

Approved For Release 2003/10/22 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500170012-6

Today, we treasure the remaining stretch of lonely beach and the still-virgin forest. The land has filled up, the unlimited was found to have a limit, and the infinite distances to be finite indeed.

The Population Reference Bureau predicts that if our population increase continues, "outdoor recreation in these United States will have become a nostalgic memory, even perhaps before the babies born today have children of their own." The Bureau's report suggests that it may become necessary to "resort to rigid rationing of the use of national parks, permitting each citizen a brief, uncrowded holiday once every 5 years, then even 10, 15, or 20 years as population increases."

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall has written an eloquent plea for conservation. "America," he says, "today stands poised on a pinnacle of wealth and power, yet we live in a land of vanishing beauty, of increasing ugliness, of shrinking open space, and of an overall environment that is diminished daily by pollution and noise and blight."

Our natural resources are dwindling, too. Americans, with our high standards of living, expend resources and energy at a prodigious rate. Minerals and most sources of energy are nonrenewable. When we spend them, we spend capital, not income; when they are gone, they are gone forever. Even our water supply is a worry in many areas. More than 1,000 American communities have been forced to curtail water service.

At present rates of growth, America's population will double in less than 50 years. Think of the impact of this growth on your hometown. Imagine what it will mean to our schools to have twice as many pupils in the lifetime of our children—and four times as many in the lifetime of our grandchildren. Imagine what will happen to our libraries, museums, all our cultural and recreational institutions, as well as to our hospitals, welfare agencies, penal institutions and other public services. In innumerable communities, budgets are already strained or in deficit. Many communities are approaching financial crisis—and the outlook as population grows is for crisis doubled and redoubled.

Such is the pace of our growth that we will have to do in the next few decades what it took centuries to accomplish in the past. In New York State, for example, a new 60-year development plan estimates that in the next 20 years, public and private builders will construct more physical facilities—schools, factories, highways, homes—than existed in the entire State in 1940.

In metropolitan city and suburban village, population growth is already severely challenging our ability to maintain and expand the community institutions and public facilities that contribute so much to the quality of our way of life. Without reasonable population stabilization, the coming decades can only see a further erosion of their excellence.

Some may question whether the American population growth constitutes a population "crisis." I believe the word "crisis" is justified: Its dictionary meaning is "a time for decision." The consequences of population growth in America are far different in kind and magnitude from those in less-developed nations. But because the problems of others are greater, we should not ignore our own. The toll of population growth on the quality of life is a loss to us and to the life we will pass on to our children. Therefore, we should recognize that action to resolve our population problem is in our interest. The choice is no longer whether population stabilization is necessary, but only how and when it can be achieved.

THE STEPS WE CAN TAKE

The questions we, as responsible citizens, must ask ourselves are: What can we—you

and I—do about it? How may we as individuals act constructively? Let me suggest three practical opportunities for action that are open to us.

First, we should inform ourselves more fully about the population problem. We can try to see it in full perspective, in all its dimensions. The range of its implications is wide, far beyond a threat to material resources. We should know and appraise its effects on our community and its institutions, and on the cherished and vital intangibles of life.

Social progress in a democracy is best served by informed discussion. We should try to clarify our thinking about population stabilization. When our attitudes are better defined, we can better consider the views of others. Such dialogs in living rooms and meeting places will illuminate the wide areas of agreement that exist among people of different backgrounds and different faiths. On a subject as vital as this, there is no longer excuse to whisper.

As we inform ourselves, we should work so others may be informed. We should encourage our information media to present the population problem and its ramifications to the widest possible audience. The right to know is important to Americans.

No one can or should be forced to practice birth control, or to advocate it against his conscience, but neither should he be denied the right to know the facts and to decide for himself. I agree with those who maintain that hospitals and social service and welfare agencies should not withhold family-planning information until it is specifically requested. This discriminates against the less informed and indigent, because they are the most likely to need help and the least likely to know it is available.

Second, we should encourage and support greater governmental action on population matters.

It is surely only reasonable that government on every level—Federal, State and local—should make greater efforts to learn the facts and the full implications of population trends. This information should be a fundamental basis for long-range planning and freely available to the public.

Private organizations have a significant role in attempts to resolve the population problem. They contribute much in the way of research, specialized knowledge and trained personnel. Their work deserves our time and our resources. Yet the population problem, in America and elsewhere, is so ramified, so important and so immediate that only government can attack it on the scale required. But government cannot easily take initiative on questions so politically sensitive. Government moves most effectively when need has been demonstrated, when public opinion has begun to form. As citizens, we have the opportunity to summon our leaders to imaginative and immediate action, and to muster public opinion to support their efforts.

Often, in a democracy, we are prone to evade individual responsibility on such large questions. We rationalize inaction on grounds that the problem is too complex, and the end result beyond our ability to influence. But we should remember that we, the individual citizens of a free society, hold the final responsibility. It is we who are America; our government is the sum of ourselves. Its attitude is our expressed thought; its policy is our manifested will.

Third, in planning the size of our own families, we should weigh carefully the collective effect of our decisions upon the future well-being of our communities.

DECISIONS BY DEFAULT

Decisions on family size are always based on the self-interest of the family. In poorer lands, the factors of decision are more food, decent shelter, better health, better economic

and educational opportunities. But we in the United States and elsewhere, who already have these basic necessities in relative abundance, should also take into account life's higher objectives, the third dimension to which I have referred. In planning how many children we will have, we should consider not only ourselves and our immediate family, but also the impact of continued population growth upon our community and the society in which we live.

We too can be guilty of decisions by default. We are in default of adequate knowledge if we do not fully realize the many-faceted threat of overpopulation. True, most people in our sophisticated society know the rudimentary facts about how to control birth. But the facts of which none of us are well enough aware are the consequences of population growth on the quality of our life.

The concern for the total well-being of the community is a new consideration in family planning. The changed and changing circumstances of our day force it before us. Since the beginning of recorded time, man has had large numbers of children "lest the people perish." This was accepted as necessary for the survival of the family, the tribe, the race. In most cultures, fertility was a blessing, a true gift from the gods to be sought by prayer and sacrifice.

The population pressure of our day leads us to this new concept of "responsible parenthood"; parenthood responsible not only to the immediate family, but to the broader community. The phrase "responsible parenthood" is gaining circulation among religious leaders and others concerned with man's place in the social order. Father William J. Gibbons, S.J., of Fordham University, has said that the size of the family "should take into account the physical and mental health of the parents, their economic condition, and the society in which they live."

Judaism has always stressed the high duties of parenthood. Rabbi David H. Wilce includes the well-being of society among the determinants of family size: "The concept of the sanctity of life is enhanced and the holiness of marriage is given a new dimension when parenthood is freely elected, when children are born wanted, and when family size is determined by conditions of health and well-being for the individual family and for society." Protestant theologians also have frequently emphasized responsible parenthood and the claims of society in the consideration of the size of a family.

A NEW ETHIC FOR PARENTS

Margaret Mead, the anthropologist, says: "As parents, cherishing and enjoying our children, we can see the need for a new ethic of parenthood. We can no longer say that everyone should have a child, that families should have as many children as they can afford, that all couples have a right to have as many children as they wish, that parenthood excels all other virtues and is to be commended above all other ways of life. We cannot now, as a people, continue to extol a way of life which—however much we enjoy it in the present—will all too soon destroy what we have worked so long to achieve * * *." "Above all," she concludes, "we must recognize that the time to limit the size of our families is now, that the living must take precedence over the unborn now, if future generations are to be born into a livable world."

Thus we Americans should reexamine many of our attitudes toward population. It is no longer "somebody else's problem," a phenomenon that concerns only people in far-off countries or in pockets of poverty here at home. Nor should as-many-as-we-can-afford be the criterion of how many children we should have.

Our primary thoughts should be for the dignity of the individual and for the quality of life.

Approved For Release 2003/10/22 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000500170012-6

Our times give us a new imperative: that we realize that family planning is not only for the poor; it is for all whose lives are being made poorer by its lack.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Bill file SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY AND RE- FORM OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate received from the President his message on the succession to the Presidency and the Vice-Presidency and on the reform of the system of electing national leaders. On both of these subjects many Senators have been interested in depth for a considerable period. In both areas the sense of urgency prevails, even now, as rarely before.

In his message, President Johnson pointed out that the possibility exists—indeed, has been threatened in recent months—that the electors chosen by each State might not actually vote as the constituency voted and that, therefore, there could be an emergence of a consequence not dictated by the voters at large. I strongly concur in the President's desire to make certain that such a possibility is foreclosed.

For several sessions of Congress, I have been the sponsor of a constitutional amendment which would retain for all the States the present formula for counting votes on an electoral formula basis, thus preserving the balance of power between the large-population and small-population States, as intended by the Founding Fathers; but, at the same time, my amendment would eliminate the actual selection of electors and, therefore, absolutely foreclose the possibility in any way of electors not following the dictates of the voters in their States. It seems to me that with all the ramifications of this proposal that have been made and the various approaches that have been suggested, this is the simplest and most direct way to solve the problem that would be posed in such an eventuality.

In our modern day, the necessity to elect the actual persons to be named as electors is a rather excessive indulgence, particularly in times when the procedure is ordinarily routine or a ceremony, and nothing more, and when out of such a routine or mere ceremony could still arise the possibility of an overturning of constituent intent. It only adds to the necessity for clearing up this problem forthrightly and now.

I invite special attention to an amendment to the Constitution, which I have submitted at nearly every session of Congress since I became a Member of this body. It is a real pleasure that we note that the disposition at this time seems to be to move at once on this subject.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed following my re-

marks on this particular question the joint resolution I first introduced on this subject, and which still rests with the Committee on the Judiciary.

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

S. J. RES. 11

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States:

"ARTICLE —

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during a term of four years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as provided in this Constitution. No person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible for that of Vice President of the United States.

"Sec. 2. Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress. There shall be held in each State an election to determine what candidates for the offices of President and Vice President shall receive the electoral votes of that State. The voters in such election shall vote for the candidate of a political party for President and for the candidate of the same political party for Vice President. The candidate for President receiving the greatest number of popular votes in any State shall receive all of the electoral votes of that State for President, except that if the candidates of more than one political party receive an equal number of popular votes in any State and such number is greater than the number received by any other candidate, the electoral votes of the State shall be divided equally among the candidates of such parties. The candidate for Vice President of a party whose candidate for President receives electoral votes of a State for President shall receive the same number of electoral votes of such State for Vice President. If, in any State, the candidate of any political party for President receives popular votes as the candidate of more than one political party for President and different persons are the candidates of any of such parties for Vice President, the electoral votes of such State for Vice President shall be given to the candidate for Vice President of the political party as the candidate of which the candidate receiving the electoral votes of such State for President received the greatest number of popular votes. The voters in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. The places and manner of holding such election shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof, but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations. The Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States, and, unless otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of President and Vice President is to begin.

"Sec. 3. Within forty-five days after the election, the chief executive of each State shall make distinct lists showing the number of votes cast in such State for each of the candidates for the offices of President and Vice President, the names of the candidates receiving the electoral votes of such State, and the number of such electoral votes,

which lists shall be signed, certified, and transmitted under the seal of such State to the seat of the Government of the United States directed to the President of the Senate. On the 6th day of January following the election, unless the Congress by law appoints a different day not earlier than the 4th day of January and not later than the 10th day of January, the President of the Senate shall in the presence of the House of Representatives open all the certificates and the result of the election shall then be ascertained. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be the President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of the electoral votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those receiving electoral votes for President, the House of Representatives shall choose immediately, by ballot, the President. In choosing the President the votes shall be taken by States, the representation from each State having one vote. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of a member or members from two-thirds of the States and a majority of all the States shall be necessary to a choice. The person receiving the greatest number of electoral votes for Vice President shall be the Vice President, if such number is a majority of the whole number of the electoral votes; and if no person has such a majority, then from the persons having the two highest numbers on the list of those receiving electoral votes for Vice President, the Senate shall choose the Vice President. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of two-thirds of the whole number of Senators, and a majority of the whole number shall be necessary to a choice. The Congress may by law provide for the case of the death of any person who, except for his death, would have been entitled to receive a majority of the electoral votes for President or Vice President.

"Sec. 4. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution, and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"Sec. 5. This article shall apply to the election of Presidents and Vice Presidents whose regular terms begin more than two years after its ratification.

"Sec. 6. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress."

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to comment in a general way on the other section of the President's concern in his message; namely, that of the succession to the Presidency. I suppose that as one who at one time, at least, trod the paths of the classrooms within the walls of Ivy, I could confess to having a change of mind on some of my views of government, of updating the machinery of democracy, and that sort of thing. Whereas I subscribed many years ago to the existing presidential succession system, I feel now, in hindsight and upon further reflection and study, that we were closer to a more effective, a more balanced, and a more meaningful formula 10 or 15 years ago when, under the old succession act, the members of the Cabinet, in the order of the creation of their departments, would, in fact, succeed to the Presidency.

It seems to me that in the interest of the times in which we are trying to provide the leadership and the momentum in a government such as ours, it must now be obvious that the sense of the President's intent, the direction of the

President's policies, and the apprisement of what has been going on attendant to all those facets of the Government more logically repose within the members of the Cabinet, close to the President, than they would necessarily in the particular Members of Congress.

Likewise, the system under which we operate at present, which provides that in the event of an extreme crisis, one that would remove both the President and the Vice President, the Speaker of the House would accede to the White House, in effect serves the purpose of contradicting another one of our constitutional intents, that intent being the separation of the legislative and executive branches of the Government.

So, adding both these considerations together, I would urge the favorable consideration of a return to the old Presidential Succession Act, which, following the Vice President, would place the Secretary of State in line, then the Secretary of the Treasury, and so on down through the Cabinet posts. I believe that this system would more truly reflect the intent of the voters, as well as the policy direction most recently to pass the test of a national referendum, namely, the last presidential election. And thus believes the new President of the United States, Lyndon Johnson, with his sense of urgency and his insistence upon moving likewise in that direction.

Finally, in terms of a vacated Vice-Presidency, I should like to join my voice with those who would accord to the Vice President, upon his acceding to the Presidency, or in the event of anything happening to the Vice President while the President was still in command, the privilege of letting the President personally select the Vice President for the remainder of that term, subject to the approval of this body of Congress, as is the case in other types of Presidential appointments. It seems to me that this is most consistent with the intent of Executive responsibility and the testing of that responsibility directly, in that he must then go to the voters for his ultimate sanction if there is any question about his selection.

These, then, would be direct moves in upgrading and modernizing the machinery of democracy and keeping us apace with the tempo of change in current times.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, several Senators have remarked today, during the consideration of the pending measure, that they intend to offer amendments to the bill on Monday and request yea-and-nay votes. They have postponed their requests for the immediate consideration of their amendments and the votes thereon in order to permit an affirmative presentation of the entire bill today. However, they have presented this afternoon, in great part,

the merits of their individual amendments.

In view of this fact and the prospect of yea-and-nay votes on several of the amendments prior to the vote on the passage of the bill at 3 o'clock on Monday next, I propose the following unanimous consent request, with the full concurrence of the distinguished minority leader:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that effective at 11 a.m. on Monday, February 1, 1965, debate on any amendment to the pending bill shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of the amendment and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator in charge of the bill; provided, further, that on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], amendment No. 11, the time allotted shall be 40 minutes, 30 minutes to be allocated to the mover of the amendment [Mr. HRUSKA] and 10 minutes to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator in charge of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent request, reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective on Monday, February 1, 1965, beginning at 11 o'clock and during the further consideration of the bill (S. 3) to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region, debate on any amendment (except in amendment by Senator HRUSKA, numbered 11, which shall be debated for 40 minutes with 30 minutes under control of Senator HRUSKA and 10 under control of Senator RANDOLPH), motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 20 minutes, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and Senator RANDOLPH: *Provided*, That in the event Senator RANDOLPH is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That the Senate vote on final passage of the bill at 3 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 1965.

ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 10 O'CLOCK MONDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business this afternoon, it stand in recess until 10 o'clock on Monday morning next.

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

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill S. 3, to provide public works and economic development programs and the planning and coordination needed to assist in the development of the Appalachian region.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the timing of these amendments will still make it possible to have

a final vote on the bill at 3 o'clock, as originally proposed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is correct. This is an accommodation within the unanimous-consent agreement passed on by the Senate on yesterday. For the information of the Senate, it is not anticipated that there will be a morning hour on next Monday.

PROPOSED FEDERAL STIMULATION OF BEEF PRODUCTION IN THE APPALACHIAN REGION SHOULD BE STOPPED

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, as all Senators will recall, the cattle industry of this country was forced to struggle through most of last year's session of Congress to get a bare minimum of relief from the depressing weight of imported beef on our price structure. When the matter could finally be brought to a vote in the Senate on its merits, the Senate by a vote of 72 to 15 passed legislation to place limits on this flood of imported beef.

Now the cattle industry in this country seems to be under attack from another corner. By the terms of the Appalachia bill, it is proposed to grant Federal subsidies up to 80 percent for purposes described as land stabilization, conservation and erosion control. Although there is no mention of pasturage or of cattle in the bill, the provision is virtually the same as section 203 of the 1964 bill.

It will be recalled that section 203 of last year's bill was deleted by the Senate. Its opening sentence read:

In order to promote fuller utilization of one of the region's important natural resources, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants to assist in the "improvement and development of pastureland for livestock in the region."

The quoted portion of this language does not appear in the 1965 version of the bill. But in the testimony given at hearings, it was stated that section 203 will provide to eligible farmers such improvement as will make it economically feasible for livestock production." Within a very few years this would mean the improvement of 3.3 million acres, a witness testified.

The section in last year's bill, which was deleted, was the subject of testimony of Secretary Freeman, which in part reads as follows:

The principal opportunity for enhanced income from agriculture in Appalachia lies in a further expansion of livestock production. We calculate that by 1972, with the full development of Appalachia's pasture resources, farmers in the region could raise their total annual income to a level about \$230 million above its present level.

If such testimony were true last year, it is obviously still applicable this year; \$230 million worth of additional cattle marketings is equivalent to somewhat more than 1 billion pounds of livestock.

Thus the very section in last year's bill, which was stricken by this body of the Congress, has found its way back into the bill with continued disastrous impact on the U.S. cattle industry as last year, if it is retained.

My amendment No. 11 would delete the entire section 203 as was done last year. The cosponsors of the amendment support the same action as taken last year, too.

Our opposition to this proposal is not due to any lack of sympathy for the problems of the small farmers of the Appalachia region. We understand those problems and would help with them if we could. But we cannot afford to grant discriminatory assistance to the cattle industry of one part of the country at the expense of our own producers. We cannot be expected to acquiesce in a proposal directed squarely against the livelihood of our own people.

Mr. President, surely Senators have not forgotten the uphill struggle of American cattlemen during these past 2 years, to keep their heads above water, to maintain the solvency and the productivity of the American cattle industry. American cattlemen suffered severely from the sharp price declines of 1963 and 1964. Initially, prices of fed cattle dropped as much as 30 percent on the major livestock markets. Choice slaughter steers in Chicago which were over \$30 a hundred in the latter part of 1952, averaged between \$21 and \$22 a hundred during much of last year. Although a part of this price drop has been recovered, it is only a part and prices are still distressingly low.

The plans announced for the Appalachia region were in terms of feeder cattle rather than fat cattle. The picture in this respect is even more depressing. Feeder cattle are still far below the prices even of last year. In Omaha during the week ended January 23, according to the Department of Agriculture, choice feeder steers averaged only \$21.50 per hundred, compared with \$24.25 per hundred at the same time last year.

It would be my hope that whatever action the Senate takes, it will not inflict another blow on the American cattle industry. Last year, the Secretary of Agriculture went up and down the land proclaiming that the problems of the cattle industry were due primarily to our own overproduction. It is inconsistent, in fact it is ridiculous for him to recommend and for us to take action to stimulate further beef production through the use of special Federal subsidies on a basis which discriminates in favor of one section of the country and against all other sections.

Amendment No. 11 should be approved so that section 203 will be deleted.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the State of Ohio ranks 35th in area among the States of the Union, 5th in population, and second to none of the 50 States in scenic beauty.

In fact, Ohio has sometimes in the past been called the United States in miniature for the reason that in reality my State represents a complete cross section of all American life, with the exception, of course, of the high mountains such as those in the State

of our majority leader, the senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and in the other Western States, and also with the exception of the arid territory of the Southwest.

With those two exceptions, Ohio has almost every type of terrain. There are great sweeps of rolling farmland, vast forests, beautiful valleys interlaced with rivers and lakes, and the flat land of the Corn Belt. One-fifth of the population in my State is engaged in agricultural activities. We are proud of the family farmers of Ohio.

However, I know, as does everyone who has flown over my State, or who has traveled through the State of Ohio on our fine thoroughfares, that the great natural beauty of a large part of Ohio has been desecrated by strip mining of the coalfields. This is also true, of course, in some other States.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, as Governor of our State and as a Senator, has been a leader in the fight to compel the mineowners and the coal operators in the State of Ohio to do something toward the restoration of the beauty of nature which has been desecrated by them.

In the operation of the strip mines in Ohio, the coal operators, to pursue their private purposes and seek profit, have removed the topsoil. They have removed the beautiful trees, the grass, the shrubs. In their place, they have left shale and rock, on which nothing will grow. Barren, unsightly earth, and acid-poisoned holes are what remain after the mineowners and the operators of the strip mines in the State have done their job.

As a member of the Committee on Public Works, I attended hearings and listened to the testimony of witnesses. I was present and my vote was cast, along with the votes of others, to bring this administration measure to the floor of the Senate. I intend, of course, to support this fine legislative proposal. Nevertheless, it is the intention of the junior Senator from Ohio to support the amendment offered by his colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio.

We must, by our action, and by our vote in the Senate, manifest that it is neither the intention nor the policy of Congress to be idle and acquiesce in the desecration of beautiful landscapes and the poisoning of the soil in the State of Ohio and in other States, and then provide that those guilty of this desecration would be put to no expense whatever in the restoring of the land to the condition in which they found it. It would be unthinkable to place that burden entirely on the taxpayers of our country.

My colleague, the senior Senator from Ohio, as the Governor of Ohio, urged the legislature of our State time and time again to right this wrong that has been committed by the strip mine owners and operators in Ohio.

In the Senate he has urged the appointment of a commission to study strip coal mine operations. He has taken exactly the position he took as Governor of our State when he urged the legislature to crack down on those who desecrated the land and fertile soil and

ravished the beauties of nature for the sake of profit.

We should stop, look, and listen before we ask that Federal funds be expended to rehabilitate land ravished by strip mine operators in Ohio and other States. It is a ridiculous paradox to permit this.

So it is that, while I want this administration proposal to be enacted into law, for the sake of future generations of Americans it is high time that the Federal Government began to have a real interest in a situation which permits the destruction of so much of our Nation's land and so much of the beauty that the Almighty has given to us in the United States.

I feel, as does my colleague from Ohio, and as I am certain many, if not the majority of Senators feel, that the State legislatures owe a duty to provide remedial legislation and that we in the Congress also owe that duty.

I am glad to follow the leadership of my colleague from Ohio and intend to support his amendment. I hope it will be adopted.

I yield the floor.

(Mr. MONTROYA assumed the chair as Presiding Officer.)

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, I rise in support of the proposed Appalachia Regional Development Act, which I am cosponsoring. Tennessee is one of the 11 States included in Appalachia, having 49 out of its 95 counties located within the region. Forty-five percent of the State's inhabitants live, work, and raise their families there. However, unless more opportunities are provided for the region's young people, a good number of these people will not raise their families in the land of their fathers. Nor will their talents and energies contribute to the area. In the decade between 1950 and 1960, for example, 63 percent of Tennessee's outmigration came from the 45 percent of the people in Tennessee Appalachia. This, of course, represents, in large part, the cream of our young people, who have concluded that life's struggle was difficult enough without having to face the extra burden of inadequate opportunity.

In Appalachia as a whole, one in three families have an annual income of less than \$3,000 as compared with one and five families in the balance of the country. In Tennessee Appalachia, one in every 2½ families have an income of less than what President Johnson considers to be the minimal family income above poverty. Per capita income in Appalachia as a whole is \$1,405, while in the Tennessee portion it only amounts to \$1,257. We have approximately 35,000 people on the unemployed rolls in this area of our State, resulting primarily from an employment decline of 57 percent in mining during the decade of the fifties.

Of course, this situation is made worse by the fact that 16 percent of the adult population in the Tennessee Appalachia has less than 5 years of education, as compared with 11.6 percent in the entire region and 8 percent in the United States. And, as a result of these conditions, these Tennessee families make up a sizable portion of the people in Appalachia receiving \$41 million per month in Federal welfare payments. This amounts to al-