills, one-third of whom had been on relief rolls and 95 percent of whom were classified in poverty categories. In Philadelphia alone, there are some 5000 additional persons at this time on a waiting list.

Emulating the Philadelphia prototype, 51 operational and 39 partially operable and developing OICs were reported at the end of 1969, making a total of 90 OICs throughout the nation. Among these 90, Philadelphia, Washington, Brooklyn, New York, Boston, Oklahoma City and Seattle OICs have the characteristics of having the best recruitment, job placement, retention and performance records of any training programs in the country.

In spite of the lack of adequate resources, the OIC's generally in America, comprise the best training programs *overall* in the nation, with an average national cost of approximately $1000 per person. This amounts to less than one-third the cost per individual in other federally sponsored training programs.

Up to February of 1970, nearly 50,000 (49,116) trainees have been helped in OIC's across the country, with 28,000 having been placed into training related jobs; and with additional thousands having received job placements and help directly from the OIC Feeder Program, which provides self-help motivational assistance to all OIC trainees.

Since 1964, the Opportunities Industrialization Centers have displayed a marked capability to provide the kind of training necessary to reduce the incidence of unemployment, and place significant numbers of disadvantaged workers on the road to economic security. OIC's, also, by their very existence in cities, have inspired new hope among the deprived masses in these communities where people have found in OIC a "training program that really cares about their needs."

Although the large majority of OIC trainees are African Americans, the OIC serves all Americans regardless of race or color.

One of the most unique and significant characteristics of the OIC Program is that it relates to, and is totally involved with the community. OIC's are initiated, regulated, administered and developed by community leadership; and recruiting is done in the "concentrated community" by community recruiters, on the sidewalks, in the poolrooms, and all places where the unemployed "hang out." Industry is involved in every process of OIC's local development.

Recruits are then placed in a pre-vocational or "Feeder Program" where they are taught hygiene, poise, speech, self-pride, American heritage appreciation and adaptation to the "world of work." Trainees are then "fed" into OIC Skill Centers which are established with the assistance of industry, where students receive training in skills for jobs that are known to be available.

A subsidiary of OIC, the Adult Armchair Education Program, preassists by going into the community and into the homes of the indigenous where work is done to help people with the three Rs, American heritage appreciation, and other self-help personal and community development skills.

Of the 90 OICs under development as of December 1969, only 30 of the operating OICs were receiving comprehensive federal funding, the remaining 60 OICs for the most part, are totally dependent upon private sources of support.

If OIC could do what it has done in just a few years, with piecemeal, fragmented and uncertain funds, borrowing from Peter to pay Paul, and at the same time developing our capabilities and management skills as we go along, imagine what OIC could do for America if we were given ample funds to do the

job it is clear we are able to do! I believe we deserve to have all America help us to "help ourselves."

The total funding of the 59 operating centers up to 1969 came to almost 25 million dollars, of which 21.8 million dollars came from government funding sources and 2.6 million dollars from private sources. This breakdown shows that about 88% of OICs operating income came from government sources, half of which was tri-agency—DOL, OEO and HEW and the rest, 12%—from business and foundation areas.

As far as the major reason for our existence is concerned the OICs of America graduated 33,463 trainees up to 1968, and another 15,653 in 1969, giving us a grand total of 49,116 graduates to-date from our 74 centers in 59 cities. The current enrollment for classes in January 1970, comes to 9,916. From 35 to 40,000 people will graduate during 1970 alone.

Our job placements through 1968 came to 17,141 with another 11,062 put into jobs in 1969, giving us a total of 28,203 graduates placed. More important the retention rate after 6 months on the job (based on a sample survey of graduates from 3 centers) came to 79% with only a small slippage to 76% after 1 year.

We can all be proud of these figures, for they signify among other things, that the OICs have come of age as a potent force for dealing with the training and placement of the disadvantaged and hard-core unemployed by returning them to a useful civic occupation.

The future will probably bring serious competition for the manpower dollar. Right now, the focus of manpower attention is upon the disadvantaged and so-called hard-core. OIC can continue to play a significant role in training and placing these groups of unemployed—of all colors—in the job market. Those of us in the national work are aware of potential competition for jobs in the market place from two large groups of potential workers.

One is from returning Vietnam Veterans, both black and white—who will be demanding equal access to available jobs, who will also have their well known Veterans preferences.

The other will be the hundreds of thousands of semi-skilled, blue collar workers, laid off by civilian defense industries and Military installations as the Pentagon continues to make necessary post Vietnam cutbacks. Government's attention and manpower dollars will be focused upon them.

OIC can and does serve as a catalyst in labor relations. Despite rumors to the contrary, that we only focus our efforts on the needs and desires of business and industry it is a fact that OIC is also labor oriented and conscious of its ties with the labor unions. We are conscious that the employer is not the only source of problems. Our instruction to trainees has always included union orientation and has encouraged active union participation where it is possible. The records of our former trainees now in full employment and membership in the organized labor force are symbols of this cooperation. Where union membership is a problem OIC must work on that problem. Continued good relations in the future between OIC and the unions are imperative in any efforts to increase our influence among the male population to get more male enrollees into our programs. The key is good available jobs at top pay and the fulfillment of the American dream of equal opportunity for the growth and development of each individual.

The immediate future projection of OIC is to train 100 thousand persons per year into useful jobs with upgrading possibilities. If OIC is provided the resources to train 100 thousand persons for jobs, it would mean a gain of $66 million dollars annually to the government in the form of welfare payment savings; and $200 million dollars annually in additional income. All of which would represent a broadened base of purchasing power for the nation. At the average cost of $1000 per trainee, the investment would be returned three dollars to one at the end of the first year.

I have a distant dream of what the OIC program might be like ten years hence—1980—if they are properly funded. I believe that if the federal, state and local governments, foundations and private enterprises were to invest some $300 million dollars a year in the OIC program in American cities throughout the country over the next decade, that over 2 million men and women could be trained for skilled productive jobs that would add more than $30 billion dollars in new incomes to the national economy, plus untold savings in relief and welfare checks.

This would mean a one thousand percent dividend in ten years for each dollar invested in the OIC across the United States of America.

The need actually is for OICs to be established like supermarkets in the neighborhood areas of our concentrated communities all over the country. A supermarket chain does not put one market in one city and another in another city; it locates the markets in every neighborhood, in every community where the need for food exists. OIC programs should be established in every neighborhood in every concentrated community in America, providing massive evening training programs, as well as daytime ones.

Upgrading of skills is just as important as training the underemployed, for the great need for jobs is not just among the so-called "hard-core unemployed" but among the millions who are willing to work now but ill prepared to meet the labor needs and demands of the day. We can lift the employment level of the underemployed and thereby provide an extra space for the hard-core unemployed. Otherwise, we may find ourselves in the position of trying to put a bushel of potatoes in a basket that is already filled with a bushel of wheat.

If supported and expanded into hundreds of smaller communities as we develop and prove our successes, it is conceivable that OICs could well promote such a rise in the economy and productivity of the nation as to lead to the seemingly impossible end of establishing national economic stability.

Through the medium of the OICs, the nation can turn the corner away from a rising "welfare" state for the disadvantaged, to a new "Workfare" state of self-help for all who are able to work and do a job.

In the event of possible recessions, the OICs would provide an essential "holding action" for the re-training and re-direction of individuals into public and private type job markets, and be a prime factor in the concentrated communities towards working helpfully and positively with the people in a time of national economic stress. Further, in such situations, OICs would aid in the development of para-professionals for community services, daycare work and other forms of educational programs that would be so vitally necessary for neighborhood rehabilitation projects.

It is also crucially important to know that OIC is vitally interested in the development of programs in our great rural areas. This is a necessity if we are to really solve the problems of our big cities. We can erase poverty in the big cities of America altogether, and in five (5) years have the same problem all over again—because of the migrants from the rural areas who will see what has happened in the large cities and view them as the places with "pots of gold."

Interestingly, the OIC program has made such an impact that the news of its work has spread around the world. To the effect that OIC programs are now in process of development in Nigeria, Ghana, and the Dominican Republic, and inquiries about the establishment of OICs are being received from all over the world.

It is my hope, therefore, that support for the Opportunities Industrialization Center type programs be specifically encouched without necessarily naming it, in new manpower legislation in order for the program to adequately and qualitatively do the job that it has already demonstrated it is capable of doing.

It is my hope that the expertise and services of the OIC National Program, which provide technical assistance to OIC developmental efforts, will be utilized more extensively to serve non OIC programs, should they desire that service, in order that the OIC techniques developed might be made more broadly available.

I can see how OIC type programs might be utilized in communities large and small where there is a need for skill manpower training and development in those particular communities. The program is organized in such a way that it can develop linkage with any institution, or group, public or private, operating anywhere, in order for the job to be done to "help people to help themselves."

In this respect I honestly feel that the bill should mandate a more positive participation of the Office of Education and HEW, at both of the national (Washington) and regional levels, both operationally and from the standpoint of committeed and active leadership. I believe that this is essential if we are to make any kind of in-depth, root attack on the problem of Black Americans and other minority groups.

For some time I have felt we are oversimplifying the dilemma of getting people into jobs. While I, of all people, certainly wouldn't want to underestimate the importance of the job in our value system, we have got to consider, also, the present and long-range goals of minority group Americans in a broader context. HEW, especially the Office of Education with its link to the educational community, is somewhat peculiarly suited, program-wise and philosophically, to work with the total human being and all of the myriad of conditions of mind and body resulting from years of deprivation and second class citizenship.

Those who understand the concept of OIC know that we are more than just a job training program. In OIC we are concerned with the whole human spirit. In our centers our aims and objectives we talk about "the whole man concept." That's why in Baltimore and other locations, reports show that there is less turnover of OIC graduates than with employees from other sources.

Another reason I am hopeful that this manpower bill will mandate more positive HEW and Office of Education involvement is that our OICs are just beginning to link up with the regular school systems across the country. The Office of Education is presently accelerating its efforts to have OICs funded through State Education agencies, while not destroying the distinct and basic characteristics of OIC as totally a community based program. While I am convinced that the remedial work we are doing with disadvantaged school dropouts is of great importance, as a realist I recognize that the really important goal for OICs and similar training groups is to influence change in the regular school systems and other Constitutional units of Government. Considering the funds from the property tax base and non-discretional Federal funds available to the regular school systems, we have go to work with them to achieve meaningful changes if we hope to enhance the quality of life for the 20 or 25 million Black Americans and for 10 million Spanish speaking Americans, and our many, many American Indians. I feel certain that it would be in the best interest of the people

to be served, the taxpayers, and the Government if this Bill provided for stronger Office of Education/HEW leadership and a more natural link to the country's education community.

OIC has developed working relationships with many of the Employment Security agencies across America. This linkage has proven mutually beneficial and OIC is expanding these relationships wherever possible. Continuing linkages with the Employment Services will provide additional job opportunity exposure to OIC graduates. OIC is committed to complement the activity of the agencies rather than act as a competitor.

Through our advisory committees we have cultivated excellent contacts with the business community across the country. Hopefully, some of these contacts could also be used to build bridges linking the disadvantaged with the business community and with the State Education agencies and other elements of the community.

I repeat, as of now, of the 90 or more OIC projects and programs under development in the United States, only a third of them receive federal funds and even the flow of these funds for those federally supplemented programs is extremely poor.

It is my hope that specific consideration be given to broadening support to programs such as OIC through the appropriate federal agencies, into as many communities as possible, in order that a spirit of hope might come to the tens of millions of people shut out from the benefits of the free enterprise system due to lack of motivation, attitude, and adequate skill training, and other kinds of educational aids so crucially needed at this time!

TESTIMONY PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY CONGRESSWOMAN SHIRLEY CHISHOLM BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER, AND POVERTY, MARCH 19, 1970

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this subcommittee to support—with all the strength at my command—legislation designed to guarantee Federal funding for opportunities industralization centers throughout the country.

Mr. Chairman, approximately 25 million Americans are impoverished. Close to forty percent of the Black community fall into this category of desperate citizens who cannot afford the essential of a happy, healthy, full life. I speak to you, therefore, about a problem which is quite close to me physically as well as emotionally.

The sense of poverty that engulfs the individual; that isolates him from the community of the living, and that deadens his spirit is a feeling not easily comprehended by we who sit in this Chamber. And yet this unfathomable sense of despair and frustration is compounded to an even greater degree each time the unemployed or unskilled victim of poverty becomes aware that there are decent jobs available, each time welfare mothers discover that there is a training center just across town but travel and babysitter expenses prohibit taking advantage of its services.

In too many cases, Mr. Chairman, an escape from poverty can be facilitated but the nature of our anti-poverty programs make it much more difficult: so close and yet so far.

To illustrate this point, I have compiled a table showing the number of people unemployed in selected States as of November, 1969. I have also listed the amount of available jobs on record at the State employment offices at the same time. (I am told that the openings recorded by the employment offices usually represent anywhere from one-quarter to one-third of the total job availabilities.) I hasten to add that the table is not completely foolproof. Obviously there are several hidden variables such as temporary unemployment, openings for menial or unskilled jobs, and so on. Nevertheless, I feel that the table can and does show that in spite of available jobs, many people do without work. One must also introduce the fact that a large group of those who work do so for the minimum wage which—it must be stressed—yields an annual income below the already unrealistic poverty line set by the Federal Government. And all the while, there are higher paying jobs in the offing.

Now as you no doubt are aware, there are generally two methods for assimilating the unemployed or lowly employed into adequately paying work: Those oriented towards on-the-job experience and those which stress training. Opportunities industrialization centers, conceived in 1964 out of the awareness that there are jobs available and people to fill them if only they had the skill, are dedicated to the training approach.

It should be pointed out that the Heineman Commission Report to the President on Income Maintenance indicated recently that the training programs are more effective and economical than the work experience alternative. Furthermore, among available training programs, O.I.C.'s are far more economical than virtually any other. For while it costs the Government an estimated $3600 to train an individual, O.I.C. provides a more complete service at a national average of slightly more than $1000 per trainee. In our Brooklyn O.I.C. center the Federal cost per head is running at about $1,857. This higher cost in part reflects outlays for machinery, renovation of building space, and the like which are one-time investments.

Mr. Chairman, I will not recount for you the details of the O.I.C. program because I am certain that the committee members have familiarized themselves with the essentials. Moreover, permit me to mention several facets of the O.I.C. approach which I feel must be emphasized.

Too many of our present anti-poverty and manpower development programs are condescending in nature. They are initiated and administered, in many cases, by people whose main concern is removing guilt from their consciences rather than really helping those who need it. The result is a thwarting of the identity and a stifling of the enthusiasm of those who participate in the programs.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are exceptions. O.I.C. is an example of those programs which are genuinely concerned with the individual: with developing backbone, channeling drive, creating confidence—each so vitally necessary for "making it" in today's society. O.I.C. graduates have not been mass-produced. On the contrary, they have gone through a program which, to the greatest extent possible, attempts to cater its services to the individual needs of each participant. The class-room atmosphere of teacher-student relationships is de-emphasized while small, flexible, open discussions characterize the all-important feeder program. O.I.C.'s are not manned by patronizing instructors who instill an unnecessary and unhealthy dependence on themselves in their students. Rather, the O.I.C.'s are dedicated to the "self-help" philosophy best captured in the motto over the doors of one center: "If you cannot lift yourself by your own bootstraps because you don't have boots, O.I.C. will give you a pair."

There is a second aspect of the O.I.C. program which must be highly commended, Mr. Chairman. In my trips around the country, I have grown aware of the fact that too frequently our manpower development programs suffer from a lack of coordination. That is, men and women participate in programs and get trained for jobs which are not at all in demand in the city or environs in which the center is located; or, skills necessary for jobs open in a specific area are often not taught. At the same time, people have emerged from "training programs" prepared to do useless, time-wasting tasks.

Gentlemen, we have got to put an end to these types of irrelevant, ineffective programs. Now is the time to stop applying a series of isolated bandages to this sickness known as poverty, and begin to coordinate our treatment of this malaise before it overwhelms us. We must develop and fund programs that make sense, which train area people for area jobs, jobs that will not be obsolete by the time the trainee graduates.

Because of its close working relationship with the local entrepreneurial organizations, the O.I.C. training programs can be geared closely to the needs of business and industry in the area. In fact, each training subject is closely advised and partially directed by competent, dedicated men already established in their field. Graduates are therefore in great demand and can be quickly absorbed into the economic life of the community. A member of the Philadelphia O.I.C. remarked in 1966 that "support from the business community has become so great that failure of the O.I.C. would mean almost as great a disillusionment in the business community as in the Negro community."

A few figures will, I believe, demonstrate the effectiveness of the program and the worthiness of the cause. The centers have graduated 32,700 students in the past five years; 27,900 were placed in respectable jobs. The figures for Brooklyn are 3,310 enrolled (November 26, 1967–December 31, 1969) and 1,287 placed in jobs or referred to appropriate training programs. In 1969 alone, O.I.C. centers have graduated 13,100 and 10,900 have already been placed. The current enrollment is almost 10,000; slightly less than one-tenth of these are enrolled in one O.I.C. in my own borough of Brooklyn, where there is a waiting list of close to 5,000. Thus, Mr. Chairman, the demand for the program can be clearly seen.

Yet, another point must also be considered. Here in Washington, those who went through O.I.C. had an average income of about $1800 prior to coming to the program. Many were on welfare and few paid taxes. However, the O.I.C. graduates in the District currently have a combined economic power approaching $2.5 million. This trend has been duplicated all over the country. In my own Brooklyn centers the average number of welfare recipients who receive training in the day and evening programs is 201 (161 per day, 40 per evening). Additionally, about 39 of the people participating in day training are unemployment insurance recipients who are getting retraining or new training for another job.

The point is that appropriating Federal money for efficient, effective training programs, such as O.I.C., will not be lost at all. Training will mean fewer and fewer people on welfare rolls and greater and greater numbers contributing to the tax base. As has been pointed out by a chamber of commerce official in Philadelphia: "If you could double the Negro income in this country in ten years you would add a market the size of Canada—our largest foreign customer."

Up to this point, Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to zero in on several characteristics of the O.I.C.'s. It seems to me that the two basic elements of the opportunities industrialization centers—emphasis on self help and identity building, along with the relevant and effective training for available jobs—mark it as one of the most worthwhile training programs, one which has proven itself despite its short history, and one, therefore, for which Federal funds must be guaranteed.

I would like now, if I may, to concentrate on some crucial problems currently faced by the O.I.C.'s which it is imperative that this committee consider before acting—favorably it is hoped—on the proposed O.I.C. legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I have already stated that

graduates of the program in 1969 are 40 percent of the total graduate body since the program began some 5 years ago. Yet in spite of the drastic increase in enrollment, the O.I.C. budget has not come close to keeping pace. In some cases, not only has there been a budget lag, but there has been no increase whatsoever over the last couple of years. What the limited resources mean in human terms is that the formation of additional or supplementary facilities has been prevented. The absence of these centers means that people eager for training but who cannot afford the travel or babysitter expenses have been unable to take advantage of O.I.C. services. It means that the Brooklyn center has a waiting list of 5,000 while I get calls by industries in my area begging me to send them skilled workers. This trend, Mr. Chairman, must be stopped. By inserting O.I.C. services right into the Manpower Training Act, O.I.C.'s can hopefully receive more Federal funds than if it were simply another program.

This brings me to the second problem. Up to this point, Federal aid to O.I.C.'s has come from various agencies and has been haphazard. There is never complete assurance of funding continuing for a full fiscal year. Centers throughout the country have been forced to operate on contingency plans from month to month. Planning for the future is virtually out of the question since there is rarely a long-term commitment to O.I.C.'s. They wait for an emergency before spending their meager resources resulting in far greater expenses than had they been able to look ahead and prevent certain inevitable things from materializing.

Moreover, it should be realized that O.I.C.'s, because of their success, have been stabilizing forces between inner-city residents and business and industry. But this stability can no longer be guaranteed if O.I.C. financing is not, itself, made more stable.

There is a further problem in this regard. Whenever the sporadic grants do come through, there is a time lapse before the money arrives. For example, the Brooklyn O.I.C. was awarded a $1.2 million contract from the Federal Government on June 24, 1967, but they didn't receive any money until Dec. 6, 1967. This type of delay makes an efficient operation of any organization most difficult. Again, this problem can be alleviated if federal financial assistance to O.I.C.'s is explicitly stated in the manpower act.

The third problem is one which disturbs me greatly and is one which must be reckoned with. I direct your attention to several phrases in Senator Bogg's bill S 1362 and his amendments to S 2838: "Such services shall include recruitment, counseling, remediation, vocational training, job development, job placement, and other appropriate services." The point is, Mr. Chairman, that the basic thrust of O.I.C. and the prime reason for its success has been its wholeness. O.I.C. is involved in the entire training process—from recruitment in bars and pool halls, to character and aptitude development, to guidance and follow through, and to "adult armchair education." The O.I.C. staff knows and relates to each participant over a period of time and as thoroughly as humanly possible.

Now it has come to my attention that because of supposed economic necessities, some Government agencies on various levels are attempting to incorporate the corresponding O.I.C. activity into their realm of responsibility. That is, for example, state employment agencies are tying to assume the placement function, schools are trying to take on the job of recruitment, and so on. This diffusion of O.I.C. functions appears to be going on in Oakland, Seattle, and—to some extent—in my own district, to name only a few victims of this encroachment.

In my view, if this is allowed to continue, it would totally destroy O.I.C. as an effective program. Its basis, I repeat, is its integral nature: Staff can relate to the individuals; they know them well and can, therefore, suggest individualized plans for their futures. This simply could not be duplicated by several agencies sharing heretofore solely O.I.C. responsibilities. Intra-agency communication is poor; "O.I.C. type" participants and government bureaucrats would find it difficult to relate to each other; and agencies could not give good advice based on their necessarily skimpy knowledge of the people involved.

After all, Mr. Chairman, the manpower training programs grew out of just this awareness: That government agencies were not executing these responsibilities effectively. We cannot afford to risk giving them another chance—by default or otherwise. For the human resources with which we are dealing are far too precious.

It is for this reason that I am extremely critical of the emphasis upon state employment agencies in the Nixon administration's family assistance plan. I repeat, the whole reason manpower programs came into existence in the first place in that the state employment agencies were not doing their jobs. It seems ludicrous to me to reward them for their failure just because it fits into someone's philosophical scheme of decentralization. It would be fine if it worked but it doesn't.

Since the inception of the various manpower programs, the state employment agency people have not been goaded into significant improvements.

If you think federal bureaucrats are difficult you ought to see them on the state and local level. The state employment agencies are limited in their thinking with respect to the real needs of people and many haven't the foggiest notion of what outreach or intensive recruitment is all about. Their offices are "downtown" not in the ghetto. If one works up the courage to go into their cold, uninviting offices, he will most likely be shuffled to one or more people; fill out a series of forms, wait; wait some more and then finally he will speak to some irrelevant civil service individual who will, with a touch of noblesse oblige; give him a list of instructions and referrals. If he tried to ask questions in Spanish or the non-standard English which is the linqua franca of the black ghetto, forget it, because he won't be understood. Recruitment, training, and placement should be part of a package and it must be ghetto oriented.

In reference to this whole decentralization theory which is in vogue now, I would like to make another point. At this time in an effort to decentralize the cumbersome Federal machinery and to get the decision-making process closer to the people concerned, the Labor Department has given a great deal more authority and responsibility to its regional offices. I think this is good and useful, but there are certain practical problems which must be considered. It means that in the south people who are interested in training programs for blacks must deal with people who are more susceptible to political pressure from State governments and people who themselves have a white southern point of view. This set-up inhibits the creation and functioning of black-oriented training programs. Aggressive, black-run and black-oriented programs simply won't get funded or refunded. This is already happening. I know because they come to me and the other nine black members for help. They come to us because they feel that the state government, regional office of the Labor Department, and their own representatives are not responsive or sympathetic.

If you are going to have this decentralization and the enhancement of the regional office, there ought to be a review procedure at the Federal level—a last court of appeal if you will. I am not putting the South down. I think an appeal procedure is necessary for people in all regions in the country, but we must recognize that there are special problems in the South. That is why the phase "southern strategy" is such a loaded one.

Another point is that the present administration is placing too much emphasis on the private sector in its manpower programs. For example the Department of Labor has cut back the out-of-school neighborhood youth corps program three times; the last time by one-third. These out-of-school slots did not go into the in-school neighborhood youth corps program. Instead the Labor Department has been funneling all these monies into the jobs program of the national alliance for business. I think business can and should play a bigger role in manpower training, but I also know that businessmen are not going to train the really hard-core. They are not going to initiate programs for ex-felons and ex-drug addicts or other people with serious problems.

Right now inflation and tight money have caused layoffs in our big industries. All those guys who were trained in the much-celebrated NAB programs in Detroit are being laid off. It is the old rule of last hired first fired.

It is just plain foolish to put all our eggs in one basket. We need a variety of manpower programs for a variety of needs.

Finally, I would like to point out the very real need for day care facilities to meet the needs of women workers. Day care facilities are necessary not only during the training program but later when the woman has found a job.

In the Brooklyn O.I.C. program the majority of the enrollees are women. The breakdown is: 1,405 men and 1,905 women. The directors of O.I.C. report that the highest rate of dropouts and absenteeism is due to the lack of child care facilities. If the babysitter doesn't show up or Tommy gets sick and has to go to the clinic, mommie has to take him.

We have 32 million working women and many more who want to work. We have five million pre-school children but only 641,000 day care spaces available. Many women, approximately 3 million, are rearing their children in fatherless homes. Among blacks, 24% of the families are headed by women. These women need jobs and in order to work they need adequate day care facilities.

As Elizabeth Koontz, of the women's bureau, has pointed out the lack of day care facilities has been the chief drawback in the implementation of the win day care program. It is not enough to provide stipends for day care. The stipend is no good if there are no day care centers. It is like giving someone grocery money where there is no grocery store. We need to spend money, big money, on facilities and teacher training for day care if we want our training and employment program to work.

This is the situation as I view it, gentlemen. Permit me to summarize my sentiments with this final observation: Opportunities industrialization centers were started in a jail house late in 1964 and have developed, within five years, into a many-faceted program which seeks to assist those whose lives have been marred by discrimination and poverty. It effectively enables its participants to rise above the squalor of the slums and to assume a control over their destiny.

An O.I.C. graduate once remarked that "it's like a year of storms and then all of a sudden the sun starts shining." Former President Johnson described O.I.C. as composed of a "spirit that wants to say 'yes' to life itself, that wants to affirm the dignity of man, whatever his origins, whatever his race, whatever his religion."

Mr. Chairman and members of this subcommittee, we cannot say "no" the spirit; we cannot let it die. Opportunities industrialization centers have proven themselves. They deserve our wholehearted support.

Thank you!

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LABOR FORCE AND LABOR MARKET IN SELECTED STATES [1] [2]

State	Number of job vacancies [3]	Number of unemployed
California	22,059	372,000
Colorado	2,210	31,100
Illinois	21,432	156,000
Iowa	3,534	29,800
Massachusetts	12,659	101,800
Missouri	7,945	62,300
Minnesota	8,507	49,300
New Jersey	17,586	122,500
New York	35,959	310,000
Ohio	17,598	158,800
Oklahoma	1,193	36,300
Pennsylvania	17,592	142,000
Rhode Island	3,293	13,800
Texas	14,903	135,000
Vermont	1,589	5,400
West Virginia	929	31,400
Wisconsin	8,919	71,300

[1] Source: U.S. Department of Labor.
[2] Data as of November 1969.
[3] On record at the State employment offices.

PUBLICATION OF DRUG COMPENDIUM NEEDED TO COUNTER EXORBITANT DRUG PRICES

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to require the Federal Government to publish a listing of the generic equivalents of name brand prescription drugs. This would counter artificially high prices which are hurting consumers, especially the elderly.

There is no difference between a chemical composition drug and brand name drugs except the price.

This bill would provide for publishing a drug compendium with accompanying descriptions of drugs, price information, warnings, and evaluation of drug's efficacy. It would be made available to physicians and druggists, periodically updated, and financially supported by charging the drug firms on an equitable basis determined by the volume of their business.

It is ridiculous for consumers to pay for brand name drugs, because they can buy an identical prescription under its generic name for as much as 1,000 percent less. For example, a drug used to control high blood pressure is sold by its manufacturer for $7.50 per 100 tablets. Under its generic name, it can be purchased at 75 cents per 100.

Indeed, prescription drug prices have risen 50 percent in the last 10 years. The drug industry is spending $600 million a year to promote its products and it passes the cost onto the consumer.

This promotion includes advertising in medical journals, advertising sent directly to doctors, salesmen who personally call upon physicians urging them to use particular drugs, and widespread distribution of free samples of new drugs.

Drug firms spend $3,000 a year on each one of the Nation's more than 200,000 physicians—for a total of $600 million. That total exceeds by $100 million the amount spent by the same firms on new drug research.

Indeed, a recent study which focused on the leading 41 industries in this country found that the drug industry was first in profits in 6 of the 10 years ending in 1966. In the 4 years since then, their profits were not lower than third in rank.

Those hardest hit by exorbitant drug prices are the elderly. Senior citizens constitute less than 10 percent of the population, but account for 23 percent of the money spent on prescription drugs.

Physicians do not recommend generic equivalents because they are faced with a phenomenal assortment of drugs from which they must choose. They rely heavily on advertising and other promotional materials from drug firms for their information. This compendium would provide a comparative basis from which to choose more inexpensive, but effective prescription drugs.

There is not in existence today a comparative drug price list which the physician can use to choose the more inexpensive brand for his patients.

In 1968, Dr. Philip R. Lee, then Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for health and scientific affairs, sent every doctor in the country a letter asking for their comments on the idea of having such a compendium published and made available to every doctor. Of those who replied to the letter, 77 percent favored the idea.

What my bill proposes, Mr. Speaker, is that such a compendium be created, kept up to date, and that the cost of printing it be charged to the drug firms on an equitable basis to be determined by volume of business conducted.

The compendium would also include a description of the drug, indications and contraindications, warnings, adverse reactions, and management of overdosage.

In an effort to drive down the ridiculously high price of prescription drugs and to protect consumers—particularly the elderly—from being fleeced, I would urge careful consideration of my proposal for a comprehensive drug compendium.

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD-WINNING SPEECH

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, for the benefit of Members of Congress who have not had an opportunity to read it, I ask unanimous consent that the 1969 Freedoms Foundation award-winning speech by Mr. Brian L. Bex be printed in the RECORD.

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

FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARD-WINNING SPEECH

Shakespeare once wrote "The fault, dear Brutus, is not in our stars, but in ourselves..."

There is a tragic irony that a country and a people as great as the United States and the great body of energetic and resourceful Americans should find themselves in a dilemma which every day becomes more manifest.

The greatest, richest, and most progressive nation in all history now stands like some ancient monument which is slowly eroding away under the action of the sands, the winds, and the weather.

Ours is a country whose gross national product in goods and services has reached a fantastic level of one trillion dollars this year. It is a country with more automobiles, more telephones, more automatic appliances, more people living on a standard of comfort than any other in the world.

But ours is a country sadly vexed and greatly beset. We mass produce everything in this country: everything except character.

It used to be that when you wanted something, you worked to earn it. Now you stage a riot and get it given to you at someone else's expense.

If your father or grandfather lost his job, he took whatever work he could get. Now hordes of relief "clients" refuse a job unless it is to their liking, and they demand the job be brought to them.

This nation was built by immigrants who struggled here for opportunity, and would have scorned the false idea of "something for nothing." Now it seems to be an almost universal (and all-too-often) ambition.

It used to take a lifetime of gruelling work and scrimping for a family or a country to earn a little surplus, a taste of security. Now mobs of so-called "students" and whole "emerging nations" demand they be given it, out of your earnings and with no effort on their part.

"Minority groups" all over the earth seem to think the world owes them everything they want.

Have you ever wondered what happened to the America of yesterday? Yesterday, you paid your debts as quickly as possible, and sacrificed to do so. You disciplined your children, but disciplined yourself, first. You spent less than you earned, and demanded your government do the same. You went to church, your children to Sunday school, you held daily prayers, and no court would have dared to interpose any law into your private religion. You would have been horrified at (and quick to change) men in high places who made "deals." You expected to prosper only by doing a better and better job. You obeyed the law, but took an active enough part in government to see that the laws were just. You "walked softly but carried a big stick." And that was the character which brought this country victory in three wars in your lifetime, built it back from a shattering depression and fed and saved the civilized world.

Today, America is becoming a nation of drifters so accustomed to turning to the government or someone else for help that it is losing its heritage of hard work, thrift, and above all, individual responsibility. The mood of today is to say: If we have a disaster, let the government declare us a disaster area and send help; if we get out of work, we have unemployment insurance; sooner or later, we will have Social Security, so why worry?

I do not think we can continue to function as a free society unless people take some sense of responsibility for themselves and their own future.

Morality, integrity, law and order, and other cherished principles of our great heritage are battling for survival in many communities today. They are under constant attack from degrading and corrupting influences which, if not halted, will sweep away every vestige of decency and orderliness remaining in our society.

Certain groups, numerically weak but vociferously strong, appear determined to destroy all acceptable standards of personal conduct

and sane behavior patterns. They seem bent on eliminating all ethical practices relating to our established order.

It is becoming increasingly more apparent that a philosophy of the left (in all its shadings, from Communism to the welfare state to the "mixed economy" concept) can only be successfully fought by a positive philosophy of freedom. Ideas must be fought with other ideas, not emotions. It is not enough to know what one believes in, it is equally important to know why one holds certain convictions. An attack against a position is best met by a strong counterattack, whether the battle is one of physical force or the force of opposing philosophical and economic ideologies.

Clearly, it is time for each one of us to examine basic premises. It is time to reexamine our convictions and delve into the underlying reasons for them. Most of us know what our opinions are; it is just as important to discover where these opinions came from, what are the fundamental moral and philosophical premises on which they are based. It is time to stop fighting a defensive battle against leftist ideologies and turn the tide back with a strong showing of clear, rational, carefully considered ideas.

Most people are aware that our way, the American way of life, is being seriously challenged—that if something isn't done, things will get worse instead of better. There may not be agreement on which issue or issues are the most crucial, but among those most frequently mentioned are apathy, conformity, lack of a sense of responsibility, racial conflict, inflation, internationalists, socialism-Communism, juvenile delinquency, automobile accidents, government spending, monopoly union, foreign competition, and the like.

Yet, we find even those persons most seriously concerned asking this question: "But what can I do about it?" I'd like to have a nickel for every time I have heard this expression from those who earn more than I do. I say it this way to emphasize the fact that so many people, whose capabilities in business fields far exceed mine, plead full ignorance in the all-important business of fulfilling their duty as American citizens.

Salesmen who make hundreds of contacts before they make a sale, advertisers who are happy with a few orders per thousand broadsided mailed, fishermen who will go to any lengths in the mere hope of landing the big one, become very different people when it comes to performing their civic duties. Here, they seem to expect immediate and overwhelming results with a minimum of effort. They underestimate the competition. The grafter, the subversive, and the special interest groups have much to gain by imposing their wills upon legislators and upon the public; and what they gain is immediate. You and I, who want the blessings of liberty secure for ourselves and our posterity, perhaps are less aware of what we gain by defending and advancing Americanism.

Whatever the reason, the fact remains: People seem to like to believe they can't do anything—so they do nothing, yet, what each person is capable of doing, and has the ability to do, is most substantial.

First, you must have an opinion, as soundly based and firmly established as possible. Second, you must see that this opinion is expressed in public, for an unknown opinion has no more value than any other form of unknown wealth.

Most of us aren't going to hire a hall, put on our own TV show, or even write a book. But we can, at least in conversations, say we are not convinced (when we aren't), and let those who have made a good point know that we think they have done well. Even those who would remain least involved can do this much.

You are busy, but you do read widely to keep informed. Good! As you read, mark articles, underline cogent phrases, check summarizing paragraphs. Then, send these on to others. If you have the time, include a note such as, "This also confirms what you said," or "You may be right, but there does appear to be another side." Formal letters of transmittal are seldom necessary. Just mail these materials where you think they would do the most good.

You may doubt the effectiveness of this technique until you see an editor, to whom you have sent a mailing or two, permanently change his policies; or a legislator change his vote on an issue. Or, a friend who has been in disagreement with you will come around one day and say: "You know that last item you sent really has something to it. I never thought of it that way."

If most of us did just this much, the principles and institutions of Americanism wouldn't be as contorted and corroded as they are now. Of course, you could go much further. You could refrain from letting purely commercial considerations "force" you to contribute and support movements and actions that you know are wrong. You could initiate correspondence with governmental officials, trade association executives and editors.

No matter how "big" or "small" you may consider yourself, realize that you may be the sole initiator of an idea—and that if you stop, everything stops. And this works both ways; for others need support, too. This you can do. You can support those who are supporting that which you believe is right.

The big question is not, "What can I do about it?" But rather, "How can I possibly afford not to do something?"

In this business of being a citizen, start! Keep moving! And you'll find you have really begun to "do something about it."

You see—today too many of us believe in the free enterprise system until the going gets tough—

We need a new dedication, a renewed devotion to our American private enterprise system.

There is no room for a Doubting Thomas. The preacher who wishes to preserve freedom of religion must also be a fighter for our free enterprise system, without any buts!

We have a responsibility to fight against the slow erosion of our free enterprise system. To preserve the right to our American heritage we must work harder at our responsibilities. We must oppose the "gimme" pressure groups and the political "handerouts." We must militantly challenge the philosophy that government can do everytihng for us and charge the bill to others. There are no others—they are you. We must stand, as individuals, for the right to own, to save, to invest in our free enterprise system. Without this freedom, other freedoms will soon be of little value.

Freedom is not hereditary.

Freedom has a price: and that price is vigilance.

The time has come for us to reestablish the rights, for which we stand—To reassert our unalienable rights to human dignity, self-reliance—To be again the kind of people who once made America great. And how shall we approach this problem? And will our answer be the needed vaccine for the rendering important of the collectivist cancer? I think it shall. I think the answer lies in this:

Today in America, everyone is a negativist, i.e., one who is anti: anti-Communist, anti-Nazi, anti-federal aid to education. Now there is little wrong with being a negativist, except when it prevents the same from being constructive. You see, the first thing a person is going to ask you when he knows you are anti-something is: "What are you for? What do you believe in?" No fairer question could be presented. Now the problem arises due to the fact that those of the anti-grouping seldom can find the answer to this all-important question. What do you propose? This is the very problem. Not what a person is against, but what he is for; not anti, but pro; an alternative, something better, not merely more of the same, under a different label.

I suggest that we become pro-free enterprise, pro-capitalism, rather than anti-Communism. Now for the person who understands the systems in question, he will readily understand and realize that to be for one, you by definition must be against the other. To be a Communist, you must be against capitalism. Rather than talking about the evils of collectivism, speak on the benefits of capitalism, the advantages of living in a free enterprise, competitive society.

You see, Americans in general regard the collectivist system, no matter what the "isms," as something alien and unrelated to America, and in turn we would never join the Socialist or Communist parties.

Yet, we clamor loudly for every piece of socialistic legislation which is offered—so long as it is sugar-coated with an American label or wrapped in the American Flag.

It seems to me that this must be very disheartening to sincere socialists to note the continuing impotence of their party, while, at the same time, a pseudosocialism in free enterprise wrapping has been able to command such a tremendous following from the rank and file. This is indeed a sad commentary on the political and economic ignorance of the American people.

We dismiss socialism with a wave of the hand, and then line up in droves behind Social Security, socialized medicine, industry, housing, and education. We denounce collectivism, and yet innocently and ignorantly spout its doctrines day in and day out. The reason for this is so simple that we Americans often overlook it: We just do not understand our own system. We as Americans do not understand capitalism, which just happens to be the only system devised by man which allows for human freedoms and justice in the same breath.

There is little question that the collectivistic proposals seem logical, just, and humanitarian. They sound like the idealistic answer for a muddled world's prayer. In one breath, they denounce the slavery of totalitarianism and the "crazy quilt of capitalism," and offer the Utopian "middle way," which eliminates the liabilities and retains the assets of both collectivism and individualism. It is all very intoxicating and consoling—until one realizes that oil and water do not mix. When one arrives at this conclusion in the discussion, the proponent of such a heaven and earth begins to delete himself from the dialogue.

Address those who would replace our system with collectivism: Mr. Collectivist: Show me! Show me a spot of God's green earth where collectivism has increased individual freedom and eliminated poverty. Show me where it has not meant rigorous and arbitrary regulation. Show me where it has proved the road to escape to true freedom as well as to peace and plenty. Show me your Utopia, not on paper, but in reality! You admit in your writings that socialism in Germany, Italy, and Russia resulted in Nazism, Fascism, and Communism, but you say that these were perversions of true socialism—and you abhor them. That is fine; I do, too. But show me where socialism has avoided these pitfalls and led to freedom and prosperity for everyone, as your blueprints say it will. Show me!

Despite the continued emphasis on increased production via collectivism, we can find no examples of such results in proof. All on paper, nothing in reality. Show me a socialized or even a half-socialized country which has remotely approached our free enterprise record of production and plenty. Show me a socialized or half-socialized coun-

try which has produced a higher standard of living for workers than capitalistic America. Show me where socialism has produced cheaper cars, telephones, radios, movies, gadgets and comforts, and where they have been more widely distributed among the average people. Show me a collectivist society where 72 percent of the population have life-insurance policies and 49 percent have bank accounts. If you know a better, happier, more envied workers' republic than we have right here in America, where is it? Please show us.

To this the collectivist has no answer. And why? He knows that capitalism and free enterprise have made it this way. This system, based on individual initiative and profit, has produced the best for the most. Socialists and Communists make the same mistake: They place security ahead of freedom. America is the prime example of a nation which founded itself on the basic principle of individual freedom. Our Constitution bristles with limitations upon the government—and the result has been (exclusive of the last thirty years) a greater measure of security for Americans than for all other nations. America offers unlimited rewards for initiative, enterprise, and wisdom, and she must never guarantee the same for laziness, incompetence or failure. This free way of life is a rugged, painful business at times; but it has paid the biggest dividends on earth and is well worth every weary mile of it.

You see, freedom appeals to men's strengths; socialism and Communism appeal to man's weaknesses. Freedom teaches a man to stand independently on his own feet; the others teach him to lose himself in the protective herd.

Our argument for capitalism is that America has proved beyond any doubt that she has the best economic and political system yet devised. This is proven by our glorious record, not by some hypothetical blueprint that some over-educated-under-worked humanitarian visioned in a dream. America did not become the bread-basket, the factory, the bank, and the hope of the world by following the wrong systems or believing the wrong principles. Her solution is visible in every home, in every city, in every store, in this country.

For you see, when the 55 men went to Philadelphia in 1787, they had a dream. It was with great courage and conviction that they hoped to form an enduring basis of government for the nation which had been a-borning and whose future destiny and greatness existed only in their minds as a vision. These men agreed and disagreed—there was argument and counter-argument. There was anger and there was calm thought. There was prayer and there was blasphemy. Finally there was compromise, the final product of their toil being the Constitution of the United States of America—a profound composite of their highest judgment and aspirations.

The Constitution having been completed, an arduous task lay ahead. These "salesmen of democracy" had to sell their product to the people whom they represented. A man must have confidence in the value of the product he is marketing. These 55 men had faith in the Constitution, yet they knew that it takes much more than faith to sell a concept.

Despite the many handicaps they had to overcome in communication and transportation, Madison, Franklin, Hamilton, and their colleagues, sold their product to the people of the young nation.

In the intervening years since 1789, many events of great political importance have occurred. Systems of government have risen and fallen. Yet in this time period, the Constitution of the United States has remained the most prominent expression of the American ideal of freedom and justice. Yes, the years have confirmed the founding fathers faith in their product.

For nearly two centuries, this Constitution has been the efficient framework within which a free and vibrant people have been able to realize their fullest potential.

In every period of our history, outside forces have tried unsuccessfully to weaken our democratic structure. During times like these, past generations of dedicated Americans, including our fathers and grandfathers, have reaffirmed their faith in democracy and their devotion to country. Many Americans have given their lives so that others might be able to pick the fruits of a bounteous nation. In war and peace, they have dedicated themselves to solving the problems of a growing nation. Our democratic framework is a stimulating atmosphere for their free quest for knowledge.

In order for our nation to continue resisting destructive influences, my generation must also be willing to re-affirm its faith in America. Our men in Vietnam are fighting to preserve free choice, and our students are sharpening their minds and skills in order to deal with the problems of an increasingly complex society. Despite the overwhelming loyalty of the majority, a minority of young Americans are evoking a genuine concern by their apathy and inane dissension.

You often hear it asked: But, how can citizens show America how it feels? How can the youth of America and their elders express their appreciation for the riches of opportunity and fulfillment that this country has provided? We, you and I, can participate, actively, in civic affairs. We can become operating members of the brain trust so vital to the success of our nation. For if America should fall to the collectivist disease, if she should die from bread and circuses, the epitaph of her gravestone may read as follows:

Here lies the only civilization which perished at the peak of its power, with its power unused.

Here lies a decent people who wanted love, not empire, and got neither; who tried to trade power for popularity and lost both.

Here lies a nation of advertisers who know how to change consumer tastes in cigarettes, but were themselves manipulated on all the issues that really mattered to their salvation and survival.

Here died a sort of Lancelot in the court of nations, who granting all his grievous flaws, was still somehow the noblest knight of all; except this Lancelot, crippled with an undeserved guilt complex, let his weapons and ideals fall unused, and so condemned all mankind to the thousand-year night of the Russian bear and the Chinese dragon.

Ladies and gentlemen:

The future of America lies in the hands of my generation. It is an awesome responsibility, but the obligation has been accepted by generations before us. The commitment is now ours. Of the many duties in this endeavor, the most vital to America's future lies in salesmanship. We must believe in our nation enough to go out and sell its principles to those outside our domain and to the apathetic within, so that future generations will have the drive to sustain the "Voice of America."

To sell America to American youth and American youth to America—this is the opportunity and this is the challenge. The generation that accepts this challenge will change the history of the world.

I thank you!

A MARINE SPEAKS OUT

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, long hair seems to be the vogue today, apparently symbolic of many youths who are short on order, loyalty, and contentment.

About 25 years ago there was a type of young man who characterized our youth of that time. His hair was short, but his dedication to God, his loyalty to country, and his respect for law and order were, indeed, long.

Fearing that this quite remarkable and very unique youth of not-too-long-ago might be forgotten, Mr. Robertson Page, an officer of Franklin National Bank of New York, wrote an interesting article that recaptures this youth of yesterday and introduces him to us again.

Mr. Page's article appears in a recent issue of the publication Banking under the title "A Marine Speaks Out." I submit for inclusion, the article in the RECORD, strongly recommending that everybody read it and ponder it deeply, lest they forget:

A MARINE SPEAKS OUT

(By Robertson Page)

Hey you! Yes, you with the beard and long hair and marijuana! Sorry, I didn't know they called it "grass" these days. You see, I just haven't been around much lately. Not since I was killed more than 25 years ago at a place called Wake Island.

You might say I'm on temporary leave from my grave. I've heard a lot of things about you and I wanted to see you for myself.

For example, I understand you accuse my generation of hypocrisy. Therefore, I assume you mean me.

Could be, Long Hair, I really don't know.

What I do know is that I was plenty scared when that Jap lunged at me with a fixed bayonet. Because that was the end of everything for me.

I also admit to being a little scared when I enlisted in the Marine Corps in wartime. But I did enlist—because I loved my country.

Now I learn that you don't care much for my country! I hear you have a demeaning word for it—something about "the Establishment." And that some of our newspapers support you in your infamy.

More than 30,000 tides have washed over the sandy beaches near my grave at Wake, and 25 years is a long time. But I never expected this. Not in America!

I further understand that you burned your draft card and ran for the sanctuary of a church. That others fled to Canada to escape the draft.

All in the name of *Idealism!*

It also has come to my attention that some of your bearded friends burned the American Flag in New York's Central Park. That must have been a real blow at hypocrisy!

Perhaps I'm too severe on you. It just so happens that my grave is quite shallow and I hear many things.

For one, I understand you have led violent demonstrations for the right to use four-letter words. That's a joke, pal! We Marines invented them! But, I'll tell you one thing we didn't do; we never regarded them as a constitutional right.

And I hear you demand a voice in running the universities. Gosh! I guess you must be pretty smart to know more than the professional educators!

I also hear that in the summer of 1969 more than 400,000 of you went to a "rock festival" in the Catskills, living off narcotics and group sex and having a real ball, while your peers were getting killed fighting Communists in Vietnam.

You know, it used to be that people back home rolled bandages for the men up front. I don't think I like your response very much. But forget that. I knew so many dedicated, wonderful guys who died for their country

at Wake—and at Anzio and Iwo Jima and Omaha Beach and Bastogne—that I can't get very upset over a draft card burner.

But I'll tell you one thing that I find repulsive.

In all of the disruptive protests you have fomented on the campus, you have consistently tried to destroy those institutions that have made the United States strong against its enemies—ROTC, military recruitment, and research to strengthen our national security.

It makes me wonder about you. Are you an unwitting pawn of the enemy? Or just unthinking?

That's for someone else to decide. Right now, my moment is up and I must get back to Wake Island; this time forever.

In parting, I like to think that my death was not a waste; that in supporting my country on this narrow strip of sand I defended something worthwhile for a new and better generation of Americans.

But now that I've seen you, I begin to wonder. Perhaps I should have fled to Canada!

On second thought, I'm glad death came when it did.

You see, when I left this world I held a special belief, something you idealists would call square. It consisted of a deep-seated reverence for my God, for my heritage, for my parents, and for my country.

No one can take this from me. Not even in death.

I pity the fact that you choose not to share this belief, to express this simple faith in America.

ARIZONA/HAWAII STUDENT EXCHANGE OPERATION OPPORTUNITY

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, on March 18, 20 fifth-grade students from Waianae, Maile, and Nanakuli left Hawaii to spend 2 weeks as exchange students in Steamboat Rock, Ariz., which is located on our Navajo Indian Reservation. On April 23, Navajo and Hopi Indian fifth graders will arrive in Hawaii to spend 2 weeks as exchange students.

Both States view this exchange as a cultural and educational experience that will be valuable not only for the students involved, but also for their families, their communities, and their parents.

I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles published in the Honolulu newspapers and a resolution of the Senate of Hawaii be printed in the RECORD.

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

SENATE RESOLUTION 154

Resolution congratulating the Leeward Cultural Exchange and KHVH–TV for their roles in establishing a student exchange program for Waianae

Whereas, on March 18, 1970, twenty fifth grade students from Waianae, Maili and Nanakuli will leave Hawaii to spend two weeks as exchange students in Steamboat Rock, Arizona, which is located within a Navajo Indian reservation; and

Whereas, on April 23, 1970, twenty Navajo and Hopi Indian fifth grade students will arrive in Hawaii to spend two weeks as exchange students in Waianae; and

Whereas, this exchange is the first exchange ever made between children from Hawaii and children of American Indian ancestry; and

Whereas, these visits will result in valuable cultural and educational experiences not only for the children involved, but also for the parents of the children involved and other adults in the community; and

Whereas, the Leeward Cultural Exchange was formed for the purpose of promoting and developing this student exchange, and KHVH–TV led the fund drive for this exchange program under the name of "Operation Opportunity"; and

Whereas, more than $8,000 was raised from the community in order to make this exchange economically possible; now, therefore

Be it resolved by the Senate of the Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii, Regular Session of 1970, that the Leeward Cultural Exchange and KHVH–TV be and they hereby are congratulated for their roles in establishing a student exchange program in Waianae; and

Be it further resolved that certified copies of this Resolution be transmitted to Edward J. McGrath, President of the Leeward Cultural Exchange, and Lawrence S. Berger, President of KHVH–TV.

NAVAJO LAND BECKONS LEEWARD YOUNGSTERS

Twenty Leeward Oahu fifth graders will leave next week to spend two weeks living and going to school in a little Navajo Indian settlement named Steamboat Rock, Arizona.

The trip, which will be countered in April by a visit of 20 Navajo youngsters to Leeward, was dreamed up by two federal Teacher Corps volunteers and was made possible by enthusiastic community support.

The idea started last year when Edward J. McGrath and Craig Thompson joined the Teacher Corps together.

Teacher Corps is a federally funded program that sends non-education college graduates to various areas to help local teachers innovate new out-of-the-classroom programs.

McGrath was sent to Leeward and Thompson was sent to the Arizona Navajo Reservation. The two threw around the idea of a cultural exchange and decided to sound out their respective communities on the idea.

"Everyone was really enthusiastic about the idea," McGrath said. "Both the Leeward and Navajo people have very definite and unique cultural features and both are very proud of them."

So the Leeward Cultural Exchange was formed and an appeal for funds locally brought an immediate community response that resulted in the donation of the $8,401 necessary for the Leeward youngsters to make the trip.

KHVH–TV led the fund drive under the name "Operation Opportunity."

The group will leave a week from Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. on Continental Airlines flight 766. The public is invited to see them off.

Steamboat Rock is in Northeastern Arizona, about 160 miles northeast of Flagstaff. It is in the center of the Navajo Reservation and sits on the outskirts of the Hopi Reservation, which is surrounded by Navajo land.

The Leeward students will stay at Toyei Boarding School, which is just outside Steamboat Rock. The boarding school houses both Navajo and Hopi children, who live there during the school week and go home on weekends.

Activities include visits to the hogans (mud dwellings) of Navajo families, visits to such scenic and cultural attractions as the Grand Canyon, and a visit to Disneyland on the way home.

WAIANAE KIDS READY FOR A SWAP WITH THE INDIANS

(By Bob Krauss)

Mrs. Roy Yamada out in palm-shaded Waianae is knitting a pair of woolen mittens for her fifth-grade son, Derek.

Mrs. Elizabeth Saragosa at Maili (where the temperature averages 75 degrees) bought a pair of flannel pajamas last week for her 10-year-old son, Jeffrey.

Mrs. Herbert Amina in tropical Nanakuli, mother of 10-year-old Brian Amina, is shopping for a warm jacket.

These cold weather activities popped up on the sun-splashed Waianae Coast yesterday where 20 mothers are preparing their kids for a trip to Arizona. There they will spend two weeks on the Navajo Reservation.

Last night the temperature in Navajoland was below freezing.

That's not the only problem facing Waianae mothers.

"I have twins," said Mrs. Raymond Rodrigues. "My daughter, Ramy, was chosen to make the trip but her sister, Raelene, isn't going. They've never been separated before. I don't know how they'll take it."

A fifth-grader from Makaha, who has never been away from Hawaii, is concerned about visiting the reservation because of snakes.

"Don't worry," her teacher told her. "You wouldn't stop swimming in the ocean just because of the sharks out there, would you?"

The trip to Arizona begins a week from tomorrow and marks the beginning of the first cultural exchange ever attempted between kids from Hawaii and American Indians.

For more than a month the Waianae Coast community has been raising funds to meet the budget of $8,401.65.

"We now have $8,000 cash in hand with pledges for the rest," said Edward McGrath, president of the Leeward Cultural Exchange, sponsoring organization. "We are still taking donations.

"Any money we get beyond our own budget will be used to help the Indian kids come to Hawaii."

McGrath said the Leeward children are hoping to accept an invitation to visit a session of the State Legislature this week. Meanwhile they are practicing Hawaiian songs and dances after school every Monday and Wednesday.

"We had a picnic in Makaha on Sunday," McGrath said. "The kids performed for their parents."

Robert Moore, principal of Waianae Elementary School, said the significance of the cultural exchange is that it will be a carefully planned and supervised educational experience.

"This isn't like sending another baseball team to Disneyland," said Moore. "The object of this trip is education. Our kids have been having two classes a week since Jan. 28 in Hawaiian language, dance, music, arts and crafts, history.

"They've heard Navajo speakers, seen movies about the Navajo Reservation so they'll have some idea of what to expect. I'm hoping this will turn out to be a pilot program for other exchanges in the future."

The kids put on a car wash in Waianae two weeks ago to help raise money for the trip. They made $100. Donations have come in from all over the State.

Movie actor Richard Boone collected over $800 by passing a calabash in Waikiki night clubs.

On the reservation, McGrath said, the kids will visit Navajo hogans (mud houses), attend class with Navajo fifth-graders, perform hulas, tour the Grand Canyon, go on a hayride, see Indian dances and ride horses. They will spend a day at Disneyland on the way home.

A group of Navajo fifth-graders will ar-

rive in Hawaii April 23 for the second half of the exchange.

McGrath said Leeward parents are now signing up to house the children during the two-week stay. They will go swimming and fishing, attend a luau, tour the Island and attend school with the Leeward youngsters, McGrath said.

Donations can be mailed to Leeward Cultural Exchange, P.O. Box 1017, Waianae, Hawaii 96792.

NATION CANNOT AFFORD POSTAL REFORM DELAY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, leading mid-Michigan newspapers, the Jackson Citizen Patriot, and the State Journal of Lansing devoted extensive editorials on the current postal crisis. As ways are being sought to resolve not only the questions raised by the illegal work stoppage, but to bring about the badly needed reform of the entire postal system, I believe these commentaries deserve wider circulation, and I commend them to the attention of my colleagues. The editorials follow:

[From the State Journal, Mar. 22, 1970]

NATION CANNOT AFFORD POSTAL REFORM DELAY

Nobody, least of all members of Congress, should have been surprised by the postal strike which hit various parts of the nation last week and threatens a complete breakdown of the U.S. mail system.

The strike, of course, is in violation of federal law and now raises the unhappy question of what the government will do to enforce that law against thousands of workers who left their jobs last week.

It is a crisis that might well have been avoided if Congress had stopped the political footdragging of recent years and faced up to the issue of postal reform.

A strong effort to bring about that reform started under the administration of President Johnson when he appointed a special commission to come up with a plan to revitalize the obsolete and deficit-ridden postal operations. The commission made its study and came back with a call for reorganization of the Post Office Department on a self-governing basis as a non-profit government corporation.

The plan, which called for a corporate business style operation, was designed to make the postal system self-supporting within five years. It received strong bi-partisan backing across the nation and was subsequently endorsed by President Nixon when he took office.

Among those who backed the proposal were former Democratic Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien and former Republican National Committee chairman Thruston B. Morton, as well as many members of both major political parties.

Yet, when the plan reached Congress last year it bogged down in committee and failed to get off the ground. In addition, Congress has failed to act on the President's $175 million request for postal pay increases. Perhaps most aggravating of all is the point noted by postal union officials that Congress has still taken no action on a 5.4 per cent wage hike that was supposed to have taken effect last October.

Some breaking of the ice started about 10 days ago when the House Post Office Committee finally approved the bill designed to turn the postal service over to a government-owned corporation.

A vote on the bill was delayed until after the Easter recess. The Senate, meanwhile, is still wrestling with its version of the same bill. It is obvious that certain key members of congressional committees are most reluctant to give up their traditional political influence over the postal system. Progress seems to come by inches.

It has been demonstrated by long and careful research that the present postal system is obsolete and due for overhaul. Figures released last year pointed out that the Post Office has a $1.2 billion deficit and this is expected to increase steadily in the years ahead.

One Michigan congressman stressed that the fault is not with local clerks and letter carriers, but with a lack of updated and efficient management systems.

Under proposals in the present House bill, a postal service authority would be established under a bi-partisan 13-member executive council representing postal union, mail users and the public. It would permit collective bargaining with binding arbitration. Strikes would still be prohibited.

All postal workers would still be protected by civil service, salary step increases would be reached in a shorter period of time.

In short, the plan would sever the historical and political relationship between Congress and the Post Office Department. Among other things the postal corporation could set mail rates, finance itself and still draw on tax revenues for help.

It has also been noted that the plan does not set any precedents. Government owned corporations such as the Tennessee Valley Authority and Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have been in operation for many years.

Unfortunately, the rash of postal worker walkouts has now created another headache on the question of how the federal government is going to deal with an illegal strike. Hopefully, current negotiations between the government and postal union officials will bring about a compromise settlement.

Meanwhile, it is clear that the time has arrived for Congress to start moving on the long overdue issue of postal reform.

[From the Jackson Citizen Patriot, Mar. 21, 1970]

POSTAL SYSTEM NEEDS OVERHAUL

The problems of the United States Postal system have been piling up for years and now they are coming to a head with the walkout of mailmen in New York City and across the country.

Whether moves to end the walkouts will be effective remain to be seen.

The militant local of the National Association of Letter Carriers in New York City ostensibly walked off their jobs as a demand for higher pay in a city that costs more to live in than any other city in the United States.

Since federal employes are forbidden to strike, the walkout is illegal. Militant union leaders, however, aware that defiance of the law in these times is one of the best ways to capture an objective, are ignoring restraining orders issued by the federal courts.

As one postal official admitted:

"You can't jail thousands of workers."

Indeed you can't and trying to jail the leaders would probably only inflame the situation.

Postal workers, like other federal employees, have their wages set by Congress. The Letter Carriers Union negotiates with Post Office Department officials who in turn pass on the appeal to Congress.

Since the postal workers are forbidden to strike, they have little clout in their dealings with postal officials or Congress.

The threat of a strike is the ultimate weapon wielded by unions in their negotiations with management. Without that weapon, the postal workers have had to accept what pay raises a fickle Congress wants to grant.

There is sound reasoning behind not allowing federal employes to strike as the present situation dramatically shows. In most cases it means the stoppage of functions vital to the public interest.

So many of the everyday functions of our government are taken for granted that we are just not aware of what it is like to be without them until they are halted.

Halting the flow of mail is creating crises in both the public and private sector of proportions never thought of before.

Pensioners are being deprived of their meager paychecks, Wall Street business is seriously threatened, companies are unable to send out their billings or collect money due them.

The seriousness of the situation indicates that there must be a drastic overhaul of the postal system. A recent blue ribbon report called for making the mails a public corporation rather than a government agency with a responsibility for making it a financially sound operation.

The rank and file postal worker opposed the move, fearful that the long history of postal patronage jobs and political power in Congress would be abandoned.

That left the postal workers right back where they started—dependent on Congress for annual wage increases and benefits.

The postal system does not pay for itself. The annual appropriation to subsidize the system grows each year. It is woefully in need of overhauling to make it more efficient. Postal workers, indeed should be making more money. There should be no need to work a second job to support a family.

If the system is to pay its own way without a subsidy from Congress then postal rates would have to be jacked to new heights.

The postal system like the railroad system, has been allowed to decline during the 20th Century with little attention to the decay process.

Now the problems are coming to a head.

Postal workers, long underpaid in relation to other civilian jobs, need an immediate pay raise.

Then Congress needs to bite the bullet and launch an overhaul of the postal system, cutting out patronage along the way, to insure that the taxpayer who subsidizes the postal operation is getting the best deal for his money.

And the postal unions which have resisted change in their conclave need to be awakened to the fact that if they are to expect pay increases commensurate with their longevity and ability then some of the money has just got to come from tightening up much of the wasted money in the postal system.

CRISPUS ATTUCKS DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to pay tribute to the memory of one of America's black heroes. On that great day in Boston when the colonies dissolved forever the oppressive ties of colonialism, Crispus Attucks was there to take up the cause of freedom for all men. As he led that charge against tyranny, his mind was focused on the higher good which all men should count

as their inalienable right. His blood was among the first to be shed so that America might be born. Let us all remember what Crispus Attucks gave his life for, and never lose sight of our continuing battle for the self-determination of all men.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, 52 years ago, the people of Byelorussia proclaimed their independence through the establishment of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. This great event in the lives of the Byelorussian people took place on March 25, 1918, and signified the unquenchable thirst for freedom by gallant people who were under constant Russian oppression.

The known history of the Byelorussian people dates back to the ninth century. Also known as the White Russians and White Ruthenians, these people settled in the area south of the Baltic countries, north of Ukraine and east of Poland. They had their own distinctive language and culture.

In the 18th century the Byelorussian lands were seized by the czars. Briefly, between 1918 and 1921, they enjoyed a productive freedom but soon the Russian Communists seized control of Byelorussia and ever since the Soviet bear has tried to stamp out the national spirit and national culture. Since then the Byelorussians have had no way to assert their national identity. Being denied their individual history, culture, and national pride, they are simply a ward of the Kremlin, which through its ruthless rulers has annihilated more than 6 million of the Byelorussian population.

Today's Byelorussia does not maintain diplomatic relations with other nations and is not permitted to have a distinctive identity. The Byelorussian delegation to the United Nations is merely a rubberstamp for the U.S.S.R.

The drive for russification continues relentlessly, with young people being educated in Russia, Byelorussian literature is ever on the decrease, the rising rate of use of the Russian language in schools, severe religious persecution and the mass transfer of educated and technically trained citizens to other parts of the Soviet empire.

Discrimination and persecution continue, but those who have fled the slavery are keeping alive the flame of freedom for their country of national origin.

This 52d anniversary of Byelorussia's proclamation of independence is a fitting time to commemorate those who have given their lives in the name of freedom as well as those in the free world who today continue their untiring effort to give strength and hope to the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain.

Those of us who enjoy liberty won for us by our forefathers join the patriotic Byelorussians in the United States in observance of their independence day. The Declaration of Independence of Byelorussia was a modern, inspiring document, and its spirit continues to inspire the people as they patiently bear Communist oppression.

Mr. Speaker, to help commemorate this historic anniversary, I include as part of my remarks the text of the Third Constitutional Act which established Byelorussian independence:

PROCLAMATION OF INDEPENDENCE—THE THIRD, CONSTITUTIONAL ACT

One year ago the people of Byelorussia, jointly with the peoples of Russia, cast away the yoke of the Russian monarchy which was oppressing Byelorussia most of all. Without consulting the people, the czar had involved our country in the tragedy of war, which razed to the ground Byelorussian towns and villages. Now we, the Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, are liberating our country from the last vestige of state dependency imposed by the Russian monarchy upon our free and independent country.

From now on, the Byelorussian Democratic Republic is proclaimed a free and independent state. The people of Byelorussia through their elected Constituent Assembly shall themselves determine the future relations of Byelorussia with other states.

This present act nullifies all previous state relationships which gave a foreign government the power to sign the treaty in Brest also on behalf of Byelorussia; the treaty that spells death for the Byelorussian people and cuts their country into pieces. On the basis of this present act the Government of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic shall approach the interested parties and propose the revision of that part of the Brest treaty which concerns Byelorussia and the conclusion of the peace treaty with all belligerent States.

The Byelorussian Democratic Republic shall embrace the whole territory inhabited by the Byelorussian people as a majority and namely it should include the governorship of Mienisk, Vilnia, Horadzien, Viciebsk, Smalensk, Cernihau and adjacent parts of districts inhabited by Byelorussians.

The Rada of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic confirms all those rights and Civic liberties which were granted by the act of March 9th, 1918. Proclaiming the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, its Rada hopes that all freedom-loving nations will render assistance to the Byelorussian people in their endeavor to secure full realization of their political ideals of statehood.

March 25, 1918, in Mienisk.

RADA OF THE BYELORUSSIAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the proclamation of independence, I would like to have incorporated as part of my remarks an essay prepared by the Byelorussian Congress Committee of America on the historical development of the Byelorussian nation. The essay follows:

ESSAY ON BYELORUSSIA

March 25, 1970, marks an anniversary of great significance for American citizens of Byelorussian origin, for on that day Byelorussians everywhere in the countries of the free world will celebrate the 52nd anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. In Byelorussia, however, a national celebration of independence is replaced by the observance of 100th anniversary of the birth of Vladimir Ulianoff (Lenin), former leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party and former head of Soviet Russian Government, glorified as the alleged benefactor of the Byelorussian people.

The United Nations' Commission on Human Rights on March 13, 1969 has adopted a resolution to commemorate the 100th year since the birth of Vladimir Ulianoff (Lenin), former leader of the Russian Bolshevik Party and former head of Soviet Russian Government, as a great humanitarian. This celebration will take place on April 20, 1970.

Byelorussian people is enslaved by Soviet Russia today and is unable to express freely its past and present experiences under communism and its opinion on the humanitarianism of Lenin. Therefore, we would like to present an opinion on the humanitarianism of Lenin with respect to the Byelorussian people and its country.

As a theorist of Russian Bolshevism, Lenin appeared as a decisive defender of the integrity of the Russian Empire, many years before usurping power in Russia. In his program for the Russian Social-Democratic Workers' Party (Bolsheviks), Lenin acknowledged the right of non-Russian nations for selfdetermination down to separation from Russia. However, he was granting only the right of separation, but not real separation. Lenin was against separation of non-Russian nations from Russia. His position was for holding them inside the borders of the Russian state and to convince his own party members to take the same attitude (Letter, by Lenin, from Krakau to S. Shaumian, November 23, 1913).

After usurpation of power in Russia on November 7, 1917 Lenin showed utmost hostility toward the liberation of all non-Russian nations, dominated by the Russian Empire. The Declaration of Rights for nations of Russia, accepted by the Bolshevik Government, was a repetition of the national policy as it was formulated previously in the program of the Bolshevik Party by Lenin.

The treatment of Byelorussia, headed by the Lenin government—was as follows. The First All-Byelorussian Congress consisting of 1,872 representatives convened in Mienisk on December 15, 1917. This was a national Byelorussian assembly, whose aim was to decide the future statehood of Byelorussia. Bolshevik-Russian delegates were in a small minority. They were not able to influence the Congressional decisions. The Congress has chosen independence for the Byelorussian state. On December 17, 1917 the Red Russian Army dispersed the Congress by order of the Soviet Russian Government.

During the continuing war, at a favorable situation, the Council of the First All-Byelorussian Congress proclaimed independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918. In opposition to this independent Byelorussian state Lenin ordered the creation of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (BSSR). This fictitious state, as well as its government, were created by the Soviet Government in Moscow, Proclamation of the BSSR took place on January 1, 1919 in the city of Smalensk which was conquered by Russia.

Later, the Soviet Russian Army conquered most of Byelorussia. Concluding peace treaty with Poland in Riga in 1921, Lenin without representatives from the BSSR divided the territory of Byelorussia as follows: The BSSR was alloted a territory of six counties of the Miensk district only, with a population of approximately 1.2 million. Poland was given approximately 100,000 sq. km. of Byelorussia with a population of approximately 4 million. Directly to Russian SFSR there was annexed approximately 250,000 sq. km. of Byelorussian territory with a population of over 9 million. This partition of Byelorussia and subjugation of her people existed until the death of Lenin. In this way Lenin brutally suppressed the aims of the Byelorussian

people for self-determination and independence, and turned into a colonial people of Soviet Russia.

By introduction of his own totalitarian communist regime in Byelorussia, Lenin deprived Byelorussian people of all its human rights and freedoms, the rights recognized by the Western World at this time, and proclaimed earlier by the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. Those rights being: freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, freedom of press, freedom of association, freedom of worship, freedom of economical activity, freedom to elect one's own government, freedom to choose one's habitat and travel abroad, immunity of home, independence of judiciary, etc. Freedom of activity was given to the Bolshevik Party only, which was executing orders from the central government in Moscow. The leadership of this party in Byelorussia was composed of non-Byelorussians. It was a reliable instrument for domination over the Byelorussian nation.

The constitution of the BSSR, as well as the USSR, guaranteed in writing most of the above mentioned freedoms. However, these constitutions exist on paper only to mislead the foreign opinion. In reality the Bolshevik Party is using such policies which are suiting her aims, ignoring completely existing constitutions.

Lenin introduced a very brutal tyranny by governing Bolshevik Party superiors. Called by him, hypocritically, "workers' and peasants' government", as well as a Central Committee of the Bolshevik Party, included neither a single worker, not a peasant. The Communist Party occupied a privileged place, that which was previously held by nobility in czarist era.

The Bolshevik Party represented a new ruling class of fascist type. It used a limitless and merciless exploitation of working people. Starvation and hunger, shortage of all necessary articles existed in reality during Lenin's rule. Only the members of the Communist Party were supplied through special exclusive distribution stores, unaccessible to the rest of the population.

This oppression of people was possible only by the use of mass and ruthless terror. In this field Lenin showed extraordinary ability. He organized Cheka (Extarordinary Committee—Secret Police) headed by the notorious F. Derzhynsky. This mill of death had no other predecessor in modern history. The infamous czarist security service (okhranka) in comparison with Cheka was a very liberal institution. The surveillance by police was raised to systematic denunciation of each person. The Cheka kept an accumulative personal file on all. A new crime was discovered in which each person became a suspect—the potential enemy of the Soviet Government. The arrests of innocent people in mass as those potential enemies; the relentless savage abuse and torture of imprisoned people, who were admitting the non-committed crimes; the shooting of people en mass without trial—all this, as a sword of Damocles, was hanging over a defenseless people, murdered by Lenin's bureaucrats, immune to any responsibility.

Lenin is the father of Russian Bolshevism, that which is oppressing Byelorussian people for over 50 years. This period is the most severe and tragic of all Byelorussian history. During this time the Bolshevik Moscow annihilated over 6 million Byelorussians. But, at the present time, using systematic Russianization, deportations of Byelorussians to Siberia, and colonization of Byelorussia by Russians, the Moscow Government is attempting a complete removal from the globe of the separate Byelorussian nation and transforming it into a part of Russia. This genocide is a direct result of the Leninist national policies applied towards non-Russian nations of the USSR.

Miss Svetlana Alliluyeva, daughter of J. Stalin, recently made this public statement, ". . . all of this did not begin with my father. So many people think that he invented the system, the dictatorship, the police, the spying. But he didn't. He inherited it all from Lenin."

Lenin projected conquest of the entire globe by Bolshevism. He designed a universal USSR, of course, under the hegemony of Soviet Russia. This design is used by the present government of Moscow as a current program of realization. Soviet Russia is giving top priority to the development of her own military power, and is gradually realizing the testament of Lenin on the conquest and enslavement of the remaining independent countries. This subjugation of nations of central Europe after the 2nd World War, communist expansion in Greece, Korea and Vietnam, the recent military invasion into Czechoslovakia, all these are the concurrent steps leading towards the realization of the expansionist plan designed by Lenin.

We are assuming, that proposal to commemorate the birthday of Lenin in the United Nations was initiated by the representatives from Soviet Russia, or by their subservient countries-satellites. The real aim behind this diversionist maneuver is to disorient nations of the free world, and to make them more vulnerable to gradual absorption by Moscow.

We would like to call your kind attention to the fact that this commemoration would be a most cynical humiliation of the idea of humanism. It would be a public mockery of human rights as defined by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted by the United Nations. It will demonstrate a flagrant injustice expressed by the free countries towards the Byelorussian nation, which was conquered, oppressed and suffered heavily under Lenin's terrorist rule, as well as under the rule, inspired by him, of the present Government of Soviet Russia. We would like to ask you for decisive rejection of this celebration as completely inappropriate for people honoring freedom and justice for all.

At this time, the Byelorussians living in their native country do not have any opportunity to defend their national interests. Therefore, we take liberty to ask you for support of the desires of the Byelorussian people for liberation from Soviet Russian slavery, and for restoration of an independent Byelorussian state.

JUDGE RICHARD E. FIELDS ELEVATED

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the elevation of Associate Judge Richard E. Fields to the judge of the municipal court of Charleston was a very popular decision by the County Council of Charleston.

Judge Fields is the first Negro in the memory of modern Charlestonians to serve as municipal judge—or to hold any judgeship.

Judge Fields has distinguished himself by training, by demeanor, by temperament, and professional legal ability to hold the positions which he has held and which he will hold.

I am very proud that he succeeds my friend, Judge Condon, who, likewise, has distinguished himself as municipal judge.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an editorial from today's News and Courier, America's most outspoken newspaper and the South's oldest daily paper entitled, "Municipal Court":

MUNICIPAL COURT

Elevation of Associate Judge Richard E. Fields to be judge of the Municipal Court of Charleston is a logical and popular decision by unanimous vote of City Council. Judge Fields again makes local history by becoming the first Negro to hold this title. Since we applauded his appointment as associate judge we are pleased to join again in applause at the promotion.

Judge Fields had an outstanding reputation as a lawyer when he accepted the judicial appointment. In his handling of cases he has lived up to expectations. Appointment of Thomas S. Tisdale Jr., an able young attorney, to fill the vacancy created by resignation of Judge Louis E. Condon will fill the quota of judges in an important function of local government.

CAPT. ROBERT W. WILBUR, JR., RECEIVES FAA AWARD

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join Secretary of Transportation John Volpe in praising the heroic performance of Eastern Air Lines captain, Robert W. Wilbur, Jr. Captain Wilbur was awarded the Federal Aviation Administration's highest award, the Award for Extraordinary Service, at a presentation at Massachusetts General Hospital.

Captain Wilbur was shot in both arms by John J. Divivo, a passenger who burst into the cockpit of a jet shuttle flight from New York to Boston. Wilbur's copilot, First Officer James Hartley, was mortally wounded as he struggled to disarm the gunman. Captain Wilbur brought the DC–9 Jetliner down safely, in spite of his wounds.

Captain Wilbur was commended by the U.S. Senate for his "extraordinary heroism," and the official citation praised his "masterful feat of airmanship which revealed extraordinary heroism, faultless skill, and courageous equanimity. His poise and professionalism under conditions of maximum adversity warrant the admiration and gratitude not only of the 70 others aboard his aircraft but of the entire aviation community and American public at large."

I agree—and agree wholly.

Secretary Volpe said yesterday:

Captain Wilbur's actions were extraordinary. Wounded, his friend dying beside him, their assailant lying wounded on the floor behind him, Captain Wilbur cooly went through the landing procedures—even to lighting the "No Smoking" and "Seat Belt" Signs, an action which helped calm the passengers—and brought the plane in perfectly.

One of only eight men who have earned the FAA's highest award, Captain Wilbur has amply demonstrated the kind of courage and professionalism the Award for Extraordinary Service demands.

ENCOURAGING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the majority of American citizens recognize the need to end poverty in the United States. Unfortunately, this is not the case in regard to the need to encourage peaceful economic and social change in the rest of the world. All to many Americans believe that we can ignore the increasing gap between the rich nations and the poor nations.

But we ignore this gap at our own peril Mr. Speaker. Events in areas far removed from our own country can have a profound impact on us here at home. Revolutions, civil wars, wars of national liberation, all feed on the discontent caused by the abject poverty of much of the world's population. Fortunately, groups like the Friends Committee on National Legislation whose policy report on international development included below are aware of the need to build a stable world community in which the distribution of wealth more closely approximates that of equals than of clients and masters.

The policy statement of the Friends Committee on National Legislation follows:

ENCOURAGING INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT: CHALLENGE TO THE CONSCIENCE AND COMMONSENSE OF AMERICA

(A policy statement of the Friends Committee on National Legislation approved at the annual meeting, Washington, D.C., January 18, 1970)

NEW VISION NEEDED

The United Nations has declared the 1970's as the Second Decade of Development in which much greater progress must be made. FCNL educational and legislative goals on international development and trade should incorporate new thinking to answer questions like these:

1. How can the American people and Congress become convinced that there must be a major, new undertaking to assist developing nations in their struggle against poverty, ignorance, hunger and disease—because this is a moral imperative, because it is in the long-range national interest and because it is essential in building a peaceful world?

2. How can the United States both end poverty at home and do its fair share in enabling developing nations to raise living standards? If the United States cannot end poverty at home, does it have much to offer the world?

3. How can developing nations change their existing institutions and attitudes rapidly enough, through non-violent means, to meet people's rising expectations for a better life, dignity and justice?

4. How can mankind develop satisfying ways of living without exhausting the world's resources and ruining the human environment? Is industrialization a means to that end?

5. How can all countries develop public attitudes and social incentives necessary to stabilize world population?

We believe that new vision is necessary in order that mankind may grasp the unprecedented opportunities to become an interdependent, cooperative family. The United States has a moral imperative to share our great wealth and help build a comprehensive world community of all peoples. Even strict, enlightened self-interest requires the United States to provide its share of leadership in this direction. This demands commitment by the people and Congress of the United States to an international trading system which encourages peaceful economic and social development and to an annual investment of at least 2% of American Gross National Product in assistance to the developing nations.

Such commitment must be based on a concept of a world unified in its will and capability to eliminate hunger, illiteracy, and disease and stabilize over-population, but rich in diverse cultural values Such a vision can be realized by reordering priorities replacing the pursuit of the arms race with the pursuit of an enhancement of human dignity. Such a world can be achieved through a strengthening of the institutions of cooperation among nations.

We believe the United States has the economic capacity both to meet our current huge domestic needs and also to play a responsible role in international development. Utilizing even a part of the funds now going for arms would provide a huge reservoir for development. If this proves inadequate we would be prepared to support a reduction in American affluence to achieve these goals.

One challenge of the 1970's is to achieve a cooperative working relationship among the Communist and non-Communist developed nations which will promote rather than retard the process of international development. Another challenge is to encourage a broadening of popular participation in the political life and economic benefits of all nations.

The price of success is small. Increasing the purchasing power of developing nations by lowering trade barriers, easing debt burdens, and stabilizing commodity prices will force painful readjustments on some sectors of the American economy but will in the long run increase U.S. prosperity. The investment of at least 1% of GNP by our government and up to 1% by private industry and by non-governmental agencies will be a small sacrifice in relation to the 9% of GNP now being devoted to military expenditures. However, it will mean a tripling of assistance funds over the present outlay.

The price of failure is frightening. The majority of the world's citizens face desperation as the gap between the rich and the poor nations widens each year. In the greatest migration the world has ever known, cities are doubling their population every ten years, largely through the growth of slums where unemployment, social disorganization and despair are rife. There is an inexcusable waste of human skills and energy and an increased danger of conflict. The nationalism which can create the will to development may, under these conditions, be turned to international tension and war.

We believe that new forces are at work which have potential to achieve this vision and thereby provide a heritage of hope for future generations. These forces are:

TECHNOLOGY

Technology provides many material blessings for man. It can improve significantly his standard of living and the quality of life through more and better food, clothing and housing, through family limitation, desalination of sea water, better communication, transportation, urban development and many other ways. But the rapidly spreading technological culture currently consumes irreplaceable natural resources at an accelerating pace, spreads pollution into our air, rivers and oceans, and exacts a vast human cost. The rapid urbanization of the world poses as yet unsolved problems of mass living in societies where machines and systems increasingly take priority over people. These are the subjects to which the world's scientists and technicians should now be devoting themselves, rather than to military research and development.

YOUTH

Most of the people in the developing world are less than 20 years old. The development of their full human potential is a first priority for the world. The young, not committed to many of the outmoded institutions and politics of the past, often find themselves in conflict with the "establishment." Fortunately, their loyalties often surmount narrow national racial or class boundaries. Many are devoting their full energies to the task of development in their own countries. But to be successful they will need more prophetic vision, imagination and balanced judgment than has been applied to international relations in the past.

DISSATISFACTION

The much discussed "revolution of rising expectations" is being followed by demands for political and economic revolution. Existing institutions in many countries are unable to keep pace with the demand for rapid change which has been created. In many cases, ruling groups represent a narrow segment of the whole population and block proposals for reform. Increasingly there are military governments. Struggles for power in many of these countries can involve major powers on opposite sides of internal disputes, thus diverting national energies from development and increasing conflict among the major powers.

INWARD-TURNING

We sense a world-wide trend to focus national energies on internal problems. On the whole, we believe this is healthy. In the developing countries rapid economic and social development requires hard work, sacrifice and the concentrated energies of the whole nation. There is no easy road to development, although the rate of growth can be stimulated by outside capital and technical assistance. To the extent that nationalism creates a sense of identity, cooperation and a framework for education and effective organization, it is crucial to development. But nationalism should not be diverted to focus on external or internal "enemies" or succumb to the temptation to seek scapegoats when frustrations arise. There must simultaneously be recognition of the fundamental fact of interdependence and awareness of the need for regional and international cooperation. This requires greater limitation on nation-states as such in favor of the common good.

DEVELOPING AS A LEARNING PROCESS

Only in recent years has man consciously attempted through a planned and coordinated effort to achieve rapid economic and social development. There have been many successful projects and in some cases, targets have been met beyond expectations. An analysis of the Pearson Commission report for the World Bank indicates:

Despite burgeoning population growth, incomes per head in developing nations grew at 2.0 to 2.5 percent per year. This per capita income growth compares favorably with the early experience of industrialized countries.

Industrial growth in low income countries in the 1960's has been more rapid than that in the industrialized countries.

New high-yield wheat and rice seeds and methods are bringing an agricultural revolution to the developing countries.

But experience has also been a hard master. There has been waste; there have been mistakes. In our own nation there is still no

clarity as to the best methods to end poverty and raise living standards for all people in the nation. The international problem is even more complex. There are infinitely complicated questions of motivation, priorities, financing, trade standards and administration. Development goals have often been confused with military and political aims to the detriment of sound progress.

Nevertheless, lessons have been learned and experience gained which will be invaluable in the years ahead. We urge a recognition that our knowledge and understanding of the process and requirements for development are improving steadily, providing assurance that future assistance can be more effectively used than in the past.

While we agree more study is needed on the complexities of the process of modernization and how to bring it about most effectively for the benefit of all, we have some unity and clarity on a number of points:

1. Priorities

In allocating scarce resources for development many factors must be considered. We believe several should receive priority:

Need, as indicated by current living standards and number of people affected;

Reasonable assurance that assistance will improve the lot of the lower and middle classes within the country;

Sound development plans which help assure assistance will be effectively and efficiently used and population stabilized.

In many developing nations a small political, military or economic elite enjoys most of the fruits of the system and has reaped the benefits of much of the "foreign aid" which the country has received. These elites are often supported by U.S. military policy and by U.S. business interests. In these nations there must be basic reforms, often including tax reform and land redistribution, if all citizens are to benefit. Development assistance in these cases should aid in the process of reform wherever possible. If programs can be designed to improve the lot of the common people directly through health, education and community assistance programs, and relief, these should be emphasized. Above all, such regimes should not be encouraged by military assistance.

We urge that all U.S. foreign military assistance, defense support and arms sales for credit or cash be ended now.

The United States must base its support of developing nations upon how effectively the Government is meeting the real needs of its disadvantaged people; not on some ideological litmus test such as the form of its government or its economic system.

2. Sharing of skills

The fulfillment of human potential is the keystone to development. We favor a broad increase in the sharing of knowledge and skills with the developing countries especially through voluntary agencies and multilateral technical assistance. We support the initiatives at the UN for establishing an international service corps. We feel that better training facilities and greater professional opportunities within the developing nations can stem the outflow of skilled persons to the industrial states. And better integration of technical assistance into the entire developmental process will increase the effective use of available capital. These and all development programs should be undertaken on the basis of long term commitments extending over a number of years. This permits more orderly and effective use of resources and of skills of competent people who are committing a large portion of their lives to international development.

3. Social development

Economic development and modernization often result in personal insecurity and breakdown of traditional family and community life. We have a special concern that broad community planning and development proceed apace with economic development in order to maximize human values and minimize the human cost of the development process. We urge increased attention to this factor. The best values of the older culture should be retained where possible and new programs adopted where necessary to help build a spirit of community, cooperation and dignity.

4. Adequate capital

Development requires a much larger transfer of capital to the developing countries than is now occurring. We advocate:

That the developed countries devote up to 2% of their gross national product for international development purposes, including at least 1% from official development sources as distinguished from private investment and credits. More transfers should be on a grant or low-interest, long-term-payment basis, in convertible currencies without tying assistance to purchases or pledges of sales of raw materials in the donor country; and

That new sources be found to obtain this additional capital: (a) from the new wealth created annually in the developed countries through increase in the gross national product, as, for example, assignment of a portion of the Special Drawing Rights of the International Monetary Fund to the developing nations; (b) from income resulting from exploitation of generally accepted international areas, such as the high seas and Antarctica; and (b) by immediate reallocation for economic development of the interest and principal on previous development loans as payments are made.

5. International trade and investment

While economic assistance can be a catalyst, nations achieve development primarily through the use of domestic savings and foreign exchange earnings. Increased international and interregional trade, therefore, is essential to sustain long-term development and sound relationships among the nations in our increasingly interdependent world. It is crucial also in the short run to complement development assistance, create jobs and generate foreign exchange. The developed countries must reduce their trade barriers and open channels of trade for products of the developing nations, along the lines recommended by the 77 "have-not" nations at the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development. International price stabilization for basic commodities is imperative.

Skills, technology and capital are also transferred to developing nations to a substantial degree through the activities of international business corporations. Some of these enterprises have been charged with "economic imperialism" and resistance to land tax and other reforms. One way to help avoid such abuses would be to develop and achieve acceptance of an international code of corporate practices, which an appropriate UN agency or the World Bank might take the lead in formulating. The U.S. government should discourage those practices by U.S. corporations abroad which are exploitative in nature. and should encourage fair wages and a fair return to the people of the country involved through taxation, coownership and expansion of indigenous control.

6. Population

Predictions of future population growth are astounding. All public and private efforts to institute sound programs of family planning and population control should be supported. But it should be recognized that there is often only a limited role that "outsiders" can play without generating adverse reactions. As a part of our individual responsibility to stop population growth, we should limit the size of our own families to two children, adopting others if a larger family is desired.

7. Food

The green revolution resulting from new seeds, fertilizers, irrigation, production and organization methods fortunately has created a major breakthrough in food production in many countries. However, there is little prospect of feeding the world until population growth is stopped. Attention must continue to be focused on nutrition in order to insure that growing children, especially, are not damaged by malnutrition. Care must be taken that intensive farming operations do not harm the nutritional quality of the food produced, nor the soil, water or related environment.

Moreover, the U.S. must recognize that the developing countries must also have markets for their agricultural products, therefore the U.S. should not adopt policies which unfairly subsidize sales of U.S. farm products abroad.

8. Channels

The need for assistance is so great that all possible channels must be used—multinational, bilateral, public and private. Each can play an important role in individual situations. We see special advantages in using international channels which strengthen international institutions, reinforce the concept of international cooperation, and are able to draw upon resources and personnel from a wider range than bilateral or national programs. Hence we strongly support the work of the "family" of UN development programs such as the United Nations Development Programme, the Specialized Agencies, the World Bank and its affiliated International Development Association and regional economic commissions. We also support regional organizations for development such as regional banks, common markets and consortia, as well as regional development projects such as those for the Mekong River and the Indus Basin.

Programs by private groups—churches, foundations, universities, cooperatives, and others—supplement large governmental programs and can often play a pioneering and experimental role. They also evidence solid public support for the concept of international development. We commend especially efforts such as the Quaker "One Percent More Fund" which ask contributors to share 1% of their income for international development.

Bilateral programs still provide the bulk of funds for international development. In the past these programs have been viewed with considerable skepticism. Some have seemed designed basically for the military, political or narrow economic advantage of the donor nation. Others have benefitted a narrow sector in the recipient country.

We urge that U.S. bilateral development assistance concentrate on projects which have the support of competent international planning agencies, and which are designed to be of direct benefit to large masses of people, as in those authorized by Title IX of current aid legislation.

Overall, there should be greater international coordination of aid, trade and investment policies. A United Nations sponsored group should make an inventory of world need, recommend priority programs, help coordinate the various international, bilateral and private efforts, and evaulate the quality of performance.

9. Environment

As modernization occurs in the developing nations, they too will be required to deal with some of its byproducts such as pollution, waste of resources and dislocation of balances between man and nature. This raises fundamental questions regarding the nature and extent of desirable economic development. In this context the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment becomes especially significant. As a leading technologically oriented nation, the U.S. should take the initiative in formulating new and imaginative proposals for this Conference.

SMOKING CONTROVERSY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 18, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, those of us who attended last year's lengthy hearings on this bill were amazed to find, from the scores of scientific experts who appeared before us, that virtually no significant progress has been made in research to resolve the smoking controversy since the Congress last acted on this matter 5 years ago.

Last month, just as the conferees were about to meet on this bill, the American Cancer Society held a news conference to announce results of certain smoking experiments involving beagle dogs, in which some manifestations of lung cancer were said to have been observed. One witness before our committee had been Dr. Victor Buhler, one of America's most distinguished pathologists and a former president of the College of American Pathologists. Recalling his testimony regarding animal smoke inhalation studies, I wrote to Dr. Buhler and asked him to comment on this latest report. His reply strikes me as a perfect illustration of the difficulty of deriving real meaning from research results which are publicly reported, with great fanfare, before there has been any opportunity for critical scrutiny by qualified scientists.

Dr. Buhler's letter speaks for itself, and, without objection, I would like to share it with our colleagues, as follows:

ST. JOSEPH HOSPITAL,
Kansas City, Mo., February 21, 1970.

Hon. TIM LEE CARTER,
House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. CARTER: Thank you for your recent telegram in which you inquired about an animal smoke inhalation experiment announced by Drs. Auerbach and Hammond earlier this month.

In connection with my testimony before your Committee last April (which, of course, was long before Drs. Auerbach and Hammond announced their results), I stated that in some inhalation experiments "there has been considerable trauma to the respiratory system of the animal by the procedures used." I went on to say that if lung cancer were produced by this experimental method, "I would have to question the effect which the trauma itself might have had in the result."

The method used by Dr. Auerbach is just such an experiment to which I made reference. He used dogs (beagles) who "smoked" in an unnatural way by means of a surgical incision in the neck tissues and trachea which was permanently kept patent by use of a foreign body (a hollow tube). This is certainly much different than the way in which a human being smokes a cigarette.

As you know, a scientist usually informs his colleagues and shares the knowledge of his experimental work by publishing the results of his experiment in a reputable scientific journal. The results of the latest Auerbach experiment have not been so published. My first knowledge of these experiments came from a front page article in our local newspaper.

Immediately after the newspaper article appeared, I obtained a copy of the report which was the basis for the newspaper publicity. I have read this report several times and carefully reviewed its contents. In responding to your request for my comments, I am compelled to say that the report raises several important questions. For example:

1. Experimental results offered as scientific evidence are only as good as, and can be no better than, the experimental model used. With this in mind, how can anyone claim that this experiment approximates the natural method of smoking in humans? The method used by Dr. Auerbach involves the direct delivery of cigarette smoke to the lower trachea, the bronchi and the lungs, thereby bypassing the oral cavity, the pharynx, the larynx and the upper portion of the trachea. A tracheotomy is a most unnatural way for an animal to breathe and certainly introduces the possibility of infection, both bacterial and viral, not only from the tracheotomy, but also by the constant irritation of the hollow tube used to keep the tracheotomy patent. I should think that such a technique would arouse extreme skepticism. Not only were all of the protective mechanisms of the upper respiratory tract not allowed to function, but also the mixing of air and smoke which occurs under normal smoking conditions could not have occurred. In earlier beagle dog experiments, Dr. Auerbach reported that five successive inhalations of smoke were taken in by the dog without intervening inhalation of air. The dog's mouth and nostrils would presumably have to be closed by physical force so as to allow for inhalation through the hollow tube in the throat. These indisputably traumatic conditions could in themselves be causative and therefore create extreme doubt as to the meaning of the reported results.

2. It may well be that the dog is not a suitable animal for lung experimentation. For example, McLaughlin, Tyler and Canada have warned experimenters in their article entitled "A Study of the Subgross Pulmonary Anatomy in Various Mammals", American Journal of Anatomy 108(2): 149–165 (1961), that ". . . great caution should be exercised in the choice of an experimental animal for pulmonary studies if they are to be applied to man. This is especially so if the dog, cat, or monkey are to be used, in view of their marked anatomical differences from man."

3. Why were there only eight control dogs out of a total original population of ninety-seven dogs? Were the control dogs subjected to simulated smoking and otherwise treated in every way as were the other dogs? It does not appear that a properly controlled air stream directed through the tracheostoma was substituted for "smoke" and unless this was done I am inclined to question whether these eight dogs could be deemed adequate controls.

4. It is not at all clear what Dr. Auerbach means by the word "early" in his reference to "early squamous cell bronchial carcinomas." This is not standard terminology so I do not know whether he has reference to "carcinoma-in-situ" or to some other lesion. Since Dr. Auerbach's results have not been published, including adequate photographs, and since the criteria utilized are not clear, one should exercise great caution in drawing any conclusions at this time from the descriptive phraseology used.

5. Most of the "invasive tumors" reported in the dogs that "smoked" were described as being of a bronochioloalveolar type. This is the type of cancer which is infrequent in human beings. Even the Public Health Service has not associated this type of tumor with cigarette smoking. Does Dr. Auerbach refute his previous reports of a relationship of squamous cell carcinoma and smoking in humans by now claiming that the bronchioloalveolar type is more prevalent? [I should add that I *cannot* determine from the report how many "invasive tumors" *in all* were tumors deemed malignant, whether bronchiolo-aleveolar or squamous, had metastasized.]

6. Dr. Auerbach has reported tumors in over sixty percent of the "smoking" dogs in the groups sacrificed. Based on my knowledge and experience, there is no such incidence, similar to these statistics, in any human population.

7. Similarly, an amazing twenty-five percent of the non-smoking dogs were reported to have developed tumors. What might the percentage have been if the dogs had been allowed to live out their entire lives? Serious questions are raised by this reported finding with respect to the use, not just of dogs generally, but of the beagles in this particular experiment. Was any real control of genetic, viral, environmental and other factors imposed?

Medical "breakthroughs", usually announced in newspaper headlines, often turn out to be disappointments when subjected to careful scientific scrutiny. For example, a December 1967 article by Harris and Negroni reported the production of lung tumors in cigarette smoking mice. It was hailed by an American Cancer Society sponsored bulletin, widely distributed to dentists and physicians, as undermining "one of the long-standing defenses of the tobacco industry." The headline on the story read "Lung Cancer: Another Experimental 'First'." But in the published article, the authors cautioned that "the mouse lung cannot be equated histologically with the human lung, and so 'degrees of carcinogenicity' derived in one system may have no validity for the other." Even HEW's *1968 Supplement to The Health Consequences of Smoking* summed up this "scientific breakthrough" as follows: "Harris and Negroni, in experiments with C–57 black mice, *some* of which were inoculated with viruses, achieved *some* enhancement of adenocarcinoma, but *did not* produce any proven squamous cell cancers."

It must be remembered that scientists have failed to induce human type lung cancer in animal experiments for nearly thirty years by having the animals inhale cigarette smoke. In view of these findings, the unpublished report by Dr. Auerback must be viewed with considerable restraint. I sincerely hope that his reporting of "early squamous cell bronchial carcinoma" in only two dogs will not be viewed by your Committee as scientific proof as to whether or not cigarette smoking has been established as the cause of lung cancer in humans.

Respectfully,

VICTOR B. BUHLER, M.D.,
Pathologist.

SUPPORT FOR ISRAEL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the national interest of the United States dictates that we do everything within our power to preserve peace in the Middle East.

Peace in the Middle East is only possible if the Israelis and Arabs sit down and negotiate a peace treaty. History does not record any peace settlement achieved without a joint effort of the contending parties to settle all outstanding claims around the conference table.

It is in this context we must review the recent refusal by President Nixon to provide warplanes for Israel.

This action by the President will not help toward peace, it will hinder it. The Israelis are ready to go to a peace conference tomorrow. It is the Arabs who refuse to negotiate—even to talk. They will continue to refuse to talk as long as they have hope that they can destroy the State of Israel.

Any suggestion that Israel cannot obtain the necessary strength to defend herself only encourages Arab intransigence, perpetuates the present dangerous situation and prevents the achievement of a meaningful peace.

Because of the overwhelming preponderance of Arab manpower, Israel needs desperately control of the air. To maintain that control, a reasonably predictable supply of aircraft and parts is indispensable.

With the commitment of 100 French Mystere jets to Libya by the French Government, it is obvious that Israel faces a major challenge within the near future.

The Nixon policy seems to be one of brinkmanship, a painful reminder of the John Foster Dulles failures of the past.

I urge the President to rethink this policy now and to assure Israel the support necessary for its self-defense and survival.

AGAINST ALL ENEMIES

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. In the March 1970 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings appears an article authored by Capt. Robert J. Hanks, U.S. Navy, that deserves the attention of each Member of this and the other body. This article is apparently the Institute's "prize essay for 1970" and is a lucid and penetrating piece which offers real insight into the problems confronting our dedicated but very much maligned members of our Armed Forces by a segment of today's society that should know better.

The essay entitled "Against All Enemies" follows:

AGAINST ALL ENEMIES

(By Capt. Robert J. Hanks, U.S. Navy)

"For it's Tommy this an' Tommy that, an' 'Chuck him out, the brute!'
But it's 'Savior of 'is country' when the guns begin to shoot;"

When Rudyard Kipling penned these words nearly 80 years ago, he described the British regular soldier as he was traditionally viewed by his countrymen. Though the United States of 1970 bears no resemblance to Kipling's Victorian England, the words could nonetheless be applied today to America's fighting men. In fact, some phrases now being tossed about are much more vitriolic than the second line of the above stanza.

Those who currently wear the uniform of the nation's armed forces are being branded as everything from idiots to conspirators. Military men—together with a large group of "conniving industrialists"—are charged with having formed an insidious coalition designed solely to extract unending self-enrichment from the labors of the American people. This conspiratorial concept holds that the military man's payoff comprises large amounts of money and liquor, the favors of co-operative women, and promises of lucrative jobs following retirement. Moreover, his basic perfidy is compounded by a narrow-minded and potentially disastrous willingness to destroy all life on earth if Communism—man's ultimate enemy in his benighted view—seems to be a serious threat. And finally, along with the vast army of bellicose veterans he has trained and indoctrinated in the past quarter of a century, he has transformed the United States into a militaristic and predatory nation which now preys upon the rest of the world.

Examined from any angle, this is a shocking picture. And it poses a rash of questions: Who levels such charges? Are the accusations true? How dangerous are they? Most important of all: What should be done about the assault?

To begin with, it must be understood that this is no academic exercise, for upon the answers to these questions most assuredly rests the future security of the United States. The charges cannot, therefore, be brushed aside and ignored on the assumption that, like previous anti-military campaigns in America, they will fade away before any grave damage is done. This is especially true if today's critics are more numerous or, above all, more influential than the usual lunatic fringe—those who will senselessly attack any available target at any given opportunity.

A survey of these critics—both actual members of the anti-military clique, and those whose utterances the cabal exploits—reveals that we are confronted with a highly articulate and extremely influential body. It therefore behooves us to listen most carefully to and examine as objectively as possible the charges that are being made.

The following spokesmen formulate probably the most effective pronouncements currently trumpeted by the anti-militarists. It should not be inferred, however, that the former individuals are labeled herein either as leaders or members of the anti-military movement. Nor are they being classified anti-military per se. But because their words serve as eminent fuel for use by those who tend the anti-military fires, the views of these critics are vitally important. Lastly, one must note that their views will be scrutinized quite without regard to any particular order of motivation, influence, believability or sincerity.

At the outset it might be wise to digress or to speculate about the atmosphere within America that has spawned and nurtured the current outcry.

It seems reasonably clear that there are two basic causes. First and foremost is the war in Vietnam. This Southeast Asian conflict is one of the least understood—and therefore most unpopular—wars in our history, primarily because the attempts of three Administrations have failed to explain to the American people in convincing terms the nature of the war and the stakes involved. This failure and America's historic impatience syndrome have combined to disillusion and discourage a large segment of the population. With disenchantment has come increasingly vocal opposition to the war—and to the military.

The second major cause is strictly domestic: an explosive drive by minority groups—ethnic and economic—for instant political power, social equality, and financial affluence. This drive directly re-enforces the anti-war fever insofar as it involves competition for the national dollar; most especially, competition for that portion of the American budget presently devoted to defense.

Taken together, these two fundamental factors have contributed heavily to growing disrespect for constituted authority, urban riots, academic chaos, moral decline, predominance of personal aspirations over national well-being and, in extreme cases, the spectre of revolution and anarchy. It is against this backdrop that one must view the phrases now being lobbed into the military camp.

Perhaps the most widely known dissenter in the United States is Senator J. William Fulbright. He has long been a critic of defense spending; in particular, of how the arms produced by that spending are used. His objections to the Bay of Pigs and Dominican Republic crises are well known. So are his 1964 expressions of astonishment over the "uncritical support" the American people annually give to military funding. Since 1965, of course, the Senator has used his position as Chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee as a springboard for an unswerving campaign against the war in Vietnam; an issue he has clung to with the tenacity of a bulldog worrying a bone.

Until recently, however, Senator Fulbright's efforts have affected the military itself only indirectly. Deeply concerned with nationalism, which he considers the most dangerous force in this century, he advocates co-operative international approaches in almost every field of endeavor. He admits that nationalism cannot be legislated out of existence and therefore insists that the United States must lead the way by moving in the direction of a broader world community, while simultaneously directing substantially more of its collective energies toward the welfare of individuals. Implicit in this program is a considerable reduction in U.S. defense spending, first of all, to provide greater welfare support and, secondly, to demonstrate by example American willingness to lay down her arms. The Senator confesses that "to bring about [such] fundamental changes in the world we would have to take certain chances." Among them would be assuming the risk—he admits this is great—that other countries would read our "generous initiatives" wrongly and "bring about a calamity."

There is another thrust to Senator Fulbright's actions. Since 1965, he has hammered away incessantly at a "Constitutional erosion" which, in his view, has at once shouldered the Senate out of the foreign policy arena and witnessed Pentagon usurpation of all State Department prerogatives in the formulation and conduct of that foreign policy. One wonders parenthetically if the Senator believes that the locus of this usurpation has now shifted from the Pentagon to Henry Kissinger's basement office in the White House. In any event, this segment of Senator Fulbright's dissent has been directed mainly at the civilian portion of the Executive Branch rather than—a few instances excepted—at the military services themselves.

In recent months, as his apparent frustration over Vietnam continued to grow, and as he increasingly turned his attention to arms control negotiations with the Soviets, Senator Fulbright expanded his target list to include direct questioning of military leaders, their beliefs and judgment. Again, using the ready-made forum of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, he first trained his sights on U.S. overseas deployments, bases, and commitments. Then, in early 1969, he moved on his most spectacular target, the Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile System. Devoting special attention to military evaluations and recommendations, he achieved more than a little success in opening up a military credibility gap. His efforts drew loud hurrahs from hard-core anti-militarists across the country.

Nevertheless it must be emphasized that the Senator's campaign has been more implicit than explicit insofar as direct ef-

fects on the military itself are concerned. At the same time it must also be recognized that if his view of the external threat to the United States is overly sanguine, the net impact of his dissent could prove as dangerous as the fulminations of those who advocate immediate and complete unilateral disarmament of the United States.

More prolific in a literary sense and certainly more direct in his approach is another spokesman to whom the anti-military group looks for words and dogma. John Kenneth Galbraith is a long-time and most articulate liberal, a writer of some note—author of best-sellers—and former courtier of John Kennedy's Camelot. Mr. Galbraith is also an unabashed and outspoken battler against what he sees as the ultimate evil: the military-industrial complex. Perhaps the most revealing view of the beliefs held by this former chairman of the Americans for Democratic Action is provided by an article published in the June 1969 issue of *Harper's Magazine:* "How to Control the Military." As the title of his dissertation suggests, Mr. Galbraith claims that the military and its industrial allies have seized control of the country, placed its war chariot out in front, and are busily whipping the horses into a lather—in a headlong race to disaster. If any uninformed man has lingering doubts about the seriousness of the challenge confronting him or the capabilities of those who espouse the anti-military cause, he had better devote a few unemotional minutes to reading Galbraith's article.

Mr. Galbraith disclaims any belief in the conspiracy concept. He does so unconvincingly, however, observing almost immediately thereafter that "It would be idle to suppose that presently serving officers—those for example on assignment to defense plants—never have their real income improved by wealthy contractors with whom they are working, forswear all favors, entertain themselves, and sleep austerly alone." Then having neatly assassinated the entire officer corps, he reveals that he actually objects to the conspiracy theory, not because it is fallacious, but because it is gravely damaging to an understanding of the "military power," a commodity he forthwith defines for the benefit of the unanointed.

Comprising the "four Armed Services" [sic—with due apologies to the U.S. Marine Corps], the military industrialists, intelligence agencies, Foreign Service Officers, the Defense-oriented think-tanks, and the Congressional Armed Services Committees, "military power" makes decisions based upon its own private needs, quite without regard for the imperatives of the nation or the national good. Such is the Galbraithian view.

Unlike the unthinking anarchists and idealists who seem to predominate on dissident picket lines, however, the sage of Cambridge has a solution. After explaining how this military juggernaut came to power, he offers an Olympian "political Decalogue"—his own Ten Commandments—to guide those of his disciples who seek to regain "control of the military."

His program is a broad one. It entails the election of a new President, purge of Congressional Armed Services Committees, and above all: organization. Its goal is control of the military through resistance to military programs, mobilization of scientific judgment, and negotiation with the Soviets. Galbraith professes that his is not a crusade against the military man himself, then states that World War II military leaders would be appalled to find their modern counterparts handmaidens of the arms producers. One might note at this point that the pen—herein at its innuendo best—is indeed mightier than the sword.

Because his academic robe is figuratively festooned with professorial, ambassadorial, doctoral, and liberal service badges, Galbraith exerts considerable influence in the land, especially amidst the political left and in the realm of academe. His assertions and dictums cannot therefore be ignored. They must be exposed and rebutted.

Then there is another sort of spokesman for those who today are producing the kitchen heat which all in uniform feel. He is the military leader turned town-crier.

Certainly as far as military men are concerned, the most publicized and best known such pronouncement in recent months has been Marine General David M. Shoup's article in the April 1969 issue of *The Atlantic:* "The New American Militarism." Motivation for General Shoup's efforts (Colonel James A. Donovan, U.S.M.C., Ret., got precious little credit for his co-operation) is most difficult to assess. Available explanations range all the way from the General's apparent failure to become one of the "New Team" during the Kennedy years to the possibility that, having looked war square in the face, he has become a true convert to pacifism. The truth, of course, must as usual lie somewhere in between. Regardless of his motivation, though, one may be forgiven for agreeing with the *National Observer's* astute conclusion that he "has provided a distinct disservice."

As anyone who has read the article will agree, the General laid about his person with a king-sized club. After bowing briefly in the direction of President Dwight Eisenhower's farewell address—a statement to which many critics of the military allude, but which few quote in its entirety—the ex-Commandant of the Marine Corps brought in a plethora of indictments. Those who wear the military uniform—especially with insignia of senior rank—are enthralled with war, viewing it as a competitive game, and the highroad to promotion. They have only a narrow, military education (and, therefore, neither liberal nor cultural understanding); their primary loyalty is to their parent Service and the Department of Defense; they really do not understand Communism, either as a doctrine or a form of government; and they are more concerned with competing against aggression than with preserving the security of their own country. Moreover, they have brainwashed two generations of civilians—who initially held humanistic views—into becoming a bellicose, sword-waving second front. Unless these military officers are brought to heel, the poisonous weed they typify will surely kill the nation they have sworn to defend.

To the extent that articles such as this undermine the nation's security by destroying the credibility of those who manage the U.S. armed forces or by demanding unwarranted reductions in those forces, they are truly a "distinct disservice." Moreover, such articles are far more insidious than others because the authors appear to the layman as idealistic and high-minded insiders who, unable to change nefarious conditions from within, have undertaken full public exposure as the only remaining means of averting disaster. There seems little doubt that, in this instance, the General became an instant hero to the New Left, SDS, and others of similar persuasion. Far more importantly, he has probably sown a significant crop of doubt amongst the vast body of people. *Time* termed "middle Americans"—the bulk of the population, the people who dutifully pay their taxes, keep the nation running, and suffer radicals as well as their children in silence. And after all, it is this group which will ultimately decide the issue at hand.

Other voices are being raised in different ways, and they should not be overlooked. The messages vary widely.

Perhaps the most critical proposals are being made on Capitol Hill, because action taken there can force inordinate reductions in and unwise withdrawals of American military forces. For example, Senators Clifford P. Case and Walter F. Mondale—with their young staff assistants—have mounted a campaign against aircraft carriers. Senators Michael J. Mansfield and Stuart Symington were temporarily deflected from their drive to slash U.S. force levels in Europe only by the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia. New York's Senator Charles E. Goodell is attempting, at the time of this writing, to legislate complete troop withdrawal from Vietnam by 1 December 1970—regardless of the consequences.

Then there are the ignorant and intemperate tirades of the racial left. Such screechings will not be dignified with comment by this examination.

In microcosm, these are the kinds of words being used today to assault the American military. During the past months charges and accusations have grown from a trickle to a flood; a torrent which could ultimately submerge the military power of the United States. And the real danger in this assault lies in a few simple truths about the world in which we live.

It is a world of power politics. In that world are nations which wish America ill—perhaps one should be blunt: nations seeking, at the very least, our political demise. It matters not whether these nations act in concert or individually. (For this reason the issue of "monolithic Communism" is specious.) So long as one or more of these nations have the military power to inflict upon or threaten the United States with grievous national harm, then our security is in jeopardy. And so long as the United States has the military prowess to prevent such harm, or to deter it through assured capability to retaliate in greater measure, that security is preserved.

Our foreign antagonists clearly understand this power equation which has governed international relations, particularly since the beginning of World War II. After that war, those nations and blocs of nations who would profit from our political passing attempted to circumvent that equation. They tried in Europe, in Korea, Cuba, and now in Vietnam, but to date they have failed. Always, America's armed strength and dedicated fighting men have blocked the way. As a result, the United States remains—as she has been for two-and-a-half decades—the Free World's main bulwark against the omnipresent tide of slavery and totalitarianism.

The outcry against all things military in the United States, if carried to its ultimate end, would upset that international power equation and destroy American as well as Free World security. Thus, while the threat from without remains, we now face an equally potent challenge from within. It makes little difference whether that challenge is generated and sustained by those who, because of myopia, fail to perceive the external dangers confronting us; by those who, through misunderstanding or wishful thinking, believe our enemies would benignly allow us to turn our backs on the world and concentrate all our efforts on our domestic ills; or by those who are enemies in the true sense of the word—idolaters of Mao and the deceased Ho—seeking a revoluntionary Communist America. Nor does it matter if—as the *Long Beach Dispatch* put it—"a collection of liberals, misfits and ivory-tower dreamers, aided and abetted by either naive or calculating members of the media, are out to destroy the military itself." What does matter is that the continued existence of a free and democratic United States is at issue. There is an enemy within, regardless of his appearance or the design of the mantle with which he cloaks himself.

The question that now assumes critical importance for the military is: What should be done about it? The answer is not simple. One thing is abundantly clear, however, and that is what we should *not* do.

If the United States is to be protected against the efforts of those who would place her in peril—whether through apathy, ignorance, or malice—we in the military cannot

stand idly, silently by and watch it done. Our oath of office will not permit it.

Now is the time for everyone who wears the uniform of the American armed forces to take that oath out of the attic trunk, brush aside the dust it has collected, and read again the words upon it.

In concentrating on the main task of the past 30 years—the external threat—some of us may have forgotten that we solemnly swore to support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign *and domestic*. That pledge is not directed to a particular Service, a partisan belief, nor is it a license to hunt for personal gain. It is instead a dedication to prevent violent overthrow of a form of government Abraham Lincoln saw as the "last, best hope of earth." Our mission is clear: to ensure our country is not militarily weakened to the point that external enemies can, through the use of force, overthrow the U.S. Government and its Constitution.

No. We cannot remain either inactive or silent. Our oath of office most certainly does not condone such behavior.

But, before deciding what should be done, we must first ask ourselves another most difficult, but nonetheless vital question. How much truth is there in the accusations being hurled at the military?

In an organization as large as the U.S. armed forces, there are bound to be isolated cases of wrongdoing—cases which, when brought to light, are dealt with promptly by our uniformed services' leaders to the hilt of their political permissibility. Unfortunately, it takes only one such case to lend credibility to exaggerations and gross falsehoods that, though unrelated groundless, inevitably follow.

In an organization as large as the U.S. armed forces, there could be a very few who, as General Shoup claims, hunger for glory and are quite willing to sacrifice much to obtain it; there could be a very few who compromise principle and integrity for personal material gain; and there could be a few others who subjugate national need to individual Service pre-eminence. We in the military must redouble our efforts to guard against these isolated cases and, if and when they occur, we must continue to deal with them promptly and effectively.

Thus, if we in the armed services are to do our part in frustrating the aims of those who would turn the American eagle into a lamb, we must continue to single out and eliminate those among us who, by their avarice and indiscretion, despoil our integrity and destroy our credibility. Our regulations require it; American citizens deserve it. It is, moreover, not enough that we remain vigilant against wrongdoing itself; we must strengthen that vigilance against the exercise of poor judgment which gives the *appearance* of wrongdoing.

Secondly, we must police our own requirements even more rigidly if we are to disarm the critics who decry "unrestrained military spending." Specifically, we must continue our efforts to forestall justifiable criticism by attacking the problem of national military needs with hardheaded pragmatism and absolute honesty, necessarily leavened with political realism and fiscal responsibility. We cannot forget that, all too often, the vociferous critic needs only a small bit of evidence, real or apparent, to make believable a broad spectrum of accusations.

When John Kenneth Galbraith points his pen at bureaucratic institutionalism, for example, he can cite just enough evidence to make his follow-on shotgun condemnation credible; especially to the layman. When a senator uncovers one badly-written or carelessly monitored contract entailing any waste of funds, he can easily render a thousand ideal contracts suspect. When the armed services are accused of squandering public funds—be it on hardware, travel, research, or what have you—everything else we are trying to accomplish may be jeopardized.

We must continually ask ourselves, for instance, whether the American military establishment does contain some bloated staffs, worthless bases, unneeded weapons systems, or other examples of costs that cannot be supported on any rational basis—austere funding or otherwise. Insofar as the current budgetary reductions may cause us to eliminate such possible inefficiencies, they will serve us and the nation. If, on the other hand, we eliminate combat forces—the cutting edge of American military prowess—in order to hang onto a gaggle of military sacred cows, we will surely bring down on our own heads the legitimate anger of the very people we are pledged to defend. Like charity, responsibility begins at home. And, within the parameters of political reality, we must continue to be responsive to this responsibility.

We need to maintain unstinting self-vigilance because our very integrity is at issue. If, through indiscretions and sloppy practices, we permit our credibility to be shattered—it patently is chipped and cracked today—we can be sure that our sound advice and realistic requests soon will be *totally* ignored, even with respect to those issues which, in fact, mean life or death for the United States.

Safe in the knowledge that we are properly policing our *own* conduct and environment, we are free to turn our attention increasingly to those domestic critics who would, knowingly or inadvertently, gamble away U.S. national security.

And here it is pertinent to observe that while silence may be golden when fighting an aggressive external enemy, it is akin to sheer folly when combating assaults from within. In the latter instance, ammunition comprises words both spoken and written, and there is no place in such a conflict for a silent service. Moreover, the military man's historic reluctance to speak out must be overcome. Unless it is, and unless the military spokesman—buoyed by confidence in his own integrity and experience—confronts his critics directly, rather than speaking in bland, ineffectual generalities, he will make no headway at all in stemming the anti-military tide.

There is another vital requirement. As the very shrewd Galbraith noted, "There must be organization." Here we in the military are well endowed. (Certainly the SDS and others think so, judging from their efforts to subvert that organization from below.) It is an organization in being, needs only to be directed, and provides an almost infinite capacity for passing our own considered and documented view of American security needs to those most directly concerned: the vast, silent majority of the American people.

There is no other way, for instance, to counter assertions such as the one recently made by Marcus Raskin (co-director of Washington's Institute of Policy Studies) at the Conference on the Military Budget and National Priorities. He urged the abolition of the CIA, the National Security Agency, and the Defense Department within the next ten years. Only in this way, he claimed, can the "national security state" be eliminated and the continuance of a free society be assured. One can readily envisage two reactions to unchallenged irresponsibilities of this sort: chuckles of incredulity and delight in Moscow and Peking; and, in the United States, picket signs being hastily lettered by war, draft, and ROTC opponents.

Similarly, we owe it to the oath under which we serve to refute, item by item, the inaccuracies, half-truths and, in too many instances, utter nonsense which currently inundate American media.

Our approach to the problem must, of course, be a dual one. Refutation and rebuttal are essentially negative reactions. A set of positive answers is equally important; answers built around our carefully reasoned and convincingly documented conception of this nation's security needs in today's real world. Inherent in such a view is an accurate, up-to-date assessment of the external threat and what the United States needs to meet it. Those needs must be arrived at not only in the traditional way, but with the leavening provided by an objective consideration of domestic political and fiscal realities as well. Unless this latter input is included, we will fashion not just a credibility gap, but a vast chasm of distrust; one that will multiply the risks facing the United States just as surely as will many of the anti-military proposals being propounded today.

Let there be no mistake about it; the current attack upon the American military is acute—and it is growing in intensity. Joseph Kraft recently expressed the view that to succeed in "chaining the defense monster," the critics must keep shooting away. This view is widely held.

Carried to fruition, the anti-military campaign threatens to so weaken this nation's defenses as to place the United States in the greatest jeopardy in its history. After all, since we do live in a world of power politics, our ability to control our own national destiny continues to depend upon the military power which at once protects us from external attack, and constitutes the backbone of our foreign policy posture. Reasonable and informed Americans recognize that this state of affairs will probably continue to exist until the arrival of that elusive millenium when men and nations will at last conduct themselves according to the Ten Commandments—God's; not Galbraith's.

This particular domestic battle will not be easily won. Like the war in Vietnam, it is somewhat different from anything we in uniform have experienced in our past. Barbs hurled by the New Left, or by public figures who seek to convert public confusion and unease into political capital are neither new to U.S. society nor difficult to understand. Complexity enters the picture when current domestic ills are added, and the waters are muddied by self-seeking cop-outs from responsibility, on the one hand, and opportunists on the other. Finally, the confrontation is further complicated by an ingredient uncomfortably unfamiliar to the modern American fighting man: the necessity for him to defend to his own countrymen his motivation, his judgment, and above all, his integrity. This latter, of course, is the hardest cheese of all to swallow. Nevertheless, it must be done.

We have the resources and the capability to combat the assaults now being made upon the military. Even General Shoup admits that the American armed forces include large numbers of intelligent and articulate individuals. They must make themselves heard. In speeches, in writings, and in general conversation. The opportunities are myriad; we need only seize them.

Again one must insist that this is the worst possible moment for the American Servicemen to react to the current attacks with injured feelings, righteous indignation, panic, or withdrawal. Unlike Tommy Atkins, no Kipling speaks for us to remind Americans, as Kipling warned the British, that "Tommy ain't a bloomin' fool—you bet that Tommy sees!" To honor the oath we have taken, we must speak for ourselves. If we do so with the same dedication and professionalism that we have so abundantly displayed on wartime battlefields, we shall be equally successful in protecting this nation against those who now endanger it from within.

For, given the whole picture—not just the slanted and perverted glimpse being broadcast these days—the American people will speak out with the sound and reasoned majority voice which will preserve the United States and its democratic processes. They have done thus for two hundred years. If we

in the military keep our heads and faithfully honor the *whole* of our oath of office, they will be able to do so for another two hundred.

(NOTE.—A graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy with the Class of 1946, Captain Hanks served in the USS *St. Paul* (CA–73) from August 1945 to January 1949. He was assigned to AirASRon 892 in 1951–1952 and to the NROTC Unit at Oregon State University from 1952 to 1954. He was operations officer of the USS *Arnold J. Isbell* (DD–869) from 1954 to 1956, and for ComDesRon Eleven in 1956–57. He was executive officer of the USS *Floyd B. Parks* (DD–884) in 1960–1961, and commanded the USS *Boyd* (DD–544) from 1961 to 1963. Following two years on the staff of ComCruDesPac, he attended the Naval War College and, in 1966, he served first as Assistant for NATO Affairs, and then as Deputy Director for Nuclear Planning Affairs in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs). He is currently Commander Destroyer Squadron Thirteen.)

POSTAL REFORM AND THE UNION SHOP

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, one feature of the present legislation regarding postal reform which has been advanced by the administration is the introduction of the union shop principle for Federal employees. In his testimony before the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Postmaster General Winton Blount conceded that in States not having right-to-work statutes the union shop can be put into effect among postal workers. And there seems to be doubt as to whether those States having right-to-work laws would be excepted.

The March 20 issue of the Coshocton Tribune ran a column by the author and columnist, John Chamberlain, which warns against the use of the union shop in the postal reform package now being considered by Congress. His column "Flaw in Postal Reform Bill" follows:

FLAW IN POSTAL REFORM BILL

(By John Chamberlain)

President Nixon's blueprint for turning the mails over to an independent government corporation similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority has been approved by the House of Representatives Post Office Committee. So the postal reform people—and this includes most of us—may very well feel like giving three cheers.

On second thought we had better limit ourselves to two cheers or maybe a cheer-and-a-half. For, while an efficient government-owned but independently run postal corporation might do something to eliminate mail deficits, the bill, as it goes to the Rules Committee of the House, contains what has been called by the National Right to Work Committee the "hidden menace" of compulsory unionism.

Indeed, the bill would never have gotten past the formidable opposition of James Rademacher, the boss of the letter carriers union, if Postmaster General Winton Blount had not given in on the union shop question. If the bill goes through as it is now shaped up, it will be considered an unfair labor practice if the proposed new independent postal corporation refuses to bargain over the union shop.

This amounts to a 180-degree turnaround by President Richard Nixon. It was just about six months ago that the President reaffirmed the old John F. Kennedy principle that no federal worker should be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job. But now this principle—of according non-discrimination in hiring to U.S. citizens—is to be abandoned.

True enough, Postmaster General Blount has a rationale which he offers as an excuse for surrendering to the Rademacher union demands. By an ingenious quibble he argues that, once the post office is turned over to an independent body, the postal workers will no longer be "federal" employees. The Nixon executive order about a federal right-to-work guarantee would therefore, in Blount's estimation, cease to be operative. And the labor law of the land, which permits bargaining over the union shop in all the non-right-to-work-law states, must hold for all non-federal workers under the equal rights provision of the Constitution.

Such reasoning, however, is faulty on two counts. One is that it does not reckon with a logical inconsistency in the bill itself. The proposed legislation contains a clause that would prohibit strikes against the new corporation. Well, if the right to strike is to be denied, surely the right to bargain for a union shop could be prohibited, too. If Mr. Blount's stipulated "principle" can be ignored once, it can be ignored twice.

The more important objection to the Blount rationale is that turning a government function over to an "independent" corporation owned by the government does not "de-federalize" it. The hope is that a TVA-like mail corporation will be able to operate in the black. But what if it doesn't? What if it can't raise enough money in the private money market to construct new offices and to pay its bills? The Federal government would have to stand behind its obligations as the owner. If deficits should prove to be chronic, the taxpayer would be called upon to satisfy the creditors. Thus it is specious reasoning to say that the executive order shielding government employes against compulsory unionism should not be applied to postal workers under the proposed new law. A federally-owned corporation must, by definition, have federal employes.

The White House is going all out to push the new postal authority bill through. And Heaven knows it is time for postal reform. An independent mail-carrying body, whose ruling executive council would be composed of two Senators, two members of the House, seven Presidential appointees, and a director general and his deputy, would be an improvement on the present patronage-ridden organization. It would be even better if private enterprise were permitted to compete with the new government body. But if we are to continue with a national mail monopoly, there is no excuse for saddling it with a union shop, which could deny employment to non-union taxpayers who are, after all, part owners of anything that their government possesses.

HON. "TIC" FORRESTER

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of "Tic" Forrester's death last week—over the years we served together in the House I valued his friendship and admired his ability. "Tic" was small in stature, but he had a mighty voice and a great heart. He had strong opinions, and fought hard—and effectively—for his beliefs. I believe all who knew "Tic" derived benefit simply from knowing him and the way he lived his life—with strength and integrity and loyalty to his principles. While he was in Congress, "Tic" served the Nation and his district ably and honorably, and during his retirement he continued to be a valuable and contributing citizen. I am grateful for having had the opportunity to know "Tic," and I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Forrester on his death, and share her loss.

RAILROAD EMPLOYMENT ACT AMENDMENT NEEDED TO HELP UNEMPLOYED WORKERS

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take our colleagues' time this afternoon long enough to explain a serious situation which has come about as a result of legislation passed unanimously by this House in the 90th Congress.

In February 1968, President Johnson signed into law the 1968 amendments to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act. While this act included many improvements of the railroad unemployment insurance program, it also included a provision which adversely affects those railroad employees who need unemployment insurance protection most.

I am referring to section 4(a)(1)(iii), which makes railroad employees who receive severance pay or separation allowances ineligible to receive unemployment insurance benefits for the period covered by their severance pay. On its face, this may appear to be a reasonable limitation, but in practice it poses serious and unnecessary hardship.

As an example, I cite the case of over 400 employees in my congressional district, most of whom will be out of work after the Penn Central Railroad closes its car shop facilities in East Rochester, N.Y., on April 1.

I think, overall, the Penn Central, considering its shaky financial condition, has tried to be fair to these employees. The railroad offered jobs outside of the Rochester area—most outside New York State—to any employee who was willing to move.

Also, the railroad is paying the equivalent of 360 days pay as severance pay to employees remaining in the Rochester area. But in most cases, the employees involved are men who have given the best years of their lives to the railroad. They have worked at the car shops 10, 20, or 30 years. They and their wives and children—and in some cases grandchildren—have deep roots in their community. From many standpoints, it is difficult to imagine how they could relocate to a

strange and distant community. This is borne out by the fact that the vast majority of these Penn Central employees have decided to remain in East Rochester.

But even with the severance pay they will receive, almost to a man they and their families face a very difficult economic future: In a softening employment market, these men are finding equivalent jobs, and in some cases any jobs, difficult to find. Men earning $3.78 an hour find that the only jobs they can find mean a cut in pay of 30 to 40 percent of their present wage. A great number of these men are over 40, and thus find it even more difficult to find suitable reemployment. While their jobs have disappeared, their family and economic obligations remain.

Some would argue that the 360-day severance allowance is enough to compensate for these hardships. Not so. Assuming it will take many weeks, or even months for many of these men to find new work, the severance pay is in fact far less than the income these men have received on the railroad.

The severance pay is equivalent to wages not including any of the substantial fringe benefits these men have enjoyed as railroad employees. These men will be required to purchase health insurance amounting to $50 or more a month for their families. They are ineligible for sick pay. The fact that severance pay is paid to them in lump sum has a tremendous adverse effect on the withholding computation. The withholding tax rate is figured as if the total severance payment is the amount the employee earns in a single pay period, rather than over a full 16-month period.

So the severance allowance is in no sense equivalent to compensation these men would receive if the car shop facility were to remain open. Nor should it be looked upon as income to cover the period of 360 working days—or 16 months—which it supposedly covers. In a sense, this payment is a subjective valuation of the hardship caused to the employee and his family by his termination of employment by the railroad. It has only theoretical relationship to his compensation over any given period of time.

Mr. Speaker, if these employees were to receive severance pay after termination of nonrailroad job, they would nonetheless be allowed to collect unemployment benefits, since New York State does not make recipients of severance pay ineligible for unemployment.

The fact that this prohibition in the 1968 amendments to the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act was agreed to by both labor and management representatives in negotiations does not help to alleviate the hardship of those workers and their families who are affected by this provision. This was a step backward in our legislative program of helping terminated and retired railroad workers to adjust to their loss of railroad work.

Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleague to give favorable and prompt support to this measure.

DR. B. JEAN APGAR HONORED BY FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate a remarkable young scientist, Dr. B. Jean Apgar, a research biochemist with the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, on her selection as one of the outstanding women in the Federal Government. Dr. Apgar, who is stationed at the U.S. Plant, Soil, and Nutrition Laboratory in Ithaca, N.Y., is the youngest scientist ever to receive the Federal Women's Award.

For someone so young, Dr. Apgar has succeeded in making an extraordinary contribution to the field of nucleic acid chemistry and nutritional biochemistry. She played a vital role in determining the molecular structure of a ribonucleic acid—RNA—the first time that the structure of any nucleic acid had been revealed. This was an extremely significant piece of work, as RNA's help determine how living cells make and utilize proteins. And any understanding we have of the process by which this is done brings us that much closer to eventual control of genetic defects and certain diseases, including cancer.

Research had been in progress for 5 years before Dr. Apgar joined the team. Shortly afterward, she developed the critical techniques for using enzymes to split the RNA molecules. Her work provided the evidence that made it possible to finally identify and describe an RNA, a scientific finding of the highest magnitude. The information and techniques developed by Dr. Apgar and other members of the research team made it possible for the group to identify a second RNA in only 18 months' time. The man who directed the work—Dr. Robert Holley—was awarded the 1968 Nobel Prize in Physiology or Medicine.

Dr. Apgar maintains an interest in RNA and is considered an authority in the field. Scientists call upon her for advice and consultations on problems of ribonucleic acid chemistry and related areas of molecular biology.

In other studies, Dr. Apgar found that pregnant animals required much higher levels of dietary zinc than had been thought, in order to deliver their young safely. Her discovery will have marked effects on the dietary standards suitable for a number of animal species. And it will undoubtedly result in improved diets for pregnant women. Dr. Apgar's perceptive insight into the nature of research problems and her creative approach in resolving them mark her as a scientist of exceptional abilities. She combines the highest standards of scientific integrity with the highest personal values. She is a splendid example of what women in Government can offer—and achieve. I would hope that her example could attract more women of equal talent.

Dr. Apgar was born in Tyler, Tex. She holds B.A. and B.S. degrees from Texas Women's University, and M.S. and Ph. D. degrees from Cornell University.

JUDGE GEORGE HARROLD CARSWELL

HON. WILLIAM L. DAWSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. DAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I was first elected to Congress on November 3, 1942, and I am now completing the best 28 years of my life—the years I have served with my dedicated colleagues and good friends—both Democratic and Republican—from all sections of our beloved country.

During these years we have worked together to make this a better Nation for all our people to live in. We have taken tremendous strides in improving our economy, in building schools, in helping the needy, and in providing security and health care for our older citizens.

Perhaps most gratifying to me have been the advances we have made in civil rights for all citizens. Unfortunately, to be precise, I must amend that to say—advances we have made until very recently in civil rights.

In my 28 years we have seen the Armed Forces desegregated, we have seen the right of all citizens to vote assured, and we have seen decisions made and laws passed to give all citizens equality in housing, travel, public accommodations, employment, and education—in short—in all the rights of citizenship.

But we now have an administration in the White House that is obviously determined—for cold-blooded political reasons—to reverse our progress and to set us back to where we were when I came to Congress 28 years ago. The details are well known and I shall not repeat them here.

The crowning insult to those of us who have fought for true equality is the nomination of Judge George Harrold Carswell to the Supreme Court. Here we have a politician, lawyer, and judge with a 100-percent negative record. While many learned jurists have attested that his actions have demonstrated mediocre ability, what ability and cunningness he possesses have been unfailingly devoted to suppressing the well recognized rights of our minority citizens. Time after time he has avoided, evaded, or ignored the Constitution and law of the land. He has entered into petty schemes and conspiracies to the same end. And he has insulted and abused those lawyers who have appeared before him in efforts to uphold our constitutional rights.

On June 30, 1969, I wrote to the President about certain actions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In closing the letter, I said:

In addition, I wish to point out that the record of the Department since January 20, 1969, is most dismal. The enforcement of the

Constitution and the laws of our nation and the preservation of the rights of our citizens are two of the most sacred trusts placed in the President of the United States. The confidence of our people and the stability of our Nation stand in the balance. Mr. President, you have taken a most solemn oath to preserve and to protect the Constitution and laws of the United States. You must not let the American people down.

In nominating Judge Carswell, President Nixon has let the American people down. This nomination must be rejected.

DEATH OF A GREAT AMERICAN CITIZEN: MAJ. GEN. JAMES EARL RUDDER

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, it is with infinite regret that I advise this body that one of the truly great citizens of our time is dead.

The citizen—who also happens to have been a remarkably close and affectionate friend of mine—was Maj. Gen. James Earl Rudder, who died on March 23, at the age of 59, while he occupied the position of president of Texas A. & M. University—the institution of which I, also, have the honor of being an alumnus.

The career of James Earl Rudder is an example to every generation of Americans—the ideal citizen-soldier, the inspirational leader of men, the enlightened educator of youth.

He was born in Brady, Tex. and worked his way through high school, just as so many of us in the depression generation were forced to do. He worked his way through Texas A. & M., too—and made a splendid record in every aspect of his college career. He was known not only as a student of the first rank, but also as an outstanding leader among his contemporaries.

After graduation he returned to Brady and began ranching on a small scale. Typically, in view of his lifelong interest in the development of youngsters, he coached the local high school team.

While at Texas A. & M. he had been a particularly impressive member of the corps and, naturally, was a reserve officer in the Army. When World War II broke out, he was called to be a leader of men in the protection of his beloved homeland.

His record as a soldier is one of the great stories of the war.

He was called to action in 1941, and organized and trained the famous 2d Ranger Battalion, which produced a great deal of significant history in the European theater.

Undoubtedly the greatest moment in the life of James Earl Rudder came on D-Day. His assignment was to assault and take the promontory of Point du Hoe—a sheer, 100-foot cliff standing between Omaha and Utah Beaches. If the impressively fortified Point due Hoe were not taken, it was highly unlikely that either of these vital beaches could be secured.

Earl Rudder and his men assaulted the promontory, climbed it under a withering fire, and captured it. Rudder was twice wounded in the engagement but remained in action.

Gen. Omar Bradley has made the definitive statement on what James Earl Rudder—then a lieutenant colonel—did on that day. He wrote:

> No soldier in my command has ever been wished a more difficult task than that which befell the 34-year-old commander of this ranger force.

If I may make a personal observation, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I returned to the Normandy Beaches in the company of General Rudder on the 20th anniversary of the invasion. We walked over the terrain together, both of us with long memories of deeds past, and of departed comrades.

We came to the foot of Point du Hoe and stared at it. I must say that I was personally appalled at the problem which had faced Earl Rudder and his men on that day. And yet it was exhilarating to know that men had such courage, such determination, such strength, and such skill as to turn such an assault into a victory.

Eventually, we went to the top of the promontory. Since we were both 20 years older, we did not make the same frontal assault which Earl Rudder and his men had made on that pivotal day in Western history. The amenities—and the reception—were very much better on this anniversary occasion than they had been on D-Day.

When we reached the top, I was deeply moved to find that the French—who, unfortunately, have been less than generous in allotting praise to the men of other nations who freed their land—had erected a monument in honor of the almost unbelievable heroism of James Earl Rudder and his men.

When he returned from the wars, General Rudder resumed ranching. But he also found time to serve as mayor of his hometown, and never relinquished his passionate interest in his alma mater.

In 1959 he was asked to accept the presidency of Texas A. & M. He did so, just as he accepted every worthwhile challenge in life.

His record as president has already become one of the most inspiring legends of the university.

In 1959, Texas A. & M. was a great, but smallish, institution, recognized far less than it should have been outside the boundaries of our State. It had only 7,500 students—all conspicuously male—and a reputation based principally upon its Spartan virtues, its insistence upon hard physical and mental work, and the excellence of the performance of its alumni in the defense of their country.

As president, General Rudder preserved all the virtues inherent in the university, but determined also to broaden its scope and widen its horizons. He even embarked on the course—at first considered heretical and abominable—of making Texas A. & M. coeducational. When he died, on March 23, the student body had doubled in number, and it had representatives from every State of the Union, and from 75 foreign nations as well.

And, I might add, the masculine students at Texas A. & M. are still conspicuously male, and that feminine students are still conspicuously female. There are, unfortunately, too few university student bodies today about which this statement could be made.

I cannot imagine General Rudder presiding over any institution in which this situation did not exist. He was a man of impressive intellectual attainment and of great compassion, but he was also devoted to, and insistent upon, the fundamental virtues which, in his opinion, and in mine, have made the Nation great and which must be encouraged if the Nation is to remain great.

Some while ago I rejoiced publicly that Texas A. & M. was alone among all the colleges of Texas in that it did not have on campus a chapter of the Students for a Democratic Society—a misnomer, if I ever heard one. This was not because of any repressive policies on the part of General Rudder. It was simply because he ran the kind of institution which would not be attractive to the SDS type, and he attracted a student body which would not be responsive to such activity.

Under General Rudder's administration, professors, and even deans, walked the campus in safety, in friendship and in mutual respect as far as the undergraduates were concerned.

During the past 11 years there were no demonstrations at Texas A. & M., no sit-ins, no occupations of university buildings, no hysterical outbursts of frenzied violence which have created so many nightmares on so many other campuses.

General Rudder was in charge at A. & M.; there never was any doubt about that, and he intended to keep it that way. He once announced that if agitators ever tried to create trouble on his campus, they would have "one hell of a fight."

"And," he added, "this pot-bellied President will be in the front ranks, leading it." It occurred to no one to doubt his word.

Mr. Speaker, when James Earl Rudder died I lost a dear and highly treasured friend. The loss is great and unforgettable, but it is purely personal.

Of much greater importance is the fact that when James Earl Rudder died, the Nation lost a magnificent citizen; a unique character, an enormous contributor to the well-being of our future generations.

It is often said that no man is irreplaceable. Perhaps this is true. But James Earl Rudder was a citizen of such a stature that I feel he was as close to being irreplaceable as any man I have known in public or private life.

All those who knew him, loved him. We are all vastly impoverished by his passing.

More importantly, the State of Texas

and the entire Nation are impoverished by this loss of a magnificent citizen, a magnificent soldier, and a magnificent educator of men.

GET RID OF THE BOMBERS

HON. CHALMERS P. WYLIE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, recently a series of bombings has shocked the national conscience. Bomb terrorists have struck in California, Colorado, Washington, Michigan, and Maryland. From the evidence that has been gathered, it appears that a small group of young radicals and anarchists have decided that the only way to implement the social reforms they expouse is through violence and destruction. There is information that some of these individuals are affiliated with the Weathermen, a left-wing faction of the Students for a Democratic Society. In addition to the actual bombing, many cities have been gripped by telephone threats and numerous bomb scares, including Columbus. Lives have been lost, public facilities have had to be evacuated, and property has been destroyed. Existing Federal law, covering the sale and transportation of explosives, is not adequate to meet this new problem.

Today I have joined Congressman WILLIAM H. MCCULLOCH and others of my colleagues in cosponsoring President Nixon's legislation to strengthen our laws dealing with explosives. This proposed legislation provides a penalty of 10 years in prison and/or a fine of $10,000 for anyone involved in the transportation or receipt of explosives intended to be used for unlawful purposes. It further provides for capital punishment when there has been a death to an individual, as the result of such bombings. There appeared in today's Washington Daily News an editorial which I feel is worthy of note by all Members of this body, concerning "Bombers." I commend this editorial to my colleagues with a request that we act, and act immediately to stop these destardly deeds:

GET RID OF THE BOMBERS

President Nixon has sent to Congress a bill intended to crack down—and crack down hard—on bomb throwers, would-be bomb-throwers and those kooks who call up and say falsely a bomb has been planted in your home or your office, or your car, or somewhere.

This is a first-class bill, and Congress should pass it as fast as the legislative process will permit.

It is a first-class bill because it is tough. It proposes to impose hard penalties on the offenders.

Simple possession of a bomb, or any other destructive device of this type, would draw an imprisonment of up to 10 years. Transporting one of these lethal gadgets or using it to damage a building could draw like penalties. If the explosion injured anybody, the penalty would be doubled, and if anyone should die the punishment could be a death sentence.

None of this is excessive. Screwballs who resort to bombs, whatever their motives or pretended motives, deserve no sympathy at all. There is only one way to deal with them—put them out of business.

As the President noted, there recently has been an alarming increase in this type of murderous mischief. And there is no reason to meet this problem with "patience or indulgence." Violence demands the sternest type of government enforcement. If Congress chooses to make the Nixon bill even tougher, it is all right with us. Just pass it, and fast.

MANNED SPACE SHUTTLE STATION SHOULD BE LOCATED AT CAPE KENNEDY

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the United States has put four men on the moon and other flights under the Apollo program will be forthcoming.

Yet, we must look beyond the next year or two. We must look toward other achievements and progress in the exploration of space.

One project being planned by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is a space shuttle station which will be our first effort in the establishment of regularly planned space trips which will originate from an orbiting space station.

This space shuttle station will be launched within a few years, and the site for that launching is presently under consideration by the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I would like to enclose at this point in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues, two editorials from newspapers which serve the Cape Kennedy, Fla., area concerning the location of the proposed space shuttle launching site.

The editorials follow:

[From Today, Mar. 7, 1970]

A CHANCE TO SPEAK

Brevard County, the state of Florida and the often forgotten taxpayer apparently are going to get an opportunity to speak up for the space shuttle program.

The Manned Space Flight Subcommittee of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics will hold a hearing in Brevard on where the shuttle should be launched from.

We know the answer. From the Kennedy Space Center.

KSC has the space (paid for), the buildings (paid for) and the talented people, trained and ready to go to work on the important shuttle program.

That any other area of the country could even be considered is incredible. KSC has a billion dollars invested in building a national resource, plus the necessary thousands of people to do the job.

We're glad the subcommittee, which wields considerable influence in Congress, sees fit to come down on the eve of Apollo 13 to hold hearings and get our side of the story.

But it's not just Brevard County's sales pitch that we want them to hear, it's the pitch of the long ignored taxpayer.

Remember him?

He's the guy who was totally ignored when the Manned Spacecraft Center was built in Texas, and ended up footing the bill for political foolishness.

Obviously other states would like to have the space shuttle located within their borders. When the time comes that shuttle craft are as common as airplanes, they'll get their share.

But until that time, only one place in the United States has all the necessary ingredients for a truly low-cost shuttle development and operation.

A word of caution to zealous Brevard boosters:

Let's not get so carried away with our own importance that we take the future for granted, or that we let something this important to our future get muddled down in local politics and personalities.

When the subcommittee shows up to hear our side of the shuttle story, let's approach it as a unified community showing genuine concern and support.

[From the Orlando (Fla.) Sentinel, Mar. 8, 1970]

ECONOMY AND COMMON SENSE DEMAND CAPE SHUTTLE STATION

The Nation made one space mistake when it put the manned spacecraft center at Houston under political pressure.

But it must not make another by locating the proposed space shuttle station anywhere but at the Kennedy Space Center.

Virtually everything needed for the shuttle station is at the Cape already. Duplicating facilities somewhere else would cost easily $1 billion. In a time of inflation and austerity in government, the nation cannot afford a needless waste of this magnitude.

The space shuttle has been described by Dr. Leroy Day, chief of NASA's space shuttle working group, as "the cornerstone of our future plans for doing anything in space."

Space shuttles to ply between earth and orbiting space stations are needed in the same way elevators are to reach the tops of buildings.

Envisioned by NASA are reusable space shuttle vehicles which can burn ordinary fuels and can take off and land from air bases or major airports.

Utilizing this concept would bring the price of a space flight down from about $1,000 to $100 a pound. Space officials, both military and civilian, have made a space shuttle system their No. 1 priority. Without it, our exploration of the space medium will be slowed.

Brevard County is asking to be heard before a federal decision is made on the shuttle transportation center.

President Nixon should grant this request, for Brevard County with its 80,000 acres of NASA-owned land plus millions in equipment, can make a stronger case than any other area of the country.

The strongest case of all, of course, is that the Cape will continue to be the No. 1 launching site for all future space missions.

No good purpose can be served by scattering our space effort.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ARKANSAS GENERAL ASSEMBLY URGES ACTION ON POW PROBLEM

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, the 67th general assembly of the State of Arkansas had adopted a resolution concerning U.S. servicemen who are being held as prisoners in North Vietnam. In part the measure commends efforts to increase interest in and awareness of the problems of POW's by the Arkansas Chapter of Concern for Prisoners of War, Inc., Mrs. Judy Fagan Hornibrook, chairman.

The resolution has been transmitted to me by the secretary of state, the Honorable Kelly Bryant. It was sponsored in the State senate by the Honorable Ben Allen of Little Rock.

I commend to my colleagues Senate Concurrent Resolution 4 of the General Assembly of Arkansas as an expression of concern for the plight of U.S. servicemen being held as prisoners by North Vietnam and a call for greater action in their behalf:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE ARKANSAS CHAPTER, CONCERN FOR PRISONERS OF WAR, INC., MRS. JUDY FAGAN HORNIBROOK, CHAIRMAN, FOR THEIR EFFORTS TO MAKE THE CITIZENS OF ARKANSAS AWARE OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO PRISONERS OF WAR AND URGING PRESIDENT NIXON TO MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO SECURE AGREEMENT BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE TO ABIDE BY RULES OF THE GENEVA CONVENTION

Whereas, the lives of many families in Arkansas are being adversely affected by the continuing refusal of the North Vietnamese government to abide by the articles of the Geneva Convention relating to prisoners of war, i.e., no exchange of frequent and regular mail between the prisoners of war and their families, no valid list of prisoners of war furnished, no impartial inspection of prison camps made, and no assurance that prisoners of war receive humane treatment; and

Whereas, the shortage and sometimes total lack of communication with these prisoners of war has led to great uncertainty and distress in the lives of wives, parents, and children of these Arkansas servicemen, thereby causing great anguish among these families;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the first extraordinary session of the sixty-seventh general assembly of the State of Arkansas, the Senate concurring therein:

Section 1. That the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas, meeting in Extraordinary Session on this date, does hereby commend the endeavors of the Arkansas Chapter, Concern For Prisoners of War, Inc., Mrs. Judy Fagan Hornibrook, Chairman, in its efforts to make the citizenry of Arkansas aware of these problems and conditions, and to urge President Richard M. Nixon to use every feasible method in cooperating with the concerned departments and agencies of our government, the United Nations, and the governments of other nations to secure North Vietnamese agreement to abide by the aforementioned rules of the Geneva Convention; we further urge all citizens of Arkansas to sustain vigorous efforts to secure the release of these servicemen.

Section 2. Upon adoption of this Resolution, the Secretary of the Senate shall cause a copy thereof to be transmitted to the President of the United States, to each member of the Arkansas Congressional Delegation, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of State of the United States.

FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT AMENDMENTS

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against the amendments to the Foreign Military Sales Act. This bill authorized up to $350 million in credits for arms sales, principally to less developed countries. I voted against the bill because I believe that the sale of such arms only serves to contribute toward discord in the rest of the world and encourages nations to purchase armaments which they do not need at the expense of essential domestic priorities.

Since 1945 some $66 billion worth of armaments have been sold in world markets by both governments and private arms merchants. These weapons have been used in all of the dozens of large and small wars since that time. There are virtually no international restrictions on this destructive and wasteful trade. In point of fact arms sales are actively promoted by all of the weapons manufacturing nations, our own included. This year alone U.S. sales of conventional weapons will total $1.9 billion.

At the same time that we are engaged in the strategic arms limitation talks we have, by passing the Foreign Military Sales Act, aggravated the very problem we hope to solve—increased armaments and increased world tension. We need to formulate a stricter policy of our Government's role in supplying arms to the rest of the world.

The President must undertake a comprehensive review of our military assistance programs, particularly with respect to sales of conventional arms. We must initiate discussions with other major powers and in the United Nations on ways to control the worldwide armaments trade, and I urge the President to signify the intention of the United States to control this trade.

If we are truly interested in arms control, we should not hold out inducements to other countries to buy arms, especially when those countries are underdeveloped and need to establish a stable economy which will provide for the most basic needs of their populations.

In this regard, I would like to have inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks a copy of an article entitled, "Poor Nations Spend Fortune on Arms Purchases," which appeared in the New York Times on August 18, 1969. The article clearly demonstrates the fact that we and other nations are exporting and selling large quantities of arms to underdeveloped nations.

The article states that the Pentagon "has estimated the arms market of the non-Communist world during the period 1965–74 at $100 billion of which $70 billion would be domestically manufactured. This would put the arms trade at $30 billion or $3 billion a year, aside from sales within the Communist world. The Pentagon's own goal was to take half of this market, or $1.5 billion a year." The article also states that the "United States is rated the largest arms exporter in the world."

Mr. Speaker, this is a disgraceful situation which should command far more public attention than it has received. We must take a careful look at our present military policy. It is not consonant with our avowed foreign policy objective of disarmament and a world of peace.

The article follows:

POOR NATIONS SPEND FORTUNE ON ARMS PURCHASES

(By John L. Hess)

PARIS, August 17.—An ironic exception to the theme that the poor countries are getting poorer is in the possession of weapons.

Throughout the emerging nations, in Asia, Africa and Latin America, the poor man's arms race is gathering speed. For reasons of prestige and defense, so-called underdeveloped countries are buying everything from pistols to the most advanced and costly fighter-bombers, missiles, tanks, radar systems, even submarines.

The purchases are fueling such brushfire conflicts as the ones in Nigeria, the Middle East, the Sudan and Portugal's African territories.

Military expenditures of the underdeveloped countries are rising faster than their gross national products, a fact that means that a growing share of their slender resources is being diverted to weaponry.

Interviews with practitioners and scholarly analysts of the trade suggest that the arms race is virtually out of control, as all the industrial powers, from the United States and the Soviet Union to Portugal, Yugoslavia and Israel, compete actively for one of the world's most lucrative markets.

All but a trickle of the vast arms trade is theoretically under government control, since exports are licensed and closely watched. Nevertheless, rather than seeking to restrain the boom, nearly all governments of industrial or semi-industrial powers are actively promoting arms sale, either through public agencies or, as in the case of West Germany, through private or semiprivate organizations.

A few current examples demonstrate the problems.

A handful of private arms dealers have received mimeographed letters from the South Vietnamese Defense Ministry offering to sell them 202,887 small arms.

According to a dealer whose Saigon agent inspected the weapons, they range from "perfect" to "battlefield salvage," which he described as "covered with mud and blood."

Since these are only the first installment on a huge stock of surplus arms in South Vietnam, that country seems likely to become an important supply base for any new brushfire wars of the near future.

Current scandals in Sweden and Switzerland show that even the best intentions are often incapable of controlling the arms trade. Both countries are neutrals that manufacture arms to defend their neutrality. They also sell arms, to keep their weapons industries strong, but forbid exports to troubled areas.

Sweden was upset to learn that light planes made by Saab had been armed in France and used by Count Carl Gustaf von

Rosen to bomb Nigerian bases on behalf of Biafra. An investigation is under way.

SWISS PREPARING CASE

The Swiss are preparing a prosecution in what has become known as the Oerlikon affair. Details have been withheld, but it is reliably affirmed that more than $21-million worth of Oerlikon antiaircraft guns and ammunition—some of it unused Government surplus—were delivered to the United Arab Republic, Israel, Lebanon, Nigeria, South Africa and Saudi Arabia. All are on the Swiss embargo list.

Oerlikon says "two or three employes" swung those deals without the knowledge of top management. It is reliably reported that the employes obtained from French customs officials documents professing that the destination for the arms was France. Most of them are said to have been shipped through Marseilles.

The crash of a planeload of arms on the way from Belgium to Nigeria a year ago brought questions in the Belgian Parliament, which had thought there was an embargo.

BELGIUM A SPECIAL CASE

In the trade, Belgium has the reputation of being an exceptionally easygoing transit point, and Antwerp is said to have a "bourse" in forged certificates. In any case, it is said, anyone who badly wants arms can obtain them, and even the lack of funds is not insurmountable.

Portugal and South Africa are reportedly major suppliers of Biafra, along with the French and, curiously, the Czechoslovaks—although just as curiously, the Soviet Union, Britain and the United Arab Republic are helping the Nigerian federal forces.

Rebel Sudanese are said to have obtained rifles from Ethiopia, which detests the Government at Khartoum, and the Kurds of Iraq gets arms from Iran, Turkey and Israel. Insurgents of the Portuguese territories in Africa are based in Algeria, Tanzania and the Congo and use small arms of Soviet design. The Portuguese use arms of their own manufacture and some French and American aircraft, despite a United States embargo.

NO PROOF OF C.I.A. ROLE

The United States Central Intelligence Agency is often said in the trade to be involved in some of these situations, but no proof has been forthcoming. A dealer said to have served the agency on occasion simply smiled and waved away a question about it.

But all this more or less clandestine small-arms business has about the same relation to the world arms trade as the windshield-wiper replacement business has to the automobile trade.

Samuel Cummings, an American who is president of the International Armaments Corporation, the world's largest private dealer in arms, puts private trade in small arms at a few tens of millions of dollars a year. This may be an underestimate, but in any case the total falls well short of a single important deal for planes, missiles, tanks, submarines or electronic defense systems.

$2.5-BILLION A YEAR

The Institute for Strategic Studies, a highly regarded private organization based in London, lists about 70 major arms transactions announced in the fiscal year 1967–68. The announced cost to the buyers totaled nearly $2.5-billion—not including 16 deals for which no cost figures were available.

Among the deals were huge sales of West German tanks to Italy and of American and French aircraft and missiles to Israel, as well as the Soviet rearmament of the United Arab Republic. All these would probably bring the total to $4-billion or more.

The Pentagon has estimated the arms market of the non-Communist world during the period 1965 through 1974 at $100-billion, of which $70-billion would be domestically manufactured. This would put the arms trade at $30-billion, or $3-billion a year, aside from sales within the Communist world. (The Pentagon's own goal was to take half of this market, or $1.5-billion a year.)

SALES EXCEED ESTIMATE

The figures for 1967–68 show that this estimate was already being exceeded a year ago.

As long as five years ago, underdeveloped countries were estimated by the Institute for Strategic Studies to be spending $10-billion a year on defense, of which $1-billion went for arms imports. Later studies, under way in Stockholm, London and Boston, are not yet available, but figures on military spending by individual countries in the underdeveloped world show a pattern of sharp increases in spending since 1965, both in cash totals and as a proportion of gross national product.

The third world may now be not far from the United States, which spends nearly one-tenth of its resources on military forces.

U.S. IN FIRST PLACE

Published figures are unreliable, but the United States is rated the largest arms exporter in the world, followed by the Soviet Union. France appears lately to have pushed Britain out of third place.

All four offer a complete range of arms for sale, except for the "ultimate" weapons—nuclear bombs and their carriers. (A German student of the arms race suggested tongue in cheek in an interview that since there have been no wars within the atomic club, the way to assure peace would be to give all countries atomic weapons.)

Behind the top four in arms sales come the specialist producers: Italy, West Germany, Switzerland, Sweden, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Japan, Israel, Yugoslavia and Spain.

MOTIVES ARE THE SAME

The motivation for this drive, for both Communist and non-Communist countries, is the same. All countries engaged in modernization of their forces are generating large amounts of surplus weapons. Many, notably the United States, have balance-of-payments problems, that is, they are endangering their reserves of gold by paying more to foreigners than foreigners pay them. The Pentagon offsets its spending abroad by selling arms.

The weapons industry has become so large that layoffs would cause social unrest. In any case, most countries regard a strong and varied arms industry as essential to their defense and except for the big powers, none could afford such industries were it not for exports.

Major governments use arms deliveries as a political as well as economic instrument. A skeptic is John Stanley, a specialist of the Institute for Strategic Studies, who observed in an interview in London: "You don't make friends by delivering arms, but you certainly make enemies by stopping."

The institute, as a scholarly organization, takes no position on any political question. Mr. Stanley, speaking for himself, also voiced his opinion on a related matter. He said: "I see no justification for private people being engaged in the sale of surplus arms."

ARGENTINE CASE CITED

* * * vation, he cited the Argentine general's "Plan Europa"—the Europeanization of their weaponry, which had been almost entirely American. Orginally, their goal was modernization; they simply wanted the latest, most prestigious equipment, including fast, heavy tanks.

Washington refused to sell, arguing that such costly weapons were of no possible use to Argentina. Angered, the Argentines turned to France, which was eager to sell AMX 30's, among the finest tanks of their class in the world.

Mr. Cummings, the arms dealer, says that at the time he offered to sell the Argentines the tanks they originally sought, M–47 Pattons. The tanks would have come from West Germany, which is replacing the Pattons with its own Leopards, but the sale could have been made only with United States approval.

BID IS TURNED DOWN

Mr. Cummings said that his price, about $40,000 a tank, was less than one-third the United States price for Pattons and one-fifth the cost of the AMX. But, he said, a high Argentine official told him, "We are sick of the United States." Argentina bought French.

American efforts to keep supersonic fighters out of South America were similarly frustrated by Peruvian and Brazilian purchases of French equipment.

A current affair of the same nature involves India and Pakistan. In their border war of 1965, both sides used mainly American equipment, provided for their defense against China and the Soviet Union. Washington was reluctant to replace their losses, not only because it did not want a repetition of the fighting, but also because sales to either side incurred the enmity of the other.

A LEAKY EMBARGO

But India began obtaining Soviet equipment, and Pakistan got some Chinese tanks. The American embargo, officially maintained, sprang large leaks. West Germany sold surplus American F–86 Sabre jets to Iran, which sold them to India, and the West Germans also sold surplus British Sea Hawks to Italy, which sold them to Pakistan.

Deals by Pakistan to obtain more Patton tanks by way of West Germany, Italy and Turkey have so far not been completed, but have generated considerable resentment or embarrassment for all the countries involved, including the United States.

Individual supplier countries have proved incapable of effectively halting the sale of arms to troubled areas or curbing the supply of intricate and costly equipment to countries that cannot afford them and indeed can hardly use them. (Some countries have bought tanks too heavy for their roads and bridges, and the Institute for Strategic Studies says one government owns tanks it has not issued to its army "for reasons of internal security.")

EVEN MODEST ATTEMPTS FAIL

In the absence of an international arms control agreement, the principle that prevails is, "If we don't sell them, somebody else will." But even the most modest proposals for international cooperation have foundered.

The closest allies of the United States in Europe have steadfastly resisted the Pentagon's program for standardization of arms in the Western alliance. Their view is that although this might save money it would mean total dependence on the American industry. As a result, a salesman for an American plane company said, "a lot of unnecessary money is being spent on reinventing the wheel."

Denmark tentatively suggested in the United Nations last year that all arms sales be registered. This met reactions ranging from indifference to hostility—notably from the third world. India, especially, argued that arms-trade controls automatically discriminated in favor of the arms-producing countries and against the have-not countries. The proposal was dropped.

Some students of the arms trade, among them Mr. Stanley of the Institute for Strategic Studies, hold that the public conscience is nevertheless a potential brake on undesirable dealings. He felt that governments should be held accountable for their countries' arms-sales policy, and that when they are, changes sometimes result. He cited the 1967–68 Senate arms hearings that ended the huge, secret revolving credit fund used by the Pentagon to promote exports without knowledge of the Congress.

"The United States has tried to be responsible and not to fuel the arms race," Mr. Stanley said, "but these principles are con-

stantly being undermined by economic compulsions."

Dr. Morris Pearton, a British historian who has been studying economic aspects of the arms race for the institute, was struck by attitudes he had met in the United States. He said:

"Some American firms told us that 'being in the arms business is good for us in the stock market.' Nobody in Europe said that. The fact that business wants some things needs no further justification in the United States."

PRIVATE DEALERS SCORED

John Kenneth Galbraith, the economist and author, has suggested that all companies whose business comes mainly from the government be nationalized.

Governments do use private dealers to dispose of weapons for a variety of reasons, among them to avoid publicity. The dealers say that with their worldwide networks of agents, they know better than some governments where surplus arms may be sold, although the service is one that military and commercial attachés of embassies are supposed to render.

To the extent that one motive for poor countries to buy arms is to enrich their leaders, the private dealer is in a better position than governments to satisfy the demand. Mr. Cummings, who is reputed to be a "straight" operator, or one who abides by United States and British controls, says the payoff—"dash" in Africa, "baksheesh" in the Middle East and "mordida" in Latin America—is prevalent throughout the third world.

Interviewed in London while he was visiting one of his plants, where thousands of rifles were being reconditioned or "sporterized," Mr. Cummings estimated that there were about 15 serious private arms brokers in the trade.

He himself has agents in every country of the world, he said. They are wealthy men—planters, industrialists, retired generals or politicians—who take no salary but negotiate their commissions for each deal. He hesitated to make an estimate, but said that 5 per cent would be "safe" on a big deal.

COSTA RICA GETS PRAISE

All this is small in relation to the business done by government agencies of the United States, Britain, France, the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia, or by many private corporations. For example, at least 45 American aerospace companies have offices in the major West European capitals, promoting sales that run into billions of dollars a year. They have a trade organization and are indistinguishable in their work and style of living from colleagues in other lines of business.

Mr. Cummings is not worried about the competition. "We are bound to be kept busy," he said, "in Africa, Latin America and, you can say, the Middle East."

"The only country in Latin America with any brains about military equipment," he added, "is Costa Rica: it has no tanks, no real fighters and no navy—and it gets along fine."

"There is no plumbing the depths of the arms trade," he concluded, "any more than there is plumbing the depths of human folly."

THE HONORABLE JAMES B. UTT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, when I first came here nearly 8 years ago, Congressman James Utt was very kind and courteous making my first few months in Washington so much easier, and from that time his kindness never faltered and was always a great comfort.

For nearly 20 years he ably served his district, his State, and his Nation. It was an honor to have served in the California delegation with James Utt. The vital energy, expertise and concern he evidenced both in this Chamber and in his life will be greatly missed.

My sympathy is extended to his gracious widow, Charlena, and the other members of his fine family.

TAX REFORM ACT OF 1969

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I think the following article in reference to the Tax Reform Act of 1969 will be of interest:

[From the Christian Science Monitor]

FEDERAL TAX LOOPHOLES PLUGGED

(By Richard A. Nenneman)

WASHINGTON.—"We know the tax reform was a good law," a high Treasury Department official jested—"You should see the mail we're getting complaining about it."

He was referring to the Tax Reform Act of 1969, passed in a hurry before the Christmas recess of Congress. At first glance it looked more like a tax giveaway than a real reform.

Not everyone agrees with this man's estimate of the law. Dr. Arthur M. Okun, for example, former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under President Johnson, sad: "I am disappointed with the tax reform act. . . . For every dollar we gained, we had to give up three. What we have left of the federal revenue is better, but we lost some of it in the process."

These are the views, not only of Dr. Okun, but of many liberal economists who say the tax cuts in the act undermine the financial base for needed federal programs in the coming years.

REFORMS CALLED REAL

Joseph W. Barr, who was Mr. Johnson's last Treasury secretary, points out, however, that the reforms in the act are indeed reforms. He distinguishes these from the tax-relief provisions which, like Dr. Okun, he dislikes. (Mr. Barr now is president of the American Security & Trust Company in Washington.)

"You never pick up revenue on a reform bill itself," says another source, adding that rates can be boosted later.

"Just look at the major loopholes under the old law," said Mr. Barr. (It was he who last year called public attention to the 154 persons with incomes over $200,000 who paid no federal taxes at all.)

"There were six main loopholes that caused the inequities under the old law—capital gains, exemption of municipal-bond interest, accelerated depreciation, the unlimited charitable contribution, farm losses, and depletion. They closed up every one of them except municipals."

The municipal-bond-interest exemption would have gotten changed, most observers say, if the nation's mayors and governors hadn't panicked and pressured Congress not to end the tax shelter for their indebtedness. So this remains for the "next time" around.

EXEMPTION HELD COSTLY

As matters stand, the holders of municipals save in income taxes far more than the municipalities save in extra interest expense. This is one of those social arrangements that helps rich individuals more than the groups it was meant to help. It is, in short, a costly exemption. The Treasury Department in 1969 estimated the municipal-interest exemption costs the government $2 billion annually.

As for the other five loopholes, they were indeed changed. Accelerated depreciation of real estate has been severely limited. Farm losses, that can be balanced against regular income, are limited to $25,000 annually. The oil depletion allowance was cut back from 27½ percent to 22 percent. And the unlimited charitable deduction was curbed, although at the same time the regular charitable contributions deduction was raised from 30 to 50 percent of income.

The change that may hit the greatest number of people is in the capital-gains tax. It previously had a top limit of 25 percent. That rate remains on the first $50,000 of capital gains in any one year, and then goes up to a maximum of 35 percent for individuals. (The rate was changed to 30 percent for corporations.)

ESCAPE DEVICES CLOSED

In cases where taxpayers also have substantial earned income, large capital gains may cause some to lose their 50 percent maximum tax bracket on the earned income and pay the old rate of 70 percent. (This is because "preference" income from capital gains, for example, in excess of $30,000 takes away the 50 percent limit for an equal amount of earned income.) In extreme cases, the new capital-gains tax could be an effective 46.5 percent.

In dollars, these changes may not be terribly significant. The capital-gains change, for instance, is supposed to haul in only $275 million extra a year from individuals and $175 million from corporations.

This doesn't make the loophole adjustments unimportant, however. These were the main devices by which the rich escaped taxes. To the extent that they have been closed, it is now a fairer system.

Critics of the federal tax system previously have claimed that as fast as one set of loopholes was closed, tax attorneys found a new set. Some of those who worked on this law doubt that this now will be the case. They think not only that major progress was made in closing loopholes, but that the increase in the capital-gains tax will blunt the incentive to qualify as much income as possible as a capital gain.

LOSSES SET AT $9 BILLION

With capital-gains rates up and the maximum rates on earned income down from 70 to 50 percent, the maximum tax-rate differential between the two kinds of income is cut by two-thirds. The result is that both kinds of income tend to be treated more equally under the tax laws.

The staggering revenue losses, coming to $9 billion, under the total reform act are its most disturbing feature. When all the provisions have been phased in (by 1973), there will be an annual loss of $4.8 billion from the increase in the personal exemption; $1.6 billion from the increased standard deduction; $2.1 billion from the low-income allowance (which removes 5.5 million persons from the tax rolls); and $420 million from the adjustment of single-person income-tax schedules (although there is a considerable improvement in fairness here).

There is a further loss of $4.4 billion from the increase in social-security payments. The funds come from a separate trust fund, however, and social-security officials said there is no need yet to raise social-security taxes. They will doubtless go up in the course of time, though.

In general, there is a tendency here to minimize the importance of the tax-relief provisions. The main thing is that a major reform was passed. The revenue losses as

noted above, tend to be regarded as the price of reform.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS LISTED

Stanley Surrey, professor at Harvard Law school, Cambridge, Mass., summarized the improvements in the law:

The taxes on the poor and near-poor were reduced, through the low-income allowance. However, Professor Surrey asked, if we have decided that the poor shouldn't have to pay income tax, why do they still have to pay the regressive social-security tax?

A greater degree of equity exists for those earning up to $20,000 a year. The increase in the standard deduction to $2,000 tends to put apartment dwellers, who have neither mortgage interest nor property taxes to deduct, on an even footing with their suburban home-owning cousins.

Some feel it might be more equitable for most of the personal deductions to be removed in toto. This is one of those simplifications of the law that would run into much organized opposition, however; much the same effect is gained by giving a larger deduction to everyone. The Internal Revenue Service expects an additional 11 million taxpayers to start using the simplified 1040 form next year instead of itemizing deductions.

The increased exemptions are most valuable to the lower- and middle-income classes. They also are more valuable to big families.

WAGE-EARNERS' EQUALIZER

The reduction in the maximum rate on earned income to 50 percent equalizes taxes for those whose main income is from wages—such as professional people or athletes—vis-a-vis those who have more opportunities to use tax shelters.

There is a new 10 percent flat tax on 10 classes of income previously exempted. This will bring in only about $600 million in revenues to start. But it should end the spectacle of very wealthy people escaping all taxation.

All in all, there will be somewhat less likelihood of those with similar real incomes paying substantially different taxes. (Economists call this horizontal equity.)

It isn't as clear what has happened to vertical equity—the relative equity between divergent income groups. It depends, in the first place, on how much of a load one thinks the rich ought to carry. But that consideration aside, it isn't even that easy to tell what has happened. The poor and lower-income groups get the most benefit from the reform as far as direct taxes go.

But this tax reform is being "paid" for largely by a higher burden being placed on the corporate-income tax. To the extent that this is really borne by the public, by increased prices, etc. (the next article takes up this point), it can be argued that what the poor gained in lower direct taxes has been put back on their shoulders through the corporation income tax.

The most significant thing about the law to this reporter is that the system has shown itself capable of at least being nudged.

DIRECTION RULED IMPORTANT

The degree of change may not be as important as the direction. If the oil industry is not hurt by the change in depletion allowances, it will probably be cut again. If the accumulation of capital does not suffer noticeably, the capital-gain tax may be pushed up some more.

As a postscript, it is perhaps time for the public to become more aware of the role of capital formation by individuals in a capitalistic society. Is it passé or do we still need to encourage it?

Dale Wickham, a Washington tax lawyer who served as special counsel to the Senate Finance Committee last year, goes so far as to question whether we might not eventually tax capital gains as regular income. The use of income averaging, he says, would cushion the burden on anyone realizing large gains in any one year.

In last year's reform, we went a long step in the direction of his suggestion. Before going any further, we need to decide more clearly whether it is still meaningful to talk of a capital gain as some special kind of income. In the past, society has recognized a risk inherent in all capital investment. To encourage that risk-taking, it held out a special incentive.

Whatever remains to be done with the federal income tax, one point should be remembered: it is the shining jewel among American taxes. This will become more apparent after the corporation income tax, sales tax, and the property tax have been analyzed.

OUR SAGGING MERCHANT MARINE

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most critical problems facing our Nation is the pressing need to revitalize our sagging merchant marine fleet. During the past decade, our merchant marine posture has sunk to an all-time low, but the Nixon administration is determined to remedy this situation by making a substantial investment in the improvement of the merchant fleet.

I am pleased to include the following article by John Farina, maritime writer for the San Diego Evening Tribune, in the RECORD:

[From the San Diego Evening Tribune, Mar. 18, 1970]

PORTS OF CALL: MARITIME NEWS

(By John Farina)

The Russians are coming, says Federal Maritime Commission Chairman Helen Delich Bentley, and they're coming by the sea. The result has been a slippage of prestige for the United States in maritime power during the past 10 years.

The Soviets, remarks Mrs. Bentley, appointed to her post last year by President Nixon, "speak of the profits made by their ships in trade with the world. They speak of the foreign ports they enter and they boast of the fact that their seamen serve as ambassadors, cementing friendship for Russia and advancing the Communist view.

"What they do not speak of publicly, but what has become evident to maritime nations, is the extent to which modern, newly constructed Russian ships have now begun to undercut world shipping rates in competition with ships of other nations."

The competitive position of the United States vis-a-vis the Soviet Union will improve, Mrs. Bentley believes, with adoption by the Congress of President Nixon's program to revitalize the maritime industry.

The House recently authorized expenditure of $429.3 million for the maritime administration in fiscal 1971.

About half of that amount—$199.5 million—would be earmarked for construction of 19 merchant ships. Only 10 ships are being funded in the current fiscal year.

Nixon has recommended early enactment of the legislation, which will permit the construction of 300 merchant ships over a 10-year period. A 30-ships-a-year rate would be reached in fiscal 1973.

The second largest item in the authorization bill is $193 million for ship operation subsidies.

THREE SIGNIFICANT MARITIME CHANGES NOTED

The legislation, according to Rep. Hugh L. Carey, D-N.Y., would bring about three significant changes in this country's maritime efforts.

First—It would broaden the merchant marine program by encouraging the development of all segments of the industry.

Second—It would significantly increase the number of new ships being built each year in American shipyards, tripling the number constructed in recent years and projecting a steady high level of ship building for at least the next decade.

Third—It would give impetus to U.S. efforts to increase the American-flag share of imports and exports.

This last point, Carey says, is the "keystone of the program—because building ships without seeing to it that they have cargo would be a gross waste of the taxpayer's money.

"The ultimate success of the Maritime Act of 1970 will be determined by how significantly we increase the amount of cargo moving in the holds of American vessels."

The program thus is an ambitious one, Carey says, marking an important upward surge in the nation's maritime investment.

LEGISLATION PROVIDES BARE-BONES EFFORT

Even so, he adds, the legislation in his opinion is a "barebones maritime" effort.

"Because of the state of the economy, the funds that this program represents may be all that we can expect in the coming fiscal year. But they do not even come close to what I think we should be spending—or to what I think we must spend in the future."

Development of the U.S. maritime industry is vitally important, Carey says, "in terms of increased self-reliance in bringing raw goods to America to fuel our industrial complex and in carrying finished products to waiting consumers around the globe—in terms of a more adequate defense capability—in terms of our balance of payments—and, of even greater importance, in terms of sustaining life on this planet in the decades to come."

Maritime Administrator Andrew E. Gibson says challenge and opportunity are the important keys to development of the merchant marine fleet.

"The Maritime Commission is challenged," he says, "to better serve the maritime industry and the American public. American importers and exporters are challenged to use American-flag ships. And American investors are challenged to provide the $5 billion or so in new capital the shipping and shipbuilding industries will need to modernize their operations and provide new ships and equipment. The President's program will offer this last group the opportunity to achieve this."

PUBLIC MORE AWARE OF SEAPOWER VALUE

In San Diego, John V. Banks, executive vice president of National Steel and Shipbuilding Co., comments that during the past two years "there has been an increasing public awareness of the fundamental value of seapower that has, since the days of the clipper ships, made our country economically and militarily strong.

"They saw ships, not planes, delivering more than 95 per cent of the cargo needed to support the war in Vietnam. They saw the uncontestable value of our aircraft carriers sustaining two years of air strikes without a single loss.

"They saw our balance of payments getting incredibly out of balance. And some of them saw the growing threat of Russian seapower.

"Perhaps fortuitously, many started to question the relative priority of space exploration to the needs here on earth . . . As a result of this awareness, important shifts in priorities have taken place. President Nixon has wisely committed his administration to the rebuilding of the Navy and the merchant marine."

DAUGHTERS OF PENELOPE

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, women leaders are more and more in the news every day. In fact, there is a redefinition of the rights and responsibilities of women occurring in our society.

I should like to share with my colleagues a pertinent speech by Joanna—Mrs. Charles J.—Panagopoulos, grand president of the Daughters of Penelope and proponent of a most positive approach to this subject.

In her speech, Mrs. Panagopoulos paid tribute, on behalf of the Daughters of Penelope, to one of America's most noted women, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH. As a tribute to Senator SMITH and to women, I should like to include this fine address in the RECORD.

The festivities of this evening constitute a significant milestone in the 40 year history of the Daughters of Penelope.

Heretofore, our Order, in the national, district and local levels, has concerned itself, and engaged in, activities of a charitable nature—such as scholarship assistance, financial aid to our religious institutions, drives for the collection of funds in support of various charities, and programs designed to preserve the best of our Hellenic heritage and traditions, and adapt them to, and thus enrich, our American culture.

All laudable and necessary activities, which must be continued and intensified. But they are also the traditional aims of most women's organizations.

This evening marks the addition of a new dimension to our perspective of life—an expansion of the limits of our concern and the boundaries of our activities.

This new concern, for us as an organization, is the awareness and acknowledgement that the Daughters of Penelope must take part, in some form, in the general attempt to obtain for the women of our country the guarantees, under the law, of the equal treatment, rights, privileges and opportunities in all aspects of life, which modern thinking demands for every individual—male and female.

We all have heard that statement that "The hand that rocks the cradle, is the hand that rules the world"—A man said that!—And no doubt that when those lines were first written over one hundred years ago, women could only rule the world, or help rule it—vicariously—, they were too busy rocking the cradle and performing the chores attendant to that circumstance.

However, to use a trite but true phrase—Things have changed! That cradle is now automated. Modern technology has taken care of that. And, therefore, woman now has far more time to interest herself and participate in fields which once she barely had time to hear about.

Much better educated, far more aware of the world around her as a result of advanced communications and with more available time, the woman of today aspires not to rule the world, but to be a full and effective partner in its development—in the arts and sciences, in education, in business and banking, and in that area of human endeavor which most immediately affects the lives of all of us—government.

However, due to encrusted and antiquated attitudes which have been allowed to remain unchanged because of our own passivity—woman has not been granted her full freedom to give of her understanding, abilities and talents to the advancement of our society.

This year will mark the fiftieth anniversary of the 19th Amendment under which women were granted the constitutional right to vote. Five decades have passed—progress has been made—but the pace is too slow. Another decade should not be permitted to pass without woman's achieving full equality in all fields of endeavor.

That is why the Daughters of Penelope, as an organization, must concern itself with this cause.

By participation, I certainly do not mean taking to the streets with protest signs, or disrupting the normal processes and procedures of government.

Rather, I mean the participation in efforts, projects, and activities designed to constantly remind those in authority of the inherent injustice of the status of women as it exists in our society today.

And that brings us to the purpose of this evening's affair. What would be more fitting and proper to publicly signal this new area of concern of the Daughters of Penelope than to recognize and salute those women, who have been, and still are, in the forefront of this cause of obtaining equal rights and opportunities for all persons—regardless of sex.

This evening, we have chosen to express our gratitude and appreciation to those women who have selected as their field of endeavor the art and science of politics and government, because that field, as I previously said, most immediately affects our daily lives.

We hope and expect that these events, which will be held biennially, will recognize and honor other women who have shown by their achievements in the field of education, the arts and sciences, the business world, and in the medical, legal and judicial professions, that there is truly no difference between the sexes in ability and talent in these respective fields.

At this time, I would like to thank Sister Elizabeth Athanasakos and her committee for the arrangements of this evening's program.

However, this event is given depth and significance by the presence of our honored guests, who have been introduced by our Chairman.

To these remarkable ladies, whose dedicated service to our country, and outstanding records of personal achievement serve as an example and an inspiration to us all, I personally, and on behalf of the Grand Lodge, and all the members of the Daughters of Penelope, express my sincere appreciation for their presence here this evening.

Yet, we cannot speak of remarkable women, outstanding records, dedicated service, without singling out for very special mention and honor the name of Senator Margaret Chase Smith, and I am certain that no one here is of a different opinion, for here is a woman who has carved out for herself a niche as one of the most dedicated servants and greatest women in the history of our country.

To give a short resume of her record and her accomplishments would do her a great injustice, but I am just as certain that an itemized accounting of her lifetime achievements would be even more embarrassing to her.

However, I would be very remiss in my duties if I did not recite just some small part of the record of this great woman whom the Daughters of Penelope have selected as the first recipient of our Salute to Women Award.

I should first comment on the fact that the lovely rose has become a symbol and trademark of this charming personality. And if the gentlemen in the audience will forgive me, I cannot help but think, as a woman, that it is a symbol of her status as the sole woman in the Senate—a rose among all those thorns!

A native of Showhegan, Maine (or as we say up North in Massachusetts a Downeaster')

Quote—Republican—end of quote.

A member of the United States House of Representatives from 1940 to 49, and a member of the United States Senate from 1949 to date.

She has broken all records of votes received by candidates in the State of Maine—both percentagewise and in actual numbers.

She is the only woman to have ever been elected to four full terms in the United States Senate.

She is the first woman, at a National Convention of a major political party, to have her name placed in nomination for the office of President of the United States.

She is the only woman to have served in both houses of Congress, and prior to her political career, which began in 1930, when she served on the Republican State Committee of Maine, she was successively a teacher, an executive of a telephone, newspaper and a woolen company and a nationally syndicated columnist.

Her committee service in the House and Senate has been most extensive as witness by that fact that she is now serving on the Appropriations Committee—the Armed Services Committee—the Preparedness Investigations Sub-Committee—and the C.I.A. Sub-Committee.

She has served as a Lt. Col. in the Air Force Reserve. She has been awarded by outstanding and leading colleges and universities throughout the country the grand total of 51 degrees.

She has received awards in almost every category granted to those in public office—but the one which most tellingly points up the sum total of her life was the award which she received in 1967 from the United Press International Poll, as one of the ten most influential women of the World.

Rated as one of America's most effective Ambassadors of Good-Will, and one who has been proposed by many for several years for the Vice-Presidency of the United States, she is truly a most outstanding representative of women in the United States and in the World.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S SMALL BUSINESS PROPOSALS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to voice my wholehearted support for President Nixon's constructive proposals to help small business.

In this era of bigness, we should never forget that many of the corporate giants today started out as a one-man shop in a leaky garage. But the inventive tinkerers of the past could never have become successful without a favorable business climate, without adequate financing, without favorable tax policies.

It is to help preserve this climate, and help provide needed assistance for small businessmen that the President has recently acted.

I especially want to endorse his recommendations in behalf of minority enterprise.

Minority members make up 15 percent of our population, but they own less than than 3 percent of our businesses. If our free enterprise system is to mean what it says in the way of offering equal op-

portunity for all, we must redress this imbalance.

One of the President's proposals will help strengthen the program known as MESBIC—Minority Enterprise Small Business Investment Company. Under the able direction of Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans this program is being vigorously pushed, and I think it holds tremendous potential to help qualified minority members start their own businesses. The MESBIC program is a joint undertaking between Government and private business to provide venture capital. A private firm sets up a MESBIC with at least $150,000, which is matched two for one by Government. This $450,000 can generate as much as $2 million in loans for new enterprise.

The President has proposed that this be strengthened in two ways: first, by authorizing banks to become involved as a MESBIC sponsor, and second, by providing for ordinary income tax deductions for contributions to MESBIC's operating under nonprofit corporation statutes.

I intend to support these and the other proposals which have been made by the President. I feel it is extremely important for all of us to back the President in his efforts on behalf of the millions of small businessmen of this Nation who need and deserve our assistance.

THE FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION—WIDOWS' EQUITY BILL

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, as you know, I was privileged to introduce the widows' equity bill at the request of the Fleet Reserve Association. This legislation, if enacted, would provide the surviving widows of deceased military retirees with the same consideration insofar as an annuity is concerned as is now enjoyed by the widows of civil service employees.

Mr. Speaker, this is a longstanding inequity that Congress should correct.

I am pleased that my efforts and those of the Fleet Reserve Association are beginning to be noticed across the Nation. Mrs. Ted D. Fickes, president of the Retired Officers Wives and Widows Club in Long Beach, Calif., recently wrote a letter to the editor of the Santa Ana Register on this subject which I include in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Santa Ana Register, Feb. 11, 1970]

WIDOWS' PENSION

I would like to inform the service people in your area of a very important piece of legislation now pending in the Armed Services Committee.

Congressman Charles Gubser of California introduced H.R. 6226, the Widows Equity Bill. If passed, this bill would give service widows a pension equal to that of Civil Service widows. The men would pay into it. It is not aid! H.R. 6226 would replace that costly and unsatisfactory thing called the serviceman's family protection plan. Only 15 per cent of the servicemen can afford it. On a depressed salary, the enlisted and low rank find it a hardship, and for the retired people it is prohibitive.

Many men in the service do not realize there are widows who are left without any pension after the death of their husbands, even after 30 years of service!

Readers, please write your congressman and senator to vote for and support H.R. 6226.

Mrs. TED D. FICKES,
President, Retired Officers Wives and Widows.

UNSOLICITED CREDIT CARDS FLOOD NATION

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Life magazine in its current issue contains an article concerning the flooding of the Nation with credit cards—including millions of unsolicited cards.

Because of the implications of this indiscriminate distribution of credit cards, the House Small Business Committee is looking into the matter with respect to the impact of these cards issued by big lending institutions and others on small business.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this most important matter, I place the article from Life magazine in the RECORD.

The article follows:

A LITTLE GIFT FROM YOUR FRIENDLY BANKER

(By Paul O'Neil)

American banks have mailed more than 100 million credit cards to unsuspecting citizens of the Republic during the last four years, and have offered each recipient not only a handful of "instant cash" but a dreamy method of buying by signature after the lettuce runs out. One should not conclude that bankers no longer consider money a sacred commodity. They do. They do. But the soberest of trust institutions now suggest that we forget those strictures on thrift with which they belabored us so vigorously in the past and "live better" by refusing to "settle for second best." This means that our friendly banker hopes we will run up credit-card bills we cannot pay off in 25 days and will allow him to charge us EIGHTEEN percent a year on the resultant debt. It does not mean that he trusts us. He will put us on the "hot list" in a flash if we go broke in the process or try to support mistresses at his expense.

We tend to be such 1) slippery, 2) careless or 3) compulsively extravagant louts that bankers have always viewed our attempts to wheedle loans from them with vast suspicion, and have kept the notes by which such transactions are solemnized locked up in fortress-like vaults. The credit-card concept has led them to something very like mailing off hundred-dollar bills to every Tom, Dick and Harry in town, with accompanying notes pledging the receiver to act like a good chap and pay it all back later. They have gamely stifled an instinctive sense of horror in so doing because the cards also present them with an irresistible opportunity for new commercial accounts and the quick, vastly profitable development of widespread consumer credit. Still, some of the effects have been hilarious. In Chicago, during 1966, banks fought each other like jackals to get their cards into the hands of the public only to discover that brigades of thieves, con men and deadbeats were galloping through stores with them and running up disastrous sums in fraudulent or uncollectable debt. And bankers have had to endure incessant complaint at the invasion of privacy inherent in unsolicited distribution, the most vehement of it from innocents discovering—on receipt of bills for mysterious purchases—that cards bearing their names had been waylaid, forged and misused without ever reaching them.

Credit cards, and particularly bank cards, have inspired new and enduring types of white-collar crime, have attracted the beady attention of the Mafia, and have revealed a fascinating capacity for dishonesty in employes of the postal system, who steal them from the mails and sell them for prices up to $50. Their vulnerability to theft while being manufactured, embossed and transported in bulk suggests the possibility of even more spectacular crime in the future; so does the possibility that some larcenous-minded electronics expert might jam up the big computers which record and assess the credit buying they inspire. One of the banks' fondest selling points—that the cards are devices which "simplify" life—is the subject of ironic controversion: insurance companies insist on offering policies to protect the citizen against lawsuits if his cards are lost or stolen. Legislators, meanwhile, view the proliferation of cards with increasing alarm and offer bills to restrict the presumptuousness, even insolence, with which banks utilize the mails in recruiting converts.

But bank cards are here to stay. At least 20 million of the people on whom they have thus far been dumped seem absolutely delighted with them. Most of these enthusiasts are proving perfectly capable, moreover, of maintaining a steady if sometimes precarious balance between improvidence and solvency while using them. Seventy-eight percent of these users are even more obliging; they not only "roll their credit"—by paying off less than they owe each month and thus staying in debt for indeterminate periods—but show no slightest restiveness at the "small service charge of one and one half percent a month" this privilege costs them.

An enormous number of people have thrown their cards into the garbage can, of course, or have cut them up and mailed the pieces back with ill-tempered instructions as to methods of eventual disposal. New York's indignant Democratic Congressman Jonathan B. Bingham has gone further: he has been able to register his objections to plastic credit on the floor of the House of Representatives. These began when Boston's State Street Bank and Trust Company sent him an unsolicited BankAmericard last winter with "my name slightly misspelled." He sent it back with an "angry note." The bank answered with statement of credit-card indebtedness: a bill for a "$10.79 purchase my wife had made by mail from S. S. Pierce Co.—and which she had already paid by check." He dashed off another angry note. "What naiveté," he cried later, on the floor. "The computer was completely unimpressed." He just got another statement, this one with 16¢ in interest added and a "sharp reminder" of his financial delinquency. "I feel," he has told his fellow legislators, "like a character in a Kafka novel!"

But such soreheads—even if they are soreheads who have been elected to high office—do not count. The average man, his senses dulled by an endless reception of junk mail, simply chucks his card into a desk or cupboard or dresser drawer if he is among those who are not instantly galvanized by their bank's sudden new interest in their well-being. He may eventually betray reactions characteristic of the sorehead group: when the bank sends him a follow-up statement (which shows no charges but is simply intended to goad him into revealing whether

he still has his card), he may poke holes in it or punch it full of staples and send it back to confuse the bank's computer. But as long as the card stays in his dresser he is subject, though he is not aware of it, to a curious and enduring sort of subconscious temptation. Bank records indicate he will eventually dig it out and give it a try and will thereafter tend to use it again . . . and again . . .

Banks themselves, meanwhile, have hacked away a good deal of the naiveté inefficiency and confusion which hampered their early efforts to invent and play the new credit game. They have largely abandoned their efforts to go it alone while doing so. Nothing so suggests that the bank card is now a permanent and significant part of American life—and an instrument of social as well as financial change—as the fact that banks have now aligned themselves into the same pattern of dual national organization which has produced Republicans and Democrats, the A.F.L. and the C.I.O. and all those National and American Leagues into which professional sport has so unerringly divided itself. The overwhelming majority of banks now involved in, or just entering, the credit-card business utilize one of two national licensing systems: Bank Americard (developed locally and over a long period of time by California's Bank of America) and the Master Charge card (which competing San Francisco banks hurriedly conceived in 1967 as a response to it).

Promoters of the belated Master Charge card have been forced to play "catch up," as they say in football, and have displayed a certain tendency to fumble and throw long on first down. They have exerted themselves mightily, nevertheless, and both systems are now racing along almost exactly neck and neck. Each card is presently being issued by more than 3,000 banks.

Each system claims slightly more than 20 million "holders." Federal Reserve economists estimate that half of them—10 million possessors of BankAmericards and another 10 million owners of Master Charge cards—use their credit accounts actively and maintain an average indebtedness of $185 apiece. The remaining 20 million members of plastic society have yet to use their cards but still have not, to the banks' best knowledge, tied them to the legs of carrier pigeons, scuffed them up by forcing locks with them, or otherwise abandoned, destroyed or mutilated them.

These overall figures make it dramatically plain that American banks have hoisted themselves, almost overnight, into a position of strategic dominance in the credit-card business. The grand total of all other such credit symbols—oil company cards, restaurant cards, "travel and entertainment" cards and department store charge plates—still exceeds the total of all bank cards, but no single competing company comes close to matching either Bank Americard or Master Charge. The bank card's rate of growth, moreover, is still dizzying; the number of issuing banks has increased nationally by 68% in the last 12 months.

Bank cards still encounter areas of resistance. Most big department stores refuse to honor them since these institutions use their own credit lists to push merchandise by mail and have no impulse to surrender this means of communicating with their customers. Restaurants in many places will have no part of them. They do not yet threaten the three established "travel and entertainment" cards—American Express, Diners' Club and Carte Blanche, which charge a $15.00 annual fee, spurn applicants making less than $7,500 a year unless they have lots of money in the bank, and grant unlimited credit on a 30-to-60-day interest-free basis. But Master Charge and BankAmericard are already so pervasive (the first good in 49 states, the second in 44 and both honored in dozens of foreign countries) and so broadly usable (almost 600,000 retail outlets ranging from pet shops to airlines) that it is difficult not to think they will wipe out most other cards in the long run. Both bank systems tirelessly seek new uses for plastic; holders in 10 different states where banks have made the proper arrangements can now use them in paying up to $500 worth of federal income taxes.

The bank card is still in a state of fiduciary adolescence, but it has already experienced several distinct evolutionary phases—the last, and most stable, of which can be said to have begun last year when four of the biggest New York banks and three lesser ones finally got into the franchised card game. These moratory giants gave plastic credit the sort of ultimate endorsement which, say, pot might achieve if Fifth Avenue dowagers began smoking it in the Oak Room at the Plaza.

It has taken two decades of experimentation to bring the big card game (initially conceived in New York in 1951) to this degree of sophistication. California's Bank of America, which seized upon the idea in 1961, was first to start it toward fruition. As it became apparent that the boys in California were dredging something comparable to the riffle at Sutter's Mill, colleagues all over the country began to catch the prospecting fever too, to shed their trepidation at the public's lamentable tendencies toward insolvency and, one by one, to try panning all those faceless folks out thar beyond the bank for traces of dust which had not yet been paid out for the mortgage, the car and the grocer. The charge card promised to be an instrument which could extract pay dirt from several types of gravel—the banks asked merchants for discounts or kickbacks of from 1% to 6½% on all card credit transactions (in return for which they guaranteed the stores immediate cash for the goods involved in such sales) and, by assuming the job of long-term bill collecting themselves, stood ready to make another 18% per annum on customer indebtedness which endured longer than 25 days. And since a merchant had to open an account to get his dough every day, the card-issuing bank was also presented with a kind of secondary opportunity, a chance to snatch all his other commercial business from some less adventurous competitor.

During the early years of the great plastic rush, however, most of these visions proved to be mirages—and mirages, worse yet, which hid all sorts of quicksand, loco weed and rattlenake nests. Bankers setting out to play the new credit game were involved, almost instantly, in a sort of interlocking dilemma: they could not ask the public to use their cards if no merchants would honor them, and could not ask a merchant for acceptance and discounts without being able to suggest that an army of buyers was gathering outside his showroom windows. They were usually forced, thus, to launch both processes at once—and had to be fast, fast, fast in "getting their plastic on the air" (creditese for card distribution) so that gangs of salesmen could hurry to the task of reciting mailing statistics and hauling tradesmen into the fold. They did so, in many cases, with a kind of eager innocence which none of them would have countenanced for a moment in firms with which they did business; a few of them, caught up in the excitement of the unfamiliar chase, seem to have become as blithely careless of consequences as a drunken sailor shooting craps in a Mexican whorehouse on New Year's Eve.

Some families got six or seven cards from one Chicago bank just before the holiday buying season of 1966 and were occasionally puzzled to discover that the plastic was embossed in the names of infant children. Endless thousands of cards have gone astray in every big city—at times as many as 10% of those put into the mails—because metropolitan cliff dwellers move so continuously. They have been mailed off to unemployables, drunks, narcotics addicts and to compulsive debtors, a process President Johnson's Special Assistant Betty Furness found very like "giving sugar to diabetics."

A study of 84 representative card operations which San Jose Attorney Richard N. Salle and Economist Constantine Danellis conducted last year for the Charge Account Bankers Association showed that only a fifth of the banks investigated checked the credit background of those to whom cards were mailed. Only a third required some minimum balance when sending cards to their own customers. Thirty percent used mailing lists of people with whom the bank had no experience at all, and the citizen who actually came forward and requested a card was welcomed with open arms between 50% and 75% of the time—a fifth of the banks did not even bother to find out if he had a job.

Since bankers try to stay as far as possible from the purlieus of venality, they should doubtless be forgiven for failing to anticipate some of the excited skulduggery they triggered with their mass mailing campaigns. Few if any of them realized that every big city has specialized thieves who prowl apartment house mailboxes on the first of every month looking for relief checks. By sending credit cards out on the first, too, they automatically introduced hundreds of light-fingered parasites to a new and heady means of sustenance. Banks seldom stopped to consider the folly of mailing vast heaps of cards on Friday, thus immobilizing them in substations or post offices over the weekend and all but inviting clerks with low moral thresholds (and correspondingly low salaries) to adopt a few of them at their leisure. Least of all did the new plastic entrepreneurs anticipate the hundreds of small store operators who have formed alliances with possessors of forged, stolen cards, "sold" them hundreds of dollars' worth of fictitious goods, and blithely billed the bank for the resultant nontransactions.

Neither the Department of Justice nor the FBI will make any estimate of the number of bank-card frauds in recent years. Chief Postal Inspector William J. Cotter, while admitting to 80 arrests of postal employes last year and a 700% increase in the last four years in time spent on credit-card investigation by his department, likes to blame the trouble on "long-haired musicians who use stolen cards in one town today and another tomorrow." People who would never steal property or forge a check will run up bills on a stray credit card. The letter carrier who finds himself returning unwanted cards to the bank, the garbage man who discovers discards in the rubbish, the resident of a boarding house who finds one misaddressed on the hall table or the slum housewife who gets one in the mail, all tend to feel fate has sent them a handy little present. So many have been lost, stolen or have gone astray during big orgies of distribution that the smart cheater has been able to use one for a few hours or a few days, throw it away and start using another with only the remotest risk of being caught. If you know the right people in New York today you can buy a validly stamped but unsigned driver's license for $150, forge it, and thus furnish spurious proof of identity if questioned about a forged bank card.

Sixteen retailers, three gas station operators, a postal employe and ten co-conspirators have recently been indicted by a federal grand jury in Chicago—but not before two and a half years of untrammeled larceny in which they did five banks out of "millions of dollars." Brooklyn District Attorney Eugene Gold rails at "helter-skelter card distribution" and, like many another prosecutor, feels he is being called upon to sweep up

mistakes the banks could have avoided with care and foresight. Credit-card fraud has become Brooklyn's leading "white-collar crime," and Gold's office handles 20 complaints which stem from it and institutes one new criminal prosecution involving it every day.

The banks have gone to a great deal of trouble to soothe the misgivings which criminal misuse raises in the breasts of prospective holders and to assure them that they will not be liable for debts incurred after loss or theft—IF (ah, dulcet phrase) they report the incident within 24 hours. There is nothing in the fine print, however, about the fellow who may not miss his plastic for a week or 10 days after it has fallen into the hands of some rascal. This is doubtless wise. The average bank will launch itself after such an unfortunate like a grizzly charging a rabbit if it decides he has been "negligent," and could hardly improve its image by publicizing the ominous fiduciary snuffling and the squeaks of horror and dismay which characterize these undignified little episodes. There is nothing unique, for instance, about the methods with which New York's First National City Bank is attempting to extract dough from a hapless Brooklyn bug exterminator, Daniel Orlick.

Orlick and his wife Gloria were not only delighted but flattered when First National City invited them to sign up for one of its credit cards last year—a fellow in insect eradication does not make much money or hear much applause as he practices his specialty, and both felt a sense of improved status when they were embraced by plastic society. But Orlick, alas, seldom actually used his card and had no idea how long it had been missing when he duly wrote the bank, last April 16, to say he had lost it.

He was not only horrified but astonished (since the card had a credit limit of $400) to receive a statement for $558.82 by return mail. Another statement quickly followed, this time for $1,137.06. Gloria telephoned the bank in agitation to say 1) that her husband had reported the loss, 2) to ask how a crook could evade the $400 limit and 3) to protest that the Orlicks didn't have $1,137.06 to pay for anything, least of all some nogoodnik's illegal pursuit of *la dolce vita*. "Nobody at the bank seemed to know what was going on," she says. "I had an awful time just getting somebody who would talk to me. And when they finally switched me to a man in the collections department he was terribly cold and nasty . . . he just told me to get the money and said he didn't care how we did it."

Statement, meanwhile, followed statement—the last of them for $1,636.02. One of them listed the license number of a car for which Orlick's personal crook had bought gasoline. "I thought I'd hit gold," cries Gloria. "I called the cops. I called the bank's security department. But they both told me it had been a rented car or something." Rented car or not, the Orlicks stubbornly went on refusing to pay, and First National City, having failed to squeeze the crook's total expenditures out of them, now calculates that his spending amounted to no more than $963.98 at the time Orlick reported the loss of his card. The bank is presently hacking at them through the offices of a lawyer, who has added legal fees to the $963.98 which bring it up to $1,156.76 and has hauled them into court to attempt to collect it. The Orlicks have consulted a lawyer, too. "*He* tells us to settle," says Gloria, "since he won't defend us for less than $500. We dont' know *what* to do. Right now we're living with it, y'know?"

Plastic society will doubtless go on producing similar vicitims, since its members will inevitably go on losing their status symbols, too, but bank-card fraud is nevertheless being reduced in many sections of the country. Progressive banks check the credit of prospective holders with increasing diligence, and have hit on simple but effective means of tightening up their mailing techniques. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company of New York, for instance, now hides its cards in pieces of paperboard to prevent their being "felt" by mail handlers, encloses these "carriers" in plain envelopes of varying colors, sorts the envelopes into batches intended for specific neighborhoods, and delivers each batch to its particular substation in mailbags which remain sealed until turned over to letter carriers. Unsolicited mass mailing itself, meanwhile, has largely served its purpose and is dwindling away; banks which have utilized it to recruit their basic cadres of users are abandoning it to court volunteer applicants by more selective means, and are inventing methods (free bottles of wine for those who pay restaurants with credit cards rather than vulgar cash) of "activating" all that old but virgin plastic lying around, unused, in the cupboards of stubborn, debt-shy and unspeakably old-fashioned burglars.

There are those who believe the credit card is provoking a revolution in banking as profound as that which ensued after London's goldsmiths began issuing notes rather than actual cash during the 17th Century, and that the arrogance, haste and confusion attendant on its introduction must be accepted, even forgiven, as by-products of inevitable and salutary change. Whatever the validity of this view, one must guess that plastic credit is equally significant as a social phenomenon and, salutary or not, will influence the values and living habits of the average man at least as dramatically as it influences the techniques of the counting-house. Millions of card users, for instance, are already the creatures of big, third-generation computers, machines which provide the real key to successful card systems since they eliminate paper work and can oversee and monitor the financial condition and buying habits of enormous masses of people.

Both BankAmericard and Master Charge banks have banded into regional "interchange" associations which finance and operate this electronic hardware on a communal basis. The Master Charge groups alone, for instance, maintain 13 central computer centers in the U.S., the biggest and most fascinating of them in an industrial park at Long Island's Lake Success. The Long Island plant now represents 220 banks in New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Florida, Wisconsin and Delaware. Its gleaming, white-brick building houses complex machinery which "captures" data from an endless flow of sales slips, and two IBM 360–50 computers which not only store the resultant torrent of information, but can vomit back status reports on any of two million cards in the twinkling of an eye.

How deeply has a card user eaten into his $200 or $400 credit limit? The computer knows. Has a card been used to make "suspicious" purchases—three sports jackets in one day, say, or seven automobile tires? The computer will express a kind of electronic anxiety when it is next asked for comment. Eastern Master Charge merchants, 30,000 of whom now operate under the jurisdiction of the Long Island installation, must dial a telephone code number and communicate with the computer before charging any item of $50 or more. Rows of girls, who wear telephonic headsets and spend their days facing television screens at the center, act as intermediaries in this process; the merchant reads his customer's Master Charge number over the telephone, the girl punches it on a numerical keyboard, and the screen instantly reveals the condition of the card account in question. The Lake Success plant maintains its own private police—a knot of poker-faced ex-cops in vaguely unnatural sports jackets—who cut in on the line if the computer announces that a card has been lost, stolen or has been misused, and tell the merchant to grab the plastic if he can do so without bodily harm and attempt to detain the customer while they alert the local cops.

All this screening—and the fact that banks themselves are assembling larger and larger "security" forces which investigate fraud and turn their evidence over to the police—is gradually bringing misuse under control. There are still gaps in these *chevaux-de-frise:* the advent of the bank cards usuable anywhere in the country or in Europe has offered the credit crook something of the same opportunity zone defenses offer the pass receiver in football: if he moves fast enough from one computer area to the next while entertaining blondes and running up hotel bills, he can very probably stay a jump ahead of the law for a long time. And the card associations nervously anticipate bigger crime. The embossing machines which imprint names and numbers on plastics blanks at Lake Success are installed in a glasswalled room. The women who run them must lock up their coats and handbags on reporting to work and endure the constant scrutiny of guards while on shift. Both blanks and finished cards are taken in and out of the industrial park in armored cars.

But if credit-card crime can be expected to go on providing the kind of headlines bankers deplore, it is far less important than the antidotes it inspires. The controls and communications systems which are being developed to make plastic credit fraud-free and efficient also involve the ordinary card user and will do so more dramatically in the future. The bank card is an imperfect medium of exchange at the moment because nobody can be absolutely certain that it, unlike the impersonal $20 bill, is always backed by real buying power. If a seller could make sure a credit-card buyer is who he says he is on every occasion and could discover whether he has enough cash in his account to pay for his purchase, this difficulty could be eliminated. Bank associations, thus, are pressing for means of achieving "instant communication and instant credit verification."

IBM and TRW, Inc., are currently engaged, for instance, in the development of an experimental system known as Omniswitch. Banking alliances such as the eastern Master Charge institutions, which have commissioned this particular work, hope in the end to achieve computers which can not only be reached, automatically, from any telephone in the country, but which will recite the state of the customer's account in clear English ("audio-response") and, on being instructed by a few taps of a touch-tone button, will deduct the price of his purchase at the very moment he makes it.

It would be hard to guess just how completely Americans might embrace the sort of social implications such a system could inspire—although millions have already cast a vote for some of them by signing their present cards and millions more will doubtless follow suit. The credit card is inflationary (merchants must be expected to ooch prices a bit to compensate for their kickbacks to the banks), even though it is responsible for only 2% of today's $98.2 billion on consumer debt. It is expensive, at least for the majority which pays 1.5% a month on its bills. It can still lead to hideous embarrassments if lost. But it remains, in its curious way, a status symbol; most banks refer to it as a "charge" card rather than a credit card, since they have discovered that a vast segment of the middle class believes debt is sinful but charging is chic. More fascinating yet, it seems to be a kind of key to dreams. Bank-card advertising, like those airline commercials which call upon us to drop everything and take fly-now-pay-later flights to Hawaii or, God save us all, Zurich, subtly suggest that actual money is not really involved.

There is a possibility, thus, that credit cards could become a major medium of exchange and that the future American could end up with just one of them as his means of paying for almost everything—his house and car as well as his suits and lunches. The one-card man would be called upon to tell his bank's computer more about his life, times, financial condition and fondness for drink or drugs than many of us might like to confess today, but he might be privy to delights which we are denied. Take lifetime credit for newly married couples, calculated on an actuarial basis from estimates of total potential earnings and expenses. Such couples could get a kind of emotional bonus, too—at least according to New York Marketing Consultant Lawrence G. Chait: "Their credit man would become their family counselor."

And a one-card world might just provide realization, at last, of that splendid concept, the Universal Number. One would be privileged, if so, to possess a personal number from the cradle to the grave: it would be printed on one's baby bracelet, stamped on one's schoolbooks, utilized as one's lifetime license number and as one's serial number in the service—and, of course, embossed on one's all-time credit card. Those who pine for a simplistic and revelatory society will be comforted to know that a committee of the American Bankers Association is aware of the opportunity and is considering the added efficiency it could bring to plastic credit.

A REASONABLE BILL

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation designed to relieve an inequity in the Communications Act. My bill would amend the act to exempt certain categories of commercial fishing vessels from existing equipment and operator requirements.

I am convinced that an injustice was committed when fishing vessels were subjected to the same standards as cargo boats by 1965 amendments to the act.

As most of our colleagues know, the domestic fishing industry has been losing ground to foreign competitors thrust forward by the helpful policies of their own governments.

To comply with the 1965 requirements will impose serious additional hardship on our already hard-pressed fishermen. I am told that costs of the necessary modifications will average about $1,000 in smaller vessels, and that the requirement that fishing boats displacing 1,600 gross tons or more carry a radio telegraph station and operator has effectively ruled out these larger, more efficient vessels for our own fishermen.

International conventions, to which the United States subscribes, have clearly differentiated between cargo and fishing boats in setting forth standards for radios and other communications gear.

Our own fishermen should not be hobbled by unduly stringent requirements that are not imposed on their foreign rivals.

SOUTH CAROLINA POSTAL EMPLOYEES ARE ON THE JOB

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, it now appears that the mammoth postal strike which for the past few days has literally paralyzed many of our major urban areas, has subsided to the extent that we can now look back on this national crisis and make some observations.

Without question, the postal employees have some justifiable grievances, no less of which is salary, especially in view of the substantial increases given in many of the higher echelons of Federal employment, which includes the Congress. Of course I introduced a resolution to disapprove the congressional increase in the light of the serious financial situation; nevertheless, many postal employees look upon this as justification for immediate action in meeting their salary demands.

Since I first came to Congress in 1962, I have argued consistently that our postal workers are not receiving adequate compensation. I have introduced and supported legislation over the years to correct this inequity and I will certainly continue to do so. The day should have long ago passed when our postal or any other Federal employee had to moonlight in order to support his family.

If there was ever a time to commend our loyal, dedicated, and patriotic postal workers who, day in and day out, fair or foul weather, are on the job, it is right now. Now I am not talking about those who abandoned their responsibilities to the people, whom they are sworn to serve, and walked off their jobs several days ago. When one considers the totality of the situation, the strikers only constituted a fraction of American postal employees. Despite incredible pressure, the great majority of employees stood fast and made certain that the mails were not interrupted. In this connection, I want to commend, in the highest fashion, post office employees in my State of South Carolina. I know of no group more dedicated and devoted to the public than postal workers in South Carolina.

In every town and city in our State which has a post office, they are considered pillars of the community. Oftentimes in our smaller cities, the post office is the only Federal installation and for many people this is the only physical contact that they will have with the Federal Government. With very few exceptions, in South Carolina, the post office workers are ambassadors of good will for the Government. The events of the past few days have served as a symbolic reminder of their faithfulness to the public trust. Rather than defy the law, post office employees in South Carolina were on the job as usual.

I feel confident that Congress will enact a meaningful postal pay raise bill this year, but Congress cannot legislate under a threat by a small minority of workers who participate in an illegal work stoppage. Last year I supported H.R. 13000, the Federal Salary Comparability Act of 1969. The object of this bill is to keep Federal wage scales comparable to those in private industry as well as include a pay raise for most postal workers and reducing from 21 to 8 years the time required to reach top postal pay levels. I believe that we must enact this legislation in behalf of our loyal postal workers. While we deplore the irresponsible strike of the few, let us not forget the responsible actions of the overwhelming majority.

KANSANS LIKE "SESAME STREET"

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most exciting new programs for children is a half-hour presentation called "Sesame Street" which is produced by the Children's Television Workshop and supported by the U.S. Office of Education. It is aimed at the Nation's 12 million preschool children and constitutes a major breakthrough and promises for the first time to plant the seeds of learning in young minds before they reach school through television.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Kansas Teacher, official publication of the Kansas State Teachers' Association, which illustrates the enthusiastic reaction to "Sesame Street" in Kansas. The article follows:

KANSANS LIKE "SESAME STREET"

100 percent raves.

That's how Mrs. Dorothy Stafford, television curriculum specialist for KTWU in Topeka, describes the letters and telephone calls thanking the station for "Sesame Street," the National ETV show for preschoolers.

"We get thank-you's every day from both children and adults," she said, adding the only criticism has been from parents asking if the show could be changed to the afternoons or repeated on Saturdays.

A telephone call from a Topeka mother is typical. She said "My son has just sat still in front of the television for an hour. That's the first time he's ever done that."

Mrs. Stafford's mail shows that critics come in all ages and sizes. One four-year-old girl writes "I like 'Sesame Street' a lot but once you called a whale a fish. A whale is not a fish."

Another child's letter had the number "2" on a page. His mother's note of explanation: "My two-year-old has just made his first '2' while watching 'Sesame Street.' It's such a relief to know this show requires no monitoring."

"Sesame Street" is successfully competing according to an Abilene mother. She writes: "Our three-year-old son knows that when the 'Lucy Show' comes on it's time for 'Sesame Street' and he changes stations."

Variety magazine reports that Nielson ratings for the first week in December show that between five and six million children watch the show each day. This represents about half of the nation's preschoolers.

In a recent memo to the stations carrying

"Sesame Street," Joan Cooney, executive director of the Children's Television Workshop (CTW), says plans are being made to continue the show next fall.

CTW produces the show, partially supported by the U.S. Office of Education. CTW and USOE are studying the show's audience and its educational effects. Results will be available this spring.

AIR POLLUTION

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the March 26 issue of the Wall Street Journal carried an informative article written by Mr. John V. Conti on the efforts of private citizens and State authorities to control and eliminate air pollution through our judicial system.

The article notes that the judiciary of this country is being given an opportunity to join the legislative and executive branches in recognizing the danger inherent in man's misuse of the environment. Therefore, I include the text of this article at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CLEANING UP IN COURTS: CONSERVATIONISTS PRESS SUITS TO ASSERT RIGHT TO A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT—PHOENIX ACTION SAYS SMOKE DAMAGES NATURAL BEAUTY; ILLINOIS TACKLES AIRLINES—INDUSTRY FEARS THE COSTS

(By John V. Conti)

Do you have a legal right to fresh air?

A growing number of conservation groups and governmental agencies contend that you do—and that you likewise are legally entitled to clean waterways, clear blue skies and surroundings where a reasonable number of scenic wonders and breeding grounds for wildlife are left undisturbed. They contend, moreover, that it doesn't take a special law to guarantee your right to these things—they're simply yours.

That may sound like a novel idea, but it's inspiring a broad legal attack in courts across the nation against all sorts of degradation of the environment. Scores of lawsuits have been filed recently by conservation organizations, irate individuals and public officials determined to establish the right of everybody to pollution-free surroundings. Many suits contend that ordinary legal concepts of nuisance and negligence should be expanded to protect the environmental rights of the citizen, while others argue that such rights are protected by the Constitution.

RESTRICTED VISIBILITY

In Phoenix, for example, two university professors and their wives are seeking $2 billion in damages from six copper companies that operate nearly all the copper smelters in Arizona. The suit charges that smoke from the smelters not only is injurious to health but also restricts visibility and "damages the natural beauty of the environment." The plaintiffs are asking that the damages be divided among the 700,000 residents of the Salt River Valley, which encompasses Phoenix.

In Alexandria, Va., a citizens association and two conservation groups have filed suit to block an apartment development that would require filling about nine acres of the Hunting Creek Estuary, one of a number of estuaries that shelter wildlife along the Potomac River. The suit, brought on Constitutional grounds, contends that the development would damage a valuable natural resource of the people.

The Justice Department recently filed a civil suit against Florida Power & Light Co., charging that the utility is creating thermal pollution of Biscayne Bay with heated water discharged by two of its power plants. Contending that the thermal pollution is "rapidly ruining marine life," the suit asks a court order requiring the company to set up and adhere to a schedule for ending the pollution.

There's ample evidence that the suits filed so far are just a start. The battle is increasingly taking on the character of a well-organized campaign coordinated by various environmentalist groups.

NEWS OF LITIGATION

The Conservation Foundation, a Washington-based research and information group, plans to start publishing an environmental law "reporter" this summer to bring details of significant pollution litigation to lawyers. The American Trial Lawyers Association recently formed an environmental law committee, and it has held seminars on environmental suits for lawyers, scientists, law students and others.

Just last weekend a group known as the Natural Resources Defense Council Inc. was formed at a meeting in Princeton, N.J. Modeled after the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund, the group plans to bring pollution suits and to help others do so just as the fund has done in civil rights cases. The group's organizers are a number of New York attorneys, including Wall Street lawyer Stephen Duggan.

The defendants in environmental suits are nearly always corporations, and the specter of an explosion of such litigation has confronted U.S. industry with a huge potential for damage liability. Corporate executives also are worried about the delay and disruption of planned expansions that are challenged by environmentalists.

The potential cost to industry in existing claims is already sizable. "The amount in litigation over the country is staggering," says Frank L. Seamans, a Pittsburgh lawyer who has defended such companies as U.S. Steel, Aluminum Co. of America, Sun Oil Corp. and Monsanto Chemical Co. against pollution damage suits.

One suit, filed in Federal court in New York on behalf of "all the people of the United States" including "generations yet unborn," demands a colossal $30 billion in damages from eight producers of DDT for punishment and restitution of damage allegedly done to the environment by the pesticide. The suit was filed by Carol A. Yannacone of Patchogue, N.Y., wife of a lawyer who has been active in environmental causes.

BILLIONS FOR SMOG

Another potentially huge claim was filed by the state of California earlier this month against the four major auto makers and the Automobile Manufacturers Association. Charging that the companies and the trade associations conspired to halt development of auto smog-control devices, the suit asks redress for damages caused in the state by auto exhaust pollution. The amount is unspecified, but state officials say it could run into billions of dollars.

Most companies that have been named as defendants in environmental suits are reluctant to discuss the details of the cases. But a spokesman for U.S. Steel, which has been involved in a number of cases, says, "We take all these suits very seriously."

Many of those filing pollution suits say they are doing so because they feel anti-pollution laws and those who enforce them simply don't do an adequate job. "If there's a theme to all these suits, it's an attempt to circumvent relatively ineffective regulatory agencies," says Joseph L. Sax, a University of Michigan law professor who is writing a book on environmental law.

In Illinois, under a controversial new law, state Attorney General William J. Scott can bring civil action on his own against any polluter, whether or not the matter is being considered by any other state agency.

"We saw that all the discourse relating to pollution was between industry and the boards of enforcement, which were more or less dominated by industry-oriented people. The public, which was being polluted, was never part of the discussion," says Allen A. Freeman, deputy attorney general. "So we developed the concept that the attorney general is the lawyer for the people and therefore wil bring lawsuits on behalf of the people in the field of pollution."

Among the results is a suit filed just Tuesday against the city of Chicago, charging the city with illegal dumping and open burning of refuse at O'Hare Field. The suit alleges the burning causes air pollution and hampers the visibility of airlines pilots when landing. It asks a permanent injunction to prevent the city from continuing the dumping and burning.

The attorney general's office also has filed suit against 23 airlines that use the airport, seeking to force them to install new pollution-control devices on all aircraft engines. Other suits seek court-enforced timetables that would force U.S. Steel and Republic Steel to clean up discharges by their plants into Lake Michigan and the Calumet River. Mr. Scott also has filed an antitrust suit against the four major auto makers, alleging a conspiracy to avoid installation of smog-control devices on cars.

To be sure, the criminal laws pertaining to pollution aren't being entirely ignored. In recent weeks, the Federal Government has filed criminal suits against Olin Corp., Procter & Gamble Co., International Harvester Co., and others, charging them with polluting Chicago-area waterways. New Jersey's Department of Health is pushing a program against industrial pollution that has resulted in 140 complaints and $140,000 in court-ordered penalties.

At this point, no one knows what the results of most civil pollution suits will be. "Very few of these matters are beyond the pleading stage," says James Jeans, a professor at the University of Missouri law school who is chairman of the American Trial Lawyers Association's environmental law committee.

But, emboldened by a few early successes, environmentalists feel they stand a good chance of expanding the established legal concepts of nuisance or negligence to cover environmental questions.

Such legal concepts traditionally have been tied closely to property rights. "Until recently you didn't have a damage claim except for physically demonstrable damage, such as if your cow died or your tree died" as a result of pollution, says Pittsburgh lawyer Seamans.

But now environmental litigants are seeking both to prove harm that is other than economic and to assert rights less tangible than property rights. This has raised a question known to lawyers as "standing" to sue—or the ability to prove that you have a right to bring your problems before a court.

MORE LIBERAL CONCEPT

In the past, if a man couldn't show any direct personal economic harm, courts tended to throw his claim out on grounds that he didn't have any standing in the case. But in recent years the courts have become far more liberal in their concept of standing, permitting persons to come before the court as members of the public alleging damage to the public interest.

One of the most important decisions on the question of standing occurred in what is probably, in terms of legal precedent, the most important environmental case argued so far—the battle of conservationists to prevent construction of a power plant at Storm King Mountain in the Hudson River in New York. The conservationists succeeded in getting standing in court to challenge the Federal Power Commission's approval of Consolidated Edison Co.'s plans to build the plant. (At the moment, after years of litigation, the case is back before the FPC under a Federal court order requiring the FPC to reconsider its approval of the plant, taking environmental factors into account.)

The Storm King case established that conservationists do have standing to argue against planned projects that they contend would harm the environment.

Once in court, of course, environmentalists still must prove damage to the environment is occurring. "The courts want something a little more definite than people coming in and saying the sky isn't as blue as it used to be, or that the fumes are aggravating their sinuses," says Roderick A. Cameron, executive director of the Environmental Defense Fund, a Long Island-based coalition of lawyers and scientists.

INTANGIBLE INTERESTS

Still, he notes, "the courts are now a little more inclined to move in the direction of protecting these intangible interests."

One of the problems faced by environmental groups is coming up with the technical data to prove that pollution exists and to show its effects. To help with technical problems, Mr. Cameron's Environmental Defense Fund has put together a committee of about 300 scientists who are willing to lend their expertise and testify in environmental cases. "We're acquiring a stable of expert witnesses," says Mr. Cameron, who, at 31, is himself both a lawyer and an engineer.

The fund also plans a program of mock trials at universities, using law students as lawyers and faculty members as expert witnesses so that all those involved will get some experience with pollution litigation. "Scientists are a little leery of getting involved in litigation, but once they get their feet wet they're a little less so," Mr. Cameron says.

MINORITY ENTERPRISES

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, minorities represent about 15 percent of our country's population, but only 2.9 percent of America's businesses. Efforts are being made, however, to bring these figures into equilibrium so that the minorities of America will be better able to participate as owners and employers in our free enterprise system. One of the leading agencies behind this drive has been OMBE—the Office of Minority Business Enterprise—U.S. Department of Commerce.

My understanding of OMBE and its programs has been broadened, thanks to some welcome assistance. A brief but concise outline of the program has been prepared by a Dominguez State College student from my 17th California District, Wilhelm "Bill" Pickens. His outline is based on information gathered at an OMBE meeting held on February 12, 1970, in Los Angeles and from the study of publications dealing with Federal assistance programs for minority business enterprises.

I have found the outline an excellent ready reference and information source and believe it may be of interest to some of my colleagues. So that others will be able to take advantage of Mr. Pickens' outline, I submit it for the RECORD:

MEETING

Office of Minority Enterprises (OMBE) held at the Federal Building, Los Angeles, Calif., on Friday, February 6, 1970, at 9:10 a.m. until 11:00 a.m. with one hour lecture and one hour question-answer period.

I. Creation of the OMBE.

A. Evolved from dialogue between Richard Nixon and Hubert Humphrey during the 1968 Campaign.

B. Nixon Executive Order 11458: Focuses efforts on minority businesses from private business, federal, state, and local business enterprises.

C. Advisory Council for minority enterprises.

II. Problem.

A. The minority is 15% of the population.

1. Out of 5,400,000 businesses, minorities own only 2.9% of the businesses.

2. Three leading minority ownerships of businesses are:

a. Life insurance, .2% assets.

b. Banks, .04% assets.

c. Gas stations, assets unknown.

B. Difficulties of minority businesses.

1. Qualifications.

2. Business heritage.

3. Opportunity.

4. Capital.

5. Business know-how.

III. Focus of Change for the OMBE.

A. Commitment of the Nixon Administration.

B. Minority determination to get a piece of the action.

C. Rising income (consumer market).

D. Improve education and skill level.

E. Increase commitment by the majority of the community.

IV. Role of OMBE.

A. Programs of Federal Government.

B. Programs of private sector.

C. Enlist State and local organizations.

D. Stimulate minority communities.

E. Act as information center.

V. Ingredients of Minority Businesses.

A. Qualifiable individual.

B. Realistic opportunity.

C. Adequate capital.

D. Managerial assistance.

VI. Sources of candidates.

A. Existing businesses.

B. Returning veterans.

C. Educational institutions.

D. Community organizations.

VII. Sources of opportunities.

A. Individuals.

B. Franchises.

C. Turnkey (Spin-off corporation businesses)

D. Government procurement.

E. Business procurement.

VIII. Sources of Capital.

A. Government.

B. Business.

C. Credit.

IX. Sources of Assistance.

A. SBA Program.

B. Industry.

C. Progressions.

D. Educational institutions.

E. Community action.

F. Trade organizations.

X. Co-ordination of government activities.

A. Inter-agency committees.

B. Task force and work groups.

C. Publicity of federal assistance programs.

D. Fixed program goals—$31 million for fiscal 1970.

E. Initiated pilot programs.

XI. Information.

A. Monthly publication of OMBE outlook.

B. Public direction of private assistance programs.

C. Information center on minority enterprise activities.

D. Fifty-three workshops with community organizations.

E. The present program enlarged to 48 national forums.

F. Company data banks available.

G. Statement of policy for minority enterprise programs.

XII. Business Opportunity Programs.

A. Franchising.

B. Gas service stations.

C. Auto dealerships.

D. Contract preferences: Survey of minority manufacturers capabilities.

XIII. Minority Small Business Investment Company (MESBIC Plan)—Major Ideas of MESBIC Program.

A. Provisions.

1. Corporate involvement.

2. 85% of capital will be private.

3. Technical assistance.

4. Minimum interference from government.

5. Non-profit motivation.

B. Example of MESBIC Plan:

Sponsor capital (minimum)	$150,000
SBA Matching (two for one)	300,000
Total	450,000
Bank loans, capital with SBA guarantee	1,800,000
Total	2,250,000

XIV. Assistance Program.

A. Professions.

B. Trade associations.

C. Graduate and undergraduate schools of businesses.

XV. Pending Programs

A. Census of minority business population.

B. Survey of minority businesses.

C. Activities of community organizations.

D. Resources directories.

E. National conferences with foundations, banks, universities.

F. Public service advertising of OMBE.

G. State OMBE.

H. Scholarship assistance programs.

XVI. Business opportunities.

A. Veteran's Programs.

B. Indian Reservation Programs.

C. Spin-off programs.

D. Opportunity in retailing.

E. Urban coalition.

XVII. Financial assistance.

A. One hundred MESBICS.

B. Major insurance commitment.

C. Foundation seed money.

D. Minority bank deposit programs.

E. AMANA Plan (not clarified).

F. Minority insurance coverage.

G. Government guaranteed bonding for contractors.

H. Subsidy guaranteed SBA loans.

OVERALL PLAN: THE ANSWER?

Qualifiable individual, Capital, Business opportunity, and Managerial Assistance, working with a local organization equals new business enterprises.

Comment: This meeting that I attended was very interesting and enlightening in some ways, but I saw a lack of minorities in attendance. The foundation of this program follows the 1965 Bedford-Stuyvesant Project sponsored by Senator Robert F. Kennedy, except that his program included minority leadership and participation.

THE CONSTITUTION—NEED AND FULFILLMENT

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion national speech contest, on the subject of the Constitution, is an excellent experience for youths—boys and girls—of high school age. The contestants give a 10-minute prepared speech, and then give a 5-minute presentation after 5 minutes of preparation, on a Constitution-related subject drawn out of a hat.

This year's Virginia State winner was James "Mac" Davis, a senior at Wakefield High School in Arlington County. On April 6, he will compete against several other State winners at Rocky Mount, N.C. His prepared speech, submitted here for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, is entitled "The Constitution—Need and Fulfillment."

"Mac," incidentally, is my son. His speech follows:

THE CONSTITUTION—NEED AND FULFILLMENT

(By James "Mac" Davis)

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is my introduction. It is also the introduction to the Constitution of our Nation as it was written 183 years ago. The Preamble sets forth the purpose and aim of the document it introduces. It also reflects the pressing need of the time for that document.

Cornwallis' surrender at Yorktown ended the Revolutionary War for all practical purposes. Thereafter, a period of instability in finance and politics settled upon the fledgling, newly independent states along the Atlantic Coast. Each individual state considered itself sovereign, and each selfishly guarded its affirmed right to govern itself. In fact, these thirteen individual states regarded each other with open jealousy. Several highly inflated and unstable currencies sprang up, including the continentals issued by the Continental Congress; pieces of paper so worthless that even today we hear the adage "not worth a continental." States raised tariff barriers against each other. State legislatures, which had assumed Revolutionary War debts, refused to pay them. Private credit was destroyed by irresponsible acts allowing debtors to escape payment of their obligations. Great Britain refused to reopen vital trade channels between the British Commonwealth and the American states, and British troops continued to occupy what was then known as the Northwest territory. On two occasions armed conflict over boundary disputes erupted between adjoining states. In Massachusetts Captain Daniel Sharp led thousands of armed farmers in a march on the State Capital at Boston.

This unrest was manifested in a petition circulated among the officers of the Continental Armies by a Colonel Nicola. The petition asked George Washington to become a military-supported dictator. Although General Washington vigorously refused, he and other patriots were apprised of the seriousness and depth of the economic and political crisis which confronted America; thus he joined with Madison, Hamilton, Franklin, and others in supporting the calls for a Constitutional convention.

These were the turbulent background years which brought the delegates of the thirteen states together at Philadelphia in May of 1787.

In less than four months under the wise and patient chairmanship of a great Virginian who was to become known as the Father of our Country, these delegates, drawing upon their knowledge of history, upon their experiences under prerevolutionary tyranny and post revolutionary domestic anarchy and international affront, through compromising their strongly expressed, and strongly felt feelings, drafted a document which will forever stand as a milestone in the story of freedom, a document which eventually fulfilled the needs of a new America, a document which British statesman William Gladstone called "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

When Gladstone made that statement he had the advantage of years and history to sustain him. The men of Revolutionary times, however, had only the strength of their faith and determination to guide the Constitution to fulfillment. These brave men recognized that great words alone cannot assure a successful government. Thus when Benjamin Franklin was asked at the close of the Convention "What kind of a government do we have now?" his answer was *"A Republic if we can keep it so."*

A framework of government carefully designed to protect free people from tyranny on the one hand and anarchy on the other, a government of three separate co-equal branches, a government of checks and balances, *if we can keep it so.*

The Constitution was boldly designed to preserve and nurture the creed of liberty. But however pure the truths of the Constitution, they are not self sustaining. Laws can only do so much. The writers of the Constitution gave us an outline for preserving the principles they cherished. The rest is up to us, the people of the United States.

In the second generation of our Republic's existence, the French historian, Guziot, while visiting in the United States asked the American James Russell Lowell in what was probably a cynical manner, how long will the American Republic endure? Lowell's answer was "So long as the ideals of our founding fathers continue to dominate." In these words did this great American writer remind the Americans of his generation and of all generations to shoulder the burden of responsibility as citizens of the American Republic, as well as savor the benefits of that citizenship.

And so, like James Russell Lowell, let me remind you, the Americans of this generation, that our prized rights of free speech, free press, and that of dissent are useless unless used. So I urge those with something constructive to say to speak up, those with something constructive to write to print it, and those with something to oppose to constructively dissent. But use your rights, don't abuse them. There may be those who truly believe that our government is bad and our Nation evil, and that the only remedy is verbal desecration and material destruction.

Because of these people and for our own sake, the American citizens, like us, who do cherish our Constitution should speak out and be felt throughout the land. If you love this country, protect it, for it is your God given duty to protect what you love. Speak out for the Constitution, and do so proudly. Be a constructive American citizen.

The Constitution has given us a government strong enough to defend us, to protect us, and yet limited in its authority, thus protecting our individual rights as citizens. Clearly justice will be established, domestic tranquility will prevail, the defense will be assured, the general welfare will be promoted, and liberty will be secured to ourselves and our posterity only to the extent that we, the citizens of today, preserve the ideals of our founding fathers and adhere to the just principles of the Constitution which they ordained and established. The Constitution can fulfill the needs of America only if we the people make it work.

The patriots of this nation's birth recognized the task for men of retaining liberty. They wrote a Constitution to aid in liberty's protection. The patriots of a hundred years later recognized the task for men of expanding liberty. They fought Civil War to preserve unity and extend freedom. The patriots of today face an awesome task for man. They must preserve unity and protect the ancient, delicate and powerful concept of liberty in a modern world.

This is the challenge of our time. This is the torch we carry. This is our dream for the future. Responsible leadership of the free world, staunch support of Constitutional principles and of the laws of our land which implement our Constitution.

Love of our Country, respect for its institutions, vigorous participation in American citizenship, respect for the decisions of the majority while guarding the rights of the minority.

These are the ideals of the founding fathers. These are the principles. These are the traditions of those who gave us "One Nation, under God, Indivisible, with Liberty and Justice for all."

THE TEMPTATIONS: SPECIALISTS IN SOUL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, some people achieve success and on attaining it soon forget whence they came. Then there are others for whom personal success seems not to interfere with their concern for those less fortunate. It is in this last category that I would place the Temptations.

If there are any of my colleagues who may not be familiar with the Temptations, may I point out that they are the top male vocal recording group in America—specializing in soul music. They are by name—Paul Williams, Dennis Edwards, Melvin Franklin, Otis Williams, and Eddie Kendricks. Under the guiding hand of Berry Gordy, Jr., president of Motown, the Temptations have risen to the heights as indicated by Trade magazine's vote for them as "the world's most successful singing group." They have an enthusiastic following among the young as well as the not so young.

In these troubled times, too often we fail to take notice of some of the more positive things that young people are doing. For that reason I would draw your attention to these five young men who have used their talents and their popularity in a very constructive way. From their humble Alabama origins through formative teen years in Detroit, they have

carried with them a concern for others which was apparently instilled in them early in their lives through family training and regular church attendance.

There are few artists that I know who have devoted more of their time and talents to public service. They have committed themselves to at least four benefits a year—netting for civic and charitable purposes over a quarter of a million dollars. Through a scholarship fund which they established in memory of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., they provide the means for a number of young persons to attend college. They spend a great deal of their leisure time visiting schools in order to stress the value of education and to encourage young people to remain in school. Each of the group has established businesses in the Detroit area which have created jobs and training opportunities for black youngsters. Their involvement is total and sincere, and whether they are communicating with young people on the basketball court, the baseball field, by personal speaking appearances or through their music, the effect has been inspirational to many and appreciated by all.

They have also contributed as ambassadors of good will and understanding in their travels abroad from Asia to Europe. Most recently they were received in London by the Archbishop of Canterbury who had heard of their good works and invited them to meet with him in his efforts to get a better understanding of racial problems and solutions in this country. I understand that this meeting has resulted in a continuing friendship and dialog.

As a Member of Congress from the Detroit area, I have observed these young men moving about in the community giving encouragement, speaking out on pressing civic problems and, oftentimes by just lending their presence, making their concern for a better city and Nation known to everyone. They have become great but have remained humble and loyal to the concept of raising the standards of those less fortunate so that all can participate in the opportunities this country affords. I am proud to be among their fans who are legion. May the Temptations continue to spread their special brand of soul-music and meaningful concern for others.

APPROVAL OF COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL SECURITY

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, due to a committed speaking engagement, I was unfortunately absent yesterday when the roll was called for the vote on House Resolution 844, to authorize funding for the Committee on Internal Security. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea" for approval of the requested funds required for the operation of this valuable committee for calendar year 1970.

SMILE, YOU'RE ON CANTED CAMERA

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, lights, camera, action—are the missiles neatly stacked; be sure the men smile as the camera moves in for a closeup; the pounding of pistons and the roar of the sea; screaming jet engines gleaming against the background of a sunny sky; what power. And they do all this for you and me.

The sights and the sounds—what is this all about? Very simple—the Department of Defense is concerned about its image—concerned to the tune of spending over $28,000,000 of the taxpayers' money this past year for public relations activities. Just exactly what are they trying to prove?

I raise this question not because I am "anti-Defense"—there are already too many people around who would disarm this Nation unilaterally; that is their burden to bear.

But I am profiscal responsibility and integrity in Government spending; I am prodemanding a dollar value for a dollar spent; and most important of all, I am protaxpayer. It puzzles me how, in listing national priorities—regardless of which expert is volunteering his views for public consumption—somehow, the taxpayer always winds up on the bottom. I am sick and tired of this—and so are the millions of law-abiding, industrious, respectable, and exceedingly patient American citizens who are increasingly voicing their exasperation at having to finance the ever-expanding and maddening spending schemes and bureaucratic monstrosities which are sapping the very strength of this Nation.

We have all heard a great deal about inflation in recent years—the Defense Department has known more than its share. But in the 10 years since 1959, while the Consumer Price Index has risen 25.8 percent, and the overall defense budget has increased by over 80 percent, the DOD publicity budget has skyrocketed from $2.8 million to $28,000,000—a 1,000-percent increase—now that is really what I call inflation.

So the Department of Defense has concluded it must spend $28,000,000 of the taxpayers' money for promotional activities. One might expect this type of thing from a tobacco company, or from an agency that wants to urge a new "miracle cleaner" on the country, or to remind all children to eat their munchie crunchies for breakfast. But is such a staggering sum of money necessary or justifiable merely to put polish upon our military hardware?

I wish to include in the RECORD an article by the National Tax Foundation—March 1970—which gives a better understanding of the magnitude of this big business operation. I hope each of my colleagues will read it—and be convicted by it. The article follows:

SAY DOD PROMOTIONAL COSTS NINEFOLD HIGHER THAN 1959'S

Spending to publicize the Defense Department's and the armed services' activities has increased nine-fold over that of ten years ago and by recent figures reached $28 million. Congress set a $2.8 million ceiling on such publicity expenditures in 1959—when the defense budget was $43 billion. Between 1959 and this fiscal year, notes Tax Foundation, Inc., the overall defense budget has increased to $79 billion. It will be trimmed a little in fiscal 1971.

To try to halt this rising promotional cost, Sen. Fulbright (Ark.) late last year introduced a bill which would limit such spending. He claims the size of the armed forces increased 36 percent in the 1959–69 period, and the cost of living, 25 percent. Limiting expenditures for promotion and publicity to $10 million, he says would still allow a 370 percent hike over the 1959 spending ceiling.

As of last year, according to the Senator, the activities of the 200 military and civilian personnel employed by the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs cost $3.7 million.

In 1969, Navy public relations activities—a full-time staff of 1,086, plus 1,600 to 1,800 part-timers, were employed—cost about $9.9 million.

The Army in 1969 employed 442 military personnel and 170 civilians in "public affairs" activities at an estimated cost of $4.9 million, while the Air Force spent an estimated $9.4 million for similar activities, using the full-time services of 944 people.

Highlights from the Senator's lengthy exposure:

1. Seven pages of the *Congressional Record* listed films made by Navy;

2. Another 14 pages listed dignitaries, press, etc., taken on trips (on Air Force planes) to AF installations;

3. Another 15 pages listed persons transported to various Army bases. Two pages were used to show the distribution of an Army film, "The Big Picture," over a two-year period. The film cost $902,529.34.

JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY TEAM; CINDERELLA SPORTS TEAM OF 1970

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, Poet Berton Braley wrote:

If I should lose, let me stand by the road.
And cheer as the winners go by!

The National Collegiate Athletic Association basketball championships were held recently at the Cole Field House on the University of Maryland campus.

It was my pleasure to witness the Jacksonville University basketball team playing in the NCAA tournament for the first time in the school's short history as a 4-year degree granting institution—the first class was graduated in 1959.

While the University of California at Los Angeles team won—its sixth national title—Jacksonville University's basketball team unified my hometown of Jacksonville, Fla., like no other single group or event in history. All Florida identifies with the winning young Dolphins—they are a symbol of happiness and good feeling because they are the Cinderella sports team of 1970. They lost only two games of 29 played, including a victory over the No. 1 ranked team Kentucky, and one of the games they

lost was to UCLA, a winning basketball legend.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to recognize Jacksonville University and its dynamic president, Robert H. Spiro, its 3,000 students, its faculty, 50 percent of whom have doctorate degrees, and its great basketball team, coached by Joe Williams, assisted by Dr. Judson Harris, the athletic director, and Tom Wasdin, and the players: All-Americans Rex Morgan and Artis Gilmore, Rod McIntyre, Pembrook Burrows III, Chip Dublin, Mike Blevins, Greg Nelson, Vaughn Wedeking, Rusty Baldwin, Denny Hawkins, Curtis Kruer, and Ken Selke.

The Jacksonville basketball team did not win the 1970 NCAA championship, but if I may add to Poet Braley's quotation:

If I should lose, let me stand by the road. And cheer as the winners go by! Because the losers sometimes win too!

Jacksonville University is a winner to its many supporters and new fans across America today.

MISSISSIPPI FARM INCOME

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago the Mississippi Extension Service initiated an ambitious project to increase farm income in our State to $1.5 billion by 1975.

The value of Mississippi products have increased from $926 million in 1964 to $1,099 million in 1969, nearly 20 percent gain despite losses suffered by Hurricane Camille.

Credit for the progress so far must go to the dedicated men and women of the Cooperative Extension Service, agricultural leaders, and cooperating leaders from commerce and industry.

The McComb, Miss., Enterprise Journal recently carried an editorial on this endeavor of Mississippians to expand the rural economy of our State. It follows:

STATE FARM INCOME HEADS TO '1.5 IN '75'

Mississippi has a 10-year goal set in the area of agricultural production which is indicated by the term, "1.5 by '75." This means the aim to expand agricultural production to $1.5 billion by the year 1975.

This program was launched by the Mississippi Cooperative Extension Service in 1965. The fourth year of this 10-year campaign was recently recognized. Between the years 1965 and 1969 farm production went from $926 million to over one billion dollars. The billion dollar mark was reached for the first time in Mississippi history in the year 1967. And it is predicted that the goal of $1.5 billion will be attained by 1975.

Gains and losses about balanced each other to keep the 1969 value of Mississippi farm production at the record $1.1 billion of 1968. Production of meat animals and of poultry and eggs each exceeded $200 million for the first time ever. Forestry also made a big gain. Soybeans, in spite of lower yields and prices this year, are still ahead of planned projections. The values of these major areas equal or exceed the planned projection.

Poor weather pushed the value of cotton below both 1968 and the base year, 1964. The beginning upward climb of horticultural crops was cancelled at least partly by the almost complete destruction of the $5 million tung industry by Hurricane Camille.

Value of milk production continued a slow but steady increase. Food grains and feed crops again declined.

The greatest gain in 1.5 by '75 has been in meat animals. Although good prices helped the meat animal industry, the recent gain represents greater stability and higher quality. Mississippi cattlemen are an important source of feeders for the Corn Belt and other areas. Management aims at making more money from each calf.

The quarterly sales of the 12 feeder pig associations approached $1 million for the first time. These sales add to the incomes of many families on small farms. There are more hog feeders and complete operations with 50 to 100 or more sows.

The continued rise in consumer incomes has brought a strong demand for red meat. Feeder cattle prices in 1970 are expected to remain above those of recent years. Hog prices may decline during the second half of the year.

Some of the latest facts about agri-business in Mississippi are:

Total wages in agricultural related industries climbed from $580 million in 1967 to $660 million in 1968, or 14 percent.

Employment in specified farm related industries rose from 147,000 in 1967 to 152,000 in 1968. This was 41 per cent of all employment covered by the Mississippi Employment Security Law.

Farm production expenses increased from $597 million in 1967 to $632 million in 1968.

Mississippi farmers have $5 billion invested in plant, equipment, and operating capital. This investment will likely exceed $7 billion by 1975.

Credit for farm operating loans is $250 million a year. It is expected to approach $500 million by 1975.

NATIONAL CENTER FOR VOLUNTARY ACTION, PRIVATE SOLUTIONS FOR PUBLIC PROBLEMS

HON. LARRY WINN, JR.

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

Mr. WINN. Mr. Speaker, Willard W. Garvey, chairman of the board of Garvey Industries, Wichita, Kans., has been appointed to the Board of Directors of the National Center for Voluntary Action by President Nixon. I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues Mr. Garvey's remarks relating to the creation of this unique organization. I commend President Nixon for the establishment of the National Center for Voluntary Action, for the selection of Bud Wilkinson as its president, and for the appointment of an outstanding Kansas citizen, Willard Garvey, to its Board of Directors.

The remarks follow:

STATEMENT GIVEN TO PRESS BY WILLARD W. GARVEY REGARDING THE NATIONAL CENTER FOR VOLUNTARY ACTION FEBRUARY 16, 1970

The National Center for Voluntary Action is a unique undertaking to find *Private Solutions to Public Problems*. The President of the United States desired to unite the public and private resources of the country in a "creative partnership" to bring Americans together. This national volunteer effort is directed at mobilizing volunteers to help solve some of our pressing social problems in order to enhance the quality of life for all people.

This National Center is a privately funded tax-exempt Corporation in the District of Columbia. It is the private enterprise member of a "creative partnership." President Nixon is the Honorary Chairman of the National Center and Max M. Fisher is the Chairman of the Board of Directors. Eighty citizens representing many different backgrounds combine to create a unified national spirit. The "creative partnership" concept is carried out further by having several Cabinet Officers serve on the Board by virtue of their positions.

(Bud) Wilkinson serves as the President. He coordinates the Voluntary Sector Activities as well as the Cabinet Committee.

President Nixon cited the many valuable ongoing volunteer efforts undertaken by people across the country in his October 1968 speech, "The Voluntary Way." He observed that (a) most problems have already been solved in individual cases someplace, but need to be communicated; (b) there are nearly a million existing voluntary agencies or groups to help people; and (c) a Gallup Poll shows 69 million Americans who desire to spend several hours a week as volunteers to help other people.

The National Center for Voluntary Action implements this program and is an effort to reverse the trend toward total government control by providing alternative private actions projects together with tools to help solve their own problems.

The Center (1) plans a computerized clearinghouse of these volunteer programs to provide information about such private solutions to public problems to groups throughout the country; (2) provides an "Equal Time" public education and communication campaign to bring attention to and stimulate the public to become involved in volunteer efforts; (3) convenes task forces and conferences in specific project areas. It utilizes the best available expertise from both the government and private sectors to develop innovative solution-oriented programs. It channels and implements such programs through existing on-going organizations.

Wichita has played, and will continue to play, a major role in the Center's activities. Our Wichita Volunteer Bureau has already been utilized as a pilot project, upon which many of the National Center's Activities are based.

A great deal of time and effort have been expended over the years by myself and members of various organizations with which I am involved in "beating the drum" for voluntary action. We are proud to see many of these ideas incorporated into the program at the national level and expect to see Wichita have a truly vital role in reconstituting the individual, the family, and the community through Voluntary efforts.

We look forward to working with President Nixon and the Board of Directors of the National Center and invite all citizens of Wichita to become involved and participate in this exciting new era.

TO CONTROL CRIME

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, the Select Committee on Crime was fortunate in its Washington hearings of last month

to receive the excellent and knowledgeable testimony of three of Washington's most respected citizens—Mr. Joseph B. Danzansky, president of Giant Food Stores and chairman of the Mayor's Economic Development Committee; Mr. Leroy Libel, president of Aristo Cleaners, and Mr. Basil Winstead, vice president of Safeway Stores, Inc., and chairman of the Crime Committee of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade. The full text of the 4 days of hearings in the Metropolitan Washington area, including the recommendations made by Messrs. Danzansky, Libel, and Winstead, will soon be available as a committee document.

It was in a recent issue of the Washington Star that I read a letter to the editor written by Mr. Danzansky. It is a clear, concise statement that goes beyond describing the District's crime problem—Mr. Danzansky offers solutions. For the benefit of the many readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include Mr. Danzansky's letter.

I also offer an editorial that appeared in the Alexandria Gazette of March 13 concerning the need for a commitment of additional funds to prevent and control crime in America and a March 6 editorial from the Albuquerque, N. Mex., Tribune, which is representative of numerous editorials that have appeared since members of the Crime Committee introduced legislation to place a quota on the number of amphetamine or "pep pills" produced in the United States each year:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 17, 1970]

TO CONTROL CRIME

SIR: If you ever wondered whether the good citizens of our community read your paper, I can set your mind at ease. Since my testimony before the House Select Committee on Crime was reported in The Star of February 26, I have been bombarded with letters and telephone calls from readers. This might have been pleasantly flattering to the ego, except that the communications ranged from mildly enraged to apopletic. Furthermore, I might have chalked it up to a lack of sensitivity to the public mood on my part, except that I did not say what they thought I did.

While your reporter recorded my words faithfully, they were unfortunately removed from the protective clothing of the proper context. Standing shivering, naked and alone, they appear to say that the crime problem in the District is overexaggerated. In fact, my testimony urged a strong program to bring crime in the District under control and to eliminate its root causes.

To calm the indignation of some of your letter-writers and telephone-callers, and to set the record straight, I offer the following digest of my testimony:

The criminal reign of terror in the Nation's Capital must be brought to a halt. It is incumbent upon the Congress to give the professional law enforcement officials of our city the tools they need to do the job. I urge that the strongest possible legislation be enacted to come to grips with this problem.

IN THE GRIP OF FEAR

The people of the Washington area are in the grip of fear. It is not proportional to the reality of the situation. The chances of the average shopper becoming a victim of crime are still minuscule. But that is not important. People believe they are in danger, and are reacting accordingly. Therefore, our streets are becoming deserted, our economy is declining, and government revenues are falling. We must act with all possible energy and haste to restore the confidence of the average citizen in the ability of his government to provide elementary protection of person and property.

I applaud the steps now being taken by Mayor Washington to increase police foot patrols. There is no better deterrent to crime and nothing more reassuring to the average citizen than the foot patrolman. I hope that we will see more policemen hired from the inner city. The policeman drawn from the inner city knows the neighborhoods and the people. He has the best chance of eliminating police-community hostility and alienation.

There ought to be a greatly expanded program of lighting the alleys and the dark places where street criminals might lie in wait. The use of helicopters to provide additional surveillance sounds like an excellent proposal. So does the proposed establishment of a joint police flying squad, to deal with the problem of apprehending fugitives who cross over from one metropolitan jurisdiction to another.

EVERY BOY NEEDS A HERO

A key area for immediate attention is a better relationship of police officers and the youths of our inner city. Every boy needs a hero. Many of these youngsters do not have a father in the home, and the adult males they do know are criminals, dope pushers, hustlers, or other shady characters. These are the examples they emulate. I would strongly urge the establishment of broad programs under the sponsorship of police organizations to reach out to these alienated youth.

And, while we are on the subject of heroes, I think we are ignoring the best potential inner-city hero we have—Mayor Walter E. Washington. We ought to stop sniping at him and hold him up as an example to inner city youth. We ought to be saying: Here is a man who overcame much stronger racial barriers of a more unenlightened time to become the mayor of the most important city in the world. He is living proof that nothing is impossible in our system for the man who really wants to get ahead in the world and is willing to discipline himself for a worthwhile goal.

In dealing with the problem of crime, we often fail to recognize the full dimensions of the problem. We must realize that if a young man is arrested and thrown into a prison that is little better than a human sewer, he is likely to emerge a rat. Jails that punish without rehabilitating foster crime rather than reduce it. We need a corrections system where a young man does not get the equivalent of an advanced degree in street crime from older—and more experienced—inmates. We need a corrections system where prisoners receive counseling, schooling and training to prepare themselves for honest work. We need more parole officers and counselors, and more halfway houses where prisoners about to be released can adjust to society. We need to give rehabilitated ex-convicts a chance to go straight and to support their families without returning to crime.

TASK EVEN BROADER

But our task is even broader than that. Our social maladies must be corrected if we are to have any hope of rescuing our cities and bringing crime down to manageable proportions.

First, every able-bodied person who can work and wants to work must be given an opportunity to work with dignity and at decent wages. Business cannot do the job itself. It is going to take a massive federal investment, and possibly the government may have to become an employer of last resort.

Second, the ghetto must be destroyed and replaced with a wholesome environment for all the residents of our cities. Slums are degrading to the human spirit.

The Mayor's Economic Development Committee has prepared an Overall Economic Development Program, which is a blueprint for making the Nation's Capital the nation's model city by the end of the decade. It is a workable plan, but it will require a commitment from the federal government to recognize its special responsibility for the District of Columbia and provide the needed financial support for the solution of its great problems.

JOSEPH B. DANZANSKY.

[From the Alexandria Gazette, Mar. 13, 1970]

BILLIONS TO FIGHT CRIME

It should cost the federal government a billion dollars to start, if not two or three billions the first year, and more each year thereafter, if it is to defeat crime in the streets, the House Select Committee chairman has concluded after the first four hearings. Rep. Claude Pepper, Florida Democrat, who mentioned these figures, compared them with the amount the Nixon administration had asked for, $480 million, under the Law Enforcement Assistance Act.

Pepper's first hearings were all held in Washington, known caustically as the "crime capital of the world." This month, the committee moves to Baltimore to study the problems of youth crime. It goes on from one big city to another until it has obtained a general crime picture. But even in its first confrontation with crime, it did not hesitate to condemn as too little the administration request and to suggest it must be multiplied several times to be effective.

One testimony that perhaps tells the crime story of Washington was told the committee by a man who had been robbed of $15,000 in 1968. He has installed an elaborate system at his front door to stop intruders. Asked if it had not restricted the evening activities of his four daughters, the victim said simply, "They don't go out. The risk is too great."

Crime in the street has done that to life in the nation's capital. It is the sort of thing that makes even the spending of billions, to stamp it out, look good to more and more supporters.

[From the Albuquerque Tribune, Mar. 6, 1970]

QUOTA NEEDED FOR PEP PILLS

Three measures have been introduced in the House to impose a strict quota system curtailing the number of amphetamine tablets produced in this country.

It may not matter which is enacted into law—they differ primarily in enforcement provisions—but the need for a quota on these pep pills seems unquestionable.

Rep. Claude Pepper of Florida, chairman of the House Select Committee on Crime—a bipartisan majority of which supports a quota system—stated:

"Amphetamine or 'pep' pills alone pour out of the drug factories at a rate of 5 billion tablets a year and account for 8 per cent of all prescriptions written.

"This is highly questionable, given the testimony of expert witnesses before our committee such as Dr. Sidney Cohen of the National Institute of Health who said only several thousand are needed for non-controversial medical purposes. It appears that as much as half go into illicit use while the remainder are prescribed for such medically questionable uses as weight reduction and to combat fatigue."

A quota system would help choke off the supply of these pills now flowing into the black market.

THE PROMISE OF THE KENNEDY CENTER

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House have from time to time heard arguments that the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, presently under construction, is an overpriced and unnecessary addition to the Washington, D.C., skyline.

For that reason, I was pleased to read an article in the March issue of the Washingtonian magazine, which effectively refutes this viewpoint.

The article, entitled "The Kennedy Center: Cultural Bonanza or White Marble Elephant," describes the careful planning evident in the concept of the Center as well as its potential for enriching the cultural life of our Nation's Capitol and the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the text of the article, by Julius Duscha, into the RECORD, as follows:

THE KENNEDY CENTER: CULTURAL BONANZA OR WHITE MARBLE ELEPHANT?

(By Julius Duscha)

The three thousand words that follow are dedicated to the quite unfashionable proposition that the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts will succeed. It will become a world-famous center where the best in music, opera, ballet, theater, and film will be presented and where new ideas and new approaches to the performing arts will be tried.

The center, however, will never be self-supporting. No one involved in the construction of the building or in the planning for its programming and other activities has ever expected the center to pay its own way.

And why should it? Municipal auditoriums and baseball and football stadiums have seldom made money; yet they have been lavishly supported by state and local governments.

Success is more than just making money. For the Kennedy Center, success should be measured in terms of the excellence of its programming, the boldness of its efforts to encourage new developments in the arts, and the willingness of the center's Board of Trustees to develop such ancillary activities as a conservatory of music, a national theater company, national ballet and opera companies, and a really good symphony orchestra.

To help pay for such programming and activities, the Kennedy Center will need help from both private and federal sources. A relatively few million dollars a year will probably be enough, and if the center's leadership turns out to be as good as it now seems to be, there is every reason to believe that Congress and private philanthropy will make sure the center succeeds. It is certainly more deserving of subsidy than, say, the oil millionaires or the factory farmers.

The leaders of the Kennedy Center come to their jobs with first-rate credentials. Roger L. Stevens, chairman of the center, is a successful Broadway producer and theater owner who understands both the practicalities and the potential of the theater. Stevens is largely responsible for raising the more than $20 million in private funds that have been contributed to the center. Without his interest and work, the center would never have been built. Once the center is in operation, Stevens probably will take on the added duties of theatrical advisor.

General director of the center is William McCormick Blair, Jr., an associate of the late Adlai Stevenson, a respected lawyer, and like Stevens a man of imagination and flair.

George London, the operatic and concert singer, is the center's artistic administrator. He is well known in Europe and the United States and is highly respected throughout the musical world.

London is working under Julius Rudel, conductor and general director of the New York City Opera, who is the Kennedy Center's musical advisor. The forty-nine-year-old Rudel, born in Vienna and now an American citizen, is internationally recognized as one of the great conductors and outstanding leaders of the musical world.

The only publicly announced programming for the center is its plan to open in September 1971 with a festival of music and drama to be highlighted by a new work by Leonard Bernstein and by a festival of great American orchestras.

QUALITY OF CENTER'S FACILITIES

It is still chic to argue at Georgetown or even Bethesda cocktail parties that (a) the Kennedy Center should never have been built; (b) if it had to be built it was put in the wrong place; (c) there should have been three or four smaller buildings rather than one huge, 630-foot-long structure; (d) the whole thing smacks of official culture; and (e) who needs it in these days of pop art and free-form entertainment?

However, smart these arguments may sound when mixed well with martinis, they are irrelevant in 1970. The center is almost two-thirds completed. Enough Federal and private money is available to finish construction at an estimated total cost of $66.4 million.

The question that ought to be occupying the self-appointed leaders and guardians of the performing arts in Washington and elsewhere in the country is how best to use Edward Durell Stone's marble building on the banks of the Potomac.

The facilities will rank among the best in the world. In the center of the building will be a 2,300-seat Opera House designed for productions ranging from opera and ballet to musical comedy. On one side of the Opera House a 2,700-seat Concert Hall is being built, and on the other side the 1,100-seat Eisenhower Theater for drama is taking form. Above it will be a 500-seat theater primarily for film but also for lectures and chamber music. On the same roof-terrace level as the film theater will be space for receptions, band concerts, and meetings as well as room for an art gallery and restaurant facilities.

Each of the three major halls will have the finest in stage equipment, acoustics, and soundproofing. The seating capacity of the Opera House, for example, has been held down so that it will be an optimum size for singers. Behind both the Opera House and the Eisenhower Theater will be rehearsal halls.

A grand foyer—with floor-to-ceiling windows rising six stories and providing a dramatic view of the Potomac, Roosevelt Island, and the Virginia skyline—will connect the three principal auditoriums. They will be separated by a Hall of States and a Hall of Nations leading from the center's entrance plaza on the side of the building opposite the river. Beneath the center is a three-story garage with room for 1,600 cars.

Encased in white marble—a gift from Italy in memory of John F. Kennedy—and surrounded by soon-to-be-bronzed steel pillars, the Kennedy Center is already becoming as familiar a part of the Washington skyline as the nearby Lincoln Memorial—which some felt it would overshadow, but doesn't—and the Washington Monument.

The center's location, controversial since it was selected by Congress in 1958, has turned out to be as good a spot as could have been found. The center will be easily accessible from Rock Creek Parkway, Virginia Avenue, and the Inner Loop Freeway, which connects with the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. If the center had been located near downtown, as the merchants there wanted it to be, it would now be facing the same problems as the rest of the center city at night. It will be a long time before Washingtonians go downtown the way they used to after dark.

THE KENNEDY CENTER AND OTHER CULTURAL CENTERS

Okay, so the building may turn out to be beautiful and may even get a few kind words from Wolf Von Eckhardt and Ada Louise Huxtable, but doesn't everyone know that the real problem with a cultural center only begins once the palace for the performing arts is finished? How in the world is anyone going to keep this newest monument solvent? Congress doesn't like ratholes, even when they are surrounded with Italian marble.

Remember what happened to the mere $13 million Atlanta Memorial Arts Center? The Atlanta Municipal Theater was in deep financial trouble soon after it began its productions in the fall of 1968. Don't forget either the problems of the $35 million Los Angeles Music Center, which must rely on substantial subsidies from private sources. And even baseball fans know of the struggles of the $175 million Lincoln Center in New York, where deficits run to $11 million or so each year.

But the Kennedy Center will have important advantages over the centers in Atlanta, Los Angeles, and New York. It is in the nation's capital and will be truly a national center. It will command the attention of the President, the Congress, and the country. The millions of tourists who come to Washington each year will be attracted to the center not only because of its location and newness but also because of the mystique of the Kennedy name.

As a national institution, the Kennedy Center should expect to get operating money from Congress. The center's Board of Trustees should make it clear from the very beginning that Federal operating money will be needed and expected. Rep. Frank Thompson (D.–N.J.), responsible for getting the legislation establishing the center through a balky House of Representatives in 1958, says, "I expected then and I expected now that the center will operate at a deficit. But that doesn't bother me in the least. I think the government has an obligation to make it run because in a sense we will have a national workshop here."

Yes, but who wants some Congressman from Pocatello telling us tastemakers what we should present at the Kennedy Center? This question is about as irrelevant as the continuing discussion over whether the center should have been built.

Congress and the Federal government are already hip deep in the Kennedy Center. The center would never have been built without Congressional approval and appropriation of Federal funds. The center is in fact a unit of the Federal government. Although it operates under the guidance of a forty-five-man Board of Trustees representing a wide variety of cultural and political strains in the country, the center is a part of the Smithsonian Institution. The construction of the center is being supervised by the General Services Administration. Of the $66 million cost, $23 million is being met by Federal grants and another $23 million by Federal loans. The

loans are being used for the parking garage, which will be available by day to Federal employees and others who work near the center, and which presumably will earn enough money to pay off the loans.

But no one on Capitol Hill has put on a hard hat and supervised the construction of the center. Nor are members of Congress likely to become artistic directors for the center. The legislation which created the center laid down guidelines spelling out the center's purposes as a national institution to enhance the performing arts. It is the center's Board of Trustees and not Congress that will make the ultimate decisions about what the center does and how it responds to national interests, and the thirty private citizens on the board are appointed by the President for ten-year, politically-safe terms. The other fifteen members are government officials who serve as long as they hold their jobs.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD

Members of the board include such Washingtonians as businessman Floyd D. Akers and lawyer Ralph E. Becker; Broadway types such as Richard Adler, Robert W. Dowling, and Richard Rodgers; such friends of the Kennedys as K. Lemoyne Billings, Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and William Walton; and of course Sen. Edward M. Kennedy and Mrs. Stephen E. Smith, sister of the late President. Mrs. Aristole Onassis is an honorary chairman of the board.

Mrs. Onassis, widow of the late President, has not shown much interest in the center since her remarriage, although several years ago she did get involved in the center's programming plans. For example, she tried to get Leonard Bernstein to take on the job of artistic director for the center.

Mrs. Onassis also made a last-minute effort in 1964 to try to change the center's location from Foggy Bottom to a site on the Mall near the National Gallery of Art, but by then plans for the center were too far along to change them without causing a sharp rise in costs. It is generally thought that Walton, who has always opposed the center's Foggy Bottom site as well as the concept of a cultural center, persuaded Mrs. Onassis to try to change the location.

There also have been disagreements on the board between some of the grand-design oriented members and the more practical directors, such as Stevens and Becker, who have been immersed in the project since its beginnings and have insisted that the board take one step at a time, concentrating all its energies first on raising money for the building, and then moving on to the even more difficult problems of finding money to pay for programming.

The board, in fact, is just now getting into programming matters, which are likely to be far more controversial than the tough but more mundane problems of putting together enough public and private money to construct a building. There is general agreement among board members, however, that the center must do a great deal more than just provide dull nights out for tired and bored businessmen, members of Congress, and Cabinet members and their socially ambitious and overdressed wives.

James E. Allen, Jr., U.S. Commissioner of Education, who by virtue of his office is a member of the board, is now conducting some preliminary studies of the kind of programming the center might do to attract ghetto youngsters—and their parents—as well as others who might otherwise never think of going to a cultural center.

S. Dillon Ripley, II, the secretary of the Smithsonian Institution and an ex officio member of the board, is also interested in the educational aspects of the center's programming. Ripley's detractors think he would like to take over the Kennedy Center, should it fail. At the very least, it is thought that Ripley's ambitions are to run the educational programs of the center. "But never underestimate the energies of Dillon Ripley," one member said in discussing the disagreements over programming that are expected on the board.

Although Mrs. Onassis shows little interest in the center, Ted Kennedy and Jean Smith are interested and do attend Board meetings. Bill Blair makes certain that the Senator and Mrs. Smith are kept informed on all developments as they occur and is quite solicitous of them and their involvement in the center.

CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OUTSIDE

John F. Kennedy himself was never particularly interested in the performing arts or in other cultural activities. But if the center had not been designated by Congress early in 1964 as the official memorial to John F. Kennedy in the District of Columbia, it probably never would have been built.

What is now the Kennedy Center was originally the National Center of the Performing Arts. Authorized by Congress in 1958, the National Center was to have been built entirely with private funds on a seventeen-acre site in Foggy Bottom put together by the Federal government. (Most of the land was already Federal property.) But until the center was renamed for John F. Kennedy, and Federal funds were made available, private contributions proved hard to get. "The assumption was that this was a Federal project that didn't really need private money," Roger Stevens has noted.

Ironic, too, was the decision by the center's trustees last year to name the theater after President Eisenhower, another nontheatergoer and non-culture-lover who happened to sign the original bill providing for a National Center of the Performing Arts. But it is certainly useful for fund raising and other purposes to have a bit of bipartisanship injected into the center's nomenclature.

Although the Kennedy name has helped far more than it has hurt the center, there are still plenty of Kennedy-haters around and at times the name has carried some disadvantages with it. In the spring of 1968, for example, when it became clear that additional Federal funds would be needed to complete the center, Roger Stevens decided to wait a year before asking Congress for the money because of the heat then being generated by the late Robert F. Kennedy's campaign for the Democratic presidential nomination. When Stevens finally brought a request for an additional $7.5 million in Federal funds before Congress in 1969, he got the money but he also was criticized by some members for waiting to go to Congress until practically all the available funds were already committed to construction contracts, in effect giving Congress no choice but to ante up the needed money.

About $20.4 million of the center's funds are from private sources and foreign governments. A total of $9 million has been contributed and $5 million by corporations. All but $2.5 million of this $20.4 million has been raised. The largest private gift came from the Ford Foundation, which donated $5 million. The Rockefeller Foundation gave $1 million, the Old Dominion Foundation $500,000, and the Joseph P. Kennedy, Jr., Foundation $500,000. Almost 400 industrial and business firms have made contributions. Only $2 million in private contributions has come from residents of the Washington area. One of the largest contributions in the Washington area came from the Hattie M. Strong Foundation.

Italy donated all of the marble needed for the exterior and the interior of the building, a gift valued at $1 million. From Austria will come a huge crystal chandelier for the Opera House. The Danish government will decorate and furnish the north lounge of the Opera House. The German government is donating bronze panels for the center's entrance area. Ireland is giving a crystal chandelier for the presidential lounge of the Opera House. From Japan the center will receive a red and gold silk curtain for the Opera House. Norway is donating eleven crystal chandeliers for the center's Concert Hall. Sweden is giving fourteen crystal chandeliers for the center's grand foyer.

The delays in the construction of the center have resulted, however, in a doubling of the original cost estimates. In a decade the center's price tag has increased from $11 million to $66.4 million. Most of the increase can be attributed to inflation, but some is due to faulty estimating. The steel work, for example, cost over $2 million more than originally estimated because of just bad arithmetic. Another $1 million was added to the costs when jets were allowed into National Airport and more soundproofing materials had to be built into the center, which is just off the final approach pattern to the airport.

LESSONS LEARNED

It would have been nice to have had the center in operation for the last decade, but delay in its construction and opening has meant that Stevens and his aides can benefit from the mistakes and lessons of the Lincoln Center, the Atlanta Center, and the Music Center in Los Angeles. And the principal lesson to be learned from the troubles of the existing centers is the importance of starting slowly and of making certain that money is in hand before commitments are made for attractions, programs, and festivals with interesting artistic possibilities but murky commercial outlooks.

Stevens is very much aware of the importance of having money in hand before committing the center to big programming ideas. When pressed for details on the center's plans for noncommercial attractions, Stevens replies, "If people want public service operations, they've first got to find a way to pay for them."

Stevens also is determined that the center not take on the financial problems of such organizations as the Washington National Symphony. If the National Symphony presents its concerts at the center instead of at Constitution Hall, this does not mean that the center will provide an economic umbrella for the Symphony's money problems.

During its first year or two the Kennedy Center will rely heavily on established commercial attractions in all of its halls. There will be some noncommercial programming such as the American College Theater Festival, which the Friends of the Kennedy Center sponsored last spring at Ford's Theater, and a tent theater on the Mall, and probably a similar jazz festival.

Although Stevens says he has commitments for a million dollars or so in operating capital, there is not yet money in sight for ambitious programming that would make it possible for the center to sponsor an opera company or a national theater company. In the meantime, Stevens believes that it is of the utmost importance for the center to make a good beginning with commercially sound attractions, and when money is forthcoming, to go on from there to experimental and riskier ventures.

In the first years, for instance, the Opera House will be used for opera and ballet no more than six months of the year. The Metropolitan Opera and distinguished European companies will perform in the Opera House. The rest of the year it will be available for musical comedies either on their way to Broadway or touring after a successful New York run.

"The musical comedies will be commercial and money-making ventures," George London acknowledges, "but this is defensible artistically, too, because the musical at is best is the great American lyric form."

In addition to housing the National Symphony, the Concert Hall probably will be the site of the many concerts by well-known musical artists now presented by Patrick Hayes and others in Constitution Hall and Lisner Auditorium.

In the Eisenhower Theater, six months of each year will be given over to Broadway plays, and the other six months will be available for such noncommercial programming as the College Theater Festival.

The film theater will be used largely for experimental work, and it is expected that George Stevens, Jr., the son of the eminent director, a filmmaker in his own right and director of the American Film Institute, will be in charge of the film programming.

What about pop culture, rock music, and off-Broadway kinds of productions? "If Janis Joplin wants to play the Kennedy Center, we would be happy to book her in," Roger Stevens says, "but I don't really think the Kennedy Center is the place for *Oh! Calcutta!*"

"Our main concern will be with good things," London says in summing up his approach to programming. "If it's new it isn't necessarily good. Art has to have discipline. Sure, we're going to play it close to the vest, because we also want to stay alive. But the sky's the limit if we have the money."

Impresario Patrick Hayes thinks that too many Washingtonians are concerning themselves only with what the center is going to do in its first year or two rather than looking at the center in the perspective of ten to forty years. Within such a period, for example, Hayes sees the center as becoming the home of a great conservatory of music.

CRITICISMS

There are, of course, critics of the center's leadership, and one of the most articulate is Ralph Black, manager of Washington's National Ballet and a former manager of the National Symphony.

"Six months opera, six months musical comedy," comments Black. "I think that's just tragic. I'm not opposed to musicals, nor am I a snob about them. I just don't think the Opera House should be a Broadway house. I don't have any question that it can be filled with artistic works. You're building audiences today."

Another critic is Richard Pearlman the manager of the Washington Opera Society and a former stage manager for the Metropolitan Opera, who asks, "What could be more dead end than bringing musicals to the Kennedy Center? Artistically, musicals are at a dead end in this country."

Rather than staging Broadway musicals at the Kennedy Center or even presenting opera in a familiar setting and a traditional way, Pearlman believes that the center should experiment by perhaps trying to combine opera, Broadway, and rock in a new kind of musical and by "scraping off the barnacles from existing operas to see what is really there" instead of "just grinding out sausages from a machine and thinking that a production is all right as long as no one falls off the stage."

However critical men like Black and Pearlman may be of the center, they and almost everyone else in Washington looking for a showcase for singers, dancers, musicians, or actors want to get on one of the center's stages. Black, for example, has had a long argument with Stevens over whether the National Ballet ought to be the resident ballet company at the center. But Stevens has stuck to his 1968 decision making the American Ballet Theater of New York the resident company. It will play at the center for a few weeks in both the spring and the fall.

The New York City Opera is expected to be named the resident opera company for the Kennedy Center. Julius Rudel, conductor of the City Opera, is already the center's musical advisor. But Pearlman, like Black, thinks his group should be the resident company because it is actually headquartered here while the New York City Opera, like the American Ballet Theater, remains a New York-based company and will be in residence in Washington only a few weeks of every year. Artistically, of course, the New York groups are superior to the Washington companies.

Washingtonians look on the center as their own bauble, but Stevens, Blair, and London continue to emphasize its national character. And they are right. The center would not have been built without $46 million in Federal funds collected from all the taxpayers, not just those in the Washington area. Only five percent of the $20.4 million raised so far from private sources has come from Washingtonians.

"Everybody will want to play in the place," Patrick Hayes says. "The magnificence and beauty of the center will attract people. And given a good show, people will storm the doors."

THE CENTER AND OTHER WASHINGTON FACILITIES

There is apprehension about the center among such people as Scott Kirkpatrick, the manager of the National Theater, and Tom and Zelda Fichandler, who have built the Arena Stage into a nationally known theater. And what about Constitution Hall and Lisner Auditorium? Will they be dark and deserted once the Kennedy Center opens?

The National Theater and the Kennedy Center will be competing for Broadway shows. But the National, with its 1,700 seats and excellent acoustics, will still be a formidable competitor for plays with the 1,100-seat Eisenhower Theater. Those 600 extra seats each night will look awfully good to the producer of a hit. The Kennedy Center's Opera House undoubtedly will drain away musicals from the National. But the affluent Washington area ought to be able to support more than one theater for Broadway productions. Furthermore, the Kennedy Center will be in the Broadway business no more than half of each year.

As for the Arena, it has developed a loyal audience by presenting old and new plays which often are not directly competitive with Broadway. The non-commercial attractions at the Kennedy Center will be more directly competitive with the Arena, but again there would seem to be room for such competition.

Constitution Hall and Lisner will not be as busy as they are now, but Patrick Hayes, for one, believes that both will be heavily booked within five years of the opening of the Kennedy Center. Hayes thinks that the cultural boom of the post-World War II years will continue and that the Kennedy Center will by no means be able to handle all of it. And as for Sol Hurok and others who bring expensive attractions to the United States from abroad, Constitution Hall will still look good with its 3,800 seats compared with the 2,700 seats in the Kennedy Center's Concert Hall or the 3,200 seats in its Opera House.

The Kennedy Center itself also ought to turn a lot more Washingtonians into theatergoers and concertgoers. The newness of the center and the mystique of the Kennedy name will be as attractive to Washingtonians as it will be to tourists. Conscious of the large amount of Federal money that has already gone into the center and the need for additional Federal funds to help meet operating deficits, Stevens, Blair, and London seem determined to make good on the center's slogan: "The Kennedy Center is for everyone."

Tickets will be made available at low prices to students and others who cannot afford the regular scale. Special programs will be put on for school audiences. The center's three major halls are equipped for live television broadcasting and for filming and taping.

THE CENTER'S PROMISE

The Kennedy Center will, of course, have its troubles and frustrations. Its deficits will be decried in the halls of Congress. Rival impresarios will accuse the tax-free subsidized Kennedy Center of unfair competition. And the center will surely be picketed from time to time by confrontation-prone, pop-culture militants.

There may be plain old structural and logistical problems, too. Some people are still worried over the sufficiency of the center's soundproofing. The self-park garage also could result in jarring traffic jams, but Roger Stevens believes there will be enough entrances onto Rock Creek Parkway, Virginia Avenue, and the Inner Loop to empty the garage in the fifteen minutes the engineers who built it claim it will take. Staggered curtain times will be used so that more than 6,000 persons won't be converging on the place at the same hour.

All new buildings and all ambitious new projects encounter problems when getting under way, and there will be troubles for the Kennedy Center, but by being in the nation's capital and by already having the Federal government deeply involved, the center's chances for success and for continued Federal financial support are excellent. And this is why it will become one of the world's leading cultural centers.

POLLUTION

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Public Health Subcommittee has held 2 weeks of hearings on extensions of the Clean Air Act and the Solid Waste Disposal Act and I must say that I am very dissatisfied and discouraged with the way the law has been administered and enforced.

It has become very clear that these programs lack priority, are underfunded and unenforced. There must be a drastic redirection of efforts and priorities if we are to honestly meet the problems of air pollution and solid waste disposal.

About 60 percent of the air pollution comes from automobile pollution and the law provides for standards for auto emissions.

But we have found that between 70 and 80 percent of the cars which come under these standards are not meeting them. This makes those standards about useless and they will remain so unless there is adequate enforcement.

What is amazing is that the National Air Pollution Control Administration knows this and has known for some time now that the standards were not being met. Yet car after car was certified, was sold and taken to the highways, soon to be polluting the air in direct violation of the Federal standards and the intent of the law.

And NAPCA, although knowing that the certification of these cars was not worth the paper it takes to write it on, never made public the results which

showed that these cars were polluting and not meeting standards, until questioned before our committee.

I feel something could have been done if the Congress had known about the situation.

NAPCA could have gone to the manufacturers and asked that they improve their antipollution systems on their cars. If nothing were done to improve the situation, NAPCA could have made public disclosures of the offending automobiles. And then too, there was the remedy that NAPCA could have come to the Congress and told us that the certification program was not working.

But they did not. Instead they continued to perpetrate this sham on the American public. People buying cars for the past 3 years have paid extra money for air pollution devices or systems on cars that did not work. And in effect, the National Air Pollution Control Administration was a partner in deceiving the public.

There has also been a lack of enforcement under the abatement provisions of the law.

During hearings, NAPCA told us that there were only 10 air pollution abatement suits filed. I daresay that there are more than 10 places where people or industries or municipalities are fouling the air. This just points to the lack of aggressiveness of the Federal Government in making the Clean Air Act work.

In addition, NAPCA was instructed to designate air quality regions under the provisions of the law. This was supposed to be accomplished within 18 months of the passage of the law.

Yet, we found that during the hearings, only one air region has been approved and only 29 have been submitted. When the law was passed, we envisioned that there would be between 55 and 75 air regions. So we see that here, too, NAPCA has dragged its feet and failed to live up to the law.

In fact, I think that there is a very good probability that the slowness which has characterized NAPCA's action has actually slowed down States' progress. The States have had to wait for the Federal Government to move.

Under the law, NAPCA was to register gasolines, but again, this portion of the law has not been carried out.

There has also been a lack of interest and priorities in the area of solid waste disposal.

The problem of air pollution has received a great deal of attention and it should. But the problem of solid waste disposal may be even more pressing. This is something that is as close as your backyard. Every community in the United States, no matter what size, has the problem of what to do with the trash that is discarded daily. And this problem is growing at a tremendous rate. We average about 20 pounds per person per day. We are spending $4.5 billion a year on an antiquated system of hauling away our solid waste. Yet the Federal budget for solid waste disposal is only $15.3 million. That means that we are spending about the same amount for solving the entire Nation's solid waste problems as we are on one F-111 fighter plane.

During the hearings, one proposal seemed very encouraging. A new incinerator plant has been developed which will reduce waste drastically and at the same time will provide power. The burning required will produce heat that turns turbines. A representative of the company doing work on the project said that if these plants were spotted around the Nation in sufficient numbers, they could add 10 percent to the Nation's electrical output, at the same time that they took care of the cities' solid waste.

This is an example of what can be done. We are working now on recycling of metals and we must do more in order to reuse what we discard.

If the administration will place a proper priority on solid waste disposal, then we can accomplish something. But to date, we have heard that "we owe a debt to nature" and that it is a "now or never proposition." Yet the administration's action has not corresponded with its rhetoric.

CONSERVATION SHOWCASE IN CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting into the RECORD a very interesting article which appeared in the March issue of Soil Conservation, a publication of the Soil Conservation Service of the Department of Agriculture. It describes a 76-acre conservation showcase located in Windham County in the northeastern section of my congressional district in Connecticut.

The project was established by the Windham County Soil and Water Conservation District, and serves as an outdoor catalog where visitors may study the performance of plants before using them on their own properties. It thus provides a firsthand view of the numerous means by which the landowner may engage in conservation practices.

I particularly commend this article to my colleagues as an example of the outstanding work being performed by the Soil Conservation Service. Its achievements in preserving our irreplaceable water and soil resources serve as a blueprint for the type of effort which must be undertaken if our environment is to be saved from the excesses of unregulated human activity.

The article is written by Albion L. Weeks and Elmer E. Offerman, district conservationist and resource planning specialist, respectively, at Brooklyn and Storrs, Conn. It reads as follows:

SHOWCASE FOR COUNTRY LIVING

A 76-acre Conservation Showcase in northeastern Connecticut is helping to orient former urban residents to country living.

The Windham County Soil and Water Conservation District established the show case to give newcomers a firsthand view of the alternatives in land uses and conservation practices available to improve their lands. It serves as an outdoor catalog where observers can study the performance of plants before using them on their properties.

The Soil Conservation Service assisted the district in establishing suitable plants for the demonstration area. SCS test performance of plants at its Big Flats, N.Y., and Cape May Court House, N.J., plant materials centers before they are recommended to the district. The Windham showcase includes nearly 75 introduced species of plant materials being evaluated under a cooperative agreement between SCS and the district. Emphasis is on multi-purpose plants that have values for wildlife, erosion control, and beautification, especially those useful in a situation of changing land use.

One of the most versatile plants on the showcase grounds is the perennial flatpea, Lathyrus Sylvestrus. Its dense mat of leaves and stems produces excellent surface protection against erosion. It is similar in appearance and growth habit to the ornamental sweetpea, although flowers are less numerous and showy. The plants reach a height of 2 to 3 feet during the growing season, then settle to less than a foot during the winter.

At the Windham Showcase, an area cleared for a woods road was seeded in the fall of 1963 to a mixture of perennial flatpea and Kentucky 31 tall fescue. The pea became the dominant species and has successfully competed with quackgrass and woody plants.

Perennial flatpea when used as cover for woods roads, access roads, firebreaks, nature trails, hiking and bridle paths, and powerline rights-of-way, requires little maintenance and provide food and cover for wildlife. Use of this plant for sediment control in urban areas seems feasible.

Showcase visitors also see examples of excellent ground covers of reed canarygrass, smooth brome, birdsfoot trefoil, and crownvetch. They observe wildlife feeding on Cardinal autumn olive, a special strain introduced by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Amur honeysuckle also provides winter food for pheasants, rabbits, other game, and songbirds.

Through its showcase, the Windham County Soil and Water Conservation District is able to demonstrate many ways to practice conservation on private lands.—Albion L. Weeks and Elmer E. Offerman, district conservationist and resource planning specialists, SCS, Brooklyn and Storrs, Conn.

A UNION WITH SOUL

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an article which appeared in the Sunday New York Times Magazine, March 22, 1970.

This outstanding piece by A. H. Raskin, tells the success story of Local 1199, Hospital and Nursing Home Employees Union. This group has successfully fought antiunion sentiment and bettered workers' conditions in a number of cities including Pittsburgh, my home.

Local 1199 has been a success both in the traditional labor organizing sense and in its ability to bring blacks and whites together for a common cause.

Let me quote from the article:

What gives Local 1199 its special magic is the extent to which it has coupled the substantial bread-and-butter gains it has brought its rank and file with equally solid

progress toward making unionism a way of life, an integral element in the freedom struggle.

Mr. Speaker, I insert this article into the RECORD with my personal salute to Local 1199 for a job well done:

A UNION WITH "SOUL"

(By A. H. Raskin)

Where is the Union now, friend,
At the Strike's end?
Inside my heart, friend.

There is little soul music in American labor today. Most unions have become dispiriting mirror images of the corporations with which they bargain. Their leaders are men of substance, more comfortable at Moriarty's than at Le Pavillon but not strangers to either. They receive respectful hearing on Capitol Hill or at City Hall, administer billions of dollars in trust funds, build headquarters that rival the temples of the money-changers and serve on countless boards dedicated to civic uplift.

The bigger the union, the more remote its rank and file—hundreds of thousands of names in computerized files, new members brought in automatically under union-shop agreements, dues collected by employer checkoff in the same inexorable way that Uncle Sam plucks his taxes out of the pay envelope. The chief breaks in this disembodied pattern come when the members upset a proposed contract or insurgents challenge the entrenched leadership as Joseph A. Yablonski tried to do in the United Mine Workers before a murderer's bullets cut him down. Or the disruption can come from outside in the form of clamor by Negroes and other minorities against the monopolistic control over job opportunities exercised by unions in construction and other skilled trades.

In the spiritual wasteland these problems of success have created for a movement born of worker discontent, two unions stand out as nurturers of the old idealism, perhaps because they move into the nineteen-seventies still obliged to fight the elementary battles for human dignity that gave unions their great emotional appeal in the turbulent thirties.

One is the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, headed by Cesar Chavez, which for four frustrating years has been striking the growers of California table grapes to gain some measure of security for the nomadic army of Mexican-American and Filipino pickers.

The other is Local 1199 of the Drug and Hospital Union, a New York-based organization that is combining soul power and union power to bring higher pay and a new sense of group identity to growing numbers of hospital employes across the nation, the great majority of them black and Puerto Rican. The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. used to call Local 1199 his favorite union. Three weeks before his assassination, Dr. King told a "Salute to Freedom" rally conducted by the hospital union here: "You have provided concrete and visible proof that when black and white workers unite in a democratic organization like Local 1199 they can move mountains."

In this period of racial polarization, when even so sophisticated a city as New York has demonstrated through its still smoldering conflict over school decentralization how fragile are the bonds of tolerance that tie the community together, the experience of Local 1199 affords encouraging evidence that a racially integrated approach within existing institutions can redistribute power and thus begin to satisfy the yearnings of those in the cellar of opportunity for self-direction toward a place in the sun.

Here is a union formed by Jewish drug clerks in Harlem and the Bronx at the start of the Great Depression nearly four decades ago. It went into the hospital field in 1958 almost by accident. A Negro porter at Montefiore Hospital compared notes with a relative working as a porter in a Bronx pharmacy. The hospital porter was earning $36 for a 44-hour week; the drugstore porter was getting $72 for 40 hours, plus employer-paid pension, health and welfare protection.

The Local 1199 member told the union's president, Leon J. Davis, that hospital workers could use its help. A day or two later, Elliott Godoff, now a vice president of Local 1199 but then an unemployed registered pharmacist came into the union hiring hall seeking a job as a druggist. He stopped to chat with Davis, an old friend, who remembered that in the nineteen-thirties Godoff had organized workers in the municipal hospitals for the old United Public Workers. Out of that recollection came an assignment to Godoff and Ted Mitchell, a black organizer who had originally worked as a drugstore porter, to begin signing up members in Montefiore.

Workers in the city's voluntary hospitals earned so little in those days that many needed supplementary relief from the Welfare Department to feed, clothe and house their families. They were the left-outs in all the laws guaranteeing collective bargaining, minimum wages, unemployment compensation and other statutory protections for workers. They had neither Blue Cross nor sick-pay insurance, and it was a tragic joke in the hospitals that none of their nonprofessional employees could afford to be sick.

The philanthropists who sat on hospital boards did not cheer the advent of Local 1199. Bitter strikes in 1959 and 1962—strikes in which the union defied injunctions and found itself under constant attack for imperiling patients' lives—preceded full status in New York. Today, 36,500 hospital workers in the metropolitan area belong to Local 1199, more than seven times the 5,000 in the parent division of pharmacy employees. The current minimum wage of $100 for a 40-hour week is triple the pay floor of a little more than a decade ago.

The upsurge here brought stirrings of unionization in other parts of the country, but the drive did not gain real momentum until a strike of 500 black hospital workers in Charleston, S.C., last year welded organized labor and civil-rights groups into an indomitable alliance. It took 113 days and more than a thousand arrests before the coalition won a full victory in that most Southern of cities, with its graceful mansions, moss-hung trees and a museum on the site of the old slave mart.

Even while National Guard men with fixed bayonets turned Charleston into a military compound, the dominant force in the strike was a massive spiritual involvement. When the first breakthrough was achieved on the strike's 100th day, the Rev. Ralph Abernathy, Dr. King's successor as head of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, was fasting in the Charleston jail. A dozen of his associates from S.C.L.C. and Local 1199 came to his cell with a bail bond to free him so he could speak at a victory rally. His refusal to go until a complete settlement had been won sparked an impromptu revival meeting in which everyone linked arms and sang "We Shall Overcome." As the last notes cut through the 115-degree heat, all sank to their knees on the concrete floor and Abernathy led them in prayer.

When the imminence of an accord was announced in a crowded Negro church, the entire congregation wept and knelt in prayer. One man sobbed: "It's so terrible. We've been so together; now it's over." Dozens of letters after the settlement testified to the impact on the strikers, almost all of whom were women. Mrs. Claire G. Brown, an obstetric technician, who went to prison with several of her five children for strike activity, wrote of her surprise that organizations like Local 1199 and the S.C.L.C. "would risk jail, time, money and their very lives to help hundreds of poor people like me, whom a lot of other people may think wasn't important enough even to consider."

"It helped me to realize how important I am as a person, which I'm afraid I didn't quite realize before," Mrs. Brown said. "I further realized that the power structure isn't all-powerful, but that they are to do the bidding of the people, and the people can make them do it."

A similar realization on the part of many Baltimore hospital workers helped bring 7,500 nonprofessional employes there under union contract after the Charleston triumph. Progress was made easier by the decision of the most prestigious of the city's institutions, the Johns Hopkins Medical Center, not to hide behind the absence of any state law requiring hospitals to deal with unions.* Though far from joyous at the prospect of unionization, Johns Hopkins agreed to let the workers make their own decision through an election and the union won by a 2-to-1 margin. Wages, which had been $1.60 an hour before Local 1199 came on the scene last summer, are now up to $2.10. The present New York floor of $2.50 an hour and $100 a week will be reached next Dec. 1, an increase of more than 50 per cent in a little over a year.

With organizers already at work in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Detroit, Durham, N.C., and many Connecticut and New Jersey communities, Local 1199 has now become the founding father of a full-fledged National Union of Hospital and Nursing Home Employes. The goal is to enroll as many as possible of the country's 2.5-million hospital workers into locals that will acknowledge their paternity by retaining the 1199 number, with an identifying initial tacked on for each new city. Thus, Charleston is 1199 B, Baltimore 1199 E and Pittsburgh 1199 P.

So far as the labor hierarchy is concerned, the new union is an offshoot of the Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, the A.F.L.–C.I.O. international with which Local 1199 itself is affiliated. Having a local union sprout a whole treeful of affiliates under a distinct national charter is decidedly unorthodox, but the prestige Local 1199 enjoys and the diversity of the power centers with which it is linked made its own international decide it was the course of wisdom to bless the new venture rather than fight it. In a year or two the fast-growing infant may well dwarf its parent international and ask the A.F.L.–C.I.O. to give it the key to a house all its own.

What gives Local 1199 its special magic is the extent to which it has coupled the substantial bread-and-butter gains it has brought its rank and file with equally solid progress toward making unionism a way of life, an integral element in the freedom struggle. New York City has given official recognition to the local's contributions in that direction by designating it as sponsor for a $30-million urban-renewal project to be built on the Harlem bank of the East River. The project will provide cooperative apartments for 1,350 families, many of them headed by hospital employes, on a 9.5-acre riverfront tract now populated mostly by rats. The union's aim is to turn the development into a center for inter-racial living through the inclusion of a dozen community facilities.

*Fewer than 10 states have laws that firmly guarantee hospital workers the right to join unions, hold representation elections and bargain collectively, rights that most workers won 35 years ago. New York passed such a law only in 1963. Where there are no such laws, hospital administrators have generally interpreted their absence as a prohibition on dealing with unions.

In all its activities, 1199 tries to prove that "a good union doesn't have to be dull." Its home-produced film, "Like a Beautiful Child," surpasses any television documentary in poignancy and effectiveness, an understated epic of workers in quest of "the little things that make the difference." The 1959 strike here led to publication of a book of poems in the Joe Hill tradition by Marshall Dubin, the union's educational director. (The poem at the start of this article is from that collection.) Live theater programs, seminars and $40,000 a year in college scholarships for the children of 1199 members are among the raisins in the union-baked bread.

Through all its four decades the local has been on the far left of New York's labor movement. It broke with the labor establishment to support Senator Eugene J. McCarthy for the Democratic Presidential nomination in 1968. It lined up with Ocean Hill-Brownsville and other champions of community control in their fight with the United Federation of Teachers. When the Central Labor Council went all-out to prevent Mayor Lindsay's reelection last year, the hospital workers put all their energies into insuring the Mayor a second term.

Despite such walkaways from conventional union "solidarity," the local has had vigorous support from the rest of labor in its organizational battles. Indeed, its leaders give a large share of the credit for their success in the make-or-break 1959 hospital strike to Harry Van Arsdale Jr., president of the Central Labor Council, who currently rates as a kind of ogre to many black unionists. When the hospitals dug in to repel unionization, Van Arsdale mobilized the construction trades—then even more lily-white than they are now—to walk the picket lines night and day with the Negro and Puerto Rican strikers. Equally important, he used his considerable political influence with Mayor Robert F. Wagner to put the heat on the balky hospital trustees and thus end the Lady Bountiful brand of economic feudalism.

Leon Davis, who has remained president of Local 1199 almost from its inception, is still an enthusiastic Van Arsdale booster, for all their fallings-out over Lindsay and the school strike. "When we were striking in Charleston," Davis says, "Van Arsdale couldn't have worked harder to rally help if it were his own electricians on strike."

Indeed, help in the Charleston strike came from labor nationally. George Meany took the lead in raising $100,000 from the A.F.L.–C.I.O. and its affiliates. The rival Alliance for Labor Action, headed by Walter P. Reuther, contributed $35,000. Perhaps the most potent assistance of all came from Thomas W. (Teddy) Gleason, tough-talking head of the International Longshoremen's Association, whose threat to shut down the port got a lot of Charleston businessmen interested in a settlement.

Davis, whose radicalism once made him a pariah to most other top unionists, is mildly amused by the eagerness they now show to embrace him and his organization. "For the labor movement," he says, "identifying with us is like going to church or synagogue. We are a badge of holiness, a mezuzah they can wear around their neck. They all want to help. A racket guy, a guy who runs a no-good union, sent me a $1,000 check to help the Charleston strike."

The most unusual testimonial to Local 1199's probity came from Simone Rizzo (Sam the Plumber) DeCavalcante, the New Jersey *mafioso*, whose tapped telephone conversations covered a couple of thousand pages of F.B.I. transcript. In one bugged talk, he advised Local 1199 to stop bothering a Plainfield nursing home. Murray Kempton, a man with an ear for such things, culls from the record these deathless words of DeCavalcante: "This is a slap in the face to me. . . . I got money in there. . . . You better watch your step where you put your feet. . . . Tell [Davis] he better not threaten people or I will wash every street with him. . . ." The union didn't scare and in two days DeCavalcante decided it would be smart to settle.

Even more remarkable, however, is the steady strengthening of the ties between 1199 and the civil-rights movement in a period when white-black relationships in the rest of labor are more down than up. When the Charleston strike ended, Abernathy's chief assistant, the Rev. Andrew Young, told the victory rally: "We won this strike because of a wonderful marriage, the marriage of the S.C.L.C. and Local 1199. The first of many beautiful children of this marriage is Local 1199 B here in Charleston, and there are going to be as many more children like 1199 B as there are letters in the alphabet."

The support for the local comes not just from moderates like Roy Wilkins and A. Philip Randolph but from such militants as the late Malcolm X. His enthusiasm for 1199, he said in a talk shortly before his murder, rose from the fact that its leaders were not "afraid of upsetting the status quo or the apple cart of those people who are running City Hall or sitting in Albany or sitting in the White House."

The heads of all the feuding national black groups got together for the first time in years to sign a joint declaration backing the Charleston strikers. Dr. King's widow, Coretta Scott King, as honorary chairman of the national organizing drive. She has helped to make the blue-and-white 1199 cap a countrywide freedom symbol.

One explanation for this united support is that 1199 has been a good deal more enterprising than have other white-led unions with a majority of "minority" members in seeking out, developing and utilizing leadership potential among its black and Puerto Rican rank and file. Typical is Fred Punch, a year ago an orderly at St. Barnabas Hospital in the Bronx, who has been running the whirlwind organizing campaign in Baltimore and is now a vice president of the new national union.

He is no token black in the Local 1199 command structure, either. Mary Moultrie, a nurse's aid in the State Medical College Hospital at Charleston, whose firing was one of the triggers of the strike there, not only got her hospital job back but is now president of 1199 B and a national union vice president as well. She was a featured speaker at the national convention of the A.F.L.–C.I.O. in Atlantic City last October, the first black rank-and-filer ever to make such an address.

The secretary-treasurer of the national union is Henry Nicholas, a male aide at Mt. Sinai in the 1959 New York strike, who never got beyond elementary school in his native Mississippi but who played a lead role in Charleston and is currently top man in the effort to unionize Pittsburgh hospitals. Most prominent of all the up-from-the-ranks leaders is Doris Turner, a former diet clerk at Lenox Hill, who distinguished herself in the initial strike and now heads the entire hospital division in New York, with 20 area directors and organizers on her staff.

She is secretary of the national union and is about to move up to executive vice president of the New York local as part of a reorganization that will expand black and Puerto Rican representation on the 1199 staff. When the new structure becomes operative after the local's elections next month, 8 of the 15 vice presidents will be Negro or Puerto Rican. So will 8 of the 11 organizers.

Davis, born in Russia 57 years ago, will still head the cast, both locally and nationally. But he is not counting on seniority to keep him on top permanently. When asked how long he thinks he and other pioneers of the old Pharmacists Union can maintain seats of power in an organization now 80 per cent "minority" members, Davis replies cheerfully: "Oh, we'll have to go. We know that. The old leadership is here to prepare new leaders. They are coming from the hospital ranks, black, Puerto Rican, white. The assets they have are that they understand their own people much better than any of us. We have great practical and administrative experience, which they largely lack and which you need to run a union today."

But there is a great gun between the cool rationality of such pronouncements and the black-power pressures that throb in the ghetto and find their way into the life of the union. Davis, a soapboxer from way back, is not above utilizing demagogy of the raw-meat variety in the crisis stages of contract negotiations. At such junctures, he often couples appeals to passion with strike threats—despite the fact that the New York law which opened up a statutory right to collective bargaining for hospital employes in 1963 specifically requires that disputes not settled through direct negotiations be submitted to binding arbitration. This heedlessness of a legal mandate to prevent the sick from becoming hostages in labor-management battles only worsens race divisions, in the view of hospital administrators.

So does the union's use of confrontation techniques—imprisoning hospital executives in their offices while black delegates "tell it like it is," and staging "high noons" at which all union workers walk out in a show of strength. In Baltimore, Elliott Godoff warned officials that the union "could make Charleston look like a poker game," and Fred Punch talked of "tearing the damn town down."

My own wanderings through the cavernous halls of Johns Hopkins after the peaceful contract signing there made it plain that the campaign had left a bad residue of racial friction, with most of the white workers in the bargaining unit—the bulk of them maintenance mechanics and engineers—sullen about the union's victory. Even the fact that they were earning more as a result had not turned them into boosters.

This carry-over of bitterness depresses Dr. Russell Nelson, president of the medical center. He is a thoughtful man, in tune with progressive trends in medicine and society, no counterpart of the union-baiters and their racist supporters in Charleston. It was largely his influence that prompted the Johns Hopkins trustees to authorize an election, despite their lack of legal duty to deal with the union.

"The campaign did polarize this institution," Dr. Nelson told me. "The tension is still here. One of the biggest challenges to both sides is to create the right psychological atmosphere for taking care of sick people. People can hate one another and make steel, but that kind of hatred is not good for treating sick people. I can see this union in this town being one of the most powerful social and economic tools in the black power struggle. They literally can control health services; until now they controlled only the streets."

He paused, and his gaze wandered around the dignified room, its furniture eloquent of the old South. "I can understand the mood. 'It's our turn; we're going to take over; were going to get ours,'" he said. "At least in my time, it's a force that's going to separate, not unite—a negative force rather than a positive one."

When I told Punch of Dr. Nelson's fears, the union leader was sympathetic. "You say what you have to say in a campaign," he said. "They said a lot, too. After it's over, you have to live together. We know that, and we're going to work at it. We must build bridges on both sides. A few years from now, we'll be giving testimonials to one another."

A decade of union experience in New York offers considerable support for the Punch forecast—at least as far as day-to-day hospital operation is concerned. I talked to the directors of three of the biggest institutions under contract here—Drs. Martin Cherkasky of Montefiore, S. David Pomrinse of Mt. Sinai

and Ray E. Trussell of Beth Israel—and found them in agreement that unionization had made their workers more prideful and thus helped raise performance standards. This year marks the start of a joint union-employer program for taking the dead end out of hospital jobs by upgrading blacks and Puerto Ricans at the bottom of the skill ladder to posts as nurses, technicians and clerical workers.

Turnover is down appreciably in a field which workers used to leave after a month or two, and the hospitals themselves have been spurred to retain personnel experts and improve their whole approach to human relations, to the benefit of patients as well as workers. Dr. Pomrinse noted another side benefit: "The presence of the union has given minority groups a vehicle for expression so that there is less need for them to be intemperate or irresponsible."

But this applause does not extend to the union's conduct in contract negotiations. Dr. Cherkasky, who gave 1199 its first major victory by persuading the Montefiore trustees to recognize it without a strike in 1958, has no doubt of the genuineness of Davis's desire for racial harmony, but feels "he plays with fire on the theory that he always can cool it later."

The future holds three very dissimilar challenges for 1199. One, of course, is the task of getting into hospitals that do not want it. In New York, nearly half of the city's largest hospitals—including Columbia-Presbyterian and New York Hospital—have so far managed to keep their employees contented without unionization. In Pittsburgh, the principal hospitals have countered 1199's organizing efforts with a two-step voluntary pay boost that has brought the minimum up from $1.60 to $1.95 an hour. ("The mere mention of 1199 is enough to send wages up," is the wry comment of Moe Foner, the union's executive secretary. "If we should announce we were going to Kansas City, there would be a 15-cent increase before the first organizer arrived.")

The second challenge is presented by the forces of black power and community control. Last year, a tiny but highly vocal group in New York contended that it was wrong for Local 1199, with its egalitarian tradition, to keep unskilled hospital employes and white-collar and technical groups in separate divisions. The insurgents argued that the separation catered to "prejudices and feelings of superiority based upon different skills or status or pay." The union leadership opposed a merger of the two divisions on the ground that each had special problems. In balloting last September, the service employees killed the merger proposal 8 to 1.

Currently, the union is in the middle of a battle between Beth Israel and a Lower East Side neighborhood council allied with the ultramilitant Health Revolution Unity Movement. Some union members employed at the hospital's Gouverneur Health Center teamed up with the neighborhood council in trying to take over the center, on the ground that it should come under community control.

When the rebels were fired, 163 of the union's 180 members at Gouverneur signed a petition saying that the ousted workers were mainly interested in disruption and deserved no support. On that basis, the union refused to authorize a strike for reinstatement. Davis issued a statement reiterating 1199's devotion to the principle of community control but denying that the community really backed the revolutionary movement.

Even though Davis emphasized that the local was fighting minority disruption and not the right of a community to make its own decisions, the whole union position had an embarrassing resemblance to the mumbo-jumbo U.F.T. statements on Ocean Hill-Brownsville. Undoubtedly, there will be more such difficult choices for 1199 as the hospitals become a new battleground in fights by widely divergent organizations to establish themselves as the only bona fide voices of their neighborhoods. None of this, however, has altered Davis' faith that poor people must be brought into the mainstream of society by giving them economic power and facing the risks that go with any exercise of power.

Finally, there is the challenge that will confront 1199 when its present two-year contracts with the New York hospitals expire on June 30. That challenge arises out of the bind in which all hospitals find themselves in an era when Medicare, Medicaid and Blue Cross account for 85 per cent of all income and the hospitals serve as middlemen for the public in deciding how much people can afford to pay for a day of hospital care.

It was easy for 1199 to marshal public sympathy for its argument that hospital employes should not be expected to subsidize the patients when take-home pay for the pushers of trays and the ironers of bedsheets was $28 to $30 a week. But that sympathy may not come so readily now that the workers have crossed the $100 line and the cost of a hospital bed has soared above $100 a day.

The hospitals are making common cause with Davis in fighting to keep the state from putting them in a cost-control straitjacket, but even if they win they expect to have to turn to Governor Rockefeller and Mayor Lindsay for help in negotiating a new contract without a strike. The Greater New York Hospital Association estimates that the last agreement added $100-million to the labor bill of the voluntary hospitals and pushed up the cost of patient care by $25 a day.

The real decision on how much higher hospital wages ought to go will rest with the public. There are no more "philanthropists" now—not on hospital boards or in hospital kitchens. The public pays the bills. It sits in the employer's seat, even though the hospitals do the bargaining. Davis himself says: "We must make up our mind as a people whether we want to pay for high-quality care." As one who went to jail for 30 days in the New York strike of eight years ago and for eight days more in the Charleston strike last year, he has no illusions about the tests that lie ahead.

But there is more mellowness than belligerence in his tone as he speculates on what will replace the discarded ideologies of a disordered society. "The tragedy for us with a left-wing background is that we had everything worked out and we see how empty were many of our certainties," he says. "The kids are going through that now. We failed them by destroying their fantasies. In the old days kids could draw on the past for hope in the future. Now they look back on the Hitler period, the Stalin period. They see that the kitchen is a mess, full of broken dishes. The Socialist idea, the Communist idea, sustained people for a long time. They learned to make their peace with disappointments. Now no picture of hope comes forth, and people are turning against history in their search for hope."

He believes the labor movement could help open the doors of hope for the excluded if there were a young John L. Lewis around to enroll the 10-million unorganized in the service industries. But he sees no hope of that. When well-intentioned unions in New Jersey assigned some organizers to help 1199 in the hospitals there, Davis soon sent them back. "They came to work at 10 A.M. and went home at 3 P.M.," he explains. "They were ruining our organizers, who came in at 6 A.M. and were still working at midnight."

The Spartan tradition still governs the union's own salaries. Davis draws $335 a week; other top officers, $295, and organizers, $135. The local is about to move out of its gloomy three-story building on Eighth Avenue to a 14-story structure it is putting up two blocks south on 43d Street. Davis is a bit sheepish about appearing to emulate his fellow union chiefs in erecting monuments to themselves. "We probably could have rented the space more cheaply, but it is partly psychological for our members," he says. "It will give them the feeling: 'You were nobody yesterday, now you've put up your own tall building.'"

I have talked to a good many of these exnobodies in the last few weeks. There was about all of them a quality of self-respect, a joy in being able to make ends meet without welfare and, above all, a sense of collective strength in not having to worry about arbitrary dismissal or other humiliation.

"You can live without being scared to death that next morning you'll be out of a job," said Mrs. Mozell Smith, a 50-year-old food preparer at the Hospital for Joint Diseases. "The hospital is a happier place, not full of tension all the time." She told of the special pains she takes to make sure that the babies' formulas she works on are exactly right. "A little bit of elbow grease and work ain't going to hurt you," she said. Mrs. Smith, a nursemaid before coming to the hospital seven years ago, is a delegate to the union's monthly assemblies. All the meetings, dances and annual dinners are "just like a pot of flowers—black and white, no difference, we have a wonderful time." Her earnings now are $107 a week, "not a lot of money, but it's a lot if you're used to getting $65."

A score of such testimonials made it hard to doubt that 1199 was living up to the pledge Davis gave in its name after Dr. King's assassination: "We will build no stone monuments to commemorate him. We will pass no pious resolutions. We will build our union in his image. We will raise high the banner of struggle in the fight against poverty, discrimination, ignorance, hate and war."

It is a fight that may never be wholly won, but it is a fight America cannot afford to lose.

TV NEWS COVERAGE THREATENED BY GOVERNMENT INTIMIDATION

HON. TORBERT H. MACDONALD

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last year our colleague, Congressman LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, wrote for Television Age magazine on the troubled relationship between some officeholders and the broadcast press.

The gentleman from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN) was primarily concerned about certain actions in Congress, which he felt were a potential threat to the integrity of television news operations.

I believe his comments are even more timely today. In the 9 months since the article was published, the threat has become ominous indeed—only it is emanating now from the executive branch. The harsh criticism of the media by the Vice President, the talk of subpenas to obtain newsmen's notes for the Justice Department demonstrate just how shaky the underpinnings of press freedom have become in our Nation's Capital.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN's article, as published in the June 16, 1969, issue of Television Age, follows:

INTIMIDATION—THE THREAT TO TV NEWS

Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press . . .

The First Amendment could hardly be clearer, a simple yet eloquent statement of one of the basic principles on which our nation was founded.

To me, the first 10 amendments, known as the Bill of Rights, have always meant what they said. But there are men of good intentions, both in and outside Congress, who feel otherwise. To them, the freedoms guaranteed by the founding fathers are something to be tinkered with in times of stress.

Right now, broadcast journalism is under attack by important segments of the political establishment. The House Commerce Committee is pondering legislation which, among other things, would empower government to punish broadcasters for "falsification" in newscasts by revoking their licenses to operate.

I am confident this bill will never be approved—and if by some remote chance it were, that it would immediately be struck down by the courts as grossly unconstitutional.

But what prompted the preparation of such a bill in the first place?

I think we have to go back to the Republican National Convention of 1964, in San Francisco, when the assembled delegates jeered and hooted at the very mention of the press. As many politicians do, they assumed the newsmen must be biased against them if they were not actively boosting their candidate. And the GOP standard bearer that year did have inordinate troubles conveying his message through our main political medium, television.

Unfortunately for us Democrats, the shoe was on the other foot last year. It was we who were piqued at the networks for alleged damage done our cause in the reporting of our national convention in Chicago. One of my colleagues, a man of distinction in the House of Representatives, seriously believed the broadcasters were trying to "kill" the Democrats as a major political party by covering the streets disturbances that attended the convention.

As a former television news commentator, I found this anomaly more than passing strange: how the network executives, in some bewildering massive shift of partisan loyalties, could logically be seen as tormenting the Republicans in 1964, and then turning right around and blasting the Democrats only four years later.

Be that as it may, a lot of office holders have been harboring a grudge against television—and especially televison news coverage—for some time. Remember, the average politician almost literally exists on his publicity; if it's good, he's usually got it made, and if it's bad, he'd better start looking around for a new career. Not surprisingly, this group is unusually sensitive to what is said or written about themselves and their friends. And, as in any love-hate relationship, their reactions to real or imagined affronts tend to be both emotional and excessive.

Broadcasters have had some success in keeping would-be government watchdogs at bay by frequently pointing out that television doesn't *make* news, only *reports* it. If there is ugliness in the world, the reasoning goes, it is not the fault of television which, after all, only mirrors events.

Unfortunately, there are some flaws in this logic, since people, being only human, react to cameras while tending to overlook the reporter with a pad and pencil. Responsible broadcasters, of course, are fully aware of this, and in recent years have been striving mightily to make TV a less visible presence in volatile situations such as riots.

Occasionally, though, a case comes along which provides both ammunition and encouragement for those who would encroach on the First Amendment. In this category is the *Pot Party at a University* program, produced in November, 1967, by WBBM–TV, the CBS-owned station in Chicago.

Charges that the program was "staged" by the station, and that the young reporter involved actually purchased marijuana from one of the participants, seem to me to have some validity—although they are denied by CBS. Nevertheless, because there was reason to believe that a station in its treatment of a controversial subject may have actually been more than a mere recorder of events, the damage was done.

THE SUBCOMMITTEE POUNCES

To the Special Investigations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the program seemed like fair game for a full-scale probe. Accordingly, after several weeks of hearings by the Subcommittee in Chicago and Washington, the full Commerce Committee assembled last March 13 to consider a bombshell of a report, which was adopted after a discussion lasting only one hour.

The five legislative recommendations in the report almost outdo each other in offensiveness. The proposals would:

1. Broaden the law barring "deceptive practices" in quiz shows to cover "falsification" in news broadcasts as well.

2. Make "commission of a crime" by a broadcaster grounds for the revocation of his license or construction permit.

3. Require stations to keep news film, including outtakes, for at least six months for possible review by Government investigators.

4. Obligate broadcasters to show news previews to "all interested parties."

5. Authorize a study of possible limitations on the sponsorship of newscasts.

It's quite a package, one to raise the hackles of most constitutionalists. And it did not sit well with all my colleagues in the Commerce Committee. Seven of them joined me in filing dissenting opinions of varying intensity with the committee report.

In nearly every instance, these recommendations raise the spectre of government censorship. Take the vague word "falsification." When applying it to news broadcasts, who would define it? The FCC? A federal judge? Or perhaps an irate politician?

As anyone who's ever been a newsman knows, the way to handle news inevitably and unavoidably involves a choice of judgments in that somewhere along the line someone has to decide what to print or air, and what to withhold. And, almost invariably, someone else not in that decision-making process is going to feel there is "falsification" in what is said, or unsaid, on the news program.

And are the news reporters and directors then to be held responsible for the actual "falsifications" voiced by persons interviewed for their programs? Even our highest officials have, from time to time, asserted their "right to lie" in the interests of national security. Is the newsman through some wonderful sort of telepathy supposed to know just when the news source is prevaricating—and then call his bluff—or else face possible retaliation for not being a mind reader?

AN EMPTY THREAT

The recommendation that licenses of law breakers be revoked is meaningless, since the FCC already has authority to challenge any license at any time. I was particularly intrigued by the strong implication in the report that any newsman who withholds knowledge of a crime from the authorities is invariably acting contrary to the public interest.

It is one thing to say that broadcasters should not be contemptuous of the laws—but quite another to tell them they cannot even observe a criminal activity in order to expose it to public view.

A few years ago, CBS did another program, *Biography of a Bookie Joint*, which also ruffled the powers-that-be. For several months—not hours or days—the network secreted cameras and tape recorders in a Boston establishment that was replete with communications equipment, tote boards and about 1,200 cash customers a day. Only after the meticulous investigation was completed was the U.S. Attorney General advised.

And the resulting exposé was a blockbuster. Because the CBS team had gone *quietly* about its business, enough evidence was gathered to bring about the convictions of nine bookmakers, the resignation of the corruption-tainted Boston police commissioner and a thorough shake-up of the city's police department.

Are we now to say that reporting of this type threatens the public interest?

The report's suggested requirement that news departments retain their film "for inspection by duly constituted authorities" seems very simple on the surface. A TV editor orders his film or tape cut and sequenced for clarity, for effect, and always for staying within the limitations of air time. Much of the cameraman's product is unused. But do we really wish to tell a newsman that some Government sleuth, in effect, is looking over his shoulder as he edits his film or script—that he may be judged by some future court of inquiry not alone on the basis of what he puts on the air, but by what he decides to omit as well?

The fourth proposal, to open previews to all interested parties, falls on its face without any help from me. Here, in a way-out extension of the Fairness Doctrine, a licensee is asked to circularize everyone involved or even "interested" in certain film footage if anyone at all is allowed to see it. Under this heavy-handed edict, it would conceivably be unlawful to "play back" a filmed or taped interview for scanning even by the man interviewed.

The fifth and final suggestion—for a further study of advertising and ratings in connection with the news—looks relatively inoffensive. But I am unhappy with the implied premise that the right to exercise editorial judgment is somehow compromised if one of the purposes of a news documentary is to increase ratings or circulation. The courts have long held against the idea that one forfeits his First Amendment rights, if his "press" or "speech" is a profitmaking instrument.

In considering this report, we should also ask ourselves what the press, printed and electronic, is all about in this country. There are many station licensees and newspaper publishers with whose views completely disagree. Yet I shudder when I think of the alternative: the media speaking in one monotonous voice, on direct cue from Government. We can be thankful for "difficult" television stations like KQED in San Francisco, with its bearded commentators, and for contentious journals of opinion like *New Republic* on the left and *National Review* on the right. You will never find a Government publication with their zesty—and stimulating—approach to public affairs.

I am afraid that the main effect of the recommendations in the Commerce Committee report would be to discourage the bold reporting and provocative programming which often makes mistakes, but which always helps vitalize democracy. In their place would be a diet of bland programming carefully tailored to exclude thought and discussion from the American living room.

Just by issuing the pot party report, we may have tended to discourage, if not to intimidate, those licensees who are most dedicated to programming enterprise.

A POSITIVE PROGRAM TO AID IN THE FIGHT AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, through the thoughtfulness of Mr. John T. Pollack, president of the Thatcher Glass Manufacturing Co. of New York City—which operates a plant in my district—I was recently sent a copy of the testimony of Richard L. Cheney, executive director of the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Senate Committee on Public Works, chaired by Senator MUSKIE.

I think that Mr. Cheney's statement is excellent and worthy of serious consideration by my colleagues here in the Congress. It also emphasizes industry's willingness—most of it, anyway—to cooperate in solving the environmental problems of our Nation. As President Nixon has so well pointed out, the battle to save our environment should not be a search for villains but should be a partnership effort including such simple contributions as citizens willingness to "segregate" their own trash between degradables and nondegradables. Mr. Cheney outlines a very positive program in this direction, and I think after reading the following statement all will agree that his program can become a major step toward a long-range rather than a stopgap solution to one aspect of our overall problems.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD L. CHENEY

I am Richard L. Cheney, Executive Director of the Glass Container Manufacturers Institute, a national trade association whose members, both large and small, collectively manufacture over 90 per cent of the glass containers and well over half of the closures (other than crowns) produced in the United States. Our members have 125 plants in twenty-seven states employing more than 70,000 people.

I am a graduate of Massachusetts Institute of Technology with a degree in Civil Engineering, and in the course of my responsibilities with GCMI have devoted much time and effort to the search for practical solutions to the highly complex problems of litter and solid waste disposal.

I am also the current President of the Materials Disposal Research Council, an organization of trade associations representing all facets of the packaging materials industry which was established approximately two years ago for the principal purpose of assisting in the search for solutions to the problems of solid waste disposal as they may be affected by consumer packages.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the glass container industry to express our support for the fundamental objectives of the legislation you have under consideration and to tell you of the extensive activities GCMI and its members have conducted in recent years in the areas of environmental pollution control and solid waste disposal and comment upon certain aspects of the proposed legislation. Upon completion of my statement, I shall be pleased to attempt to answer any questions you may have regarding our comments.

I might note at the outset of my statement that GCMI for many years has been a leader in the nation's litter prevention movement, through its own extensive educational activities and through its founding and substantial support of Keep America Beautiful, Inc. In the past several years GCMI has also been extremely active in investigations and research designed to solve the problems that glass containers may present in solid waste disposal. We believe that we were the first to institute such a program on an industry-wide basis.

As you requested in your invitation to appear before this Subcommittee, I shall address myself principally to the following three areas:

1. Technical and economic solutions to the problems associated with the disposal of glass containers.

2. The need to consider recovery, recycling, and reuse in the design and manufacture of consumer goods.

3. Comments on the pending legislation.

As to the first area of concern, we have seen two trends in the evolutions of the packaging industry and of waste disposal systems. The packaging industry has been technologically progressive in researching and developing the types of packages demanded by modern modes and standards of living. However, there have been relatively few corollary technological improvements in waste disposal systems to keep pace with the demands of modern living. This has not, however, been the fault of public works officials and the municipal governments but is largely due to insufficient funds, the major changes in our living habits since World War II and the burgeoning population in our urban areas. Unfortunately, the funds which have heretofore been committed to waste disposal have, in most instances, been sufficient only to deal with collection activities.

Furthermore, the character of refuse has changed radically with the changes in our mode of life. Not so many years ago, solid waste consisted principally of food waste and ashes from coal burning furnaces. Today, these items are a minor factor, having been replaced by a vast quantity of paper, packages, discarded appliances and the like.

For the reasons I have just indicated, outdated waste disposal methods have been perpetuated and consequently have compounded the problems presented by the change in the size and nature of the solid waste accumulation.

Since World War II, there also has been a trend away from the prior practice of segregating waste materials at the household and institutional sources to a concept of combined collection. This has had a steadily diminishing effect on the commercial salvaging of glass containers. For example, the salvage of glass containers was a thriving business in Los Angeles until the separation of waste in the home and elsewhere was abandoned a few years ago.

Another important factor affecting solid waste disposal has been the enactment of much needed air and water pollution regulations throughout the country which have resulted in many instances in the prohibition of open dumps and open burning, practices that are costly, cumbersome, wasteful of resources and conducive to land, air and water pollution. Most cities today are turning to the sanitary landfill as an emergency short term solution to the solid waste problem while other cities are turning to incineration. A very few are currently experimenting with composting and salvage.

It seems that all of us are largely still living in the first generation of solid waste collection and disposal, that is, the generation of the traditional garbage man and his truck. Of course, most municipal governments are now looking beyond this first generation concept. We strongly feel that burying and burning should, in the long run, be eliminated as primary methods of disposal and we also feel that sanitary landfill is, at best, only a short term solution, particularly for urban areas.

It is clear that this first generation concept of collection and disposal cannot possibly cope with the great diversity of materials which have been developed to respond to the requirements of our modern society. Moreover, it is no exaggeration to say that modern American life is highly dependent on the convenience and economy of modern packaging technology. The scientifically-oriented packaging industry, producing some $17 billion dollars worth of goods a year, should not be required to revert to outmoded packaging systems to accommodate outdated waste disposal methods. We think, rather, that waste disposal systems should join the ranks of the technologically progressive.

That is the aim of our work in the glass container industry. Before explaining this in more detail, however, I think it would be helpful to comment briefly on the role of glass in today's overall conservation, environmental, and waste disposal picture.

Glass is made of highly abundant raw materials—silica sand, limestone and soda ash. Sand accounts for 73 per cent of the composition of container glass. Thus glass manufacturing is not a serious drain on our natural resources. If properly crushed in disposal processes, the glass fragments return to the soil in virtually their original state. And being inert, they do not leach, rust, rot, mold, putrify, cause disease or noxious gases, nor pollute in any way.

Several recent studies have shown that glass constitutes an average of only about six percent by weight of residential solid waste, and an almost negligible percent by volume, if the glass is crushed in efficient landfill, incineration and composting operations. In fact, all packaging accounts for only about 13 percent of total residential, commercial and industrial waste.

We also have found that glass as a material is not a problem in present waste disposal systems. Preliminary findings in studies being conducted under our sponsorship at Drexel Institute of Technology, in Philadelphia, on the performance of glass containers in sanitary landfills indicate that if glass is properly crushed its volume is reduced to a minimum and there is no significant leaching. Glass, therefore, contributes to a firm landfill and does not contribute to water pollution. Further, glass bottles readily break up in the incineration process to help aerate the furnace charge, thus contributing to efficient combustion. As the glass is inert, it cannot contribute to air pollution in the incineration process. In the composting, crushed glass provides a valuable soil conditioner.

Proposals are frequently advanced that all packaging should be made of materials that readily decompose when discarded, on the theory that this would solve both the litter and solid waste problems. This is not a viable solution since the process of decomposition only threatens to shift the problem to one of pollution of the air, land or water. We have already seen, for example, that the inertness of crushed glass is an asset in solid waste disposal. Discarded package remains cluttering our roadsides and gradually decomposing may be more difficult and costly to pick up than present packaging. Moreover, the decomposing material may present a health hazard.

We in the glass container industry see salvage and re-use as the long-range solution of the waste problem. I think that in this we are in full agreement with the objectives of the legislation you are considering today.

We believe that conservation of raw materials demands salvage and that the long-range, efficient management of waste calls for re-use. We are convinced that salvage

will materially reduce pollution. All our research is predicated on this conviction. We have concluded at this point that there are more potential uses for waste container glass than there is glass available from refuse now or in the predictable future. In addition, the waste glass is reusable without elaborate refinement.

We are also sponsoring research at Stanford Research Institute and the Sortex Company to develop mechanical means for separating container glass from raw refuse and then sorting it optically by color for recycling back into the bottle making process. We believe that as much as 30 per cent of our raw materials for manufacturing could consist of crushed glass, or cullet as we call it.

We have cooperated with the U.S. Bureau of Mines on its successful development of means of magnetically separating glass and metal fractions from incinerator residue. It also has developed technology for converting the salvaged glass into building bricks and glass wool insulation. I have with me today examples of them for your examination. With color sorting and automatic removal of contaminants, which appear to be feasible, this glass could also be used as cullet to make new bottles.

An even larger potential exists in the use of crushed waste glass as aggregate in glasphalt, a product being developed by the University of Missouri, in Rolla, Missouri, in which the glass substitutes for crushed limestone in asphalt for paving streets. Estimates indicate that the need for such aggregate in most cities would far exceed the available glass. Most municipalities have their own hot batch asphalt plants and would need only to remove the glass from their own refuse for such a use.

The feasibility of this reuse of glass is being thoroughly tested in pilot projects consisting of sections of roads at the University of Missouri at Rolla and at a member company plant paved with this glasphalt material. GCMI will provide the crushed waste glass for a further major road test at the University. We are quite optimistic that this will prove to be a development of major commercial value.

The ultimate solution, of course, should be the separation of all the components out of waste and returning them for reuse to their respective industries, such as, paper back to the paper mill; aluminum back to the smelter; and scrap iron to the foundry.

Thus, separation becomes the major problem. There is no question that the closer to the consumer the separation starts, the tighter the recycling loop and the more efficient the system. Home separation was common in the past and a number of communities still practice it to varying degrees. Even one separation of combustibles from non-combustibles in households and commercial establishments would open new avenues to salvage and re-use. We feel that a significant market exists for glass properly separated from refuse and we and our members are currently exploring the means and economics of establishing pilot retrieval programs in certain major urban areas. We are hopeful that this may give rise to meaningful commercial opportunities in urban centers throughout the country.

New methods and concepts for waste collection, salvage and disposal are being developed by industry, and need only the opportunity for a full-scale pilot program in a typical community to demonstrate their worth. One such development is a unique wet system capable of crushing and separating glass, metals and paper pulp from other materials, we are told, at a cost of approximately $2.50 a ton of raw refuse, including operating costs and amortization, in a proposed plant designed to handle 500 tons of waste per day. GCMI is working with various research organizations to further refine glass from this process for re-use in glass furnaces.

The prospect of pipe transportation of wastes also is being investigated. The Bureau of Solid Waste Management of the U.S. Public Health Service has awarded contracts and grants to research organizations to determine the feasibility of pneumatic and hydraulic transfer.

We estimate that some twenty to twenty-five new refuse management systems are presently in varying stages of development in the private sector. These include volume reduction by high temperature incineration with a potentially reusable by-product of slag, composting methods which incorporate all refuse into a useful soil conditioner and salvage techniques recovering some or all usable materials in refuse.

Projects such as these place us at the threshold of what we might term the second generation of solid waste disposal. This will be the generation of systems and automation. We have reached a point in time when the designers and manufacturers of packaging should work with those in government responsible for waste disposal to gain a better understanding of mutual problems. Certainly the package producer should understand the problems his products may cause in waste disposal. And it is equally as important that the officials responsible for waste disposal understand industry's problems in supplying the consumer with the packages he needs and demands. Indeed, the package producer's intimate knowledge of his raw materials can make a very real contribution to the ultimate solutions.

Likewise, the views of knowledgeable government officials on the technical aspects of disposal would be significant. In this connection, we are currently sponsoring a national survey of public works officials to determine their views on these matters. As a further contribution to a mutual understanding of the problems involved, we are in the process of publishing for national distribution a factbook on solid waste.

It is our hope that the Materials Disposal Research Council, which I mentioned earlier, will help bridge the gap between industry and government in the waste disposal area. We anticipate that the Council will operate to discharge industry's responsibilities in seeking solutions in three major areas: litter prevention, solid waste management and the conservation of natural resources. We see it as a major instrument in furthering meaningful dialogue between government and industry.

Through such government-industry cooperation we can begin to prepare for what could be called the third generation of solid waste management. This would be an age in which mechanization and automation would coordinate complete systems involving environmental protection and virtually complete conservation of natural resources.

I think we have now reached a point from which we can look ahead to tie up the loose ends of solid waste management and conservation. The terms must be virtually synonymous and the systems of the future must embrace mining and agricultural wastes. We feel that the Resource Recovery Act and the National Material Policy Act can play extremely effective roles in the national thrust for a comprehensive management of our environment.

Now, before addressing myself specifically to this proposed legislation, I would like briefly to consider the second point you asked me to discuss; namely, the role of design and manufacture in the ultimate disposability of the products in question. To most people this means designing products that are rapidly degradable. I think you can surmise from what I already have said that we do not consider this to be a very fruitful approach. In the first place, if we consider salvage and re-use the ultimate solution, degradability becomes virtually meaningless or it could conceivably become a negative factor. Then, too, as I already noted, degradability carries with it the potential for creating new and different problems of land, air and water pollution.

However, there are circumstances in which design factors can contribute benefically to present-day waste disposal systems. I will use glass containers, with which I am most familiar, as an example. Over the last twenty years we have succeeded through design and manufacturing improvements to reduce the weight of the average glass container about 20 per cent while maintaining and even improving the strength of the bottles. Such a decrease in weight is an advantage in the ultimate disposal of these containers under present methods. The modern one-way beer and soft drink bottles provide an even more dramatic example. The one-way containers weigh anywhere from a half to a third of the average returnable bottle, thus enjoying an obvious advantage over returnables in waste disposal. Further, our long-range research is seeking to develop chemically tempered bottles that will be very light in weight and extremely strong, but that when broken, as in the processing of solid waste, will crumble into harmless granules or sand.

Finally, with regard to the legislation you have under consideration, we support the basic objectives of the Resource Recovery Act (S. 2005) and the National Material Policy Act (Amendment 153) which seek the salvage of useable materials and the modernizing and upgrading of municipal refuse systems. It is imperative that federal funds, along with possible state support, be used to promote studies and long-range efforts of local government and industry alike to deal with these problems. Properly placed governmental funds are essential to developing regional programs which are a key to solving the solid waste crisis.

A constructive government-industry program in urban solid waste management should avoid emotional, unsound, and piecemeal solutions. We would consider a tax or ban on a specific package such an unsatisfactory solution.

We believe any new legislation in this area should seriously consider the following factors as basic to solving the municipal solid waste problem:

1. The urban solid waste problem today is essentially one of economics. It is basically a materials handling problem, and thus should be administered by people knowledgeable in materials handling technology.

2. The program must be geared to resource recovery. It is our natural resources that are being burned and buried. Those materials that are reusable must be revitalized and returned to the economy.

3. A new partnership must be established between government and industry. Industry should certainly be permitted to have direct input into the reform programs. This could be accomplished through grants-in-aid, contracts, or subsidies to industry, since it has the expert personnel and the knowledge of its materials that are a necessary contribution to the solution of the problems.

4. Such grants should be dedicated to research and development with the major emphasis on new and progressive means of collection, transportation, separation, and disposal, and not to merely perpetuate present out-dated methods. The grant program could, in fact, be in two phases. Phase I could last through the study period designated under Amendment 153 for delineating the problem. Phase II would begin with the implementation of the recommendations foreseen by that Amendment.

In addition, while we fully support the objectives of S. 2005, we are concerned with one aspect of this bill as presently written. Specifically, we have doubt as to the practicability of Section 209(a) which would gen-

erally authorize the Secretary to recommend standards for solid waste collection and disposal systems within eighteen months after enactment of the bill. If, as we suggest, our nation needs to have new systems implemented and not simply to have outmoded systems perpetuated, it will take 18 months or more just to build pilot projects. "Standards" may be too rigid to allow the competitive process to develop fully the best long range solutions. Therefore, we urge that the term "guidelines" would be more appropriate than "standards" and that they be sufficiently broad to accommodate the widely differing conditions prevailing throughout the country. We also feel that the eighteen months time period is inadequate to complete the research and studies which constitute necessary prerequisites to any development of effective guidelines for collection and disposal systems. Further, we trust that the Secretary in formulating such guidelines will seek the knowledge of private industry during the course of the investigation and study contemplated by Section 205(a) of the bill.

We are in full agreement with the objectives of Amendment 153 and we assume that the composition of the Commission to be created by the bill will fairly represent industry as well as government. We also assume that this Commission in the course of its activities would consult to the fullest extent with representatives of the private sector.

In summary, we would like to reiterate that government funds, if made available, should be used first to stimulate immediate research in recycling and reuse of solid wastes and to set up pilot plants at key points across the country. The funding program should include several approaches, such as wet separation and dry separation for salvage purposes; high temperature incineration, compaction or composting for volume reduction; and design improvements in standard incinerator and pyrolysis units. Landfills should be used to bury the unusable by-products of these processes. After the feasibility and efficiency of these various methods have been determined, municipalities should decide which techniques would solve their particular problems. This will allow time for competition in design and construction of waste disposal systems to function and hopefully to provide the best answers at the lowest cost. Such research might well run concurrently with the longer range investigation called for by Amendment 153 in order to determine:

1. The critical factors of our society and its economy that are of foremost importance in influencing our materials policy.

2. A flexible policy toward supply and availability.

3. Our capacity for efficient and systematic utilization.

4. The economics and practical aspects of salvage and disposal.

The long-range preservation of natural resources sought by Amendment 153 is of prime concern to all industry. We in the packaging industry most certainly appreciate its implications. In this connection, I might add that we also support the overall approach to solving the solid waste problem recently recommended by the National Academy of Sciences—National Academy of Engineering, particularly the following:

1. That the solid waste crisis is basically an economic problem, primarily one of materials handling rather than one of health.

2. That solid wastes are largely products of our natural resources and should be recovered for reuse.

3. That there must be closer coordination between industry and government.

In conclusion, I again thank the Subcommittee for affording me the opportunity to appear and express our views on these extremely important matters. We hope that you will give favorable consideration to these views in your deliberations on the proposed legislation. I wil be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

Thank you.

THE CURRENT HOUSING SHORTAGE

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have been reading and hearing much about the administration's plan for the assembly line production of houses to meet the Nation's critical shortage of good and substantial dwellings at reasonable sale prices and rentals.

As might be expected the idea came from an official recruited from the automobile industry who apparently believes many of the Nation's problems can be solved by the assembly line approach.

Is it possible to overcome the housing shortage by such a method? Before anyone arrives at a definitive conclusion, may I suggest that they read an article from the February 1970 issue of House & Home, the marketing and management publication of housing and light construction.

The article, written by experts in the housing field, raises grave doubts in my mind about the administration's labeled "Operation Breakthrough" as a solution to the housing shortage.

The House & Home article follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT, THE CONGRESS, THE SECRETARY OF HUD

GENTLEMEN: In the face of the worst housing crisis this country has seen since the 1940s, the Department of Housing and Urban Development has put forth a remedy—Operation Breakthrough—that may well do more harm than good. The real problems have been virtually ignored, and it is all too possible that in the flood of publicity Operation Breakthrough is receiving, they will continue to be ignored until the crisis has turned into a disaster.

There are those who see the present situation as merely a difficult but temporary housing shortage that can be cured by jacking up house production. Their view puts too little weight on two vital factors: the rate at which the gap between supply and demand has been widening, and how long this has been going on. As much as four years ago, HOUSE & HOME pointed out that the then-current production of 1.5 million units a year was not meeting basic demand, and that unless production reached at least two million units by 1970 we'd find ourselves in very big trouble.

Well, it's 1970, we're still building about 1.5 million units a year, and we are indeed in very big trouble. Worst of all, most of that trouble is falling on the families least able to handle it.

Needless to say, the homebuilding industry would like very much to alleviate the housing shortage. And not just to create a lot of business: a growing segment of the industry is seriously concerned with the wide sociological problems of which housing is a part.

Unfortunately, the housing industry can't do the job by itself. Most of the obstacles can only be overcome if the federal government will help. And such help must be much more realistic than that offered by recent programs—particularly Operation Breakthrough.

Responsible criticism requires more than just a few simplistic slogans. So on the next 18 pages, House & Home presents its detailed argument on the nature of the housing crisis, the reason present remedies won't cure it, and the real problems that must be faced before anything constructive can begin.

We respectfully submit that few national issues are more deserving of your immediate and close attention.

RICHARD W. O'NEILL,
MAXWELL C. HUNTOON, Jr.,
(For the staff of House & Home).

The housing shortage cuts across all categories and all price ranges. The main cause is expensive money; with permanent mortgages up to 10% and 11% and apartment construction money as high as 14%, both builders and buyers have been pushed right to the wall. The fact that 1969's output will be close to 1.5 million units despite this pressure shows just how desperate the housing demand has become.

Behind the money shortage, of course, is the Viet Nam war. Hopefully, as the war and its resultant inflation are throttled back, and as the money situation swings back towards normal, much of the housing picture will get a lot better.

But easier money won't do a thing for low-income housing. And that's the most critical category among the 30 million units we need to build during this decade.

It's critical because between 1970 and 1980 some nine million low-income units will be demolished or become uninhabitable. Unless they are replaced, nine million families will either have no roofs over their heads or be forced to live in the slum circumstances that are helping create so much violent unrest today.

It's critical because even those nine million units will just barely keep us even. More than 13 million new families will be formed between 1970 and 1980, and an estimated three million of them will also need low-income housing.

It's critical because without those low-income units, the housing industry and all it's allied industries will continue to lose ground in the fight to share the growth of the gross national product. In 1960 that share was 4.5%; in 1969 it was only 2.9%.

And it's critical because there's a desperate need, particularly among low-income groups, for the jobs that another million-plus housing units a year would create.

Obviously, if anything is to be done about low-income housing, the federal government will have to be the prime mover.

Private enterprise can't do the job because it has to make a profit on what it builds. And as things stand today, a housing unit that turns a reasonable profit for its builder must be priced beyond the reach of low-income families.

Local government can't do the job because it has neither the muscle nor the will. Most local governments—both state and municipal—are, literally, either in or near bankruptcy. And they are highly sensitive to pressures by constituents who already feel themselves overtaxed—chiefly by increasing school costs.

The federal government has the financial muscle to do the job. It can finance low-income housing on the fairest possible basis because much of its revenue comes from the graduated income tax. And within certain limits, it has the power to override local objections and see that projects get built.

Equally obviously, up to now the federal government has done relatively little towards getting low-income housing built.

Put together all the federal low-income programs for 1968—the best year such housing ever had up to that time—and you get a grand total of 120,000 units. That's roughly 15% of the annual low-income need. And the all-time totals are even less inspiring. Three decades of public housing have pro-

duced just over 700,000 units; and all of the rent-supplement, 221d3, rehab, and senior-citizen programs have given us fewer than 300,000 units. Plainly, at this rate the crisis can only deepen.

Does the federal government have any new plans to deal with the crisis? Yes—Operation Breakthrough.

Operation Breakthrough is supposed to be the miracle that will suddenly start low-income housing pouring out of our factories.

It is the brainchild of HUD Secretary George Romney, who apparently believes, as have many others in the past, that (1) present methods of house construction are hopelessly obsolete and expensive, and (2) if they are modernized, costs will plummet and hundreds of thousands of houses that otherwise would not be built will begin going up.

The response to the program has surprised even those HUD officials who were highly optimistic. HUD expected perhaps a couple of hundred entries from which it planned to pick 20 or so for subsidized prototype projects. It actually got more than 600 entries, and 236 of them were so-called Type A entries (complete structural systems). The rest were Type B entries (components of systems).

There are a lot of reasons for that flood of industrialized systems, and they'll be discussed further on. There are also a couple of significant aspects to the entries received:

1. Almost all of them would eliminate the builder as we know him today. In his place would be either the system manufacturer himself, who would presumably take over all real estate, developing, marketing, and management operations, or the same developer-investor who builds most of today's apartment projects.

2. Almost all of them are based on small modules which could be made on a mobile-home-sized assembly line. But the need—particularly in urban areas—is for big multi-family buildings. And grouping or stacking small modules to make big buildings—particularly high-rise, as some systems propose—has yet to be proven more efficient than conventional high-rise techniques.

But Operation Breakthrough presupposes that industrializing will cut costs. And it won't.

We know that industrialization won't work cost miracles because we've tried it again and again in different forms. It hasn't made a dent yet, and there's no sign that anything is about to change radically now.

Let's look briefly at industrialization's record.

Take the truss. Introduced to homebuilding in the early '50s, it proved to be structurally strong and, with its full-width span, a means of closing in houses much more quickly. Builders or lumber dealers could slap trusses together on a simple jig with hammers, nails, and maybe a little glue. There was no need to invest in heavy machinery, and the total labor in a typical truss might have run as high as $5. So even though trusses were built in a shop instead of in the field, it isn't really accurate to call them a form of industralization. But then some people did set out to industrialize the truss. They bought big gang saws to cut truss members, hydraulic jigs to hold them in place, power rolls to set in truss plates. This kind of equipment cut maybe half the labor out of truss making. But it cost tens of thousands of dollars, so amortizing it required huge volumes. Some prefabbers and large lumber dealers made the investment—sometimes to their regret. And today, surprisingly many trusses are still produced on simple jig tables with hammers and nails because experience has shown that's the least expensive way to do it.

Now let's look at the one-time favorite candidate for industrialization, the wall panel.

Under certain circumstances, the shop-built panel is great. Used with trusses, it lets a builder close in a house in a day instead of, say, a week—and in some climates, he may have to wait a month during the winter to get those five good building days in a row. So you could say that in some areas and some climates, panels produced some respectable indirect cost savings. But whether the builder builds them himself or buys them from a lumber dealer or a prefabber, he pays no less for panels than for conventional walls.

But panelization was the heart of the prefab industry of the '50s. In fact, except for trusses, it was about all the industrialization many prefabbers offered. So a lot of money was spent to industrialize the panel-building process. There were automatic power nailers and such esoteric equipment as the flipper that speeded the finishing of two sides. When you consider that a couple of men and a hand hoist could do the same thing in only a minute or so more time, this was carrying industrialization to pretty far-out extremes. Predictably, there were serious problems. If these machines had been allowed to spew out the same panel for days at a time, they might have made some cost inroads. But housing has never offered much chance for such standardization. In most houses, few panels are alike. And it's physically as well as economically impossible for most companies to stockpile a big inventory. Constant changeovers mean more flexible—and hence more expensive—machines and slower production. These factors wiped out any appreciable savings and helped bring about the demise of the prefab industry as we knew it in the '50s.

A lot of big corporations got hung up on the industrialized-panel idea. We had a spate of panel systems with hardboard facings, aluminum facings, foamed-plastic cores, spacer cores, etc. Some of them had some very good qualities. And some of them seemed promising enough to persuade their manufacturers and a few progressive builders actually to build prototype panelized houses. But almost without exception, these panel systems proved to be much more expensive than conventional stud-and-skin construction. The upshot: not one is on the market today.

These were all attempts to industrialize the shell of the house, which comprises only about 25% of the total value. What about the more expensive mechanical parts?

Mechanical or utility cores got some brief experimental attention about ten years ago, although nothing on the order of what panels received. The cores usually consisted of wet plumbing walls for the kitchen, one and one-half or two baths, and, sometimes, the heating plant and electrical service panel. The idea behind them was unassailably logical: the mechanicals are the most expensive parts of the house; if you group them and mass-produce the resultant unit, big savings should follow. But big savings didn't follow. For one thing, the cores were designed for field, rather than factory, assembly, so there were few savings in the shop. More important, the standardized cores were terribly limiting on design. Every house had to have its baths and kitchens in fundamentally the same spot, and these areas also had to be pretty much the same size. The buyer of a 2,500-sq.-ft. house wants bigger and snazzier kitchens and baths than he'd get in a 1,500-sq.-ft. house, and he wants a choice of floor plans, too. Since the utility core gave him neither, and saved little or no money in the bargain, it died.

The Lustron house, put out right after World War II, was the first real attempt to industrialize the whole house. It was steel framed, with a skin of enameled steel, and in many respects it was a very good home indeed. Thanks to the steel it was made of, it was fireproof, vermin proof, rot proof, and inordinately strong. Today Lustron houses built 20 years ago look as good as new. Thus in many ways the Lustron house was the best production house ever built—which proved to be its undoing. It was too expensive. While there are those who believe that volume production would have pulled the price into line, the fact is that the first Lustrons were built under subsidies from the Reconstruction Finance Corp., so their price was artificially low. In any event, few Lustron houses were built, and the system died.

Despite the Lustron failure, it was followed by other industrialized systems which used materials other than the traditional wood and masonry. There were other steel systems as well as aluminum and reinforced-plastic systems. All of them had one thing in common: they had to be factory-built by methods other than traditional homebuilding methods. And most of them required fairly expensive factory equipment. Finally, they all shared a fatal flaw: they cost more than traditional methods and materials, and there was no promise that volume production would bring their costs down far enough. Without exception, these systems folded—most of them before reaching any real production at all.

The failure of Lustron and the other non-traditional industrialized systems should have taught people three basic lessons:

1. Old fashioned wood-and-masonry construction is still the least expensive there is and, thanks to its easy workability in the field, the most flexible. Every other system, no matter how highly industrialized, has turned out to be more expensive.

2. All of homebuilding is geared to wood-and-masonry construction, and the introduction of other materials, particularly those requiring special skills and equipment, is bound to be costly.

3. Homebuyers are leery of unfamiliar building materials. Only a very low price will tempt them away from the traditional.

But it took one more great big industrialization fiasco to convince everyone. In 1963 Alside Inc. put together an $8-million plant to produce a steel-framed, aluminum-paneled house of highly contemporary design. The combination of sophisticated machines and automated controls were supposed to pull costs down to the point where a buyer would pay only about $7 a sq. ft. for the house erected on his lot. But even before the assembly lines began running, prices started to inch up. Buyers might have been interested at the originally estimated price, but when it reached the neighborhood of $15 a sq. ft. they balked. Some models were built, but the plant never went into full production.

All right, what about the mobile home? It's industrialized to the point where carpets are laid and furniture is installed in the plant, and it costs less than a conventional house of the same size. Can't this be called a successful example of cost cutting by industrialization? Yes—except for one thing. By current housing yardsticks, the mobile home is substandard. It has 2x2 studs, thin skins, and bottom-of-the-line hardware, windows, plumbing fixtures, etc. A lot of people buy mobiles, chiefly because they need shelter and there isn't anything else at the price. And chances are that within seven or eight years a mobile will depreciate to the point where it has virtually no resale value—which makes it a rather dubious economy.

So much for mobiles, but what of the sectional house? It is usually built on the same assembly lines as the mobiles, so it's full industrialized. And most sectionals are built to completely conventional specifications, so they can qualify for FHA financing. But thanks to these healthy specifications, sectionals are no less expensive than most conventional houses, and they are considerably more expensive than similar houses produced on site by volume builders. Among other reasons, they must be heavily reinforced to sur-

vive over-the-road travel and handling by crane.

Sections make sense in rural or vacation areas where labor is high priced or nonexistent, but they have not as yet produced any cost-saving miracles. The same is true of the so-called modular box systems. They seem likely to find their greatest use in townhouses, where a standardized appearance is a relatively minor drawback, and where speed of construction is of major importance because it means renters can be in much more quickly. It's also quite possible that where a small project is concerned—say, 50 units or less—a low-volume builder might find sectionals less expensive than conventional construction. But for larger volume, a builder with an efficient field operation should be able to produce townhouses at lower cost by conventional methods.

So as things stand now, stick building in the field, though seemingly obsolescent, is still the least costly way to produce houses. And there's a key reason for this that most advocates of industrialized housing have missed: industrialization saves money by reducing labor, but it is materials, rather than labor, that accounts for the bulk of housing costs. Most manufactured products have a low ratio of raw-materials costs to in-plant costs. In fact, it's not unusual for a manufacturer to add about 1,000% to the value of raw materials as they move through his plant; in other words, his materials-to-labor cost ratio is roughly 1-to-10. By contrast, the materials-to-labor ratio is about 2-to-1 for the average field builder, and for some high-volume builders, it can reach 4-to-1. Now, if the whole process were put on a factory assembly line, extra efficiency could boost the ratio still higher. But a plant operation also adds costs of its own—factory overhead, for example, profit, and the cost of transporting the house from factory to site. And these added costs can easily cancel out, or even exceed, assembly-line savings.

Does all this mean that industrialization is a dead duck as far as housing is concerned? Not at all. There are very sound reasons for assuming that during the early '70's factory-built housing will become much more significant than panelized prefabrication ever was during the '50s and '60s. But the reason for this swing to factory production will not be to cut costs; as you've just read, industrialization usually increases costs. The reason, as you'll read later on, is that regardless of its cost, industrialization will, in a few years, be the only possible answer to a serious labor shortage. But right now, and for the immediate future, it offers no solution to the critical problem of producing low-cost housing.

If industrialization won't do the job now, why is everyone so excited about Operation Breakthrough?

Everyone's excited about Operation Breakthrough because:

1. It fits the American dream that our assembly lines can do anything.

We've seen these lines turn out TV sets, automobiles, and countless consumer products that would be prohibitively costly if they were hand made, and put them within reach of anyone of moderate means. And we reason that the same thing should be possible with housing. The trouble is, few people outside of housing have learned the lessons of the last six pages. They don't realize that only about half the cost of a typical house is in the structure itself; the rest is in land, foundations, financing, and other areas that industrialization can't touch. And they don't realize that the kind of quality-cutting that helps the mass production of other consumer goods simply won't go in housing. We are committed—and rightly so—to a product that with any care at all should last a century.

2. It seems to offer big industry a bigger share in housing's future.

The roster of submissions for Operation Breakthrough includes some of the most imposing corporate names in the nation. And there's a strong tendency, particularly in the present administration, to assume that what's good for big business is probably also good for housing, for people, or for anything else you can name. But many of these same giant corporations, and others too, have tried the housing field before with, to put it mildly, indifferent results. Some of the biggest baths in housing have been taken by some of America's biggest corporations. So neither size nor success in other fields is a guarantee of success in homebuilding.

3. It seems to offer a lot of people a shot at federal boodle.

The present Operation Breakthrough program won't make anyone very rich: only $15 million has been allocated, and it will be spread among at least 20 companies for further experimenting and prototype construction. But everyone has seen what can happen when the federal government gets interested in an industry: witness the space program, for example. And Operation Breakthrough looks to many like increased government interest in housing.

4. Most important, Operation Breakthrough effectively obscures the fact that we as a nation have made almost no commitment to housing our low-income families.

A lot of very pious talk has been committed. But the true measure of commitment is not words, but dollars, and some excerpts from the current federal budget are very revealing indeed.

We have a strong commitment to defense—$68.6 billion worth.

We have a strong commitment to farm subsidies—$5.4 billion worth.

We have a strong commitment to space—$3.7 billion worth.

We have a strong commitment to air and highway travel—$2.26 billion worth.

But our total commitment to helping poor people get decent homes is a measly $375 million. And even that shameful figure suffers more of a picking over by congressional budgeteers than most of the much larger amounts above.

So the first step out of our low-income housing crisis would be to face the fact that we'll have to spend more money.

It doesn't have to be an astronomical figure; compared to other items in the federal budget, a little housing money can go a long way. For example, just this year's overruns on the Defense Dept. budget can easily top $10 billion. Used as capital, that amount could build 500,000 low-income housing units; used as rent subsidies or matching funds for local budgets, it could generate up to five million low-cost units—enough to carry us through the first three or four years of this decade.

What will it take to get this kind of commitment? First of all, a realization by the public that we really do face a critical housing shortage; and second, enough political courage on the part of Congress and the Administration to push for more and better housing before 1972—the next presidential election year.

All right, say we do make the commitment. Then what? Then we go after the real problems.

To understand the real problems that block low-income housing you have to start with what a family pays each month for its apartment.

The chart below is excerpted from the rent roll of a 15-story elevator building containing more than 100 units. It represents the breakdown of the $228 a month a family would pay for a typical three-bedroom apartment in a typical urban area. And it's the place you have to start if you want to understand why the federal government has to help if we're going to build low-income housing, and where that help has to be applied.

The first thing that has to be understood is that $228 a month is far more than a typical low-income family can pay. Just how much more depends on several factors, including location; let's say that in this case, the family can afford only $150 a month.

The second problem is that the builder and/or owner of the building can't charge anything less than $228; if he did, he couldn't make a reasonable profit.

So it's this $78 gap between what the tenant can pay and what the owner must charge that has to be filled. And the most direct way to study that problem is to look at where the rent money goes—as shown in the chart.

It can legitimately be asked why such a study is based on rental, rather than owned, housing. The answer is simple: most low-income families can't afford to own their homes, even under federally-subsidized ownership programs. For the foreseeable future, at least, just about all our low-income housing will have to rental housing.

Payroll management and administrative expenses:	
Percent of total	11
Dollars per month (rent)	$25
Utilities:	
Percent of total	9
Dollars per month (rent)	$20
Decorating maintenance, repair:	
Percent of total	6
Dollars per month (rent)	$14
Taxes:	
Percent of total	14
Dollars per month (rent)	$31
Insurance:	
Percent of total	2
Dollars per month (rent)	$5
Interest:	
Percent of total	25
Dollars per month (rent)	$58
Debt retirement (principal):	
Percent of total	17
Dollars per month (rent)	$39
Vacancies and bad debts:	
Percent of total	9
Dollars per month (rent)	$21
Profit and reserves:	
Percent of total	7
Dollars per month (rent)	$15
Total occupancy costs:	
Percent of total	100
Dollars per month (rent)	$228

With the rent roll as a background, it's relatively easy to identify the problems that must be solved. These are the biggest:

1. PROBLEM: MONEY

Two categories of the cost of money are included in the preceding chart. They are based on the cost of the apartment, $20,000 (which indicates that the builder is a very efficient operator), and the interest on a 9%, 25-year mortgage (which most apartment builders would give their eye teeth to get today). Together they comprise 42%—nearly half—of the monthly rent (the actual proportion between the two will, of course, vary with the time the mortgage has been in force; the figures in the chart represent the average over the entire life of the mortgage). Let's look at the two separately:

Is there any way to reduce the debt service? Yes—as long as somebody pays the difference between the going rate of money and the desired reduced rate. The government has already recognized this with FHA 236, which subsidizes interest payments. If the subsidy were to cover all interest payments, 25% could be cut from the rent.

Is there any way to reduce the principal? No. Construction costs just can't really be cut, Breakthrough or no Breakthrough.

But there is a way to eliminate that entire

42% of the rent taken up by money: if the Federal government were to create a capital budget to build low-income housing, there would be no principal, hence no interest. And while the initial impact on the budget would be high, the ultimate cost would be less than that of a heavy rent-subsidy program.

2. PROBLEM: TAXES

On this particular rent breakdown, local taxes are a very reasonable 14%; in some cases the proportion can go as high as 30% or more.

Can these property taxes be cut? Not as far as local municipalities are concerned. Most of those with low-income housing problems are already on the verge of bankruptcy. If that 14% (or more) is to be cut out of the rent, another level of government—obviously the federal—must make up the loss to the local level.

Direct subsidy is one way. If it proved politically unpalatable, there is the indirect or hidden subsidy whereby the federal government makes up the loss at the local level by paying for other services: welfare, recreation, public health, etc. It is in that way that the federal government now subsidizes air travel, agriculture, etc.

3. PROBLEM: MAINTENANCE

On the rent-breakdown chart, only 6% is allotted to this category. But that's misleading: maintenance and repair of low-income housing affects—and is affected by—many other categories.

Case in point is the construction cost of the apartment. Raising the specifications for equipment, wearing surfaces, and finishing material would increase the principal portion of the rent. But it would also cut the amount that had to be spent on maintenance and repair—probably enough to more than cancel the increased construction cost. Moreover, if capital costs were to be borne by the government, the decrease in maintenance costs would benefit the tenant who must pay them.

Consider utility costs—9%. Upgraded specifications—better insulation, for example—could make appreciable cuts in the cost of heating, cooling, and electricity.

Consider administration expenses—11% of the monthly rent. Decreasing repairs would cut such overhead as paperwork and supervision.

Can we cut maintenance costs? Yes—if the appropriate government agencies will initiate and carry through an intelligent re-evaluation of house specifications.

4. PROBLEM: LAND

There is no figure specifically allotted to land costs in the rent breakdown. It is included in the "principal" category, and is a little less than 10% of the total of the apartment.

Can land cost be cut? That depends. The 10% figure is very reasonable for an urban housing project, and there are seldom any land bargains in the downtown areas where much of our low-income housing will be built.

Suburban land, however, could be very much less expensive. The trouble is, most suburbs don't want low-income housing, and have gone to great trouble to keep it out. Their chief weapon is zoning: by holding to large-lot requirements and severely limiting multifamily zoning, they make sure that only higher-income housing can be built.

The federal government can help here by gently but firmly forcing the suburbs to open their land to low-income families. Some states are already working on legislation that would override local zoning statutes to permit low-income housing; the federal government could lend its weight to such programs and press for their adoption by all states.

5. PROBLEM: RED TAPE

This is such a monumental problem that it's useless to try to assign a cost figure to it. Any builder who has worked with a government program knows that, at best, red tape will delay his project, force him to use extra administrative personnel, and thus boost his overhead costs; at worst, it will strangle him and kill his project.

Can red tape be eliminated? Probably not. But anything that the government can do towards standardizing, simplifying, and debureaucratizing the procedures of its housing agencies—and pressuring state and local bodies to do the same—will cut the cost of low-income housing—and in some cases, drastically.

6. PROBLEM: MANPOWER

Here at last is an area where industrialization may eventually help.

Industrialization will eventually help because it can bring more housing production from less skilled—hence less scarce—workers.

It's not a question of trying to find cheap labor, it's a question of finding any labor. Even at the current inadequate rate of housing production, in some areas carpenters are impossible to find. And the shortage of plumbers, electricians, and other craftsmen has helped push mechanical costs of housing clean out of sight.

The promise of industrialization is that by standardizing many of these skilled operations, it will allow less skilled labor to perform them. It might also bring new people into an industry that for the past decade has only seen its labor departing.

Industrialization will eventually help because it drastically cuts the weather-vulnerable part of the construction process.

Typically, only one day is necessary to drop a factory-built house into place; by contrast, a conventionally built job may be open to weather delays for weeks. And there are both short-and long-term advantages to the quicker way. The builder's money isn't tied up as long, so his overall costs drop; and he knows just what his structure will cost, so his safety margins can be reduced. On a larger scale, industrialization could eventually bring an end to the seasonability of homebuilding in many areas and the consequent higher wages that must be paid to workers who may be idle much of the winter.

On the other hand, industrialization can't do everything. Foundations must still be built outside, and no one yet knows how to prefab a hole in the ground.

Industrialization will eventually help because it will make more possible the use of new materials in housing.

Up to now, wood and wood products have been the predominant housing materials. Aside from the relatively low cost, their great asset is the ease with which they can be cut and fastened in the field with hand tools.

Metals and plastics, on the other hand, usually must be worked with heavy equipment that can't be brought into the field and that requires volume production to justify its expense. Since housing's present labor force is geared to wood-frame construction, many materials that could improve housing never had a chance to be used.

Industrialized housing could change that. It is built in a factory where machinery can be installed; it can be standardized to the point where volume production is possible; and its new labor force can certainly be taught to work with new materials.

So there's no doubt that industrialization will play a useful role in producing low-income housing

True, there are limitations inherent in factory-built housing. Because of trucking requirements, the size and shape of modules is limited, and that in turn puts restrictions or design; there are only so many things you can do with a box. Also, while modules can logically be combined to form townhouses and garden-apartment buildings, most urban low-income housing will have to be in medium- and high-rise buildings. And although some Breakthrough proposals show module boxes stacked up 15 and 20 stories, few housing experts believe this to be a practical concept.

Within these limitations, however, industrialization promises to be the best—and perhaps the only—way to increase housing production in the face of a dwindling labor supply.

But we don't need Operation Breakthrough to achieve industrialization.

The housing industry will industrialize anyway—when industrialization is feasible and necessary. Indeed, many of the most promising proposals for Operation Breakthrough are systems that were designed, and in some cases put in production, long before Breakthrough was conceived. While it's fair to say that Breakthrough may have led to the faster evolution of some good systems, its equally fair to question whether that faster revolution was necessary, or even desirable.

Regardless of HUD's intentions in creating Operation Breakthrough, the unhappy fact is that for the next few months all of the sound and fury that will inevitably attend the building of prototypes of winning Breakthrough systems is going to hide all the problems of money, land, taxes, and above all, lack of concern, that keeps us from mounting an effective program for low-income housing.

It's too late to do anything about Operation Breakthrough; it's already rolling. If we're very lucky, it may produce some useful results.

What's important now is that we stop kidding ourselves. When that smokescreen finally clears, we'll still have a crisis on our hands.

The time to start dealing with it is right now.

BISHOP HITS PREJUDICE

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Most Reverend Christopher J. Weldon, Catholic bishop of the Springfield, Mass., diocese, pointed out this week that prejudice against one's fellow man flouts the fundamental principles of Christianity. Speaking Monday at the pulpit of Springfield's Old First Church—marking the first time a Catholic bishop has preached from that pulpit—Bishop Weldon said it was God's "intention that we would learn to live together in love with one another."

The Bishop's message, given on the first day of Holy Week noontime ceremonies sponsored by the Council of Churches of Greater Springfield, is highly appropriate for the Easter season.

With permission, Mr. Speaker, I put in the RECORD at this point a Springfield Union article describing Bishop Weldon's talk:

BISHOP HITS PREJUDICE AS DENIAL OF MESSIAH

Prejudice is a denial of the message of Christ and God's program for redemption of man, the Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon,

Roman Catholic bishop of Springfield, said yesterday.

He preached from the pulpit of Old First Church, Court Square, on the first day of the Council of Churches of Greater Springfield-sponsored 34th annual Holy Week noonday services.

It was the first time in the history of Springfield that the Roman Catholic bishop had preached from the pulpit of First Church. Today, the Very Rev. Malcolm W. Eckel, canon of Christ Church Cathedral, Episcopal, will give the sermon.

Speaking on the topic of "What does Christ mean to me—what does my fellow man mean to me?", the leader of the Roman Catholics in Western Massachusetts equated the two questions.

"God created us intelligent and free," the prelate said, "and trusted to the intellect He has given us—trusted us—to understand the meaning of life."

"It was His intention that we would learn to live together in love with one another even as the three persons of the Blessed Trinity live together in heaven," he explained.

"Adam and Eve made the mistake of giving keener, more intelligent attention to the tempter," than to God, he added. But in spite of their having had to suffer the consequences, God never abandoned man, he explained.

"For men lived after Adam and Eve, in hopes that they would be able to profit" from God's redemptive process which would come to its fullness in the redeemer who was to come.

"In Old Testament times," the bishop continued, "human beings were just like they are today—superficial—too busy to pay attention to their religious teachings."

"But in the fullness of time the redeemer came in His human nature and showed us how to use (our own) human nature," the bishop continued.

He spoke of Christ's human side cringing before the "physical torture" and "psychological rejection and torment" which He would face, and therefore He turned into the Garden of Gethsemane to pray, after which he said "not my will but thine be done."

"That Christ, who came to earth and lived . . . and taught us by His example, is still alive today—still loves us today—still invites us to use our own full stature to understand" the program of redemption which, the bishop said, is very simple:

"That we find God in one another; if we really want to be with Him we must take His teachings in their fullness," he added. "If we took Him seriously we would seize the opportunity to allow the Christ within us to go out to meet the Christ within others."

"Who has the responsibility for continuing the program of redemption that is going on? It must be developed in every generation and today we have the responsibility."

HORTON URGES INCREASE IN VETERANS' INCOME LIMITATIONS TO PREVENT LOSS DUE TO SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASES

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, veterans should not be penalized because social security has been increased by 15 percent. Yet, under the present law, social security increase or increases in any other retirement program will adversely affect the level of VA pension payments.

For this reason, I am today cosponsoring a bill which was originally introduced by my friend and colleague, Hon. OLIN E. TEAGUE, which would increase income limitations for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that we have all received letters from veterans who will be placed in a very difficult situation if this bill is not passed. These men have served the country well, and it is ironic that an increase in social security will tax their right to have freedom from financial strain, and deny them what is their due.

My bill would increase the income limitations for a veteran or widow without dependents from $2,000 to $2,300, and for the veteran or widow with dependents from the current $3,200 to $3,500.

World War I veterans' income limitations would also be increased. The old pension law limitations will be increased by $300 a year. Thus, the income limitation for a veteran or widow without a dependent would be increased to $1,900 and for a veteran with a dependent to $3,200.

I feel that the $300 increase in income limitations would prevent any pensioner from having a net loss in his social security and Veterans' Administration benefits.

Another inequity that my measure will correct deals with the cutoff of drugs and medicine to a veteran whose income exceeds the limitation. My bill authorizes the VA to furnish drugs and medicine to a veteran who is so helpless or blind that he has qualified for the special aid and attendance allowance. The VA would have the authority to continue to furnish drugs and medicine even if the pension were stopped. However, the veteran's annual income could not exceed the maximum annual income limitation by more than $500.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this measure must be enacted before 1971 so that our veterans will not be adversely affected by the social security increase. I urge my colleagues to consider the justice of this measure and to strongly support it.

A BLACK AT THE GRIDIRON DINNER

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the article that follows is one of the most moving, and at the same time one of the most important, that I have read in a long time. I hope all my colleagues will read and ponder it.

The inertia, the resistance to change, that afflicts many of our national institutions is appalling. In this day and age, it is almost incredible that the annual Gridiron Dinner could be as Mr. Wilkins describes it. No one should argue that this is a private affair, a dinner run by a private club. The Gridiron is in fact a quasi-public institution of importance.

I have only one quarrel with Mr. Wilkins' article: He does not mention the fact—indeed he does not seem to have been conscious of the fact—that one very large group of Americans was totally excluded from the dinner: the women. If, next year, Katherine Graham, Mary McGrory, Flora Lewis, Marjorie Hunter, and some of the other stellar women reporters want to picket the dinner, I will march with them .

The Congress is not the only place in this town where anachronistic customs are thoughtlessly followed. Some self-examination is in order, and some shaking up.

The article follows:

A BLACK AT THE GRIDIRON DINNER

(By Roger Wilkins)

(NOTE.—*The writer, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States, is now a Ford Foundation executive.*)

When it was all over, a number of men had tears in their eyes, even more had lifted hearts and spirits, but a few were so dispirited that they went upstairs to get drunk. We had just heard the President and Vice President of the United States in a unique piano duet—and to many old Gridiron Dinner veterans, it was a moving show-stopper. To a few others, it was a depressing display of gross insensitivity and both conscious and unconscious racism—further proof that they and their hopes for their country are becoming more and more isolated from those places where America's heart and power seem to be moving.

The annual dinner of the Gridiron Club is the time when men can put on white ties and tails and forget the anxiety and loneliness that are central to the human condition and look at other men in white ties and tails and know that they have arrived or are still there.

The guests are generally grateful and gracious. But the event's importance is beyond the structures of graciousness because it shows the most powerful elements of the nation's daily press and all elements of the nation's government locked in a symbiotic embrace. The rich and the powerful in jest tell many truths about themselves and about their country. I don't feel very gracious about what they told me.

Some weeks ago, to my surprise and delight, a friend—a sensitive man of honor—with a little half-apology about the required costume, invited me to attend the dinner.

The first impression was stunning: almost every passing face was a familiar one. Some had names that were household words. Some merely made up a montage of the familiar faces and bearings of our times. There were Richard Helms and Walter Mondale and Henry Kissinger and George McGovern and Joel Broyhill and Tom Wicker and William Westmoreland and John Mitchell and Tom Clark (ironically placed, by some pixie no doubt, next to each other on the dais) and Robert Finch and Ralph Nader, and of course, the President of the United States.

One thing quickly became clear about those faces. Apart from Walter Washington—who, I suppose, as Mayor had to be invited—mine was the only face in a crowd of some 500 that was not white. There were no Indians, there were no Asians, there were no Puerto Ricans, there were no Mexican-Americans. There were just the Mayor and me. Incredibly, I sensed that there were few in that room who thought that anything was missing.

There is something about an atmosphere like that that is hard to define, but excruciatingly easy for a black man to feel. It is the heavy, almost tangible, clearly visible, broad assumption that in places where it counts, America is a white country. I was an American citizen sitting in a banquet room in a hotel which I had visited many

times. (My last occasion for a visit to that hotel was the farewell party for the white staff director and the black deputy staff director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights.) This night in that room, less than three miles from my home in the nation's capital, a 60 per cent black city, I felt out of place in America.

That is not to say that there were not kind men, good men, warm men in and around and about the party, nor is it to say that anyone was personally rude to me. There were some old friends and some new acquaintances whom I was genuinely glad to see. Ed Muskie who had given a very funny and exquisitely partisan speech (the Republicans have three problems: the war, inflation, and what to say on Lincoln's Birthday) was one of those. I was even warmly embraced by the Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Kleindienst, and had a long conversation with the associate director of the FBI, Mr. De Loach.

But it was not the people so much who shaped the evening. It was the humor amidst that pervasive whiteness about what was going on in this country these days that gave the evening its form and substance. There were many jokes about the "Southern strategy." White people have funny senses of humor. Some of them found something to laugh about in the Southern strategy. Black people don't think it's funny at all. That strategy hits men where they live—in their hopes for themselves and their dreams for their children. We find it sinister and frightening. And let it not be said that the Gridiron Club and its guests are not discriminating about their humor. There was a real sensitivity about the inappropriateness of poking fun that night about an ailing former president, but none about laughing about policies which crush the aspirations of millions of citizens of this nation. An instructive distinction, I thought.

There was a joke about the amendments to the Constitution (so what if we rescind the First Amendment, there'll still be 25 left), and about repression (you stop bugging me, I'll stop bugging you), and there were warm, almost admiring jokes about the lady who despises "liberal Communists" and thinks something like the Russian Revolution occurred in Washington on November 15. There was applause—explosive and prolonged—for Judges Clement Haynsworth and Julius Hoffman (the largest hands of the evening by my reckoning.)

As I looked, listened and saw the faces of those judges and of the generals and of the admirals and of the old members of the oligarchies of the House and Senate, I thought of the soft, almost beatific smile of Cesar Chavez; the serious troubled face of Vine Deloria Jr., and the handsome, sensitive faces of Andy Young and Julian Bond of Georgia. All those men and more have fought with surely as much idealism as any general ever carried with him to Saigon, with as much courage as any senator ever took with him on a fact-finding trip to a Vietnam battlefield, or even as much hope, spirit and belief in the American dream as any Peace Corps kid ever took to the Andes in Peru. But the men I have named fought for American freedom on American soil. And they were not there. But Julius Hoffman was.

As the jokes about the "Southern strategy" continued, I thought about the one-room segregated schoolhouse where I began my education in Kansas City. That was my neighborhood school. When they closed it, I was bused—without an apparent second thought—as a 5-year-old kindergartener, across town to the black elementary school. It was called Crispus Attucks.

And I thought of the day I took my daughter when she was seven along the Freedom Trail, in Boston, and of telling her about the black man named Crispus Attucks who was the first American to die in our revolution. And I remember telling her that white America would try very hard in thousands of conscious and unconscious ways both to make her feel that her people had had no part in building America's greatness and to make her feel inferior. And I remember the profoundly moving and grateful look in her eyes and the wordless hug she gave me when I told her, "Don't you believe them because they are lies." And I felt white America in that room in the Statler Hilton telling me all those things that night, and I told myself, "Don't you believe them because they are lies."

And When it came to the end, the President and the Vice President of the United States, in an act which they had consciously worked up, put on a Mr. Bones routine about the Southern strategy with the biggest boffo coming as the Vice President affected a deep Southern accent. And then they played their duets—the President playing his songs, the Vice President playing "Dixie," the whole thing climaxed by "God Bless America" and "Auld Lang Syne." The crowd ate it up. They roared. As they roared I thought that after our black decade of imploring, suing, marching, lobbying, singing, rebelling, praying and dying we had come to this: a Vice Presidential Dixie with the President as his straight man. In the serious and frivolous places of power—at the end of that decade—America was still virtually lily white. And most of the people in that room were reveling in it. What, I wondered, would it take for them to understand that men also come in colors other than white. Seeing and feeling their blindness, I shuddered at the answers that came most readily to mind.

As we stood voluntarily, some more slowly than others, when the two men began to play God Bless America, I couldn't help remembering Judy Collins (who could not sing in Chicago) singing "Where Have All the Flowers Gone?"

So, later, I joined Nick Kotz, author of "Let Them Eat Promises" and we drank down our dreams.

I don't believe that I have been blanketed in and suffocated by such racism and insensitivity since I was a sophomore in college when I was the only black invited to a minstrel spoof put on at a white fraternity house.

But then, they were only fraternity brothers, weren't they?

FRED HALL

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, on March 18, 1970, death claimed former Kansas Gov. Fred Hall. A native of Dodge City, Kans., Fred Hall served one term as Kansas chief executive in 1955–56. He also served on the Kansas Supreme Court following his resignation as Governor. Following his public service in Kansas, he moved to California where he also became active in politics. Fred Hall left his mark on Kansas politics.

Mrs. Shriver and I extend our heartfelt sympathy to his wife, Leadell, and the family on the great loss which they have suffered. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials on Fred Hall published in the Hutchinson, Kans., News and the Wichita, Kans., Beacon:

[From the Hutchinson (Kans.) News]

FRED HALL

Fred Hall won't go into the record books as Kansas' most able governor or its best governor.

But the former Dodge Citian who died this past week at the age of 53 after serving one term in 1955–56, will be remembered as an important chief executive.

Hall helped lead the heavily outnumbered progressive forces within the GOP. He fought the unbendable, established Old Guard.

He infuriated many. He refused to heed the advice of party leaders. But his intransigence brought doubt. And this doubt brought thought. And this thought brought change and the Republican Party into a new age.

Hall resigned as governor before his term was up and served on the state Supreme Court. He tried to seek the GOP gubernatorial nomination again, but was defeated in the primary. He went to California.

The new life only fed his thirst for public life. He became active in California politics and ran against movie actor George Murphy for the U.S. Senate. Murphy still holds the seat.

Hall's career was erratic but brilliant. He was a maverick and a dissenter long before the age of dissent.

His passing is a loss for Kansas.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon]

FRED HALL

Fred Hall burst over the Kansas political scene like a comet over a primitive village. He appeared suddenly out of nowhere and was almost as quickly gone. But while he was visible he caused consternation, panic, and even a measure of admiration in some quarters that amounted almost to worship.

Certainly the Republican party in the state has never been quite what it was before his day.

Hall was brilliant, erratic, and eminently unbiddable. Probably the biggest reason he was a one-term Republican governor in a state where most governors of his party think of their second terms as being automatic was that he refused to heed the advice of the party leaders or those who thought they were party leaders.

In a day before anyone really knew anything about John and Jackie Kennedy, Fred and Leadell Hall were their Kansas counterparts, and the somewhat stuffy society of the state capital buzzed with talk of his red dinner jackets and her up-to-the-minute modishness.

Fred Hall angered some Kansans virtually to the point of speechlessness. He amused others, and he greatly pleased a few. He wasn't one of our soundest governors, but he had many good ideas and during his incumbency there was never a dull moment and now he's dead at 53.

Such a person in public life accomplishes more than the record shows, for he changes political habits and individual thinking. And that's a considerable contribution.

ON JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Kenneth J. Newman retired as director of public safety in Louisville, Ky., in February of this year after a long and distinguished career as an attorney who has served as domestic relations judge and special judge of the circuit court criminal branch.

On his retirement, he embodied his ideas on law, crime, and safety in an article which should be of great interest to the Members of this House. I personally want to congratulate Judge Newman on his distinguished career and to include his remarks for the perusal of this body:

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal magazine, Mar. 22, 1970[

ON JUSTICE AND PUBLIC SAFETY

(By Kenneth J. Newman)

English novelist Edward George Bulwer-Lytton said in 1848, "Life consists in the alternate process of learning and unlearning but it is often wiser to unlearn than to learn."

My experience as Director of Public Safety for the city of Louisville in the administrations of three mayors has proven the wisdom of the novelist's words. Often firmly fixed opinions are altered when confronted with stark reality.

We live in a world of goodness, ignorance, evil and charity, and all aspects of these have been displayed during the course of my duties. If my influence served to better mankind in any phase of survival I will have been compensated.

I could relate in detail the many problems confronting a Director of Public Safety—the tense moments during civil disorders; the disciplinary hearings; the tragic deaths of police officers killed in line of duty; the awesome duty of informing a woman in faltering words that her husband and the father of her children is no more; the box score of our achievements, frustrations and failures.

But rather than dwell on the past, I shall set out my innermost thoughts on those things which I consider basic before improvement in the area of crime can be discerned.

I am convinced that any effort of a Director of Safety is not a strong reed upon which to lean in perilous times. I am persuaded that one man's feeble effort is not enough to stem the onslaught of hate, ignorance and suspicion so rampant in our society. Scientific approaches to law enforcement and crime prevention have to a degree failed because the heart of man must change before scientific advances can prove effective. The noblest charities, the best fruits of learning, the richest discoveries, the best institutions of law and justice, every great thing the world has seen, represents, more or less directly, the fruitfulness and creativeness of religion and education.

We have been made aware of the rapid increase in crime and the growing evidence of disrespect for law among many parts of our nation. We all recognize that it is a basic requirement of public officials to secure justice and to maintain public order. We also must recognize that disobedience of law and disrespect for law-enforcement officers can never be the right means of securing justice for the individuals of our nation or for groups in our society.

At this point, we need to remind ourselves of the basic functions of government as described in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States:

"We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The functions of government are designed to maintain and preserve the blessings of liberty for all our citizens. If, however, we ever depart from the concept of liberty under law no one will be secure and no one will be safe. No person recognized this with greater clarity and conviction than President Abraham Lincoln when he said that reverence for law should become the political religion of the nation. Here are his words:

"As the patriots of '76 did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and laws let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor—Let every man remember that to violate the law is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the character of his own, and his children's liberty. Let reverence for the law be breathed by every American mother, to the lisping babe that prattles on her lap. Let it be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges; let it be written in primers, spelling books, and in almanacs—Let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. *And, in short, let it become the political religion of the nation;* and let the old and the young, the rich and the poor, the grave and the gay, of all sexes and tongues, and colors and conditions, sacrifice unceasingly upon its altars. Upon these let the proud fabric of freedom last, as the foundation of its basis."

This then becomes a task for our nation's schools, churches and homes. As a former Director of Safety, another conviction has become deeply rooted in my thinking and that is the necessity of faith in Almighty God for the functioning of our society and our system of government.

It must always be remembered that reverence for God and respect for law go together. It is not an accident that practically all of the 50 states in their charter of government refer directly or indirectly to Almighty God as the source of our blessings and as the governor and ruler of all men and all nations. As the year 1970 is upon us, we are constantly reminded of this by our calendar. We refer to each year as "Anno Domini" (in the year of the Lord) and thus acknowledge the rule of God in the affairs of our everyday lives. No amount of money and training or organization can be a substitute for the spiritual heritage which underlines all our religious and civil institutions.

We need men in public life who will stand for principle and for right. The honorable Frank Carlson, formerly senator from the state of Kansas, called our attention to the fact that three major forces have brought about chaos and frustration in our age. These are, he said, universal *conformity*, universal *change* and universal *criticism*. They have left our people in a sea of doubt and uncertainty and threaten to sink the ship right before our eyes. The world today, he said, is looking for:

"Men who are not for sale;

"Men who are honest, sound from center to circumference, true to the heart's core;

"Men with consciences as steady as the needle to the pole;

"Men who will stand for the right if the heavens totter and the earth reels; men who can tell the truth and look the world right in the eye;

"Men who neither brag nor run;

"Men who neither flag nor flinch;

"Men who can have courage without shouting it;

"Men in whom the courage of everlasting life runs still, deep, and strong;

"Men who know their message and tell it;

"Men who know their place and fill it;

"Men who know their business and attend to it;

"Men who will not lie, shirk or dodge;

"Men who are not too lazy to work, nor too proud to be poor;

"Men who are willing to eat what they have earned and wear what they have paid for;

"Men who are not ashamed to say 'No' with emphasis and who are not ashamed to say 'I can't afford it.'"

As my own legacy to the future as a former director of the Department of Safety, I can suggest certain principles which will be fundamental for future occupants of this office in Louisville or in any other city in the United States.

I emphasize first that there is no substitute for character and ability in the men and women we obtain to serve in the Police Department and the Fire Department. It is very important for the future that we lay premium emphasis on the professional competence and character of those who serve the public in the area of law enforcement and the protection of property. I am proud of the spirit and attitude of our personnel and believe they will compare favorably with the personnel of any other community in the United States.

The spirit of cooperation existing between both divisions has been truly magnificent, and the Louisville Fire Department has been acclaimed nationally for excellence. Such results are a testimony to our recruitment policies.

One of the dangers for the future which we must recognize is that of public indifference and apathy. People are quick to criticize when they feel that some error has been made in law enforcement, but they are not always as quick to appreciate the unnoticed acts of faithfulness and loyalty by police and firemen in the daily carrying out of their duties. This means in effect that the public mind must have a sound system of priorities if government of the people, by the people and for the people is to be a living reality in the United States.

It is probably no exaggeration to say that the decline of every major civilization has been marked by unsound priorities. To their sorrow, the citizens find this out too late to arrest the destructive processes of decay and decline. It was pointed out by a famous historian that one of the major causes of the decline of the government of the Roman Empire was the incessant desire for pleasure and the search for entertainment on the part of individuals, along with the breakup of the home as a dependable unit of society.

The craze for pleasure is not necessarily the same thing as the pursuit of happiness which is regarded as an inalienable right, along with life and liberty in the American system. A proper respect for law and law-enforcement procedures requires an unselfish attitude, on the part of the individual and the society, which will be increasingly essential in the future of our community and the future of the nation.

Too often the police force has become victimized by a tug-of-war in the community of conflicting social forces. Law enforcement must have top priority in all of our lives or we will inevitably degenerate into anarchy, which is usually followed by some form of tyranny. This would mean the end of our precious heritage of liberty under law and one nation under God.

I would like to place renewed emphasis on the constant need for reinvigoration of local government, especially in the time of tension and change in the urban environment. In Western civilization, especially in England and the United States, the system of law and justice operates primarily at the local level of city and county government. It is for this reason that in the United States we have never had a system of national police. This means that the burden of law enforcement depends on the insight and sense of responsibility of our local communities.

There is nothing which could have greater urgency than a reawakening of a sense of local responsibility for the maintenance of public safety and order and a live and vital interest on the part of the citizens in the functions of local government. We will inevitably suffer a slow strangulation and decay if any vital function of government at the local level fails and if there is a lack of confidence by the citizens in their local officials.

So, what we face is a two-fold challenge: A new sense of urgency on the part of the people, and an abiding sense of dedication on the part of local officials. Perhaps this can be stated in the unforgettable words of a

former president: "This nation must have a new birth of freedom." Only in this way will the proper function of government be fulfilled and the goal of an orderly and just society be maintained.

There are few of us who do not have a strong propensity to diminish our present strength by entertaining fears of future weakness. This is an obstacle we must overcome—and overcome it we will with a renewed faith in duties we accept.

In 1635, Pascal said "Justice without force is powerless, force without justice is tyrannical." May all safety directors succeeding me establish this compassionate and honorable rule to guide the destinies of the Department of Public Safety in the daily pursuit of excellence. To do less would be a sin; to do more would be impossible.

PURIFICATION OF NATION'S WATERS EXPECTED TO BE LONG AND COSTLY

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times of March 17, 1970, carried a most informative article by Mr. Gladwin Hill under the headline of "Purification of Nation's Water Expected To Be Long and Costly." So that my colleagues may have an opportunity to read this article, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1970]

PURIFICATION OF NATION'S WATERS EXPECTED TO BE LONG AND COSTLY

(By Gladwin Hill)

Federal experts are finding that restoration of the nation's waters to something approaching satisfactory cleanliness is many years—and many billions of dollars—in the future.

Into a computer at the Interior Department's Federal Pollution Control Administration's building, overlooking the dirty Potomac River, these experts have fed reams of figures that can instantly give a statistical profile of sewage-plant construction in Buffalo or recapitulate Federal grants to the state of Michigan.

Up to now, according to the officials who must translate the data into action, the computer has presented this picture:

The condition of the nation's waterways is disheartening, perhaps worse than a decade ago.

The over-all problem is being aggravated by new types of pollution.

Current plans to step up antipollution efforts are promising, but their realization hinges on forthcoming judgments of Congress on some highly controversial questions.

President Nixon, in his environmental message of Feb. 10, outlined a $10-billion, four-year plan for new sewage plants ($4-billion in Federal subsidies, $6-billion to come from states and localities); a system of new financing aid to localities, and greatly expanded Federal authority in combating water pollution.

No one familiar with the problem is suggesting that this will be a cure-all. Ten billion dollars is only a drop in the nation's bucket of dirty water. The cost of cleaning up Lake Michigan alone has been expertly estimated as high as $10-billion. The ultimate prospective cost of cleaning all the nation's waterways is out of sight, somewhere beyond $100-billion.

"But this new program is the springboard we need," says Carl L. Klein, the burly, aggressive Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research.

The water section of President Nixon's message came right from Mr. Klein's desk, and the former Illinois lawyer-legislator comments buoyantly: "We went for broke in what we asked. And the White House bought it."

HEARINGS TO BEGIN SOON

Typical of a dozen major proposals in bills that Congressional Committees will soon begin hearings on is a potentially controversial provision extending Federal pollution abatement powers from interstate waters to virtually all waters of the country.

Another is a requirement that the states establish "effluent standards," or permissible discharge limits, for each and every pollution source—standards subject to Federal approval.

These are radical steps, measured against fast pollution-control measures, and they are expected to elicit opposition of many sorts from members of Congress, states, cities and industry. It has taken years of argument and maneuvering simply to shape a law covering the relatively uncontroversial problem of maritime oil spills.

A complicating element in the whole outlook is the fact that Mr. Nixon's party does not control Congress. Moreover, the chief Congressional shepherd of water pollution legislation for years has been Maine's Senator Edmund Muskie, who has criticized the Nixon program as inadequate and who is a putative electoral opponent of the President.

But the sweeping new proposals were conceived as vital to getting pollution abatement off what Assistant Secretary Klein calls "dead center."

REASON FOR CONCERN

Why all the attention to dirty water when, with modern drinking water systems, instances of death or sickness have become almost nonexistent?

Essentially the reason is that the nation needs clean water not only for drinking but also for industry, agriculture and recreation.

In the last two decades, waterways became so overburdened with fluid refuse as to point toward only one conclusion: a day not far off when rivers and lakes would be nothing but open sewers.

It was evident to all concerned that rehabilitating enough water for domestic and commercial uses would be problematical or prohibitively expensive and that the natural attributes serving recreation—fish and plant life and general beauty—might be destroyed forever.

Federal efforts against large-scale water pollution date to 1956, when a law set forth what has become known as the "conference procedure." Under this, Federal officials step into an interstate pollution situation, join with state officials in a public hearing on conditions and formulate a scheduled corrective program theoretically enforceable by Federal court action.

PROGRAM OF INCENTIVES

Using this procedure, 50 formal abatement actions have been instituted, involving most of the states, 2,000 communities and 2,000 industrial sources.

This policing action was coupled with an incentive program: Federal subsidies to localities to cover up to 55 per cent of construction costs of sewage treatment facilities. Some 9,000 projects have been so aided.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall, calculated in 1968 that this carrot-and-stick approach had brought improvement to upward of 50,000 miles of waterways.

But with population, industry and the volume of pollutants increasing by the day, these tactics began to appear glaringly insufficient.

There is general agreement that the subsidy program has been hamstrung by Federal budget-cutting. The conference procedure has proved cumbersome and slow. Abatement actions have dragged on for years while Federal officials tried to cajole, prod and cudgel state authorities—many of them plainly under the influence of polluters—into taking decisive action.

Progressive segments of industry have spent hundreds of millions of dollars on pollution abatement. Hundreds of municipalities have improved their sewerage systems. New York State alone mounted a billion-dollar water cleanup program, as the first phase of what Governor Rockefeller sees as a $3-billion task.

But such activities seemed neither extensive enough nor coherent enough. A factory's reduction of its discharges into a river might be offset by increased emissions from an over-taxed sewage plant.

ACCOUNTING OFFICE STUDY

A Federal General Accounting Office study last year concluded that despite the expenditure of $1.2-billion in Federal grants and $4.2-billion by localities for new sewage treatment facilities, there had not been improvement in the quality of the nation's waterways.

"In the last 10 years," says David D. Dominick, the youthful, bespectacled Commissioner of the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, "the quality of the nation's water has probably degenerated."

While it has always been assumed that community water systems could transform even tainted supplies into something harmless and potable, that assurance is wearing thin.

"Our treatment plants," says Dr. C. C. Johnson, head of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's consumer protection division, "are not designed for, nor are they prepared to take the chemical onslaught now coming from our streams."

FEW PURE STREAMS LEFT

For evidence, most citizens need look no farther than the nearest river. The only conspicuously unsullied streams in the country are the few that have been insulated in the Federal "Wild Rivers" wilderness preservation program.

The Hudson's lower reaches are filthy. Major rivers like the Ohio, the Mississippi and the Missouri are still heavily polluted. The Detroit River, the Cuyahoga at Cleveland, and the Houston ship canal are essentially industrial sewers. Lake Erie, in scientists' estimation, is an ecological disaster area. Lake Michigan is heavily contaminated in some areas. Even the clarity of Lake Superior is threatened.

All of these situations and many others are theoretically in the course of improvement under Federal abatement actions. But abatement involves design, engineering and construction—a process measured in years, not months. Polluters haggle endlessly with state and Federal officials over their technical and financial capabilities.

A new industrial facility can, generally speaking, incorporate proper waste-water treatment for no more than 10 per cent of total construction costs. With an old facility, economically marginal already, a big corrective outlay may be a back breaker. This is when the foot-dragging sets in, mainly.

NEED FOR MONEY CITED

Many communities have long since bonded themselves to the limit for public facilities. They plead that they just can't raise the money for the new sewage plant they need.

According to the latest data of the pollution control agency, only some 140 million of the nation's 200 million people are served by any kind of sewer system. The sewage of nearly 7 percent of those 140 million, including many right in New York City, is dis-

charged "raw," or untreated. With only about 85 million of the nation's people does sewage get the "secondary," or two-stage, treatment now considered minimal.

Yet many states have resisted Federal intervention. Iowa contended last year that it was unconstitutional. Colorado's Gov. John A. Love is on record as saying it would be "traitorous" for states to submit to Federally prescribed water quality standards.

Such attitudes are so prevalent that the Federal states standards program enacted by Congress in 1965 is still bemired, despite repeated official statements that water quality commitments from all 50 states had been "approved."

A recent check with the Pollution Control Agency disclosed that arduous negotiations were still going on with most of the states to bring their stated water quality goals—not accomplishments—to a satisfactory level.

CUTS IN APPROPRIATIONS

States and cities, on their part, have been vexed that Federal appropriations for matching-fund subsidies for sewer-plant construction over the last three years have run nearly $1-billion short of what Congress originally authorized, and that the Government owes 19 states some $800-million as its share of construction projects approved and started. (The largest such obligation is $382,618,000 to New York.)

As an interim move to outflank the various obstacles to expeditious abatement, Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel last September invoked an unused section of the 1965 water pollution law providing for direct Federal action against individual polluters.

Over bitter protests from the State of Ohio, he gave four steel companies there and the City of Toledo six months to get specified corrective measures under way or face Federal suits.

The action elicited quick compliance. But the maneuver of bypassing state administration was exemplary rather than a serviceable long-term tactic. There are countless thousands of polluters, industrial and municipal, and the Federal Government does not have the machinery to pursue them individually.

Recapitulating the highlights of this travail in a recent interview, Assistant Secretary Klein said: "It was imperative that we get new tools to do the job people are expecting to be done."

The measures now before Congress in effect shrink down to six months the indefinite period of years over which the law now allows meaningful remedial action to be protracted.

If a polluter does not start satisfactory remedial action in six months after due notice and a hearing, the Secretary of the Interior could ask the Department of Justice to bring court action leading to fines of up to $10,000 a day.

In place of the present often tortuous process of establishing that pollution is interstate, the Interior Department would have jurisdiction over any water pollution, even of invisible ground-water.

Communities' financing problems would be eased by creating a new Federal agency to buy their bonds and in turn issue its own bonds with the more marketable Federal imprimatur.

A TACIT COMMENT

The matching-grant subsidy program would be continued, on the $4-billion four-year basis, with a tacit commitment from the Nixon Administration to fund Congress's authorizations instead of chopping them with the budgetary cleaver.

President Johnson cut a $700-million authorization for fiscal year 1969 to $214-million and President Nixon last year cut a $1-billion authorization to $214-million, but Congress overrode him and appropriated $800-million.

Thus, regardless how long it takes Congress to broaden Interior's policing powers, the subsidy program is on a firmer footing.

How big a dent it will make on the over-all problem remains to be seen. Secretary Udall a year ago estimated basic national pollution control needs through 1973 as totalling nearly $30-billion—$8-billion for sewage treatment plants, over $6-billion for sewer lines, some $6-billion for industrial treatment facilities, and nearly $6-billion for new operating and maintenance costs.

Senator Muskie has suggested that the Federal Government should be spending $12.5-billion in matching-fund grants over the next five years, to stimulate upward of $25-billion in construction rather than the $4-billion in the Nixon program.

Current projections, by whomever, are generally premised on providing only two-stage treatment for sewage—precipitation of gross solids, and neutralizing of most of the other pollutants by biological or chemical action. But this leaves some stubborn residual substances, notably nitrogen and phosphorous—natural fertilizers that propagate undesirable plant growths in waterways, disrupting their entire ecology.

The belief is growing that the only ultimate solution is widespread "tertiary" or three-stage treatment, which will remove practically all adulterants and leave clean, if slightly saline, water.

This cost twice as much as two-stage treatment (including amortization of plant costs), but is already being applied on a small scale in a number of places. Assistant Secretary Klein sees it as essential, for instance, in rehabilitating the Potomac, now overburdened with inadequately treated District of Columbia sewage.

"THERMAL" POLLUTION

Meanwhile the over-all water pollution problem has been growing in complexity. A new focus of attention is the detergents—of which some 5 billion pounds were sold last year—because they consist of up to 44 per cent of phosphate.

The detergent industry contends that its product is only a secondary source of such troublesome nutrients (human waste being another). But Canada has announced plans to ban phosphate detergents, and a Federal representative recently told an international conference that his agency favored "an immediate reduction of phosphate levels in detergents."

Another growing problem is "thermal" pollution of waterways by heat from industrial cooling water, particularly power plants. Some fish species are blighted by as little as a four-degree chronic alteration of their accustomed milieu.

Thermal pollution will worsen as atomic power plants, which produce more waste heat, replace conventional fossil-fueled plants. The pollution control agency in February instituted its first thermal pollution abatement proceeding, against a Florida electric plant that is heating part of Biscayne degrees, an intolerable temperature for fish and aquatic plants.

Nor do any of the current cost estimates cover two big pollution sources that will have to be controlled to really clean up the nation's waters.

One is agricultural wastes, ranging from manure to fertilizers, which some officials have suggested may be responsible for as much contamination as municipal and industrial wastes. Little has been done about this because it is hard to get at.

The other problem is urban storm-water runoff. In most communities it goes down the same pipe as sewage, and often is nearly as dirty. But the volume at the time of a downpour is more than any sewage plant can handle. So sewage plants customarily "blow the switch," diverting large amounts of both storm water and sewage toward waterways untreated.

The only solution is to separate sewage and storm-water conduits and somehow handle storm water by itself.

VOLUNTEER ACTION AND WILLARD GARVEY

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Willard W. Garvey, of Wichita, Kans., who is chairman of the board of Garvey Industries, Inc., has been appointed to the board of directors of the National Center for Voluntary Action by President Nixon. The President has made an excellent choice in naming Mr. Garvey as one of 80 distinguished citizens, representing many different backgrounds, to serve as a director of the National Center.

Recently, two commentaries on the Volunteer Action program written by Mr. Robert Carroll, of Wichita, were brought to my attention. They effectively discuss the origin of voluntarism in America as well as the individual leadership of Willard Garvey in his community and the Nation in this important program of volunteer action. They are worthy of the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The articles follow:

VOLUNTEER ACTION PROGRAM—I

Unawareness? — ignorance? — disdain? — sometimes it's difficult to know exactly what the average American feels about his national heritage; but, whatever his feeling about the young country's history, his frequent reluctance to acknowledge either historic accomplishment or precedent does two things:— it cuts today's and tomorrow's citizens off from an important learning resource; and, it permits the Russians to stake claims of precedence in several sensitive areas of American originality—including baseball . . .

Specifically, are you aware that the concept and practices of the unpaid Community Volunteer originated in the earliest days of settlements that became the United States of America?—that volunteer programs, or *voluntarism*, originated with the signing of an agreement, drawn up by one set of founding fathers—a document known, later, as the Mayflower Compact?

Of course, that sturdy cradle of New England's population—the Mayflower—made several trips to America; but, at least one shipload agreed, together, to create, in their new country " . . . a just and equal way of life . . .". And this resolve is the earliest evidence of planned volunteer activity—a program of people helping people—in the New World—or the Old, for that matter.

(An interesting piece of research might uncover, incidentally, some evidence that the Pilgrim fathers learned more than just how to talk turkey from the original Americans—the Indian tribesmen—in that area. After all, the tribal customs of Indian-Americans have demonstrated, even prehistorically, the benefits of community-centered activities, based on a philosophy of mutual help and participation of the individual in a program designed for group-benefit.)

Forty-one members of that Mayflower shipload signed the first community-volunteer agreement; and, by 1969, the precedent set by those forty-one "neighborly-helpers" had grown into a still-growing army of 50-million volunteers. This mass of citizens was occupied in varying programs (and in varying degrees of participation) throughout the United States, and abroad; and thirty-four nationwide organizations were needed to contain them as, altogether, they raised over 8-billion-dollars! The 34 groups—now organized into the American Association of Fund-Rais-

ing Councils—will raise, during 1970, over 9-billion-dollars!—and, as of January 1970, the Gross National Product has been calculated at 903-billion dollars!

Much of the fund-raising in America, today, is done with combined efforts of professional (paid) workers and the volunteers of the original concept—the unpaid workers. Today, the funding of innumerable campaigns, nationwide, has become a vital adjunct of the national economy—in a phrase: Big Business; and, like many over-fertilized growing-things; and, if we follow a botanical analogy, such rich growing conditions can create a plant with an overdeveloped, weak structure, incapable of bearing either much-needed fruit, for harvest, or vital seeds for replenishment and continuation of the genus.

Remember, now, the original intent of volunteer-action was to utilize the talents and energies of unpaid individuals who'd work—outside the requirements of day-to-day business and family-duties—to create a better community for all . . .

Perhaps it's time for the unpaid volunteers—the people-helping-people types who, many of them, are losing both heart and interest in volunteer-action as it originated in this country—perhaps it's time for these practical-minded idealists to step back, take a good objective look at the 'organized voluntarism' that threatens both the concept and goals of the original community-helpers, and call for a re-examination of voluntarism's basic principles as articulated and practiced in the 17th-century settlements that were to become the United States of America.

. . . and some people are doing just this: they're aware of the dangers inherent in the Big-Business aspect of voluntarism today. Not only is there danger of compromising original purposes; but many of the important and admirable efforts being made—programs that encourage research which, in turn, has accomplished miraculous benefits for mankind—programs that frustrate the questionable motives of empire-builders within the governmental structure—programs dedicated to the well-being of the individual within a, consequentially, healthy society—even the successful programs are being used to mask exploitation and dubious intent, or blatant self-aggrandizement, in spurious prorgams that are financially inflationary and morally indefensible. Worst of all: the genuine volunteer is beginning to retire from the action in disillusionments and a jaundiced view of all voluntarism.

These, then, are reasons for aggressive action in several areas—and the action is beginning to attract people of proved capability as well as unquestionable motive—people who already have a pattern as well as inspiration for reversing the tide of doubt that's swelling against voluntarism.

These people are already at work. Their objective: to create better communities across the nation by using the talents, energies, and inherent instincts of Americans '. . . to create a just and equal life . . .' for all.

VOLUNTARY ACTION PROGRAM—II

A few hundred years ago, forty-one members of the Plymouth Colony signed an agreement called The Mayflower Compact—thus memorializing the amazing little ship that hauled them, in extreme discomfort and anxiety, to a new world and a new life.

Now, the Mayflower Compact was more than a salute to a ship. It was, and is, a statement of beliefs in the rights of the individual in a community of individuals; and, more than that, it is a practical acknowledgment of an individual's responsibility for the well-being of the entire community—not just as compensation for his personal rights, but as the best means of assuring and perpetuating those rights. Another way of saying this: what one doesn't know *can* hurt one; or, the best-informed society is the most secure society. . . .

Obviously, these earliest new citizens of an unformed nation realized the need for a structured government—and their entire perilous journey into both a new country and a new philosophy was predicated on the fact that any acceptable government must be self-government.

With equally obvious design, the leadership of the New Plymouth group required total participation by members of the community in whatever planned program, or unforeseen problem, might affect the well-being of the total community:—no time limits—no part-time participation—no half-asked questions of 'Why me?' or 'Right now . . . ?'—total-participation for the total-good as a guarantee of private enterprise and personal freedom.

This was the gist of the contract they signed with each other under the specific wording, '. . . to create a just and equal life . . .' These then were the first community-volunteers—implementing the first people-helping-people program in America—or in the recorded history of their peoples.

A hundred-or-so years later, the necessity for a compact arose again; and, again, the designers felt that a new, untried philosophy was the only certain element in a mass of even more complicated uncertainties—because these freedom-loving individuals were, without question, deliberately staking their lives on their philosophy. They were guilty of treason!—and they knew it!—but, they volunteered, a few of them for the many; and—we can thank God, today—their gamble was successful. In addition, another dramatic chapter was added to the history of voluntarism in America.

It's true, of course, that Tom Jefferson, George Wyeth, Patrick Henry, George Mason—and several more of the freedom-loving, free-enterprise boys who authored the Virginia Declaration of Rights—would be aghast at the corruption of their principles implicit in the monolithic structure, dedicated to empirical Federalism, that stands on the banks of the polluted Potomac today; but they would be heartened and find value, with proper safeguards, in use of the nation's capital as a coordinating center for the countless thousands of volunteers, now, who—like those hard-nosed idealists—serve their communities, in fifty states, with selflessness and devotion to basic principles of the original philosophy of American voluntarism.

The early compact-signers, all of them, would applaud President Nixon's stated design and purpose in creating a National Council for Volunteer Action. The President, joined by an imposing list of action-oriented supporters, sees merit in recognizing community-oriented citizens who serve their neighbors in such numbers, with such willingness.

To encourage this traditional, sometimes tarnished, gift of an individual's time and talents, and facilitate their participation in programs for common advantage, Mr. Nixon has formed a national committee of advisors to help him promote genuine volunteer-action; and one of his personal appointees is Willard W. Garvey, of Wichita.

Mr. Garvey, already active in his commitment to the President's request, has taken positive steps to help direct national attention toward this national workforce of unpaid contributors to the nation's communities; to create—and implement, where necessary—planning and prepared programs, some adaptable to enfranchisement, within areas, and communities, where programs and planning do not exist or have failed; to encourage and reassure some would-be, and have-been, volunteers who have begun to suspect that the spirit of neighborly assistance is no longer part of the American dream or scene.

In rapid and constructive moves, Mr. Garvey has directed his executive-assistant, David Bowers (with offices in the R. H. Garvey Building; Wichita) to begin a working study of volunteer-action and community-service programs in Wichita, in Kansas, and nationally; and, Mr. Bowers, in activating such studies with appropriate urgency, has enlisted the highly-qualified help of Mrs. Beth Hoben, a 20th-century pioneer in community-service through Wichita's remarkable Volunteer Bureau; and other specialists in areas vital to the community's welfare and security have joined Mr. Bowers's recruitment program.

Everyone concerned with these initial efforts, and the program's broad implications, is enthusiastically hopeful that a return to basic principles of American doctrine and philosophy will activate, once more, the American citizens' inherent instincts to contribute time and talent, whatever the individual's personal limitations, to the common good of the individual's own community.

Such commitment will create, without question, an identity for both the individual and the community and, of more importance, it will make secure, for coming generations, the principles of citizenship and economy that have kept America secure thus far.

AFTERTHOUGHT

An optimism—guarded by experience—exists in the minds of those involved deeply at this stage of reappraisal and renewal of old principles; and a hopefulness, hedged with caution, expresses concern that this community-oriented program will be guided, in Washington, with an acute awareness that the banks of the Potomac, and the halls of the catacombs rising from them, are peopled with empire-building opportunists looking for fresh pedestals upon which to create more monuments to self-sought significance upon the national scene.

Perhaps a primary course of action, for the *Volunteer-Action Program: Model '70*, is creation of a watchful group of volunteers, well-prepared and well-positioned, to see that multiple efforts, about to begin, are directed toward *all* American communities—and not solely toward the too-often-isolated community of Americans abroad—in Washington.

KEEP DR. KING IN PERSPECTIVE

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there was understandably a great outpouring of sentiment and emotion following the movie on Tuesday night which described the life story of the late Dr. Martin Luther King. While I recognize his contributions, the fact that he is a symbol to many people, and, without doubt, he gave meaning to many dreams of the black minority, at the same time we should not let the emotionalism of his tragic death obscure the fundamental issues. Much of the lawlessness that we have with us today can be traced to Dr. King who advocated the notion that the individual can take the law into his own hands when he does not agree with it. In an interview on the program "Meet the Press" on March 28, 1965, Dr. King stated:

I do feel that there are two types of laws. One is a just law and one is an unjust law. I think we all have moral obligations to disobey unjust laws.

I think that the distinction here is that when one breaks a law that conscience tells him is unjust, he must do it openly, he must do it cheerfully, he must do it lovingly, he must do it civilly, not uncivilly, and he must do it with a willingness to accept the penalty.

Even a liberal and permissive U.S. Supreme Court 2 years later chose to disagree with this fallacious reasoning when it affirmed his Birmingham jail sentence:

This Court cannot hold that the petitioners were constitutionally free to ignore all the procedures of the law and carry their battle to the streets. One may sympathize with the petitioners' impatient commitment to their cause. But respect for judicial process is a small price to pay for the civilizing hand of law, which alone can give abiding meaning to constitutional freedom.

We should not forget in assessing the legacy he has left the American people that on the very eve of his tragic death he had announced that on the very next day he would once more violate court orders and our orderly legal process in Memphis, Tenn. It should be noted that he advocated doing this even after the Supreme Court of the United States had upheld his jail sentence for openly violating the law. This is the negative and dangerous aspect of the legacy which he has left. The present defiance of law which we are experiencing today was aided and encouraged by national leaders such as Dr. King. Any emotional effort to enshrine his memory or give him sainthood should take into consideration the good and the bad he did during his lifetime.

DISTINGUISHED JOURNALIST COMMENTS ON WASHINGTON SCENE—WORKING PRESS ATTENDS EDITORIAL CONFERENCE

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 26, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. James W. R. White, a distinguished publisher and journalist of McMinnville, Tenn., in a recent column in the McMinnville Southern Standard outlined his views and observations following a week in Washington attending an editorial conference and workshop.

Mr. White, publisher of the McMinnville Southern Standard and the Smithville Review, relates his impressions following numerous briefing sessions with Federal officials and leaders and Members of Congress.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in these most important matters in the public interest, I place Mr. White's column in the RECORD.

The column follows:

WASHINGTON WORKSHOP: GLEANING FROM THE PUBLISHER'S NOTEBOOK

(Last week Standard Publisher James W. R. White attended an editorial workshop in Washington which afforded him the opportunity to hear and talk with numerous federal officials including members of the Congress, a Supreme Court Justice and various administrative officials. Below appears a capsule account of his trip.)

The first session was in the form of a briefing in the Rayburn House Office Building by four members of the House—Rep. Carl Albert (D. Okla.), Rep. Brock Adams (D. Wash.), Rep. John Anderson (R. Ill.), and Rep. John Myers (R. Ind.).

Rep. Albert, who is Floor Leader for the Democrats in the House, warned that the present high interest rates feed the fires of inflation and said this country is headed into a recession unless present policies are changed. He said the federal government must take over the welfare program and make its application uniform in all states. He thinks the farmers are not getting a fair shake and says a new farm bill must be written. "Medicare and Medicaid were dirty words ten years ago, but are acceptable today. . . . improvements must come in the program."

Rep. Anderson, too, expressed the view that the farmer is not enjoying a fair share of the nation's bounty. He called for reform instead of revolution. He predicted a change in the nation's foreign policy pointing out that the President has been trying to anticipate what the world will be like 5 years from now in formulating that policy.

Rep. John Myers, a dynamic speaker, is a Conservative. Although a banker before being elected to Congress, he criticized the policy of high interest rates and seemed to be of the opinion that the government could drive interest rates down by offering a lower rate on treasury borrowings including treasury notes and bills. He believes the Federal government should live within its income and should exercise more leadership working with state and county governments in seeking solutions to our problems.

Rep. Adams, who represents the Seattle area, said his district is actually in a depression as a result of layoffs (12,000 to 18,000) in the aircraft industry. He predicted that Vietnamization of the war will be unsuccessful . . . Congress won't do anything about it and during the summer we'll have to face the fact that the South Viets can't take over. He, too, insists on a balanced budget.

We heard next from Sen. Daniel K. Inouye (Dem.-Hawaii), who spoke at a luncheon in one of the many dining rooms in the $150 million Rayburn Building. Inouye, it will be recalled, delivered the keynote address at the Democratic National Convention last summer in Chicago. He faulted the Republican party for its "gross mishandling of our economy, the approach to race relations, media intimidation and court appointments", in a strictly partisan speech.

Inouye went on: "The rate of price rise has increased, not decreased, since the Republicans took over the White House. This past year it was 6.2 percent compared to the 2 percent average during the Kennedy-Johnson years. The President has refused to attack one of the prime contributors to the inflationary spiral. One of his first announcements . . . was to give the green light to the big industry—to steel, copper, aluminum, automobiles, and other basic industries, as well as to financial institutions, to increase their prices."

We moved from the Rayburn Building to the Senate Office Building and heard from three senators—Tennessee's Howard Baker (Rep.), George McGovern (Dem.-S.D.) and Richard Schweiker (R.-Pa).

Sen. Baker said that our involvements in both Korea and Viet Nam were a result of World War II foreign policy and that President Nixon is now in the process of changing our foreign policy. He said that if there is increased activity now in Laos it is because the North Vietnamese have chosen to increase their activity there. He noted a growing belief that Idealism and Separatism is desirable, but termed that supposition tragic.

Sen. McGovern chastised the Nixon administration for misleading the people and accused it of flirting with war in Laos. He said we are sending over 500 missions a day from Laos against the North Vietnamese and are not allowing the people or the press to know about it or learn what is going on.

"Have we learned nothing from the long years in Viet Nam, are we traveling the same bloody, futile path as in Viet Nam," McGovern asked. "I firmly believe we are at war in Laos on a dangerous scale," McGovern said.

Another highlight of the workshop was a trip to the stately Supreme Court building with its massive 12-ft. columns where we were privileged to meet Justice William O. Douglas and ask a few questions.

Justice Douglas, one of the Court's majority of liberals, a soft spoken, articulate and scholarly man, explained the function of the court and noted that Congress over the years has been protective of the court's jurisdiction, despite periodic hues and cries to curb it.

He submitted to many questions one of which was in regard to the ban on public school prayer. Justice Douglas explained it this way: "The First Amendment protects all religions—not just the one to which the School Board chairman adheres to." He said the Moslems are dedicated to the eradication of non-Moslems. "Now wouldn't it be a hell of a note," he said, "if the School Board prescribed a recitation from the Koran each day which implores that its followers go out and kill all the non-Moslems."

Justice Douglas said that he could not foresee any circumstance under which the Supreme Court could be subjected to the indignities which occurred in the courtroom at the recent trial of the "Chicago 7." He said that only lawyers argue before the Supreme Court and that the members considered only the transcript of the trial. No witnesses appear before that body and therefore he could not see how the Supreme Court proceedings could be disrupted in such a manner. We thought he avoided the thrust of the inquiry.

Douglas said the Constitution was designed to keep the government off the backs of the people and it is the court's duty to see that each citizen receives a fair trial as prescribed by the Constitution. He said that a free press presents problems to a fair trial, but a free press is a safety valve on the whole system. He said that he had not read or heard Vice-President Agnew's speeches that chastised the press, so he could not comment directly. However, he said he understood the Vice-President was fair game for the press, so he imagined Mr. Agnew accepted this and considered the press fair game for him.

He noted that the President appoints members to the Court who will reflect his philosophy in his decisions. "But President's have been fooled," he noted wryly.

Thursday evening a reception was held for members of Congress in the Graphic Arts section of the Smithsonian Institution Building. Present from Tennessee were Sen. and Mrs. Albert Gore, Rep. and Mrs. Joe L. Evins, Rep. and Mrs. William Anderson, Rep. and Mrs. Ray Blanton, and Rep. John Duncan. Following the reception Sen. and Mrs. Gore, Rep. and Mrs. Evins, and Rep. Duncan had dinner with the Tennessee publishers Sam Kennedy, of the Columbia Daily Herald, Horace Wells of the Clinton Courier—News, Glenn McNeil, secretary of the Tennessee Press Association and the Standard publisher.

It will be recalled that Rep. Blanton was in McMinnville a few weeks ago speaking at the Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstand-

ing Citizen Banquet and attending services at First United Methodist Church. At that time many of us understood he was sounding out the state political situation and considering very strongly tossing his hat into the gubernatorial ring. In conversations with him Thursday evening we got the distinct feeling that he is still very much in the race and an announcement may be forthcoming in that regard soon.

Sen. Gore, the seasoned and wise politician that he is, appears more confident of re-election, but at the same time realizing that he is in for a strong battle. He is not discounting the appeal of Republican Candidate Tex Ritter, particularly to the Wallace voters. Gore believes he has the support of a vast majority of the young people including the college students but is not sure how to evaluate their overall contribution to his vote. Obviously, he is worried about the negative effect that long-haired students may have on the older voters (or should we say, silent majority).

Rep. Evins has been extremely busy in committee hearings. He looks real good and appears to have recovered from a heart attack last year. In his job as Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, Rep. Evins had the task of considering legislation providing for approximately $20 billion—one-tenth of the entire national budget. In our conversations with members of Congress and other government officials, we constantly heard the comment that our own Joe L. Evins is one of the most powerful men in the nation's capital. He has been a member of the House of Representatives since 1946.

Rep. Evins predicts that the efforts to depose House Speaker John McCormack will be unsuccessful and that McCormack will run again because all the talk that he step down has displeased him. "I don't believe he would have run this time," Evins said, "if all this had not arisen." Evins blames the ultra-liberals and several newly elected Congressmen for working to oust the House Speaker. However, should McCormack step down as Speaker, Evins predicts that Arkansas' Wilbur Mills will succeed him.

Friday morning we visited the fastest growing and I believe the largest agency, the Pentagon excepted, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Here we heard from John G. Veneman, the Under Secretary and two lesser lights. We got the impression that a family of four may expect a guaranteed annual wage of $1,600 with an additional earnings of $720 exempt from taxes in the coming scheme of the Welfare program and that payments will be uniform in all states. All Washington seems to think the guaranteed wage is coming.

A walk across the street to the Department of Transportation was next. Here we heard from three outstanding men: Francis Turner, Administrator, Federal Highway Administration; Carlos C. Villarreal, Urban Mass Transportation Administrator; and Douglas W. Toms, National Highway Safety Bureau Director.

Turner told us that the Interstate Highway System Carries 20% of all traffic and that the accident rate there is one-third that on other systems. When the system is complete in 1976 (66% complete now) we will be saving 8,000 lives every year and millions of dollars in travel time and operating costs!

Toms told us about safety plans for automobiles. He said alcohol presents a tremendous safety problem because 90% drink and drive. He said approximately 10,000 lives are lost each year as a result of alcohol. No real solutions were offered.

During the afternoon we visited the Executive Offices of the White House and heard from Mr. Daniel P. Moynihan, counselor to the President, who, incidentally, has been in the news this week for memoranda he gave President Nixon purportedly calling for a "cooling off period" in race relations. The do-gooders and the left are out to get Mr. Moynihan for suggesting such a thing and especially so because he was always considered "one of them." Mr. Moynihan told us that he thinks we should be lowering our voices and that the time has now arrived to consolidate some of the gains made in the field of Civil Rights. "Put some of those gains to practical use," he said.

Mr. Moynihan is a brilliant man, but he had trouble communicating with his audience because his mind was always ahead of what he was saying.

A briefing on Drug Abuse by representatives of the National Institute of Mental Health, turned out to be a lecture on how to rear our children. Which was good but did not tell us what we expected to hear: What the government knows and is doing about the problem of Narcotics. Many of the publishers cited cases where students in junior high and even the eighth grade were involved with narcotics in their respective cities.

SENATE—*Tuesday, March 31, 1970*

The Senate, in executive session, met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri.

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

Our Father God, we thank Thee for the day of resurrection attesting the invincibility of truth and the omnipotence of love. We thank Thee too for the renewal of faith and hope in all who follow Thee in spirit and in truth.

As Thy servants here enter upon the waiting tasks of the new week, grant them a solemn sense of the stewardship of public office. Equip them with patience and perseverance for strenuous hours, sound judgment in difficult decisions, and the vision to see beyond the day's duties the working of Thine eternal kingdom.

O God, bless this Nation and so mend every flaw, heal every sickness, and perfect her in ways of justice and righteousness as to make her a blessing to all mankind.

In the name of Him who is the Light of the World. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read a communication to the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. THOMAS F. EAGLETON, a Senator from the State of Missouri, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. EAGLETON thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 25, 1970, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 495. An act for the relief of Marie-Louise (Mary Louise) Pierce; and

S. 3427. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. EAGLETON) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

For all of our arts institutions, these are times of increasing financial concern. The Fiscal Year 1969 Report of the National Endowment for the Arts, which I am transmitting herewith, notes that "the services offered by arts institutions, and the costs which they incurred, continued to expand at a faster rate than earned income and contributions. Therefore as the year continued, these institutions were confronted by mounting financial pressures."

The sums appropriated by the Congress for the Endowment during this period were at the levels established in prior years. Its programs, though limited in size, were of benefit to all of the fifty States and the five special jurisdictions, and in some instances were the means by which fine institutions in the performing arts were enabled to survive.

It was in response to the growing financial problem that on December 10, 1969, I sent to the Congress a special message on the Arts and the Humanities. I noted then that "Need and opportunity combine . . . to present the Federal government with an obligation to help broaden the base of our cultural legacy. . . ." Accordingly, I asked the Congress to extend the legislation creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, and to provide appropriations for the National Foundation in Fiscal 1971 in an amount "virtually double the current year's level."

In urging the Congress to approve a $20 million program for the National Endowment for the Arts, and an equal amount for the National Endowment for the Humanities, I maintained that few investments we could make would give us so great a return in terms of human satisfaction and spiritual fulfillment. More than ever now, I hold to that view.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1970.*