

REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR, WESTERN REGION NACTA

O. J. Burger, Director

Some of the activities accomplished during the year 1971-72 in the Western Region are as follows:

1. During the annual meeting (January 1972) with California Community Colleges that present agriculture programs the advantages of NACTA membership were discussed. About 20 of the 40 community colleges were present at this meeting. Sample copies of the NACTA Journal were distributed along with the NACTA brochure. This material was sent by mail to those who were not present.

All of the agriculture teachers in the community colleges were encouraged to submit articles for publication in the NACTA Journal.

2. A brief discussion about the advantages of NACTA membership was held at the annual spring meeting of Western Deans and Directors of Resident Instruction, Washington State University, Pullman (April 19-20, 1972). The deans were urged to encourage their faculty members to join NACTA and publish in the NACTA Journal. The deans were urged to attend the national NACTA convention at Murfreesboro and asked to urge their faculty to attend.
3. The brand-new NACTA Journal brochure was sent to all the Directors of Agriculture of the 40 California community colleges where agriculture programs are presented. This was done in early spring, 1972.

INTERNATIONAL CHANGES AFFECTING AGRICULTURE

Remarks by Deputy Assistant Secretary Andrew J. Mair
National Association of Colleges and Teachers, Murfreesboro, Tennessee – June 16, 1972

I am pleased to participate in your annual convention. The topic you have assigned to me is "International Changes Affecting Agriculture." This certainly covers a broad field.

The past 12 months have brought almost a blizzard of headlines reporting actions or events of significance for international agricultural trade.

We went during that period from the President's lifting of the embargo on non-strategic trade with Mainland China and the 50-50 shipping restrictions on grain to Russia last June to his historic mission to that country in May.

In between, world currencies were realigned; the Russians bought \$150 million worth of feed grains from us; the President visited Mainland China; prolonged dock strikes closed all of our deep water ports at one time or another; the Secretaries of Agriculture of the Soviet Union and the United States exchanged visits; grain sale talks were opened between the two countries; negotiations were completed in Europe to add four countries to the European Community; U.S. agriculture won some relatively modest but heartening concessions in negotiations with the Community and Japan, and the three countries emerged from the negotiations with a joint declaration to initiate and support global negotiations within the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, beginning in 1973, with a view to liberalizing world trade, including agricultural trade.

There have been other, lesser actions affecting agriculture, and I am certain all of you are aware that each of the events that I have listed is worthy of a speech in itself.

But don't panic. I do not intend to make all those speeches in one day. Rather, I would like to discuss with you for a few minutes an international change that is of tremendous significance to agriculture.

I am referring to the changing consumer demands for food.

Most of us are aware that in almost every country, developing as well as developed, people have more money to spend than they have ever had before. This can range from a few rupees a month in India to today's unprecedented prosperity in Western Europe – and in Japan, where per capita income has risen by more than three times in little more than 10 years.

We also find that, wherever they are, one of the first things people want when they have more money is more food, and better food. And in almost every case, this means they turn to livestock products – meat, milk, poultry – for a larger share of the protein in their diet.

This has enormous implications, not only for U.S. agricultural trade, but for the entire institution of agriculture, here and around the world.

This change began first in the United States. For the past 15 years and more, we in this country have been encouraging expansion in the production of feed grains and other livestock feeding materials. We have responded to the growing affluence of our consumers by moving increasing amounts of grain to their dinner tables as livestock products rather than food grains.

Total consumption of wheat in the United States from 1950 to 1970 moved up moderately, at best, while corn usage in this same period rose by 67 percent – an increase of almost 2 billion bushels.

In the decade following 1960, our total domestic use of feed concentrates went up by nearly one-fifth. Feed grain use is up by about 15 percent and there has been a 28 percent increase in the use of other feeds, principally soybean meal.

At the same time, the U.S. farmers' cash receipts from livestock and poultry have increased by more than 50 percent in 10 years. Combined receipts from the livestock and feed sectors of U.S. agriculture accounted for about 75 percent of farmers' total marketing receipts in 1971 compared to 68 percent in 1960.

Ours has become a livestock agriculture, and within the past few years, this change that has been so evident in American agriculture has become increasingly apparent in other parts of the world.

Japan, the United Kingdom and the European Community all are moving toward livestock-oriented agriculture, with emphasis on swine and poultry, and there is increasing interest in many countries, including these, in the production of quality beef.

World cattle numbers continued upward in 1971, increasing by 1 percent, but prices have remained strong worldwide, and there is a worldwide shortage of feeder calves, testifying to the growing demand

for beef.

I think it is fair to say here that U.S. commodity groups have worked overseas with USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service since the mid-1950's, helping to create, and then to fill, this accelerating demand for livestock products.

The payoff for the American farmer in this trend is reflected in the record U.S. farm export total of \$7.8 billion last fiscal year. And we are going to be at, or very close to, that all-time high again this year, despite those months of frustrating dock strikes that began last July.

It is significant that nearly \$3 billion of that record 1971 total represented feed stuffs, and close to another \$1 billion was livestock, poultry and their products.

So a full one-half of U.S. agriculture's export shipments in fiscal 1971 can be traced to the foreign consumer's demand for livestock products, and if we were to separate the commercial sales for dollars from the concessional sales, the ratio would be even higher.

Our exports of feedstuffs to Japan offer a good example of what has been happening. We sold Japan 5.9 million metric tons of feed grains in fiscal year 1971 – more than 20 times what we shipped to that country in 1960. In the same period, U.S. shipments of soybeans to Japan have increased by 155 percent, to 2.8 million tons.

These gains show what changes in eating habits can do, even little ones. Take one simple item in Japan – eggs. The Japanese were eating an average of 153 eggs a year per person in 1963, when the U.S. Feed Grains Council launched a 5-year campaign to increase egg consumption. And consumption did go up, reaching 300 per person last year.

You know that we haven't been shipping eggs to keep up with the Japanese demand; we have been shipping the feeds used in their production. The possibilities in this expansion come clear when you consider that the Foreign Agricultural Service estimates that this increase in the popularity of eggs alone in Japan has meant an added \$15 million a year in sales for U.S. feed producers.

Furthermore, this trend toward livestock and feed agricultural economies has become increasingly evident in countries

with centrally managed economies — the Soviet Union and other countries in Eastern Europe.

As living conditions improve, their people are also looking for better diets, and the governments are trying to provide them.

I mentioned the huge grain sale to Russia last fall; the exchange of visits by Secretary Butz and Minister Matskevich; the grain trade talks. All of these are related to the Soviet goal of putting more meat in the Russian diet by increasing livestock production by about 25 percent in the current 5-year plan.

A team of specialists from U.S. government and industry found the same drive for more animal proteins during a visit to four countries in Eastern Europe last fall — Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland and Romania. They reported livestock expansion goals that ranged from 18 percent in Hungary to 100 percent in Romania.

As I have indicated, this consumer-inspired livestock trend in world agriculture offers great opportunity for American agriculture, which is the world's most efficient and most abundant producer of the feed-stuffs basic to a modern livestock industry.

Most of these countries have a long way to go if they are to put the amount of meat in the diets of their people that the average U.S. consumer enjoys.

The U.S. consumed 186 pounds of red meat per person in 1970. Consumption in the European Community was about two-thirds of that: the Russians ate just half that amount, and the Japanese one-eighth.

The gap is even larger in beef, where U.S. consumption of 117 pounds was more than double that of the European Community and Russia, and 20 times that of Japan.

That is the shape of the growth opportunity offered American agriculture by the very fundamental changes that are taking place in many agricultural systems of the world.

People in almost every country want and are increasingly able to afford to eat more livestock products, and U.S. agriculture has the climate, the geography and the technology to provide abundant support for livestock industries anywhere in the world.

However, there is much more to realizing the full growth potential that lies ahead than putting the plow to more land and shipping the increased production overseas.

We face competition in the international market, and we face trade barriers to one degree or another at the borders of all of our principal trading partners.

I don't think U.S. agriculture, with its efficient production, needs to fear competition. What it must have more than anything is equitable access to overseas markets.

Obviously, on the face of the export record, we do have access to many markets for many products; but a variety of trade-restrictive devices is keeping us from realiz-

ing the full benefits of our comparative production advantage in many products in many places.

U.S. exports to the European Community of products protected by the Community variable levies have trended downward since 1966, for example, while our exports to the Community of non-variable levy items have increased.

On the other side of the world, Japan's lifting of import quotas on grapefruit last July brought a surge in U.S. sales of the fruit to the eager Japanese. By the end of April exports of U.S. grapefruit to Japan had reached \$9.6 million.

So it is at the negotiating table that decisions will be made that will determine just how much the new trend in world agriculture can mean to the American farmer.

Negotiations are in prospect or are underway to address problems of access and many others that have an effect on agricultural trade.

The grain trade talks with the Soviets are continuing, of course, and we now have, in addition, the joint U.S.-Soviet trade commission that will examine the broad questions of bilateral trade, which will include agricultural trade.

On a broader front, we are beginning the preparations for negotiating under the rules of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to protect our agricultural trade when the United Kingdom, Ireland, Denmark and Norway join the European Community the first of next year.

This accession will cause problems for U.S. agricultural trade, because it will bring the four countries under the Community's Common Agricultural Policy. This policy is based on a system of high internal prices, which are protected from outside competition by variable import levies. There are no effective production controls, and the resulting surpluses are moved into export under subsidies. So we are damaged on exports to the Community by its variable import levies, and on exports to third countries by the Community's export subsidies.

The four countries who are going behind those protective walls represented an agricultural market for us of more than \$600 million last year — \$470 million of it in the United Kingdom.

That could be painful, and we intend to use certain trading rights that we have in the four countries to negotiate under the GATT to do everything we can to ease the pain and to eliminate it if possible.

The impact of the Community enlargement on the United States and other outside countries will be examined under GATT auspices to see what commodities and what countries will be affected and how, in terms of the GATT rules of trade.

The examination, a tremendous task, probably won't be completed before fall. The subsequent negotiation with the enlarged Community will begin after the four candidate countries have ratified the agreement to join the Community, which we ex-

pect will be accomplished before next December 1.

An opportunity for the trading nations to examine the entire structure of international trade, and to undertake comprehensive multilateral negotiations to remove trading obstacles and liberalize the exchange of goods on a global basis is expected to come in 1973.

As I said at the outset of my talk, the declaration to initiate and support such a negotiation in the GATT framework has been issued by the United States jointly with Japan and the EC.

It will be a long and arduous task. The participating nations must come to grips with, and reconcile — if the negotiation is to be successful — differing philosophies and differing policies affecting trading items ranging from locomotives and transistors to wheat and grapes.

Intensive work is under way in the Administration and in the Department to prepare for these deliberations, and I am pleased to say that agriculture has a strong role in the preparations, and it will feature prominently in the negotiations.

This has not always been so. Agricultural concerns were more or less stepchildren in the last general GATT negotiations — the Kennedy Round in the 1960's. At that time, industrial tariffs were reduced significantly among all member nations, but the problems of agriculture were left largely untouched.

Things are different this time. Agricultural trade is written into the declaration by the United States, Japan and the European Community — the world's leading traders. The Administration view was spelled out by the President's Deputy Special Representative for Trade, William Pearce, when he said at the last USDA Outlook Conference, "... Indeed, in view of the importance of agricultural trade to the United States, tangible results in trade terms for these products are essential to the negotiations."

So you can be sure that agriculture will be heard. Domestic agricultural policies of the participants, which can have a profound effect on trade, will be a major discussion item. Others will include non-tariff barriers to trade, and trade with the developing countries, who are speaking with increasingly louder voices, although many of them do not yet appear to be ready to join the GATT and accept its responsibilities.

Underlying specific policies and programs are some considerable differences in trade philosophies which will have to be reconciled particularly insofar as the U.S., Japan, and the European Community are concerned.

The United States is an advocate of comparative advantage wherein price determines the pattern of production and flow of both domestic and international trade. We have adhered to the concept to the extent that more than 60 percent of our agricultural output receives no direct benefits from price support programs.

Further, the great bulk of U.S. farm products rely for protection solely on tariffs which average only 5 percent.

Insofar as the government's role in U.S. foreign trade is concerned, it acts as an umpire of business rather than as a partner which shares goals. We have a tradition in which government and business are not particularly close. Like GATT, we see government as the instrument for removing barriers to the successful operation of the private sector, not as the operator.

The Japanese believe that the establishment of long-range economic goals through a consensus of government and business is essential for the development of the Japanese economy. This very special business-government tie has implications for Japan's view of price in the international market.

The Japanese Government has used restrictions such as quotas, high tariffs, credit restraints, and State trading to give domestic products an advantage.

Over the past few years Japan has made major efforts to reduce its quotas — from about 120 to 35 categories of products. But despite this progress, some important items still remain under quota.

Nevertheless, Japan — like the United States — is definitely a proponent of multilateral trade in its relations with other industrialized countries. For years, however, multilateralism has been denied it. When Japan joined the GATT in the 1950's most members — but not the United States — refused to fully apply GATT rules to her. This meant Japan was discriminated against and had to deal with these countries on a bilateral basis.

Even today trade does not flow on a multilateral basis between Japan and Western Europe since most European countries continue to maintain at least some restrictions against certain Japanese products. This discrimination has led to Japan's greater reliance on the U.S. market. About 30 percent of Japan's exports come here, with only about 7 percent going to the European Community and 13 percent to all of Western Europe. This situation has greatly aggravated U.S.-Japanese trade tensions.

As for the European Community, it regards the world market as entirely artificial — a place where national shortages and surpluses are cleared with the help of subsidies and other devices paid for by those participants who can afford it.

Internally for its main agricultural products, the EC sets support prices at levels intended to provide an acceptable income to its small farmers, and imposes levies on imports to offset the difference between the Community support price and the cheapest corresponding import. Subsidies bridge the difference for exports. EC farmers are, in this way, insulated from world market developments. Support prices are high and they have encouraged production.

The gulf which separates the U.S. and

the European Community in this area is an example of the very basic differences with which we must come to terms if we are to reach mutually satisfactory solutions to our outstanding problems.

What I have been attempting to say is simply that as we move into a new period of trade negotiations, we must appreciate fully the magnitude of the task. It is not just a question of reducing tariffs, eliminating non-tariff barriers or reforming agricultural programs. We are talking about fundamental and divergent attitudes toward the organization of economic affairs nationally and internationally.

The decisions that come out of these negotiations will determine trading patterns for years to come, and they will go far in determining whether U.S. agriculture can, in fact, fully realize the opportunities for growth that lie ahead in the changing wants of the new world consumer.

For it to do so, will require the best efforts of those of us in government, and the strong support of all who are interested in agriculture for policies and programs that will give us the best possible hand at the negotiating tables and in the marketplaces of the world.

Just as the United States firmly advocates multilateralism in world trade, so are we increasingly pursuing the same concept in world aid — aid to developing countries. And this is the second subject I wanted to discuss with you today. For the moment, however, my concern is not so much with aid, per se, but rather with the vehicles for delivering it.

Two years ago, this Administration announced a reordering of its international assistance priorities. An increasing share of our development assistance would be shifted into multilateral channels. Chief among these, of course, is the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, which, among its other functions, renders a great deal of development assistance to its developing Member Countries.

Underlying the President's decision was an awareness that FAO's mechanism for stimulating international cooperation, and particularly for delivering technical assistance to developing countries, give it a substantially wider geographic scope than any single country could achieve by acting alone. Furthermore, the FAO is in a position to draw upon the financial and technical resources of many countries.

Regrettably, within the United States there is a lack of understanding of FAO's functions and of this country's role in the Organization's activities. This lack of understanding, in turn, has led to disillusionment and outright bitter opposition to the whole concept of foreign aid — let alone participation in such international organizations as the United Nations and FAO.

I think that many Americans are disillusioned because they have believed that the problem of development in developing countries was very similar to the problem of reconstructing Europe after World War

II which was achieved rapidly with the help of the Marshall Plan. Yet what they are overlooking is the tremendous difference between rehabilitating developed societies that had already existed and creating developed societies where they had never existed.

They are disillusioned because for too long too many of us believed that all the developing countries had to do was copy us — copy our social and political institutions, our technology and educational systems — and all would be well. The fallacy here, of course, has been a failure to realize until only recently that what is relevant for the United States is not necessarily suitable for another country.

In the beginning we expected too much. Then we demanded too much. When expectations went unfulfilled and demands went unmet, frustration resulted.

As the richest and most technologically advanced nation on earth we cannot afford the luxury of frustration and disillusionment. We cannot succumb to the temptation of withdrawing from the mainstream in which the less developed world swims.

If the world as we see it is unacceptable, and the world as we think it ought to be is unattainable, then obviously a practical solution lies somewhere in between. That is, after all, the message of President Nixon's trip to Mainland China and Russia. It is also the primary thrust of FAO's commitment.

Let's look at that commitment.

FAO is dedicated to raising levels of nutrition and standards of living, improving the efficiency of agricultural production and distribution, bettering the conditions of rural populations, and contributing to an expanding world economy. Splendid objectives — and every one is compatible with U.S. hopes for our own people and for the peoples of the world.

To achieve its objectives, FAO undertakes activities which may be grouped into broad categories:

(1) Maintaining international forums for the discussion of problems of common concern to Member Countries, either regionally or internationally. These include forums which zero in on technical, scientific and economic problems in practically all major phases of agriculture, fisheries, nutrition and forestry. Keep in mind that there is no other body which provides such opportunities at the inter-governmental level for consideration of most of the field falling within FAO's frame of reference.

In the commodity field there are other forums, particularly GATT and the United Nations Committee on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). However, there is very little duplication, since — by mutual understanding — the FAO's Council's Committee on Commodity Problems (CCP) and its various Intergovernmental Groups on specific commodities provide forums for the study of commodity situations and trends, while broader problems of trade and commodity agreements are discussed in

UNCTAD, and negotiations regarding tariffs and trade are conducted in GATT. At this point, I should emphasize strongly that the U.S. recognizes the need for developing countries to have increasing access to markets for those agricultural commodities which they are in a unique position to produce or which they can produce efficiently in competition with other countries. By the same token, the U.S. and other developed countries which are efficient producers of agricultural commodities, must have reasonable and balanced access to the world's markets.

(2) The second major category is the provision of technical assistance to developing countries. About two-thirds of FAO's professional staff and about three-fourths of FAO's financial resources are devoted to providing technical assistance. This also includes help in securing financing for agricultural development, in coop-

eration with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and several Regional Banks. In addition, it includes a number of activities supported by industry or other private sources.

Currently, FAO is providing technical assistance to more than 100 countries and territories. Compared with this number the U.S. is limited by legislation to giving assistance to no more than 40 countries. Consequently, while many developing countries are receiving technical aid from both the U.S. and FAO sources, a substantially larger number of such countries and territories may obtain assistance in the agricultural field only through FAO.

(3) Finally, through the joint UN/FAO World Food Program, the FAO makes substantial contributions to development through the use of food to support developmental projects.

There are, of course, activities which do

not fall within the three broad categories I have just delineated — such as the collection, analysis and dissemination of data and other information relating to agriculture; and the development of international food standards, all of which are of substantial use and benefit to us in the United States, as well as to other countries.

In general, it can be said that FAO's efforts to achieve its purposes are not only in accord with U.S. objectives but that they supplement, support and extend well beyond the efforts the U.S. is able to make bilaterally in support of our objectives.

In the final analysis, the FAO has in fact developed into a major force in international agricultural affairs. Therefore, although the U.S. will continue a number of bilateral approaches and activities, FAO must be our chosen instrument for agricultural cooperation and development on the broad international front.

REPORTS ON NACTA MEETINGS

NACTA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

October 1, 1971

The meeting was held in the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce Conference Room and called to order at 9:00 a.m. by President J. Wayland Bennett. Minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held at Sterling, Colorado, on June 17, 1971, on June 18, 1971, of the NACTA business meeting on June 18, 1971, and the Executive Committee meeting on June 19, 1971, were read and approved. Old business considered.

a) It was reported that John S. Gardiner of Kemptville College of Agriculture and Technology, Kemptville, Ontario, Canada, will act as coordinator for NACTA in Canada.

b) After discussion as to the amount to pay an annual honorarium to the Editor of the NACTA Journal a motion was made:
MOTION: To pay John Wright, NACTA Journal Editor, \$300.00 during 1972. Payments to be made as follows: \$150.00 on February 1, 1972, and \$150.00 on August 1, 1972. Passed.

Gordon Stewart reported on NACTA's financial condition as of October 1, 1971. Total assets of that date being \$4,728.51. Copy of Treasurer's Report attached.

After discussion Burger presented the motion and Carpenter seconded:
MOTION: That the Treasurer's report be accepted and that the minutes reflect the Executive Committee's appreciation for the continued excellent work and devotion to NACTA of Gordon Stewart. Passed.

Editor's Report indicated that the publication of next issue was running slightly behind schedule. Editor had contacted Journal Editorial Committee asking that they help solicit articles, help in listing recently published articles, books, etc. Report accepted.

List of NACTA committees for 1971-72 was passed out. After review of the committees it was moved and seconded that:

MOTION: That the Teacher Recognition and Evaluation Committee be changed to the Teacher Improvement and Recognition Committee and that the Executive Committee work with this Committee as to how to select and honor outstanding teachers. Passed.

Western — Burger

For 1970-71:

- a) Conducted enrollment survey
- b) Attempted to increase membership in NACTA

For 1971-72:

- a) Conduct enrollment survey
- b) Continue to work on membership
- c) Encourage articles from Agriculture teachers in California

d) Increase attention by NACTA to curriculum development and reform

Central — Carpenter

Will continue to make State contacts in the area; work on increasing membership; coordinate collection of enrollment data for 1971-72; and attempt to increase Institutional membership.

Southern — McCain

Continue to promote membership; stress contacts in each state; coordinate enrollment data for current year.

Eastern — McGuire absent

Program arrangements for 1972 Convention. Robert Alexander and Omri Rawlins reported on planning done to date on the 1972 convention. Dates of June 14-16, 1972, approved. Program topic was discussed and following motion made:

MOTION: That the topic for the 1972 Convention would not be an IOTA workshop. Passed.

President was requested to write Dr. Grant Moody and inform him of the Executive Committee action.

After additional discussion the general theme for the 1972 Convention of — AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY - IN TRANSITION was selected.

Other business:

a) Discussed numerous requests received for membership list from outside individuals and organizations. After discussion motion made and seconded:

MOTION: That discretion be used in supplying NACTA membership list and that this be limited to professional organizations and non-profit types of educational organizations. Passed.

b) Executive Committee asked to work with Journal Editorial Committee in soliciting articles.

c) 1973 meeting will be in Northeast.

d) Frank Eldridge has invited NACTA to meet at the University of Nebraska, June 19-21, 1974. Has reserved rooms in the Continuing Education Center for those attending.

e) Membership list to Bob Alexander.

f) MOTION: That President Bennett write Mr. Kiah E. Warden, Manager, The Chamber of Commerce of Greater Kansas City, 920 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64105, and express NACTA's appreciation for his personal help and use of the Chamber's facilities for the Executive Committee's meeting.

Adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

NACTA EXECUTIVE MEETING

June 14, 1972

Meeting was called to order by President Bennett at 9:15 a.m. Meeting held at Middle Tennessee State University at Murfreesboro, Tennessee. Minutes of meeting of October 1, 1971 were approved. Noted in previous minutes that NACTA has been invited to University of Nebraska June 19-21, 1974. More information needed before final decision.

Treasurer's Report — Assets up. Income up. Expenses up. Total assets equal \$6527.03. Report attached. Report accepted.

Appreciation was expressed to John Wright and Jack Everly on their production of the NACTA Journal Brochure. Discussion followed on how to get broad participation.

Editor's Report — Articles appear to be coming in better and are being reviewed before printing. September issue will be on Annual Meeting and papers submitted will be published. There is no actual backlog of papers; they are coming in on time. Size of Journal has been increased. Jack Everly gave a report as Associate Editor and progress report as regards article recruitment. Results look good and number of articles are expected to increase.

E. B. Knight Journal Award — Jack Everly. Articles of the Journal were scored by Editorial Board Awards Committee (eleven members were on the Committee).

International Programs — Report deferred to next meeting.

Delta Tau Alpha — Student president is attending Convention. There are 23 chapters at present; this is increase of 2 chapters. Have problem of identity and are bucking Alpha Zeta.

Constitutional Amendments — No report.

Enrollment Data — Brown Report attached.

Teacher Improvement and Recognition Report — Grand Moody: Needs closer identification with the Executive Committee. Report submitted and attached. Discussion followed as to percent of membership to

be Teacher Fellows; total of 5%. Committee was asked to further review Teacher Fellow program and report at Friday morning Executive Meeting.

Sustaining Membership — Wayland Bennett: No progress.

Regional Directors' Reports:

Frank Carpenter, Central Region — Wrote to encourage membership and Journal participation. Membership rose from 110 in 1970; 123 in 1971, to 156 in 1972.

Otto Burger, Western Region — Report attached.

Bob McGuire, Eastern Region — Reported on enrollment.

Frank McCain, Southern Region — Sent mailing to various individuals concerning membership. Will continue to work on membership.

Membership has grown from 294 in 1971 to 418 in 1972.

Meeting adjourned at 12:00 Noon.

Members present were:

J. Wayland Bennett
John Beeks
T. R. Buie
Frank Carpenter
O. J. Burger
Jack Everly
J. S. McCain
Robert McGuire
Grant Moody
Gordon Stewart
John Wright

Respectfully submitted,

William W. Stopper
Secretary, NACTA