Bill Russell, of the Boston Celtics, appeared at his old campus in San Francisco and gave a very beautiful and meaningful talk concerning race relationships in this country. He concluded: It is absolutely vital that we all walk down the street together.

On the night of March 21, 1969, and on all the days of Elgin Baylor's life, on or off the court, literally thousands of Americans wereona "tourney down the street" with him and his family, and trying to build, with him, a better country in which to live—a country that is so very fortunate to have Elgin Baylor.

Mr. President, there are times these days when it seems that the small minority of misfits, professional protesters, and irresponsible demonstrators among us are threatening not only our heritage but also our future. At such times, we can look to men like Elgin Baylor and the example he has set, and in their deeds we can find reassurance and inspiration. It is a privilege for me to join, in commending this exemplary American and in wishing him many more years of health, happiness, and success.

TRIBUTE TO THE AMERICAN LEGION ON THEIR 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. YARBROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to join my many colleagues in the Senate and House who are paying tribute this week to the American Legion on its 50th anniversary. For 50 years, the American Legion has honored and served veterans and their dependents, and in expressing hope that Legionnaires will continue to find satisfaction and success in their work with the sick and disabled veterans and their dependents, and in their service to the community, State, and Nation.

It has been my honor to be a member of the American Legion since my return from overseas service in the Army in June of 1946. I salute all the Legionnaires.

TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT: INCOME AND POVERTY

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it is almost 3 months since I introduced the Full Opportunity Act of 1966—S. 5. The bill would establish a Council on Social Advisers to prepare an annual social report and a joint congressional committee to review the report and the President's recommendations.

I wish to speak today about the fourth chapter of TOWARD A SOCIAL REPORT: "Income and Poverty." As Senators know, this document was prepared by HEW as a preliminary working model for a social report.

We are all aware that we are fortunate to live in the most prosperous country of the world, that in the midst of the unprecedented plenty, there are pockets of poverty. For the many people who live in these pockets of poverty the goal of S. 5, full opportunity for every American, has not been reached.

While there are fewer people today than there were 20 years ago who are earning incomes below the poverty line, the distribution of income in our country over the same period of time has not been altered. As the report notes:

In 1947 the median money income of non-white males was a little over half that of white males.

While both groups' money income in 1966 was two-thirds larger, the income "level for nonwhite men was still only a little over half that of white men." The report goes on to indicate that—

Based on extrapolations from current trends, it is not likely to disappear in the near future even for those groups most helped by the War on Poverty.

This, of course, is no excuse for us to throw up our hands in despair and escalate our efforts. If there is a war which we as a nation must wage, it is the war against poverty. This is an effort which all of us should be committed to. If this effort is to be successful, it must be intelligently planned for.

"Toward a Social Report"—even though it is only a preliminary working model—it is invaluable because in the process of analyzing our present programs and diagnosing their flaws it has yielded vital information upon which to formulate future programs. Programs, I might add, which are to be directed toward consciously picked and carefully formulated goals.

Knowledge of this type is essential if we are to avoid creating future programs like those of the past which have helped children which has, the report indicates, "contributed to dependence and stultified initiative and self-help." This type of information generated by a social report will allow us intelligently to reform our "system of income maintenance" so that we may devise those programs which may deserve to be included but also provide adequate aid for them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the fourth chapter of "Toward a Social Report" entitled "Income and Poverty," be printed in the Record.

These being no objection, chapter IV was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CHAPTER IV. INCOME AND POVERTY Are we better off?

Income is a rough but convenient measure of the goods and services—food, clothing, entertainment, medical care, and so forth—available to the people of a nation. This chapter first discusses the general level of income in the United States: What is happening to total and average income for the country as a whole? Next, it describes the distribution of that income: Are incomes becoming more or less equally distributed and how? Finally, it discusses the Negroes facing relative to whites.

Third, it must be remembered that most people have incomes which are lower than what is generally considered a minimum standard of decency. Finally, this chapter discusses, at somewhat greater length than other chapters, the policy implications of present trends: What are we doing to eliminate poverty and what could we do?

Obviously, income is not the only measure of the well-being of individuals, families, or nations. If two people have the same income but one is sick and one is healthy, the healthy person is clearly better off. Similarly, the well-being of a nation is measured, not just by its level of income, but also by its health, its education, and many other aspects of the quality of life which cannot be discussed in other chapters of this report.

Moreover, people, individually and collectively, often trade income for leisure. As productivity has increased in the United States and other advanced countries, the workweek has fallen. We have chosen to give up additional income for increased leisure.

Money income, of course, does not buy happiness, and it is by no means obvious that satisfaction rises along with income. Perhaps the very poor in contemporary America feel no greater satisfaction than the income- come; perhaps not. It may be those who are most dissatisfied have incomes just below the average and see all about them evidence of a general level of comfort which they aspire to but cannot reach. Since we cannot measure satisfaction and dissatisfaction, however, we must turn to the more easily measurable statistics of money income.

Affluent America

The most obvious fact about American income is that it is higher in the world and rising rapidly. In terms of gross national product per capita—or any other measure of the average availability of goods and services—the United States far outranks its nearest competitors, Canada and the countries of northern Europe. Average incomes in the
United States are several orders of magnitude larger than those in the underdeveloped world.

Aggregate personal income (the amounts paid to individuals in wages, grants, interest, dividends, and other forms) increased from $14 billion at the turn of the century to about $658 billion in 1966 or more than 40-fold. After adjusting for price level increases and population increases, it is estimated that personal income per capita in constant dollars was four times greater in 1966 than at the turn of the century. In other words, those of us living today have four times much in the way of goods and services as did those living in 1900.

The signs of affluence are everywhere. America now has more than 60 million automobiles; 95 percent of American households own at least one television set, 25 percent own at least two; and over 60 percent of American families own their own homes.

The distribution of income

Although overall income levels are high and rising, the distribution of income in the United States has remained practically unchanged in the last 20 years. As table 1 shows, the percentage of the 1960's brought a sharp drop in the share of the top 5 percent of all families and unrelated individuals and a rise in the share of the lowest 20 percent. World War II brought an even more marked shift in the way of goods and services as did those living in 1900.

One analysis, which takes account of the effects of family background, education, mental ability, number of siblings, and occupational occupation, concludes that perhaps one-third of the difference in average income (for 1961) between Negros and whites "arises because Negro and white men in the same line of work with the same education and training, with equal ability, from families of the same size and the same socioeconomic level simply do not draw the same wages and salaries."

Measured by income levels, nonwhites have made substantial progress in absolute terms and, to a lesser degree, in comparison to whites. However, the degree of inequality of income among nonwhites has changed very little.

Table 1 shows how total nonwhite income was shared by nonwhites. As in the overall distribution of income in the U.S., there has been little change in the share of the lowest 20 percent of nonwhite households. In 1947, the lowest 20 percent received 4.8 percent of total money income. In 1966, their share stood at 4.7 percent. There does, however, seem to be a rising trend in the share of this group beginning with 1960.
Poverty

Although the distribution of income has remained virtually unchanged, rising income levels have meant that fewer and fewer people have fallen below the "poverty line." In 1963, the Council of Economic Advisers established a tentative level of "poverty income" of $1,500 or less per year for individuals and $3,000 or less per year for families of two or more. By that standard, there were 33 million poor Americans in 1963. The standard was a useful first approximation; but, it is not, of itself, satisfactory.

To gain a greater understanding of the nature and composition of our poor population, the Social Security Administration developed new criteria built around minimum food requirements. The amounts required to purchase necessary food are based on the Department of Agriculture's "economy food plan." This plan is described as "for temporary or emergency use when funds are low." The base established by the food budget is raised by a factor of approximately three to allow for the minimum amounts necessary, at prevailing prices, for housing, clothing, medical care, etc. Adjustments are also made to reflect differences in family size, age, and farm or non-farm residence. In 1966, the poverty level for a nonfarm, male-headed family of four was $3,335. Using this standard, the poor numbered some 40 million persons in 1960. By 1967, that number had dropped to 26 million (the most recent year for which poverty statistics are available).

The decline in poverty came during a unique period of sustained economic expansion and in the midst of increased governmental efforts to alleviate the poverty problem. Not surprisingly, the benefits of economic growth and the War on Poverty have fallen unevenly on the poor population. As Table 4 shows, the sharpest declines have been in those families headed by an able-bodied working man. From 1961 to 1968, the number of nonaged, male-headed poor families declined by more than 35 percent. In contrast, the number of aged poor households declined by about 6 percent, and among the unemployed and families headed by a female, the decline was less than 5 percent.

The pattern of present programs

The incidence of poverty and the distribution of income are overwhelmingly determined by the operation of the Nation's economic system. In large part, this means that unless one has individualized means test, just about all income protection against loss of earnings is due to a severing or weakening of the tie to the labor force due to age, disability, or death, and only in a few instances has the approach been supplemented by a more or less parallel system of public assistance for those individuals not covered by the insurance system. Such protection, though available, is inadequate.

On the other hand, solutions to the problem of low income for those who have been pushed below the poverty level and coverage of the minimum wage and, more recently, with a series of human investment programs designed to help individuals improve their chances in the labor force. The Federal Government has not directly intervened in the market place to supplement the earnings of those who would otherwise still have lower incomes.

Although this section is confined to a discussion of those programs which provide a direct transfer of money income from one group to another or increase the incomes of some groups relative to others through the wage system, it is important to realize that almost every Government program can and does have an effect on the distribution of real income and wealth (physical and human), sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly. Government programs to finance the cost of health services, for example, involve large amounts of money, and the effectiveness of our public assistance programs is to a large and, in part, the result of the economic system. In large part, this means that unless one has individualized means test, just about all income protection against loss of earnings is due to a severing or weakening of the tie to the labor force due to age, disability, or death, and only in a few instances has the approach been supplemented by a more or less parallel system of public assistance for those individuals not covered by the insurance system. Such protection, though available, is inadequate.

On the other hand, solutions to the problem of low income for those who have been pushed below the poverty level and coverage of the minimum wage and, more recently, with a series of human investment programs designed to help individuals improve their chances in the labor force. The Federal Government has not directly intervened in the market place to supplement the earnings of those who would otherwise still have lower incomes.

Although this section is confined to a discussion of those programs which provide a direct transfer of money income from one group to another or increase the incomes of some groups relative to others through the wage system, it is important to realize that almost every Government program can and does have an effect on the distribution of real income and wealth (physical and human), sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly. Government programs to finance the cost of health services, for example, involve large amounts of money, and the effectiveness of our public assistance programs is to a large and, in part, the result of the economic system. In large part, this means that unless one has individualized means test, just about all income protection against loss of earnings is due to a severing or weakening of the tie to the labor force due to age, disability, or death, and only in a few instances has the approach been supplemented by a more or less parallel system of public assistance for those individuals not covered by the insurance system. Such protection, though available, is inadequate.

On the other hand, solutions to the problem of low income for those who have been pushed below the poverty level and coverage of the minimum wage and, more recently, with a series of human investment programs designed to help individuals improve their chances in the labor force. The Federal Government has not directly intervened in the market place to supplement the earnings of those who would otherwise still have lower incomes.

Although this section is confined to a discussion of those programs which provide a direct transfer of money income from one group to another or increase the incomes of some groups relative to others through the wage system, it is important to realize that almost every Government program can and does have an effect on the distribution of real income and wealth (physical and human), sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly. Government programs to finance the cost of health services, for example, involve large amounts of money, and the effectiveness of our public assistance programs is to a large and, in part, the result of the economic system. In large part, this means that unless one has individualized means test, just about all income protection against loss of earnings is due to a severing or weakening of the tie to the labor force due to age, disability, or death, and only in a few instances has the approach been supplemented by a more or less parallel system of public assistance for those individuals not covered by the insurance system. Such protection, though available, is inadequate.

On the other hand, solutions to the problem of low income for those who have been pushed below the poverty level and coverage of the minimum wage and, more recently, with a series of human investment programs designed to help individuals improve their chances in the labor force. The Federal Government has not directly intervened in the market place to supplement the earnings of those who would otherwise still have lower incomes.
Children are almost $350, compared to $115 in Ohio and $35 in Mississippi. Moreover, the determinations of eligibility, which have been made by procedures which detract from dignity and which stigmatize the recipient as being on relief or the beneficiary of a welfare handout, have been modified to increase the possibility of work force participation of married women.

Both of these facts must form the backdrop for understanding the recent attacks on public assistance. Not only have the payment levels been so low that the perpetuation of poverty from one generation to another seems inevitable, but paradoxically, the programs have also failed to the function of skill levels. The skill levels with which one enters the labor force are largely a product of the amount of education and the early life to get education, training, and to grow up healthy. Yet, the opportunity structure is not uniformly open. This has meant that the risk of poverty is much greater for some than others, and that for these the poverty of one generation is more likely to be perpetuated in the next. Children of the poor may be poor children, but face a higher probability that they will be poor adults and that, themselves, will raise poor children. This has meant that the assurance of a decent standard of living in early childhood may cause permanent and irreparable mental retardation. Children in poor families often tend to drop out of school to contribute to the family income, and the assistance they receive supports them to drop out. In addition they may spend too much money on day care and related services to enhance the opportunity structure, and at the same time has stultified Individual Initiative and self-help because of the additional income. The wages for those wages or elsewhere meant an equal reduction in assistance payments, in effect a 100 percent tax rate on earnings.

Recent enacted changes in public assistance should improve the program on the latter point. After July 1, 1969, recipients of AFDC will be permitted to exempt the first $30 of any increase in earnings above that in determining assistance levels. In addition, the 1967 Amendments established a Work Incentive Program of training and education for recipients, for day care and related services to enhance the employability of AFDC recipients.

Minimum Wage and Training Programs: Minimum wage legislation, as has been pointed out, is one of the few feasible solutions for the problem of the working poor. It has been criticized by its supporters for establishing a minimum wage level which is too low and for setting it at $1.00 an hour. It has also been attacked by its critics on the grounds that it results in significant unemployment of marginal workers and that this loss outweighs the gains. Some of these arguments are not very compelling. Hard data on the quantitative effects are lacking.

Advocates and skeptics also abound with reasons for and against training programs, and in some sense over the same issues: coverage and effectiveness.

Although no analyses are available which resolve these issues, it seems clear that if there is no concrete evidence of increased in the minimum wage would be an inefficient and not totally effective way of redistributing income advantage.

It is important to distinguish between large and small families. Adequate levels for small families would be inadequate for large ones. Many households have inadequate incomes, but not all. If the family is without children, the problem does not concern. Many of the poor work intermittently. A high minimum wage would not assure them adequate annual incomes. Many households have inadequate incomes, but not all. If the family is without children, the problem does not concern.

The poor in households headed by a male who works and those headed by a female who works all year would receive much more. A man with a wife and two children who works full time would receive no supplementation whereas a woman with three children who works full time and earns the same amount could receive the same amount. This is the extent that improvements in public assistance program would have to be made. One proposal which has been put forward would be to modify the AFDC program. Such a program would over the number of the poor.

Within categories, much of the wide variation in payment levels in present programs would be eliminated. The programs would be more adequate in terms of level of support—by 1974, it would close about 60 percent of the total poverty gap.

The programs would provide substantial financial relief for the States by removing the shared cost of the Federal/State public assistance program. By 1974, the States would realize a saving of about $4 billion in welfare costs which could be allocated to other areas of major concern.

Despite these improvements, however, the program has several distinct drawbacks:
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favors of using an income test is that it more efficiently channels funds to those who are needy. Transferring funds on the basis of age, sex, rather than on the basis of need, means that many persons who are eligible and the percentage of total benefits going to the poor may be small.

It is precisely this inefficiency which has led many legislatures to complicate programs to include “recoupment” features in their plans. One common recoupment plan would eliminate the $600 children’s exemption in the present tax laws. This, and similar plans, tend to move the costs of children’s allowance programs toward a negative income tax for children.

In summary, there is no such thing as a single, simple answer to the problems of poverty and of economic security. There are no magic solutions. We will unquestionably continue our multifaceted attack on the problem.

Nearly 35 years ago, in a message to Congress, President Roosevelt outlined the goal that still lies before us: “Our task of reconstruction does not require us to start from scratch or to find new solutions. It is rather the knowing of the way once more, to some degree forgotten, ideals and values. If the means and details are inconstantly new, the objectives are as permanent as human nature.

“The security for the individual and for the family concerns itself primarily with three factors. People want decent homes to live in, they want to locate them where they can engage in productive work; and they want some safeguards against misfortunes which cannot be wholly eliminated in this mandate world of ours.”

TRIBUTE OF SENATOR B. EVERETT JORDAN TO LAWSON B. KNOTT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I think most of us will agree that Government is to a large extent a composite reflection of the people who serve and the objectives which changes on the quality of their performance.

Granting the truth of that observation, I think ours has been considerably the better because it has had the services of many men like Lawson B. Knott.

As most of you know, he retired late last month as administrator of the General Services Administration after 34 years of service in that and other Government posts.

Of all the positions he held, his last one was by far the most demanding, exacting, and important. He was responsible for billions of dollars in Federal property and for activities directly affecting thousands of people in every part of the country.

He performed the job with dedication, imagination, skill, tact, and unshakeable integrity, which made his contributions doubly valuable.

I am proud to stress the fact that Lawson Knott is a native of my own State of North Carolina and am equally proud to call him my good friend.

I salute him as an outstanding man and a most important public servant whose record should serve as an example to those who leave behind in Government.

I cannot believe that at 56 he is going to be really retired for very long and I wish him every success and satisfaction in whatever new activity he undertakes after he has paused long enough to catch his breath from those 34 years he has devoted to his country.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, through the years the Soil Conservation Service has been extremely helpful to farmers of the country. Conservation processes initiated and sponsored by the Service have saved many acres of valuable farmland from wind and water erosion.

The Senate Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has given attention over the years to providing adequate funds for the Soil Conservation Service. However, because of the generally tight budget the last few years, funds have not been as adequate as they should be and the technical personnel and assistance to districts as have been needed. The shortage is critical and has recently been considered by the legislature in South Dakota. The legislature has passed house concurrent resolution 513 which points up the serious situation that exists. I hope that Senators will help those of us who serve on the Agricultural Appropriations Subcommittee in alleviating this situation and ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record.

This bill is an objective, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 513

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

WHEREAS there is a national shortage of technical assistance by the Soil Conservation Service to conservation districts for the conservation and development of soil, water and related resources; be it further known that the Congress of the United States be memorialized to take whatever action is necessary to carry out the program of each Conservation District and district co-operating land occupiers; and.

WHEREAS manpower ceilings and budget proposal reductions have resulted in a steady decline of assistance; and.

WHEREAS the South Dakota Conservation Service has eleven Conservation Districts without a District Conservation Technician, and.

WHEREAS the Conservation Service has less funds and personnel to serve over 40,000 Conservation District cooperators in South Dakota than was necessary to serve 28,000 cooperators, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the forty fourth Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Resolved: The Congress of the United States be memorialized to take whatever action it deems appropriate to assure that additional funds and manpower be made available to provide necessary technical assistance to South Dakota’s seventy Conservation Districts for the conservation of soil, water and related natural resources; be it further resolved that these Conservation Districts be provided with funds and technical personnel necessary to carry out the program of each Conservation District and district co-operating land occupiers; and.

Resolved: That copies of this Concurrent Resolution be transmitted to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of South Dakota to the offices of the President and Vice-President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the members of the Congressional delegation of the State of South Dakota and the Governor of the State of South Dakota.

Adopted by the House of Representatives, February 20, 1969.

Dexter H. Gunderson, Speaker of the House.

Attest: Paul Inman, Chief Clerk of the House.

James E. Fair, President of the Senate.

Attest: Niels P. Jensen, Secretary of the Senate.

SUPPORT OF PROPOSALS FOR EARLY RATIFICATION OF THE PROLIFERATION TREATY BY EDUCATIONAL COMMITTEE TO HALT ATOMIC WEAPONS SPREAD

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, Mr. Arthur Larson, who was an able adviser to former President Eisenhower, has been very active in efforts to achieve support for the Nonproliferation Treaty. Arthur Larson is chairman of the distinguished committee, the Educational Committee To Halt Atomic Weapons Spread, whose membership includes many of this country’s most distinguished citizens. I ask unanimous consent that an open letter to President Nixon and a list of the committee’s membership be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks because of the valuable contribution they have made to the widespread approval of the Nonproliferation Treaty.

There being no objection, the letter and list were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND PRESIDENT-ELECT NIXON

We strongly support your proposals for early ratification of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty. Approval of this Treaty, providing for action to stop the spread of nuclear weapons and to increase the peaceful uses of atomic energy, is urgent both for our own safety and for the well-being of all mankind.

Eighty-two nations have signed this pact—positive evidence of its critical importance to global peace. The favorable report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee gave the world reason to expect prompt ratification. Since the Senate itself, and the United States, has already approved the treaty by a margin of 61 to 26, with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee having given it an almost unanimous vote in recent months, there is no need to delay any further.

The approval of this agreement may cause irreversible damage to the Treaty’s prospects. Already there are indications that opposing forces are active. Every day’s delay increases the chance that some nuclear states may decide to take the nuclear road.

The prestige which the United States gained through its leadership in achieving the agreement is being eroded by the delay. If the United States postpones final action, sudden changes in the international climate could forever close the only opportunity for what may be the most crucial vote in the nuclear age.

Public opinion polls, nation-wide editorial boards, and supporting mail to the Senate all indicate widespread approval for this agreement, won through four years of patient and difficult negotiation. We urge you to do all in