

UNITED STATES



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 114—PART 21

SEPTEMBER 17, 1968, TO SEPTEMBER 25, 1968

(PAGES 27095 TO 28250)

ENCLOSURES

1. Horizons, July 1968: Glass Bottle Blowers Association of the U.S. and Canada, "Latin American Unions Getting Boost toward Many Union Benefits", p. 24.
2. Steel Labor, July 1968: United Steel Workers of America, "Helping Build Latin America's Alliance", p. 12.
3. Unity, April 1968: Postal, Telegraph and Telephone International (PTTI), "PTTI Regional Directors Meet", p. 3.
4. International, March 1968: Seafarers International Union, "New Horizons for Latin America", p. 2.
5. CIE, February 1968: Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, "Culinary Unionist Groomed for Key Part in Labor Aid, Alliance for Progress", p. 9.
6. Pulp & Paper Worker, October 1967: International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, "Labor's Role in Latin America", p. 7.
7. Retail Clerks Advocate, October 1967: Retail Clerks International Union, "The AIFLD—A Means of Sharing Our Good Fortune", p. 15.
8. Retail Clerks Advocate, July 1967: "AIFLD Celebrates 5th Anniversary, 16th Commencement", p. 8.
9. The Electrical Workers Journal, September 1967: International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, "The AIFLD Record", p. 20.
10. The Gem, September 1967: International Jewelry Workers' Union, "Worker-to-Worker Help Through AIFLD", p. 3.
11. UA Journal, August 1967: United Association of Journeymen and Apprentices of the Plumbing and Pipe Fitting Industry of the U.S. and Canada, "President Meany Speaks about AIFLD", p. 4.
12. ABC News, May 1967: American Bakery and Confectionery Workers' International Union, "The American Institute for Free Labor Development Celebrates Five Years of Worker to Worker Alliance for Progress", p. 5.
13. CWA News, November 1966: Communications Workers of America, "CWA is Front and Center in Labor's New Weapon for Democracy", p. 6.

Mr. MORSE. I replied to Mr. Beirne under date of August 23, 1968, as follows:

DEAR JOE: Enclosed is a copy of a letter I have written to George Meany, concerning the Committee Print of the Senate Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs, entitled, "Survey of the Alliance for Progress Labor Policies and Programs."

I would like to insert your August 13 letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and then, I propose scheduling a public hearing to be held by the Subcommittee on American Republics Affairs with regard to this matter.

Please let me know if this procedure meets with your approval.

With kind regards,

Sincerely,

WAYNE MORSE.

Mr. President, I am putting all of this material and correspondence in the RECORD so that it will be available, may I say, for public disclosure.

I also wish to say that the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs will order the hearing that I referred to some time after the middle of November. It is expected that Congress will reconvene, probably on November 9 or thereabouts, and I have notified the members of the committee and the staff of the committee that preparation should be made for holding the hearings referred to in my correspondence after Congress reconvenes following November 9.

Mr. President, the committee staff has carried out its instructions to conduct the study that the committee authorized. We have over the years followed this com-

mittee procedure, as other committees of the Senate have followed it, time and time again. No one will welcome more than the members of the committee the opportunity to have those who disagree with the staff report prepared by the staff of the committee come before us and testify, and make their case. I also wish to assure the critics and the members of the staff that they can count upon the members of the subcommittee to give an objective analysis to the record that is finally made in connection with this controversy that has arisen.

I happen to know, Mr. President, something about the operation of the labor unions in Latin America. I have participated in observation of their programs for many years. I have a very high regard for the contribution that the AFL-CIO has made, not only toward helping develop a free trade union movement in many parts of Latin America, but for the assistance that they have been to our embassies in many of the countries.

Mr. President, the report that the staff made in no way lessens my regard for the work of the AFL-CIO in Latin America. I think, however, that it is only fair to those in the labor movement who are concerned about this matter to say, as chairman of the subcommittee, that the burden of proof is upon the staff to substantiate the findings set forth in the report, and the hearings will be conducted upon that basis.

THE RECORD ON SOCIAL SECURITY LEGISLATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in Los Angeles yesterday, Vice President HUMPHREY made a statement, as follows:

With a single exception—1954—every expansion in the coverage of Social Security, every increase in benefits, has been proposed by the Democrats and opposed by the Republicans.

Mr. President, this is a gross misrepresentation of the record of the two parties on social security. For one thing, I point to the rollcall vote on November 21, 1967, when my amendment to provide automatic cost-of-living increases to social security recipients was defeated 48 to 24. Seventy-five percent of the Republicans voting were in favor; and 88 percent of the Democrats voting were opposed.

I call attention to the rollcall vote on September 3, 1964, in which an amendment by Republican Senator PROUTY, of Vermont, to increase minimum levels of social security from \$40 per month to \$70 per month was defeated 64 to 23. Seventy-five percent of the Republicans voting were in favor; and 100 percent of the Democrats voting, including then Senator HUMPHREY, were opposed.

On passage of the Social Security Amendments Act of 1967, which included a large increase in social security payments effective in February 1968, 87 percent of the Republicans voted "aye."

On June 26, 1961, the Senate adopted an amendment by Republican Senator NORRIS COTTON, of New Hampshire, to permit increased earnings by social security recipients without penalty. And

on November 21, 1967, the Senate turned down by a vote of 26 to 47 my own amendments to permit a further increase in earnings without penalty, with 92 percent of the Republicans voting in favor and 93 percent of the Democrats voting "no."

The only conclusion one can reach is that the Vice President's researchers "wobbled" on this one.

SOIL-CONSERVATION COST-BENEFIT RATIOS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, we often hear the "cost-benefit ratio" used, usually in connection with a defense project. I believe it should also be pointed out that soil conservation activities have one of the best cost-benefit ratios in Government, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a column on this subject that I have sent to our weekly newspapers in Minnesota.

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

SENATOR WALTER F. MONDALE REPORTS TO MINNESOTA: BUDGET CUTS THREATEN CONSERVATION

Both business and government use a new accounting device, "the cost-benefit ratio" when deciding on how to invest time and money. Simply stated, the cost-benefit ratio measures how much benefit a given amount of money will produce when invested in various ways:

By this measure, soil conservation has one of the best cost-benefit ratios around. To cite just one figure, the cost of dredging silt out of lakes and river channels costs 20 times more than the cost of keeping soil on the land—in other words, a 20-1 favorable cost-benefit ratio. And this ratio doesn't even begin to measure the added value in better crops that a farmer receives with good soil over poor.

This is why threatened budget cuts in the Soil Conservation Service are so disturbing. As it presently stands, SCS personnel would be cut between 600 and 1200 positions nationally, with Minnesota taking a cut of 15-40 positions; some 150 local district offices would be cut; 5 to 10 in our state. Soil conservation projects would be seriously curtailed.

This is false economy, and many more people than just farmers will suffer. Sediment pollution is not only the nation's highest-volume pollutant, it is one of the most expensive. It carries other pollutants, such as agricultural chemicals that speed the growth of algae, into our streams and lakes.

We know from long experience that conservation measures such as contour strip cropping, terracing and cover crops do work. They reduce erosion and add years of life to our lakes. They keep fertilizer and pesticide on the land, where it's supposed to be, and out of the streams and lakes.

Since the thirties the SCS has helped Americans contour 43 million acres of crop and pasture land; built millions of small dams and a million and a half acres of grassed waterways.

This conservation work should be increased, not cut back. Even today silt pollution costs the Nation some \$346 million a year, with the cost of silt in reservoirs alone running at \$100 million a year. It makes good sense to spend a fraction of this amount to keep our soil on the land.

HANDS OFF WEST GERMANY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of