

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 29, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rabbi Baruch Korff, Congregation Agudath Achim, Taunton, Mass., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, we humbly acknowledge Thy gifts to mankind and the divine image with which Thou hast endowed us; the ability to endeavor and the fortitude to strive with wisdom for the abiding glory of human life.

We beseech Thee, Father of all men, to strengthen and motivate this august body of our Nation's legislators to meet the trials of life and liberty. May their faith and vision lead them to work together with resolution, and speed the approach of Thy kingdom on earth. May they brave every hardship Thy will to perform and proclaim Thy sovereignty in witness of Thy truth.

Bless our Nation, Almighty God, keep us ever steadfast and just that no weapon formed against us may prosper and no adversary endure.

For the roadway our forefathers charted we give thanks unto Thee, O Lord, who has called this Nation in righteousness and set it for a light among the planets.

How goodly is our portion;  
How blessed our lot;  
How beautiful our heritage.  
Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## TRIBUTE TO RABBI BARUCH KORFF

(Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege as a Representative of the 10th Congressional District of Massachusetts to welcome as our chaplain today Rabbi Baruch Korff, who has served as the spiritual leader to the Congregation Agudath Achim in Taunton, Mass., and surrounding towns for 15 years. Besides being a noted Talmudic scholar, Rabbi Korff has generated during his years in Taunton a renaissance in the Jewish community and has achieved wide renown for his varied activities and achievements.

Rabbi Korff is not only personally in demand as a speaker, but he has brought to Taunton numerous other distinguished speakers to enrich and challenge both the congregation and the community as a whole. He is known and respected, too, for his great gift as a teacher, and many seek his counsel and guidance, particularly the young people. Few men have managed to establish such a rapport with the youth of today, and, in fact, Rabbi Korff has recently been named to a special mayor's board to study the problems of youth and drug addiction.

For 15 years, Rabbi Korff has also served as chaplain to the Taunton State Hospital and the Paul A. Devers State

School and devoted much of his time to helping the mentally ill and the mentally retarded. His visits, counsel, and patient understanding as well as his personal dedication have again achieved wide respect since his efforts far exceeded the normal duties of chaplain.

It is almost unnecessary to mention his other accomplishments and honors, but I would like to note that Rabbi Korff has served as director of the Emergency Committee To Save the Jewish People of Europe during World War II; was appointed by President Roosevelt as Adviser to the War Refugee Board; was executive vice president for the Political Action Committee for Palestine. In 1942 he was awarded the Good Will Cup of the New York State Interfaith Movement and since that time has received many other honors and distinctions.

Again, I consider it a great honor for this body to have Rabbi Korff as our chaplain today.

## NATIONAL COMMISSION ON POPULATION GROWTH AND THE AMERICAN FUTURE

(Mr. CARTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Republican task force on earth resources and population, I strongly commend the proposal of President Nixon for a National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. I urge my colleagues in the Congress to give the creation of the Commission their immediate consideration.

The President's statement emphasizes, I think very rightly, the important tie, too little realized, between population growth and its tragic problems of starvation and undernourishment, social disorder, environmental destruction, poor education, and ill-housing. For this reason, as the President pointed out, the structure of the Commission must be flexible; because of the far-reaching effects and abundant problems with which the Commission must deal, it is desirable that Congress allocate for the Commission an expansionary budget.

A serious lack of coordination characterizes the efforts of the numerous agencies and groups which are presently dealing with population planning and family planning, both domestically and overseas. Under a National Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, we can proceed to coordinate and correct this significant defect.

It is doubly desirable, in view of the upcoming 1970 census, that the Commission be created as soon as possible to take advantage of the new census data which will be available.

## RAISE THE TAXPAYER'S EXEMPTION

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see the activity in the Ways and Means Committee in its consideration of the problem of tax reform and to learn of the progress that has been made toward completing a bill for action by the House. Many of the items have demanded treatment for a long time. These include the requirement that no taxpayer capable of paying a tax should escape, the broad principle that the tax burden be spread equitably among taxpayers, and that every attempt be made to prevent the average individual taxpayer from shouldering an unfair share of the common burden while taxwise individuals or organizations took advantage of unforeseen loopholes.

In view of the substantial increase in tax revenues which will come from the introduction of these reforms, it is my belief and recommendation that a substantial portion of these revenues be used to increase the standard exemption of the individual taxpayer. While it is true that an increase in the exemption requires very substantial revenues from other sources, nevertheless it appears quite possible for a sizable increase to be made and it is my judgment that an increase in this area would be fair to the individual taxpayer and not disruptive of orderly financing.

The individual taxpayer, most of whose income is derived from personal earnings, is in an exposed position and cannot escape the tax bite. It is, therefore, only fair that when we eliminate some of the loopholes and tax havens we should give the benefit to the individual who has suffered from the discrimination.

I, therefore, urge Mr. Speaker that the Ways and Means Committee who are currently engaged in the final writeup of the tax bill do everything in their power to increase the individual exemption and thus strike a blow for equality of tax treatment.

## CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 127]

Anderson, Tenn.	Dawson	Moorhead
Ashley	Evins, Tenn.	Murphy, N.Y.
Boggs	Gallagher	Ottinger
Bow	Gray	Powell
Brasco	Halpern	Reid, N.Y.
Brooks	Hanley	Riegle
Burton, Utah	Hanna	Rosenthal
Carey	Harsha	Ruppe
Celler	Hébert	Scheuer
Clark	Kirwan	Stuckey
Clausen, Don H.	Lipscomb	Teague, Tex.
Daddario	Lloyd	Wampler
	Lujan	
	Minshall	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 394 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

**PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORTS**

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

**RABBI BARUCH KORFF**

(Mr. ROONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply moved by the opening prayer delivered this morning by one of the great spiritual leaders of American Jewry, Rabbi Baruch Korff. I have known Rabbi Korff for many years going back to the days when we met in the common cause of aiding the victims of the Nazis and establishing an independent State of Israel. Rabbi Korff was an adviser to the War Refugee Board established by President Roosevelt and in that capacity, lent great support to our efforts to establish a refugee camp at Oswego, N.Y. His devotion to the unfortunate victims of the Nazi holocaust never waned and our paths crossed constantly in those years through the Political Action Committee for Palestine. He was, and is, a truly dedicated man. It is very fitting that Rabbi Korff is here today for this marks his 15th anniversary with his regional congregation, Agudath Achim in Taunton, Massachusetts, and his 15th anniversary as chaplain with the Department of Mental Health of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. He is still giving of himself that this world may be a better place for all men. To my old friend I would just like to say how good it is that he is here today. Shalom.

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS, 1970**

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The motion was agreed to.

**IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 13111, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, this is the one you have been waiting for. This is the one you have read about, and this is the one you have talked about. This is the one you have been talked to about.

The labor, health, education, and welfare bill for the fiscal year 1970 totals \$16,651,000,000. But this is only part of the iceberg which is above the water.

Now you take your copy of the report that you have—that you may have in your office or you may have here. I direct your attention to pages 44 and 45 of the report. You will read that the permanent—now hear this—the permanent obligational authority for the two departments and related agencies which is mostly trust funds, totals \$47,815,000,000.

Did you hear that figure?—\$47,815,000,000. I want you to hear these figures because very few of you have heard them before.

The total amount of the funds in the 1970 budget for these two departments and related independent agencies—now wait until you hear this—is \$64,466,000,000—\$64 billion.

Well, it does not take very much imagination to foresee that this budget—and properly so—will very soon exceed the budget for the Department of Defense. I have been on the Appropriations Subcommittee of the Department of Defense since it was organized right after World War II. I am not unacquainted with that budget either.

Well, I hate war—a great President also said—and as a great American general said, "War is hell." Of course, it is. If, and when, with the help of God this can of worms in Vietnam is finished, I would expect to see this budget of the Department of Defense cut \$20 billion. I will demand, as chairman of this subcommittee, that at least \$5 billion come into the budget for Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare.

The people will demand that and I hope and pray it will happen.

Now it is all very well to say if we can afford a war, then we can afford all these increases people are talking about for education, health, and other domestic programs, and if we can go to the moon, then we can afford this and we can afford that.

The fact remains, Mr. Chairman, there is a war in Vietnam—now—and in my judgment there will be for the life of this specific appropriation bill we have before us today, June 30, 1970. It pains me to say that I believe there will be a war. This bill must face the war in Vietnam. Do not come down here today and say, "Oh, we have a war. If we could afford the war, then we could afford this and this and this." You cannot. You cannot.

Some say we wasted billions on a shot to the moon? This House voted for every dime for the shot that went to the moon. Thanks be to God, it was a success. But you must pay for it, whether you like it or not, and you must pay for this war, whether you like it or not. And I do not like it. How do you like that? But those are the facts. So let us have a minimum of breast-beating dehors the facts as I have just stated them.

Here is another fact that most people do not realize. Wait until you hear this. Of the \$16,600,000,000 in this bill, \$9,600,000,000 is for uncontrollable items. Do you know that? More than half of this bill is uncontrollable by your Committee on Appropriations. Is that not something? It is for grants to the States for public assistance, payments to the Social Security trust funds and, oh, a long list. I shall not recite the litany of the long list of grants that are uncontrollable. You know them. You voted for them all in various legislative bills.

This committee, however, is recommending no phony cuts. Oh, that has been the practice here for years, for many appropriation subcommittees to come down here and boast, "We have cut the budget x millions of dollars." Those statements on these so-called uncontrollable items are as phony as a three-dollar bill. This is not a phony subcommittee or full committee. There are no phony cuts.

So, Mr. Chairman, out of almost \$64.5 billion in the budget for these agencies, there is only \$7 billion that is controllable under our appropriation process—\$7 billion out of nearly \$65 billion is all we can talk about today. Is that not astounding? Do we see what is going to happen to our appropriation process? Out of \$64.5 billion, we can control about \$7 billion. So we are not so important, are we? That is only \$7 billion. Think about that. See what we are doing? We should be very careful today, should we not?

Everyone knows this is a tough year so far as the Federal budget is concerned and that we have to economize wherever it is reasonably possible. This we know. We have been voting for that all this long year. However, the committee has not been blind to the great need for proper financing of the important programs, the most important programs. We have not ignored them, nor, Mr. Chairman, do we consider the President's budget sacrosanct—not for a minute. This is the Appropriations Committee. The budget is no sacred cow for us. We can just take a glance at the table at the end of the report, and it will reveal many pluses and many minuses where

our committee, Mr. Chairman, has worked its will on this budget.

This year, Mr. Chairman, for the first time since I have been chairman of the subcommittee, we are recommending a net increase over the budget request—over, through the ceiling. We have, but with a rule of reason.

Oh, there is an invitation to be dramatic. A great invitation exists to be dramatic with the subjects. They just drip with it, do they not? Can the Members imagine me not taking advantage of a dramatic opportunity? God save the mark. It is strength of character, indeed.

Well, we have resisted. We have applied the rule of reason when we went above the budget. There are gross increases here totaling over \$277 million, and almost all of it is accounted for by what? By hospital construction and the various line items in education.

I am against education? I married a schoolteacher. Can Members imagine me being against education? Why, I would die without the priest. In my hometown of Wilkes-Barre they are going to dedicate, with very sound judgment, in October, a \$3.5 million elementary school named after DANIEL J. FLOOD. I think that is great. Do Members not agree with me? That is to be done in a couple of months. I am against education? How silly can we get?

It is just how far are we going to go. There is no greater bleeding heart in this whole committee than mine about education—but there is reason, not just emotions and theatrics and big figures.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will go to some of the individual items in the bill. There are over 100 appropriation items in this bill, and Members will be pleased to know I am not going to parade through all of them.

It would go on like Tennyson's brook. In total for the Department of Labor there is an actual slight cutback from the 1969 level except for manpower development and training activities, and that we are for, beginning with me. You know where I come from. I know the need in the coalfields.

For MDTA we recommend a cut of \$20 million in the request of \$675 million, but we are still putting in this bill an increase of \$248 million above 1969. Now, as the saying goes, "That ain't hay."

This increase, by the way, is almost entirely for two programs. One is the now well-known and very successful JOBS, the JOBS program, which is sponsored by the National Alliance of Businessmen, started by the Ford people. They made a great presentation to our committee. We were very impressed last year. They are going well. They are doing well. The private sector has manned the barricades in this JOBS program all through this Nation. There is no horizon to what good that program can bring, no horizon. I am amazed, frankly, that it has been embraced so generally by the private sector throughout the Nation. Is that not good?

And there is what we call the CEP, which is the concentrated employment program, the job training programs back in the communities. I have one in mine. It is a wonderful thing. Many of you

have such programs in your districts. I am sure the result is the same as in mine.

The revised budget contains a requested increase of \$2 million and 130 positions for the Labor-Management Services Administration. By the way, if you are looking at your reports, that is on page 6. I see some of you have reports out. What I am talking about is on page 6, so you can read while I am talking, if you wish.

This is for the organized crime program. The justifications for the proposed budget state, and I quote:

A large number (about 150,000 annually) of the reports submitted to the Office of Labor Management and Welfare Pension Reports contain a wealth of information essential in the fight against organized crime. Typical of this information are the names of persons who administer and control over \$100,000,000 of the welfare and pension funds, as well as the fees paid to such persons as brokers agents, accountants, attorneys, and others. The reports also contain information as to party-in-interest transactions. In the fight against organized crime this information is not only invaluable, it is indispensable.

With this we agree. As deputy attorney general in charge of prosecution of the great State of Pennsylvania, I know what this means. Others have been prosecutors and share this view. I see my friend from Alabama (Mr. ANDREWS) is present. He knows, as do many of you; we have no quarrel with this.

While the Department of Labor has never before called to the committee's attention any significant problem in this specific area, it is obvious that a potential for serious crime does exist in this area. However, all those reports, Mr. Chairman, are public information, and they certainly are readily available to the Department of Justice for use in their law enforcement activities.

Mr. Chairman, the committee will expect the Department of Labor to be cooperative with the Department of Justice in their activities against organized crime, but it feels that the main responsibility in this area is that of the Department of Justice and it would be a mistake for the Department of Labor to become so heavily involved as proposed in this request. Every record Justice wants is a public record, and we will help them get it. There should be no problem.

Now, going to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under "Consumer protection and environmental health services," here there are internal adjustments. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has been engaged in organizations and reorganizations and internal readjustments and more reorganizations throughout the last 4 or 5 years. So much so that I think the next reorganization should be a reorganization against any more reorganizations, if you know what I mean. We get it annually. But that is the way it is. It is a can of worms. However, the increase is \$8.4 million. That will cover their mandatory costs. They have a job to do and they are doing it well.

The first increase above the budget is for mental health. You will be the first to agree, Mr. Chairman, that that is the way it should be. It is a net increase of

\$2,398,000. That results, first, from the addition of \$4 million to the budget. We have added \$4 million to the budget for the program to assist communities to provide treatment services for alcoholics that was authorized by you in the Alcohol and Narcotic Addicts Rehabilitation Act of 1968.

Then, there is an item of \$1,102,000 to start a new program. This is what you must watch in these departments; the starting of a new program; letting the camel get his nose under that tent. You know, there is nothing more permanent in Washington than a temporary agency or a temporary building. You must be gun shy on these new things. This one is "Early child care demonstrations." Now, would not that break your heart? Here is this cruel FLOOD and his subcommittee. I am against children. Mr. Chairman, this House and this Congress rejected this program last year and we reject it again this year because we already have at least five separate and distinct programs, doing much the same thing that they want this \$1 million for.

And wait until you hear this one. They want \$500,000—which they will not get—for this. Now, most of you do not remember Maury Maverick. When he was here he gave birth to the term gobbledygook. Oh, Maury, if you can hear me, listen to this: \$500,000 to award contracts for research on a number of significant contemporary social problems.

Mr. Chairman, the original budget for 1970 carried \$4 million for the programs I have just mentioned. This was deleted, and I cannot understand why. But this was deleted by the Bureau of the Budget and the budget amendments, but the committee is in complete disagreement with the budget. Mr. Chairman, we have restored the full \$4 million contained in the original budget estimate.

Mr. Chairman, there are approximately 5 million alcoholics in the United States in need of medical and social services. The effects of alcoholism are costly both in dollars and in human suffering. Industry alone loses an estimated \$2 billion every year as a result of alcoholism associated with absenteeism and reduced production. Annually, 10,000 deaths are attributed to alcoholism. Problem drinking has been identified as a factor in over 50 percent of all fatal traffic accidents. Compared with the cost of alcoholism, this appropriation is miniscule. We put it back.

Now, I have discussed, Mr. Chairman, with this House before, and I think it is appropriate for me to again point to research on mental illness, as a striking example of tangible results obtained through medical research. What do we get for our money? What do you get for your money? Ah, here is exhibit A. There is no doubt that this research which is carried on under the National Institute of Mental Health and elsewhere has not only resulted in a great reduction in human suffering, but also has actually saved much more money than it has cost. In the words of the Institute's Director before the committee:

Our progress is reflected in the continuing decrease in the number of Americans residing in the Nation's mental hospitals. Thir-

teen years ago, that number was well over one-half million. Today, after more than a decade of steady advances in research and treatment, there are 401,000—a reduction of nearly 30 percent.

Now, I want you to hear this. Listen to this. This is dramatic:

Last year alone saw a decline of 25,000 patients, or 5.9 percent, including, for the first time, a decrease of 2 percent in the crucial 12-16 age group.

Had the rising mental hospital population seen before 1955 gone unchecked, we would today be confronted by 731,000 patients in our mental hospitals—or nearly twice the actual number.

That is what you got for your money.

The revised budget, Mr. Chairman—and I am talking about now page 11 of the report—the revised budget makes no change in the total amount requested under the comprehensive health planning and services program. Both the original and revised budget—and when I say the “original budget” I mean the Johnson budget, and when I say the “revised budget” it is the Nixon budget. So, if you hear me make a play on these terms, the original budget is the Johnson budget and the revised budget is the Nixon budget. The sum for partnership for health grants is \$190 million in both budgets, and that is what we have in this bill.

However, Mr. Chairman, there is quite a significant internal adjustment in the revised budget to decrease project grants to the States for health activities by \$18 million and increase formula grants by the same amount. One of the basic purposes of the partnership for health amendments to the Public Health Service Act was to shift more of the responsibility for determining priorities in expenditures of health grants to the States. As a general proposition, the committee agrees with this approach. However, Mr. Chairman, the administration proposes that funding of tuberculosis control programs be removed from the project grants category of funding and transferred to formula grants. In 1963, because it was dissatisfied with the lack of progress in controlling tuberculosis, the committee instigated a complete review of tuberculosis control in this country. The resultant report of the task force on tuberculosis control stated that the project grant was the most effective method of providing Federal support to State and local tuberculosis programs because it gave recognition to the fact that the tuberculosis problem is unevenly present among the States and localities. The committee and the Congress have supported tuberculosis control through project grants because they get funds to areas where the problem is greatest. Reports of progress over the past 5 years demonstrate conclusively the wisdom of the committee action. Because formula grants are allocated to States on the basis of population and per capita income with no relevance to specific disease problems the Committee recommends that the Department phase out the project grant support of tuberculosis control activities gradually.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot pass this appropriation for comprehensive health planning and services without mention-

ing a most dramatic new program that we initiated. This Congress, this House, initiated this program in the last supplemental appropriation bill that you voted on just a short time ago, and we are further implementing it in this bill. What is it? It is rubella—German measles—a vaccination program.

The last German measles epidemic—ah, you who are husbands, fathers, you who have children or expect to have more, tell your wives about this, if they do not know. Let me tell you this, and you tell them—the last German measles epidemic occurred in 1964, and resulted in over 20,000 children being born with birth defects ranging from relatively minor deficiencies like a missing toe or finger, if that is minor, to children born with severe mental retardation and those by the thousands born deaf, or blind, or both, because of German measles—rubella. The total eventual cost of that epidemic has been established as high as \$2.8 billion. The U.S. Public Health Service gave us a conservative estimate, that the cost of the 1964 epidemic will be over \$1 billion.

Mr. Chairman, through the research of the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases and the Division of Biologics Standards an effective vaccine has been established against German measles. Scientists now predict that this disease with its horrible consequences can probably be eliminated in the United States within a few years—thank God—through this vaccination program. That is what you are doing with some of the dollars you are appropriating. I am convinced that we can make rubella as much of a rarity in this country as polio, if we all support this program—as we did support the polio vaccination program and campaign. Do you remember that?

Mr. Chairman, we have not earmarked a specific number of dollars for this because it was not necessary. But I am sure I speak for every man in this House when I say we expect the Public Health Service to move forward with this program vigorously. If the funds are insufficient to really meet the needs of the program, I, for one, will say to them—and so will you—we hope they will come back to the Committee on Appropriations and request supplemental funds for this program. I never said that before in my life—or in the last 25 years that I have been in this House—never have I made such an invitation. But here we mean it.

The next rather significant item is a reduction of \$24 million—and now I am on page 12 of the report—\$24 million from the \$100 million request for regional medical programs.

Let me tell you about that. This is my pet pigeon. This is FLOOD's baby. We started out with a heart, cancer, and stroke program. Then some of us soon saw that the idea was so good—“let us not waste time on this—let us go on”—and we created the regional medical programs, so every person in every region in the United States will be embraced and served by this wonderful program.

So when members of my subcommittee went after this—and let me tell you my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. NATCHER)—he sure went after

them—I sat there along side of him while he took them apart bit by bit, and I could just feel my heart turn over. I thought he was going to crucify them. Well, he roughed them up but he did not crucify them. The fact of the matter is I was worried about this. But the fact remains, I must admit, the program has failed by substantial amounts to utilize the funds available in every year since it was initiated. Now it is getting off the ground. Now it is underway. We have implicit confidence in the program.

Now look at page 13 of the report, if you are still with me. The hospital construction program budget. The hospital construction program budget proposed a significant shift—a shift in the method of financing construction and modernization of hospitals and related facilities. You have a lot of mail on this. When you go home during the recess a lot of people are going to talk to you about this.

I am on the boards of two hospitals back in my district. They talk to me. They will talk more at the first meeting I go to when I get back. You, too. The original 1970 budget request was practically at the same level as the appropriation for 1969. The Nixon budget, the revised budget, cut that by \$104,400,000. They cut hospital construction and allied facilities grants by that amount. Then there was a proposed shift to what they call a mortgage guarantee program. That was entirely in keeping and entirely consistent with the philosophy of the present administration and their legislative proposals. They were consistent with their legislative philosophy in making that cut.

What happened to them was this: The legislative proposal made by the administration was turned down by this House. So where does that leave your committee? Not on the horns of a dilemma, but in a difficult situation. The legislative proposal has been turned down, and we must do one of two things. Your committee must either approve a budget that would cut hospital construction \$104,400,000 or go over the budget by that amount.

Do you know what we did? Do you know what this bad, heartless committee did? Do you remember when everybody was calling Hitler names and trying to outdo each other on names you could call Hitler, and they made great speeches and used big words to describe how bad Hitler was, no good, blah, blah, blah? Winston Churchill went on the floor of the House of Commons, after everyone had talked for hours attacking Hitler, and do you know what he said? “Hitler is a bad man,” and he sat down. Of course. Well, this bad committee, what did they do? They went over the budget \$104,400,000 for hospital construction. How do you like that? These heartless workers.

I now refer to page 13 of the report. The total in the bill for all the items now carried under the National Institutes of Health—and the discussion goes on from there for several pages—the total of the bill of NIH is \$1,453,000,000, a net increase of \$1,041,000 over the budget, and only \$44 million over the amount appropriated for 1969. This increase of 3 percent is obviously less than

enough to cover increased costs and so, in total, is going to mean some reduction in the program level. Due to rather substantial increases of approximately \$46,000,000 for the item "Health manpower" and \$41,000,000 for construction of health educational facilities, both aimed at greater output of trained medical and health personnel, the regular Institutes such as the Cancer Institute, Heart Institute, Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, and so forth, are actually cut back below the 1969 level. Thus, what most of us think of as the National Institutes of Health will not only have to absorb the increased costs in 1970, but actually will be cut over \$27 million below the 1969 funding level.

The amount in this bill for the appropriation "Health manpower" is \$218 million. That is the exact amount of the request and it is an increase of \$46 million over 1969. That is an increase. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is beyond anyone's doubt that this increase had to be made. This is the output of doctors. More doctors, more nurses, more dentists—that is what we need and by the thousands.

The construction funds, of course, go hand in glove with the grants to increase this manpower; \$126 million is in this bill, and that is \$41 million over 1969.

We did not hesitate—not a minute—in approving the increase in the budget for both of these. The committee, in effect, is indicating its agreement with both the Johnson and the Nixon administrations on the importance of this problem. The current situation dictates a shift of emphasis. Every administration, Mr. Chairman, has a catch phrase. We remember them all down through the years. I will not recite them. This year for this administration, the catch phrase is "a realignment of priorities." Is that not beautiful? The only thing the matter with it is that I did not think of it. This will shift emphasis from research to delivery. That is the important thing. But, with so much public attention on the need for delivery of services, there might be a tendency in certain quarters—and there is—to consider research an expensive luxury. It is not. We know it is a most profitable investment, I assure the Chairman. It is no luxury. The fact is that the practice of medicine has been drastically changed during the past decade as a result of what we have done for research—we in this House.

NIH research grants provide 70 percent of the funds for medical and health-related research conducted in academic institutions, hospitals, and other non-profit research institutions and about 40 percent of the funds expended for all medical research in this country. Most of the biomedical research done in this country in recent years has been to some extent dependent, and in many cases very heavily dependent, on funds made available through the NIH appropriations. The pervasive role played by this research support and the complex, interlocking pattern of many separate research achievements that eventually result in the solution of a disease problem make it very difficult, and rather meaningless, to classify accomplishments by

source of support. It is, however, undeniable that the impressive progress would not have been possible without the extensive support provided by NIH.

This year, Mr. Chairman, I have bowed to what appears to me as the inevitable, under all the circumstances, and have agreed to support appropriations for medical research that are woefully inadequate to exploit the leads we have to the answers of so many medical problems. I will certainly strongly endorse, and I think the American people will demand, the proper support for these activities as soon as we can put our fiscal house in order.

I was very impressed with the testimony of Dr. Howard Bierman on May 22, when he told my Subcommittee on Appropriations of a mass screening technique for cancer of the lung and cancer of the uterus which he said was called Cytec.

Every cancer specialist in the country agrees that early detection of cancer of the lung and cancer of the uterus would save thousands of lives each year. This means mass screening. The Cytec process, if it fulfills its early promise, may well be the answer to the problem. There are not enough pathologists in the country to process smears from 90 or 100 million people who might want and need tests for lung and uterine cancer. Therefore, we have to have an electronic or mechanical device of some kind to do the screening and this is what Cytec seems to be. The pathologists of the country would be relieved of the enormous amount of time they spend testing smears which are negative. This should be done by machine so that the pathologist can use his time examining the positive smears which will enable diagnosis to be made.

This process would give real meaning to the Pap smear, which was such a great discovery in itself. It is the reading of the smear that needs to be done on a mass basis. If this could be done as rapidly as the Cytec process suggests it will realize the full potential of the work of Dr. Papanicolaou. It would make the Pap smear available to millions of Americans who do not get it now. The American Cancer Society is to be congratulated on sponsoring the original Cytec studies in New York. I hope they go ahead now with large-scale studies to determine beyond any doubt the value of the process.

It may be necessary at some point for the Federal Government to participate in these tests. Mass screening for these forms of cancer is so important. There has been continuing cooperation between the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute, so it would be no problem to have them cooperate in a joint venture like this if further developments indicate that it is advisable.

It is refreshing to have people come before our committee and report what is being done outside the Federal structure. The people are to be commended on their initiative and enterprise. I wish them well.

Let us turn now to page 32 of the report, and starting on that page look at the budget reductions in the Office of

Education—and these have generated a great deal of correspondence—more so than all the rest of the items in the bill put together. Do Members think they have received stacks of mail? Well, if the Members have received stacks, I have received stacks and stacks and stacks—open end. There is nothing wrong with that. That is the right of petition. It can be overdone. It is entirely possible that it has been. There is such a thing in poker—of course, I know, Mr. Chairman, the chairman would never play poker, but I am very good at it—and there is such a thing as overplaying one's hand.

You know; overplaying your hand. In the theater, Mrs. REID, there is an old expression: There is only one prime sin in the theater. If a man cannot act, very well, he cannot act; that is just too bad. But if he can, and overplays a scene, that is a crime. Never overplay a scene, if you have an audience. I am advised I have an audience. All right.

I agree with the protestants. This committee unanimously agrees with these protestants that the budget sent to us for education was unrealistically low. There is no doubt about it.

On the other hand, I think it adds perspective to compare what is proposed in the budget—now, wait until you hear this—to compare what is proposed in the budget with what was actually appropriated a few years ago. The revised budget for the Office of Education for 1970, in round figures—now hear this, in 1970, for the budget—is \$3.2 billion. Put that in your head.

What was it in 1965? For 1965 do you know what it was? The total appropriation for the Office of Education in 1965 was \$1.5 billion; \$1.5 billion in 1965.

Now hold your hats. Now hear this. Do you know what it was for 1960, 10 years ago? Less than \$500 million. Less than half a billion dollars.

Education has been neglected? Education has been neglected by this Congress? They were starving to death until you, Mr. Chairman, and this House realized and recognized the need in this burgeoning Nation for education. You took the lead. You bared your breast year after year. Do not forget that when the tears start falling about how education has been neglected and nobody cares in this heartless House. As my grandfather would say, God rest his soul, put that in your pipe and smoke it.

Why, if anybody would have proposed 10 years ago a budget of \$3.2 billion for education they would have had the guy with a white coat from St. Elizabeths standing out in the hall to pick him up.

For elementary and secondary education the committee recommends the amount of the budget request for title I which will make \$1,216,175,000 available for this purpose, which is \$93,048,000 more than the amount available for 1969.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just a few weeks ago, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, we passed the education bill. This included what came to be known as the Green amendment. What did the Green amendment do? The Green amendment created a package.

The Green amendment created a package, and into this package went these four items.

Mr. Chairman, following the action of this House, this committee is recommending one lump sum for supplementary educational services, under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; library resources, under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; guidance, counseling, and testing, under title V of the National Defense Education Act; and equipment and minor remodeling, under title III of the National Defense Education Act. The bill includes \$200,163,000 for this purpose compared with \$116,163,000 in the budget, all of which was earmarked for supplementary educational services. The budget requested nothing at all for library resources; guidance, counseling, and testing; and equipment and minor remodeling.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will in just a few minutes. As soon as I finish.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I will in a few minutes. We will have lots of time.

So your committee, Mr. Chairman, reversed that. We put everything back into a package as suggested by the Green amendment. There were other things in the Green amendment, but I am just speaking of this part. Then we went above the budget by \$84 million.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. FLOOD. Well, I said that I would not yield until I had finished my statement, but, of course, how could I refuse the gentleman from Kentucky? I simply could not do it.

Mr. PERKINS. First of all, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for perhaps the most eloquent speech that I have ever heard since I have been here during the past 20 years. But on the last issue—

Mr. FLOOD. Did you get that, Mr. Reporter? Are you sure you have that down?

Mr. PERKINS. On the last issue you have raised I think the Bureau of the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations have thwarted and thrown aside the intent of the Green amendment.

First, the Green amendment does not take effect—that proposal, if it becomes law, until 1971.

Mr. FLOOD. That is correct.

Mr. PERKINS. And it left in the hands of the States, the State departments of education the discretion as to how much would go for each of these activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 1 hour.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. NATCHER) Mr. FLOOD was allowed to continue for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I yield further to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Here you come along

and place the discretion in the Office of Education.

Mr. FLOOD. Well, I shall have to interrupt the gentleman because of that gavel which the gentleman just heard.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken too much time and I will attempt to explain the committee action on the rest of the bill in a more expeditious manner.

I know you all have heard about the impacted school areas. I have been called many things in life, but I have never been called naive. There are 385 Members of this House who have a share of this pie and I will not debate it because I do not have the time.

However, I know perfectly well and you know perfectly well that an amendment is going to be introduced, probably by a member of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER), to restore a large part of these funds and I am not going to bare my breast again and again against the inevitable because I know the amendment is going to pass.

So, under the circumstances it is unnecessary for me to redefend this old argument. As has been said by the gentleman from Illinois, the able minority whip, there has never been a pancake so flat that it does not have two sides.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my time is running out. I will leave out the asides and cover the rest in just a few minutes.

For higher education the committee recommends an overall increase of \$5,000,000, and has made adjustments which will take \$16 million from the scholarship program, \$5,306,000 from the teacher fellowship program, and add \$26,306,000 to the NDEA direct student loan program. This will result in the scholarship and fellowship programs, and the loan program, all operating at approximately the 1969 level.

Vocational education is another program that has generated stacks of mail. There is a concerted drive by the proponents of this program to get Congress to appropriate \$100 million over the budget. I am personally convinced, and a majority of the committee was convinced, that this program is important enough that it should be funded at a higher level than proposed in the budget. The committee is recommending \$357,216,000, or \$78,000,000 above the request, composed of \$70,000,000 for the basic grant program and \$10 million for the work-study program, with a slightly offsetting decrease of \$2,000,000 budgeted for transfer to the Secretary of Labor for studies of manpower needs.

You have all been visited I am sure by the librarians. The committee has not recommended restoration of all of the reduction below 1969 that was recommended in the budget, but has approximately split the difference and included \$126,209,000 in the bill, an increase of \$18,500,000 over the budget and a reduction of \$16,935,000 below 1969.

The balance of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare portion of the bill includes some very large sums of money; but, with a few exceptions, for relatively routine and, in large part, uncontrollable items. The largest is the appropriation "Grants to States

for public assistance," which is continuing its upward trend. The bill includes the exact amount of the budget request of \$7,351,551,000, an increase of \$935 million over 1969. The main elements of the increase are \$115,195,000 for aid to families with dependent children, \$292,145,000 for old age assistance, \$121,661,000 for aid to the permanently and totally disabled, \$333,322,000 for medical assistance and \$100,442,000 for social services and administration at the State and local level. This is the largest of the uncontrollable items included in the bill.

Some of you have likely gotten correspondence or calls from people interested in vocational rehabilitation. The budget is an increase of \$130,793,000, but there would be an additional increase of \$53 million were it not for a limitation which provides that the allotment base be held to \$500 million rather than \$600 million as provided in the basic legislation. The committee agrees with the administration that the increase of \$131 million is rather liberal even for such a worthwhile program as this, and has approved the proposal contained in the budget.

Some of you have undoubtedly also received complaints with regard to the reduction of \$2,200,000, in the revised budget, below the amount included in the original budget for training staff for the university affiliated mental retardation centers. This was in connection with the appropriation, "Maternal and child health and welfare." The committee has made three changes in the revised budget. First, it has restored the \$2,200,000 to which I have just referred. Second, it has deleted the increase of \$2,500,000 for research in maternal and child health and crippled children's services, which leaves \$6,200,000 in the bill for this purpose. Third, it has deleted the increase of \$200,000 for the research and demonstration program in child welfare, which leaves \$4,400,000 in the bill for this purpose.

I think I should mention one other item in HEW. The revised budget contained an increase of \$5 million over the original budget for "Cooperative research or demonstration projects." All of the increase was earmarked for income maintenance experiments which will make \$9,700,000 available for that purpose. The proposal is to launch several income maintenance experiments at an estimated annual cost of \$1,000,000 to \$1,500,000 for each experiment.

The committee approved this proposal with some hesitation, however, most people are of the firm belief that the Nation's welfare system is badly in need of major reform. Many different approaches have been offered to remedy defects in the current system, but all of these suggested changes raised a number of key questions on which information is essential if a sensible long-term program of reform is to be undertaken. If these experiments result in any significant improvement in our current programs in this area, they will be worth many times their cost.

The related agencies section of the bill is rather routine this year since it does

not include the Office of Economic Opportunity. As you know, the authorizing legislation to extend the life of OEO has not yet been reported out of the House and Senate legislative committees. We, therefore, recommend that action on the budget request of slightly over \$2 billion be deferred.

Mr. Chairman, we held 4 months of hearings. We heard 659 witnesses. Our hearings have 8,500 pages. The members of this subcommittee, I am proud to let you know, sat through every minute of these hearings.

Mr. Chairman, I assure you that we did not casually or precipitously handle this bill. Under all the circumstances—under all the circumstances—plus the rule of reason, Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. I urge its support.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that in my 26 years in the Congress the gentleman from Pennsylvania has made one of the finest presentations I have ever heard. The gentleman knows his subject well.

As he has described it, this is a can of worms. I served on this committee for one term, and unless one has served on that committee one does not know the problems the members of this committee have. So I say the gentleman from Pennsylvania has done an outstanding job, not only of conducting the hearings before the committee, but in presenting the bill on the floor of this House, and I think the gentleman is entitled to the support of all of the Members.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. He is very gracious and I appreciate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has consumed 1 hour and 5 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first year that I am privileged to make the leadoff presentation for the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill for our side.

The shoes of our good friend, former Congressman Melvin Laird, now serving as our Secretary of Defense, are mighty big ones to fill indeed, and while I cannot expect to match his performance, I am very grateful for his tutelage during the past 10 years that I have served on this subcommittee.

I want to pay special tribute to our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and all the Members on the majority side for their very cooperative spirit in the makeup of this bill. On our side we are happy to have the charming and hardworking gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID) added to our subcommittee and she and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) have attended our meetings religiously and contributed greatly to our deliberations. I think it should be noted that

our hearings this year extended over a 3-month period. We heard 659 witnesses and the testimony developed covers nearly 9,000 pages.

This is a bill that reaches in some way into every household in the country and I dare say touches the life of every individual in one way or another.

As you well know, there are many items in this bill as pure and sacrosanct as God, mother, and country, and when we talk about appropriations for funding these very worthwhile and laudable programs, it would be so much easier if we never had to arrive at some arbitrary figure, for regardless of what we decide upon ultimately, there will always be those who will argue with our figures.

We do the best job we know how and, personally, I think we are bringing a pretty good bill to you today.

As the chairman has indicated, the total amount carried in this bill is \$16,651,039,700, but it should be borne in mind that unauthorized items included in the budget on which our committee has taken no action includes the Office of Economic Opportunity at roughly a \$2 billion level; advance funding for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—nearly \$1¼ billion; some \$28 million for the aging; and some \$10 million for assistance to the Indians in primary and secondary education.

Over and above this, there is permanent legislation authorizing the continuation of certain Government activities without consideration by the Congress during the annual appropriation process to the tune of \$47,803,501,000 for the fiscal year 1970. These are in the main the trust fund accounts, so you really have a grand total involved in this bill for the fiscal year 1970 of \$64,500,000,000, exclusive, as I said, of those aforementioned unauthorized items.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, or would the gentleman prefer that I wait until he concludes his presentation?

Mr. MICHEL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I would say to the gentleman that in addition this bill does not provide a dollar for the pay increases of July 1 of this year, does it?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. GROSS. And that would be a very substantial addition to the bill, is that correct?

Mr. MICHEL. There is no question about it.

Mr. GROSS. Again I thank the gentleman for yielding and say to him that although this bill is in my opinion, much richer than it should be, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) has voted consistently for economy and fiscal responsibility.

Mr. MICHEL. I think this is the toughest appropriation bill of any on which to make reductions, and I suspect that we are doing well as a committee when we simply hold our own. But we have done more than that this year in deference to those many, many Members who have pleaded with us by word and com-

munication to add money to the bill in the fields of education, student loans, vocational education, and hospital construction. As the chairman pointed out, we have \$155.8 million over the budget estimates in our bill.

Unfortunately, over \$9.6 billion in this bill are for programs classified as "relatively uncontrollable" in the budget message of the President, so all we really have to work with is the \$7 billion balance of controllable items.

It is no secret that there are many Members unhappy with our bill and a number of amendments will be offered to increase it substantially.

I made the point yesterday and I will make it again here today that many of those who will be sponsoring amendments calling for increases in this bill of \$900 million or a billion dollars are the very same Members who voted against extension of the tax surcharge just a few weeks ago.

On Tuesday, July 22, the President issued a statement when he signed the final supplemental appropriation bill for the fiscal year ended June 30, and in that statement made mention of his revised 1970 budget that contained specific reductions totaling \$4,000,000,000. He went on to say:

Since April the budget picture has worsened. We now anticipate further increases of approximately \$2.5 billion in expenditure for such uncontrollable items as interest on the public debt, medicare, social security, civil service retirement benefits, reduced receipts from offshore oil leases, public assistance and veterans benefits.

The President went on to say that he has no alternative but to direct "the heads of all departments and agencies to reduce spending in the fiscal year just begun by an additional \$3.5 billion—the amount necessary to bring current estimates back in line with the \$192.9 billion target figure we set in April."

The President concluded this statement by saying:

The Congress should also recognize that if it approves further increases above the April budget estimates, we cannot live within the \$192.9 billion unless more off-setting cuts are made.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYS. Did the gentleman read the paper today about the amount of surplus we had at the end of the fiscal year? When only last week they were estimating \$900,000 and it turned out to be \$3½ billion.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes, I read that. The point I am trying to make is even though there was a glowing account of a \$3½ billion surplus, since April we have eaten up \$2½ billion in that in uncontrollable items. So really we are just about where we started from.

Mr. HAYS. I am sure the gentleman from Illinois knows what he is talking of when he talks of uncontrollables. But the point I am trying to make is that I would not put too much stock in what the Bureau of the Budget says about anything if they cannot make estimates from

one week to another without making a \$2½ billion mistake.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, we have our work cut out for us, and I would hope the House would reject these amendments to increase our bill and sustain your Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, our committee has drawn a pretty taut line on research and demonstration projects throughout this bill. As a matter of fact, Secretary Finch was very interested in the budget request of \$25 million for demonstration schools, but since the testimony was so vague as to what the Department had in mind, your committee disallowed every dime of the request. I am not sure whether or not it is possible to spell out in any better detail what we are hoping to accomplish with this kind of research and demonstration request, and I for one would have been willing to give a little on this item.

At the same time, we did keep the money in here—\$9.7 million, as a matter of fact—for cooperative research for demonstration projects in income maintenance experiments.

Under any other situation or given set of circumstances, I would be inclined to have written off this request, except for the fact that we have got to do something to turn this whole welfare situation around. Mind you, we have in this bill a total of \$7,351,551,000 in grants to the States for maintenance, medical assistance, and social services and administration—in other words, public assistance. It is a shocking and frightening figure that continues to rise at an alarming rate. As a matter of fact, this item alone is over \$935,000,000 more than we appropriated for last year. The Secretary has given us repeated assurances in his testimony that "this is not a proposal for a guaranteed annual income, but that we want to key in on the incentive to work," manpower development programs, mobility, especially the rural migration matter, family stability, and size of family, and finally the demand for social services. These are the questions we hope to get some answers to in the Department's proposal to conduct a series of "well-controlled and carefully designed experiments, each of which will be an integral part of an overall plan."

Before getting into more specifics of this bill. Let me touch on two subjects which we find ribboned throughout our hearings, namely family planning and nutrition. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare alone will be spending \$65,899,500 on family planning services, which includes training, research, public information, and direct services.

These programs are carried on under the Social and Rehabilitation Service, Public Health Service, Health Services and Mental Health Administration, National Institutes of Health, and the Office of Education. Now, besides all these bureaus and divisions of this Department getting into the act, you will also find five other Federal agencies involved in one way or another in family planning, including the Department of State, the Department of the Interior, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Sci-

ence Foundation, and the Agency for International Development. As a matter of fact, we found out the latter agency gave the National Institutes of Health a

million and a half dollars for this activity. So, we simply scaled down the Department's request in this amount and more, where we felt it justified.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—POPULATION AND FAMILY PLANNING ACTIVITIES—OBLIGATIONS  
FISCAL YEAR 1966-70

Agency and program	Fiscal year				1970 (recommended in H.R. 13111)
	1966	1967	1968	1969	
Total, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.....	\$13,380,000	\$19,719,000	\$29,255,000	\$47,242,000	\$65,899,500
<b>SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE</b>					
Maternal and child health:					
Maternal and child health formula grants to States.....	1,800,000	2,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000	3,500,000
Project grants for maternity and infant care.....	1,200,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	14,500,000	26,300,000
Research and training in maternal and child health.....	600,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	1,700,000
Public assistance:					
Social services.....	2,000,000	3,000,000	6,300,000	8,300,000	10,300,000
Medical assistance.....	1,000,000	1,500,000	3,000,000	4,500,000	6,400,000
Cooperative research to prevent and reduce dependency.....			200,000	200,000	300,000
Subtotal, Social and Rehabilitation Service.....	6,600,000	10,000,000	16,000,000	31,500,000	48,500,000
<b>PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE</b>					
Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service: Food and drug administration, research contracts.....					
		82,000	569,000	843,000	1,118,000
Subtotal, Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service.....		82,000	569,000	843,000	1,118,000
<b>HEALTH SERVICES AND MENTAL HEALTH ADMINISTRATION</b>					
Patient care and special health services.....					
Indian Health Service.....	152,000	181,000	273,000	323,000	425,000
National Communicable Disease Center.....		20,000	000	38,000	43,000
National Institute of Mental Health.....	416,000	481,000	554,000	635,000	644,000
National Center for Health Statistics.....				64,000	314,000
Comprehensive health planning: Partnership for health.....		125,000	171,000	391,000	500,000
Subtotal, Health Services and Mental Health Administration.....	568,000	807,000	1,178,000	1,671,000	2,180,000
<b>NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH</b>					
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development.....					
	5,257,000	7,219,000	8,113,000	9,632,005	10,391,000
Health Manpower, training grants.....	81,000	199,000	417,000	483,000	443,000
Subtotal, National Institutes of Health.....	5,338,000	7,418,000	8,530,000	10,115,000	13,588,000
Subtotal, Public Health Service.....	5,906,000	8,307,000	10,360,000	12,586,000	14,089,000
<b>OFFICE OF EDUCATION</b>					
Elementary and secondary education:					
Supplementary educational centers and services.....	63,000	502,000	1,485,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Grants to States for guidance, counseling, and testing.....	233,000	233,000	233,000	161,500	161,500
Dropout prevention program.....				8,000	20,000
Higher education:					
Grants to States for community service and continuing education.....	175,000	225,000	315,000	380,000	410,000
Prospective elementary and secondary teacher fellowships.....	72,000	121,000	121,000	100,000	162,000
EPDA Institute programs.....				230,000	200,000
Adult Education: adult basic education programs.....	317,000	317,000	644,000	720,000	800,000
Grants to States for vocational education.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000
Subtotal, Office of Education.....	874,000	1,412,000	2,812,000	3,113,500	3,267,500
Scientific activities overseas <sup>1</sup> (Special foreign currency programs, Public Law 480).....			314,000	2,400,000	3,500,000

<sup>1</sup> Not included in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare total.

So far as nutrition is concerned, there is an increase of \$4 million in the budget and the Secretary has recently reprogrammed an additional \$1 million in HEW.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. Chairman, getting to the specifics so far as the Department of Labor is concerned, the biggest item is \$655,605,000 for the manpower and development training program, which represents an increase over the 1969 funding level of \$248,113,000. This should practically

double the number of trainees in the JOBS program from some 75,000 up to 140,000 and increase the number of trainees in the CEP—concentrated employment program—up to more than 156,000. We cut the revised budget request by \$20,000,000 for the so-called "State supplements." The majority of the committee was inclined to believe that grant programs in this area should be consolidated rather than proliferated, notwithstanding the fact that the Con-

gress in amending the Manpower Development and Training Act in 1968, made provision for this program in title V. The Secretary of Labor has told us that the States are ready and willing to accept this responsibility of providing at least 25 percent of the total cost of projects conducted under title V, and that 24 States report that funds are available, or have been requested, to match the 75 percent Federal grants during fiscal year 1970. As I said before, with the serious restraints imposed upon us by budget limitations, the majority of the committee decided to delete this \$20,000,000 from the bill.

While in the Office of the Manpower Administrator, we see an increase over 1969 of \$8,690,000, this increase is entirely due to transfers to this appropriation from other activities in the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training, Bureau of Employment Security, Office of Economic Opportunity, and the work incentive program. We have also made a reduction in the budget request for the experimental demonstration and research program to hold that to the 1969 funding level, although I must say that I have some reservation about this reduction, for it denies the request for \$1,582,000 for: First, a study of seasonality in the construction industry; second, the continuation of experiments in financing the move of workers to areas where jobs can be secured; third, the insuring of security bonds for workers which permits them to be employed. We were told that without this insurance, employers are often unwilling to take a risk with workers who have prison records.

I am inclined to go along with the view that studies that lead to the reduction of seasonality in construction would provide fuller employment for the individual worker, lead to a reduction in the cost of construction, and further assist in meeting the critical housing needs of the country. You may remember that this program was also specifically provided for by the Congress in the 1968 amendments to the MDTA.

We also denied the request for \$2 million under the labor-management services item that would have provided the Justice Department with information about undesirable elements in the management of workers, welfare, and pension funds. Actually, this was a request for 130 new positions and while we certainly do not want to be standing in the way of the Department of Justice's war on organized crime, we did not feel the Department of Labor ought to be saddled with this additional number of employees to be working for all practical purposes for the Department of Justice, and we say so in our committee report.

In the Office of the Secretary, we have provided for the increase in 31 positions to take over the audit function due to increases in manpower training activities, and this reflects the dollar increase of \$477,000 over the appropriations for 1969.

In concluding my remarks with respect to the Department of Labor, I would like to give a résumé of the reorganization of the Manpower Admin-

istration, so that Members might be brought up to date.

REORGANIZATION OF THE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

On March 14, 1969, the Secretary of Labor announced a sweeping reorganization of the Manpower Administration within the Department of Labor. This reorganization was the result of an intensive study of the organization that was launched by the Secretary shortly after he took office. The study revealed many structural weaknesses that had developed as manpower programs became more and more complex and began to outstrip the ability of the organization to deal with them.

There were too many lines to the field, too little coordination of the planning and operating aspects of the programs, and too much duplication of effort. The States, cities, and towns deserved a more efficient, understandable, and responsive Federal partner.

In order to remedy these deficiencies, alternative organizational structures were considered and an explicit plan was circulated to interested parties, including Members of the Congress.

Once general approval of the idea was obtained, the process of reorganization was started—that effort is now virtually complete, and the following represent some of the major changes that have grown out of it:

First. The top executive management capability of the Manpower Administration was strengthened by reestablishing the Assistant Secretary for Manpower and the Manpower Administrator as separate positions.

Second. The Manpower Administrator has been able to assume operating management responsibilities with improved staff support.

Third. A single direct line of administration was established from the Office of the Manpower Administrator to the regions. This arrangement replaces the multiple lines of administration from the national office to the field that existed under the previous structure.

Fourth. Duplication and overlapping authority in the administration of manpower programs at the national level was reduced by combining the U.S. Employment Service and the Bureau of Work-Training Programs.

Fifth. The status and effectiveness of the Employment Service function has been enhanced by moving responsibility for this function to a higher position in the Manpower Administration.

Sixth. Duplication in the provision of administrative and management support services to program offices is greatly reduced by moving resources and responsibility from the bureaus to the staff components of the Manpower Administration.

Seventh. Decentralization of operating authority, responsibility, and accountability to the Regional Manpower Administrators and the consolidation of the Manpower Administration field staff under their direction has led to significant improvements in program operations at the State and local level with the concomitant improvement of service to the public.

Thus, the newly organized Manpower Administration will be able to meet the challenge of new and expanding programs in an efficient and timely manner.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

FOOD AND DRUG CONTROL

The first specific item in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is food and drug control, and our bill includes \$72,007,000. The amount of the request and an increase of \$3,122,000 above the amount appropriated for 1969. Incidentally, 10 years ago the appropriation for food and drug control was a mere \$13,800,000, so you can see what is happened in that relatively short period of time. The only program increase is \$717,000 for the very important work of expediting the review of new drug submissions from industry, and this increase is offset by decreases of \$282,000 in other activities.

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

The next item is Air Pollution Control and this is one of the major problem areas, and as we say in our report, "More must be done if we are going to make reasonable progress in correcting the problem." We have an increase here of \$5,067,000 above the amount appropriated for 1969. Just 5 years ago, the appropriation for this item was less than \$22,000,000.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONTROL

For Environmental Control, our bill includes \$55,208,000, the amount of the request, which is \$12,213,000 above the appropriation for 1969. Incidentally, 5 years ago the appropriation for this item was just a shade over \$9,000,000. As a committee, we would like to see a reprogramming of some activities to increase the availability of funds for the solid waste program.

MENTAL HEALTH

Moving on to the very vital field of mental health, we have \$360,302,000, which is slightly over the budget request, and represents an increase of \$96,762,000 over the appropriation for 1969. Ten years ago we were appropriating just \$68,000,000 for this item.

The larger items in this increase are \$4,000,000 for the programs to assist communities to provide treatment services for alcoholics authorized in the Alcoholic and Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968; and \$2,931,000 for the narcotic addict treatment program, of which \$2,500,000 is to provide after-care services for approximately 1,300 narcotic addicts under contracts with community agencies.

Unfortunately, there are approximately 5 million alcoholics in the United States in need of medical, psychological, and social services. Testimony before our committee discloses that industry alone loses \$2 billion yearly as a result of alcohol-associated absenteeism and reduced work efficiency. Ten thousand deaths annually are attributed to alcoholism, and problem drinking has been identified as a factor in nearly 50 percent of fatal traffic accidents. So, I think it is quite fair to state that compared with the cost of alcoholism, this appropriation item is indeed minuscule.

One of the striking examples of tangible results obtained through medical research comes in this field of mental illness. It was very enlightening to learn that there has been a significant decrease in the number of Americans residing in our Nation's mental hospitals. Thirteen years ago there were well over a half million persons committed to mental hospitals. Today, after more than a decade of steady advances in research and treatment, there are 401,000, or a reduction of nearly 30 percent. Last year alone, we were told, there was a decline of 25,000 patients, or 5.9 percent, including, for the first time, a decrease of 2 percent in the crucial 15-26 age group. Had the rising mental hospital population seen before 1955 gone unchecked, we would today be confronted by 731,000 patients in our mental hospitals—or nearly twice the actual number.

#### HEALTH SERVICES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The bill includes \$44,975,000, the amount of the request, an increase of approximately \$4,000,000 over the amount available for similar activities in 1969. This appropriation relates to research and development in the area of actually rendering health services in much the same manner as the appropriations to the National Institutes of Health relate to research and development in the field of medical science. Both the original budget and the amended budget stress the importance of doing more in the area of getting the advances medical science translated into health services that are actually available to the people who need them. Our committee agrees entirely with this attitude and has approved the request in full.

#### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH PLANNING AND SERVICES

The bill includes \$207,143,000, a reduction of \$6,890,000 from the request, and \$30,853,000 above the appropriations for 1969. The reduction made by the committee represents the increase requested for migrant health grants. The bill includes \$7,200,000 for this purpose, the same amount as was available in 1969.

The significant change from 1969, in the budget, was to increase by \$23,968,000 the amount for formula grants to States for health activities, under which the States make the decisions as to priorities; and to decrease by \$6,600,000 the amount available for project grants to the States, under which the Federal Government makes the decisions as to priorities.

#### REGIONAL MEDICAL PROGRAMS

The bill includes \$76,000,000, a reduction of \$24,000,000 from the request, and an increase of \$14,093,000 above the amount appropriated for 1969. As our chairman said in recommending a reduction of \$24,000,000 from the request, the committee has no intention of curtailing the regional medical programs. On the contrary, the committee strongly supports this program and is disappointed that it got started so slowly.

We do have an item in this section to provide \$500,000 for a demonstration

project to "find out more about the causes of violent behavior that results in death or critical injury to others and seek to develop medical means to help prevent people from undertaking senseless violence." There was considerable division of thought in the committee on this item and I personally am taking exception to it, for I cannot conceive our learning anything new about the subject that we do not already know.

#### COMMUNICABLE DISEASES

The bill includes \$38,638,000, the amount of the request. It is interesting to note that during the Hong Kong flu epidemic in 1968-69, the virus was isolated in Hong Kong by July 25 and it was submitted to World Influenza Center in London on the 29th. The Communicable Disease Center is the International Reference Center for the Western Hemisphere. After establishing that the strains were different from the last flu here, the strains were furnished to the Division of Biologics Standards and by November 19 the first vaccine reached the market. Also, a vaccine has been licensed and production started for the expected epidemic of German measles this fall. With regard to venereal diseases, we are working on a diagnostic blood test for gonorrhea. We are spending approximately \$1 million on this. The increase rate is approximately 14 percent last year. The total for VD is \$4,937,000.

#### HOSPITAL CONSTRUCTION

The bill includes \$258,323,000, an increase of \$104,400,000 over the request. The chairman has explained the reasoning of the majority of the committee on this item, although I would personally have preferred to defer action to give the administration's legislative proposal a chance.

The bill also includes \$72,224,000—the amount of the request—for patient care and special health services.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Now we turn to the National Institutes of Health. As has been pointed out, the budget estimates for the NIH this year reflect, for the first time, the expanded organization and broader role of NIH as one of the three agencies into which the Department's health functions were recast in April 1968. NIH, which for many years has been justly proud of its pre-eminence in the conduct and support of biomedical research, now also has the responsibility for the health manpower and biomedical communication programs of the Department.

#### DIVISION OF BIOLOGICS STANDARDS

For the Division of Biologics Standards the bill includes \$8,225,000, the amount of the request. I think it is interesting to note that this Division played a major role in the development and licensing of the Rubella vaccine, and helped in the development and fast production of the influenza vaccine last winter.

#### NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

The amount in the bill for the National Cancer Institute is \$180,725,000, the

amount of the request. In 1969 cancer will claim 615,000 new victims and 325,000 lives in the United States. This is only exceeded by heart disease. Cancer mortality is increasing at a little less than 1 percent a year. Even with the best methods of treatment under optimum conditions, one-half of the victims would die. Lung cancer, in particular, is rising at an alarming rate and few of its victims can be cured.

In the area of detection it is interesting to note in just one type that available methods are not being used. Less than 30 percent of the women who should be getting the pap smear are doing so. Out of approximately 60 million women who should have had the test in 1968, only 18 million were tested. However, over the years the percent of women participating is growing: 1960, 8.3 percent; 1963, 15.8 percent; 1965, 22.5 percent; 1968, 30 percent.

#### NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

The bill includes \$160,513,000 for the Heart Institute, the amount requested. Diseases of the heart and the circulatory system are the major cause of death in the United States. They account for 54 percent of all deaths. They strike down over 1 million Americans each year—three times as many as all forms of cancer and nearly twice as many as all other causes of death combined. Work is continuing on artificial hearts and perfecting heart transplants.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH

The amount the committee is recommending for the National Institute of Dental Research is \$29,289,000, the amount of the request. This Institute has launched a national program aimed at the complete preventability of tooth decay by 1980. This is the most prevalent of diseases, affecting 98 percent of all Americans.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ARTHRITIS AND METABOLIC DISEASES

For the National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases, the bill includes \$137,668,000, the amount of the request. The committee this year heard testimony on the successful development of more effective artificial kidneys, with proven performance in clinical trials, which will be able to maintain patients with loss of kidney function more simply and less expensively than the equipment available heretofore.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF NEUROLOGICAL DISEASES AND STROKE

For the National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke the bill includes \$101,256,000, the amount requested. The Institute will continue its head and spinal-cord injury program and expand it as funds permit. The committee heard very dramatic testimony in the treatment of patients with Parkinson's disease with the use of the drug L-Dopa.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ALLERGY AND INFECTIOUS DISEASES

The bill includes the amount of the request, \$102,389,000 for the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases. This Institute was also very much

involved in the fast delivery of the Hong Kong flu vaccine last year.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF GENERAL MEDICAL SCIENCES

The amount is the bill for the National Institute of General Medical Sciences is \$154,288,000, the amount of the request. The Institute is starting a program in the research of trauma. The objective being to reduce the death rate, suffering and disability caused by injuries of all types.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF CHILD HEALTH AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

The amount included in the bill is \$73,098,000, reduction of \$2,754,000 from the amount requested. The reduction is in the area of family planning research. As I mentioned earlier, there is \$65 million in the bill for family planning activities.

NATIONAL EYE INSTITUTE

The bill includes \$23,685,000 for the National Eye Institute which is the amount requested. This activity was formerly under the National Institute of Neurological Disease and Stroke.

It is interesting to note that more than 1 million persons have glaucoma and half of them are unaware of the problem. Every year 3,500 persons are blinded by the disorder. Obviously, the deterioration could be stopped if some of these people saw a doctor. It is estimated that 2 percent of the population over 40 has glaucoma.

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

The bill includes \$18,328,000, the amount requested, for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences.

GENERAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES

The bill includes \$73,658,000 for general research and services which is an increase of \$3,960,000 above the amount requested. The increase in the request is in the area of clinical resource centers. The committee felt that increased hospital costs were curtailing the activities of this program and therefore restored it to the original budget request.

JOHN E. FOGARTY INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN HEALTH SCIENCES

The bill includes \$2,954,000, the amount requested.

HEALTH MANPOWER

The bill includes \$218,021,000, the amount requested, and an increase of \$45,845,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. Under the revised budget for the health manpower appropriation, the committee was informed of the administration's plan to encourage a substantial increase in medical school enrollment. The objective of this physician augmentation program is to expand the output of physicians as rapidly as possible by assisting schools of medicine and osteopathy to increase first-year enrollments in the fall of 1970 by an additional 1,000 students. As an increase of 600 was already expected, the total increase will be 1,600.

Similar increases are projected for new entrants in each of the next 3 years so that by the fall of 1973 there will be an

increment of 4,000 medical students over the number that could otherwise be expected. The cost of this program will be \$10 million for each contingent's first year, of which \$5 million is for "start-up" costs; for example, renovation, equipment, and so forth—and \$5 million for each subsequent year of the 4-year curriculum. Under this plan total funding for the program will thus be \$10 million in 1970 rising by \$5 million per year to \$25 million in 1973 after which the cost will level off to \$20 million per year.

The committee endorses the new program and approves the budget except that it directs that the increase of \$5,500,000 for nursing scholarships be transferred to direct loans in nursing, and that the increase of \$4,781,000 budgeted for scholarships for "medical, dental, etc.," be transferred to direct loans for "medical, dental, etc."

DENTAL HEALTH

The bill includes \$10,722,000, a reduction of \$165,000 from the amount requested, and an increase of \$498,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969.

CONSTRUCTION OF HEALTH EDUCATIONAL, RESEARCH AND LIBRARY FACILITIES

The bill includes \$126,100,000, the amount requested, and an increase of \$41,300,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The amount requested, plus an unobligated balance of \$22,900,000, will make \$149 million available for these matching grants for construction which is \$24,874,292 less than the amount available for obligation in 1969.

Of the amount in the bill, \$94.5 million, an increase of \$34.5 million, is for construction grants for teaching facilities at schools of medicine, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, veterinary medicine, and public health. For schools of dentistry, \$23.6 million, an increase of \$8.6 million, is included. In view of the urgent need for substantially greater numbers of the professional personnel trained at these schools, these amounts seem modest.

NATIONAL LIBRARY OF MEDICINE

The bill includes \$19,682,000, the amount requested, and an increase of \$1,521,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969.

The funds included in the bill will provide for the library's direct service operations at approximately the 1969 level and for the further implementation of its computer-based reference system, Medlars II.

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Now let me move to a very critical part of this bill for the Office of Education. We know there are going to be amendments offered to increase a number of these figures substantially. But let me sketch out again what we have done here. In the first place, for elementary and secondary education our bill includes \$459,523,700, which represents an increase of \$65,000,000 over the request and an increase of \$3,671,000 over the amount available for the same activities for 1969.

For title I we are providing \$205,360,700, which added to the advance for 1970

included in our bill last year will make \$1,216,175,000 available for this purpose. This is the exact amount of the authorized portion of the request and is \$93,048,000 over the amount available for 1969.

Personally, I was in favor of adding some money for the specific titles II and III of ESEA, and titles III and V of the National Defense Education Act. But the committee felt that since the House in acting on the legislative proposal H.R. 514 provided for a lumping together of supplementary educational services, library resources, guidance, counseling, and testing, and equipment and minor remodeling, we simply added to the \$116,163,000 earmarked for supplementary educational centers another \$84,000,000 to bring the total for these four categories up to \$200,163,000.

There was an amendment offered in our full committee by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) that would have added a total of \$110 million to the bill to restore the 1969 level for titles II and III, ESEA, and titles III and V of NDEA, but it was defeated and I suspect there will be an effort made later to do the same here on the floor.

As I said, I personally have been somewhat in favor of earmarking myself for specific categories in keeping with the views expressed to me by many of the educators out in my home district and State of Illinois, but the whole concept underlying H.R. 514 is to give the States more discretion in the use of Federal funds to meet their own special needs.

It should be borne in mind that we provide an increase of about \$103 million over 1969 for title I. This was the figure recommended by both the Johnson and Nixon administrations, and we are not, I repeat not, cutting back 1 dime in title I.

According to the justifications, the increase will provide for a 5.5-percent increase in cost of education, and for an increase of 235,000 children in the number of children counted for entitlement as a result of updating AFDC data as required by the law.

The reasons for not increasing the amount in the bill for title I are primarily the general reasons for not increasing the budget—the need to curb inflation, and the fact that Federal expenditures estimated for 1970 already exceed the previous estimates by \$3.5 billion.

In addition, however, it is clear that there is a need to evaluate the effectiveness of the title I program. The Office of Education is making an effort to get the States and school districts to concentrate their title I funds in the areas where they are most needed, rather than spreading them around so thinly that results are not apparent. There have been reports and studies indicating that many title I projects are not as effective as they might be. The Office of Education feels that there should be a thorough evaluation of the title I program, as well as other elementary and secondary education programs. There is an increase of \$4,250,000 in this bill for these evalua-

tion studies. We think a good look should be taken at this program before pouring additional funds into it.

Before moving on to the impacted-aid items I should point out that for drop-out prevention we have held to last year's level of expenditure of \$5 million. This is a substantial reduction of \$14 million from the request, but we put this reduction over into the education account to help provide that \$84 million increase.

For bilingual education we provide for \$10 million, which was the budget figure and this is \$2.5 million over the appropriation for 1969.

IMPACTED AREA AID

Mr. Chairman, our subcommittee gave a lot of thought to the question of what to do about the 1970 appropriations for impacted area aid under Public Law 874.

Some 4,600 school districts are involved in this program. Perhaps more importantly, this program affects the districts of around 385 Members of the House of Representatives.

The Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and now the Nixon administrations have all attempted to cut this program, but it has increased every year in spite of all their efforts. The Congress has not only increased the budget, but has repeatedly liberalized the authorizing legislation to expand eligibility for payments. We have just liberalized it again—but not with my vote—this session by making children living in low-rent public housing eligible for payments—H.R. 514.

This law is inequitable. It is bad. It is outrageous. It was originally enacted during the Korean war to help school districts which found themselves overstrained by an influx of children from military installations. There are still a lot of school districts which need and deserve such help from the Federal Government. But most of this money is not going to them. It is going to districts which qualify for funds simply because

they have children whose parents work in Federal buildings. These people pay local real estate and sales taxes just like everyone else. Some of these districts are among the most affluent in the United States.

The suburbs of Washington, D.C., are a good example of how this program works. Fairfax County, Va., got almost \$10.5 million in fiscal year 1969. Of that total, \$10.2 is for the so-called "b" children—whose parents work on Federal property, but do not live on Federal property. Prince Georges County, Md., is getting over \$9 million. Montgomery County, Md., is getting \$5.8 million. All of these counties have high per capita income and a high level of homeownership. They are far more capable of educating their children with their own

tax resources than many areas which receive no Federal impact aid at all.

The subcommittee is going along with the administration's budget proposal, which would pay full entitlement for "a" children, whose parents both live and work on Federal property, but allows no payments for "b" children. This will undoubtedly work a hardship on a few school districts which has a legitimate claim to Federal impact funds. But we know of no other way to call the attention of the Members to the gross inequity of this law and its enormous cost to the Federal taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, I will include at this point with my remarks a table showing the 20 largest recipients of Public Law 81-874, the so-called impacted aid legislation:

20 LARGEST RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC LAW 81-874, SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

School district and application number	1969 entitlement		1969 appropriated		1970 entitlement	
	Sec. 3(a)	Sec. 3(b)	Sec. 3(a)	Sec. 3(b)	Sec. 3(a)	Sec. 3(b)
Alaska, E-1	\$11,955,177	\$469,688	\$10,520,555	\$143,325	\$13,748,453	\$540,141
Fairfax County, Va., E-8	260,456	11,640,690	229,201	10,243,807	299,524	13,386,793
Prince Georges County, Md., E-6	444,882	10,232,093	391,496	9,004,241	511,614	11,766,906
Hawaii E-1	4,950,935	5,445,479	4,356,822	4,792,021	5,693,575	6,262,300
Montgomery County, Md., E-4	69,295	6,566,835	60,979	5,778,814	79,689	7,551,860
San Diego Unified, Calif., E-105	1,968,161	4,590,474	1,731,981	4,039,617	2,263,385	5,279,045
District of Columbia, E-1601	248,303	5,684,904	218,506	5,002,715	285,548	6,537,639
New York City N.Y., E-1701	917,309	4,293,427	807,231	3,778,215	1,054,905	4,937,441
Brevard County, Fla., E-2	564,230	3,707,142	496,522	3,262,284	648,864	4,263,213
Los Angeles, Calif., E-1718	425,004	4,103,388	374,003	3,610,981	488,754	4,718,895
Norfolk City, Va., E-15	1,063,264	2,812,259	935,672	2,474,787	1,222,753	3,234,097
Philadelphia, Pa., E-1012	296,536	3,450,745	260,951	3,036,655	341,016	3,958,356
Chicago, Ill., E-1711	24,743	3,438,585	21,773	3,025,954	28,454	3,954,372
Albuquerque, N. Mex., E-5	710,017	2,381,841	624,814	2,096,020	816,519	2,739,117
Virginia Beach, Va., E-22	281,836	2,564,353	248,015	2,256,630	324,111	2,949,005
Anne Arundel County, Md., E-2	861,857	1,857,948	753,434	1,634,994	991,135	2,136,640
Charleston County, S.C., E-2001	638,514	2,013,617	561,892	1,771,982	734,291	2,315,659
El Paso, Tex., E-45	896,981	1,726,633	789,343	1,519,437	1,031,528	1,985,627
Bellevue, Nebr., E-1008	1,837,876	749,497	1,617,330	659,557	2,113,557	861,921
Ocalaosa County, Fla., E-201	821,305	1,744,995	722,748	1,535,595	944,500	2,006,744

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Moving on to other items in this educational field we are providing \$95 million for education professions development, which is the amount of the request, and the same as that appropriated for 1969. In our report we make men-

tion that stronger emphasis should be placed upon summer workshops for teachers of the disadvantaged and upgrading the skills of teachers.

Mr. Chairman, I include at this point in the Record a Report of Human Heart Transplants as of April 1, 1969.

REPORT OF HUMAN HEART TRANSPLANTS, AS OF APR. 1, 1969

No.	Recipient		Donor		Date of transplant	Survival	Reported cause of death	Country
	Age	Sex	Age	Sex				
1	53	M	25	(O)	Dec. 3, 1967	18 days	Pneumonia	South Africa.
2	17	M	22	M	Dec. 6, 1967	6½ hrs.	(O)	United States.
3	58	M	24	M	Jan. 2, 1968	Surviving	Internal hemorrhage	South Africa.
4	57	M	43	(O)	Jan. 6, 1968	15 days	Heart failure; donor heart ½ size	United States.
5	58	M	29	F	Jan. 10, 1968	8½ hrs.	Pulmonary hypertension	Do.
6	27	M	19	F	Feb. 17, 1968	3 hrs.	Embolism/brain damage	India.
7	66	M	23	M	Apr. 27, 1968	53½ hrs.	Pulmonary embolism	France.
8	40	M	43	M	May 2, 1968	3½ days	See No. 87	United States.
9	47	M	15	F	May 2, 1968	6 mos., 6 days	Lung/kidney infection	Do.
10	45	M	26	M	May 3, 1968	46 days	(O)	United States.
11	48	M	15	M	May 7, 1968	8 hrs.	(O)	Do.
12	62	M	36	M	May 7, 1968	7 days	(O)	United States.
13	65	M	35	M	May 8, 1968	2 days	(O)	Do.
14	56	M	39	(O)	May 12, 1968	Surviving	Rejection/cardiac arrest	United States.
15	54	M	17	M	May 21, 1968	4 mos., 23 days	Total rejection	Do.
16	54	M	58	M	May 25, 1968	7 days	(O)	Brazil.
17	23	M	41	M	May 26, 1968	28 days	(O)	Canada.
18	56	(O)	38	(O)	May 30, 1968	4 hrs.	Lung/kidney complication	Canada.
19	54	M	47	M	May 30, 1968	5 days	Neurological complication	Argentina.
20	39	M	29	M	May 31, 1968	Died on table	Malfunction of right ventricle	United States.
21	41	(O)	20	(O)	June 10, 1968	1½ hrs.	(O)	Do.
22	49	M	23	M	June 28, 1968	5 mos., 2 days	Asphyxiation following indigestion	Canada.
23	24	F	32	(O)	June 28, 1968	4 mos., 13 days	Brain infection	Chile.
24	48	(O)	50	(O)	July 2, 1968	4 mos., 26 days	Heart attacks due to rejection	United States.
25	49	F	46	M	July 9, 1968	5 hrs.	(O)	Czechoslovakia.
26	58	M	33	F	July 20, 1968	Surviving	(O)	Do.
27	57	(O)	16	(O)	July 23, 1968	5 mos., 2 days	Tissue rejection	United States.
28	48	M	32	M	July 25, 1968	58 hrs.	Congestive heart failure	England.
29	49	F	40	F	July 29, 1968	25 days	Cardiac arrest	United States.

Footnotes at end of table.

REPORT OF HUMAN HEART TRANSPLANTS, AS OF APR. 1, 1969—Continued

No.	Recipient		Donor		Date of transplant	Survival	Reported cause of death	Country
	Age	Sex	Age	Sex				
30	18	M	20	M	Aug. 7, 1968	80 days	Acute respiratory insufficiency	Japan.
31	5	F	11	M	Aug. 18, 1968	9 days	Cardiac arrest/acute rejection	United States.
32	50	M	37	F	Aug. 19, 1968	68 days	Cardiac arrest	Do.
33	43	M	21	M	Aug. 22, 1968	46 days	Pneumonia	Do.
34	43	M	17	M	Aug. 24, 1968	Surviving		Do.
35	58 (1)	(1)	35 (1)	(1)	Aug. 30, 1968	11 days	Stroke	England.
36	50	M	20 (1)	(1)	Sept. 1, 1968	Surviving		United States.
37	46	M	22	M	Aug. 31, 1968	do		Do.
38	50	M	39	M	Aug. 31, 1968	do		Do.
39	42	M	39	F	Sept. 2, 1968	do		Brazil.
40	50	M	25	F	Sept. 4, 1968	do		United States.
41	47	M	17	M	Sept. 5, 1968	8 days	Cardiac arrest	Do.
42	52	M	36	F	Sept. 8, 1968	Surviving		South Africa.
43	48	F	27	M	Sept. 10, 1968	4 mos., 6 days	Hepatitis	United States.
44	21	M	24	F	Sept. 13, 1968	14 hrs.	Kidney trouble	India.
45	52	M	20	M	Sept. 15, 1968	3 mos., 20 days	Pneumonia	United States.
46	42 F	(1)	21 F	(1)	Sept. 15, 1968	14 hrs.	Cardiac arrest	Do.
47	45	M	27	F	Sept. 16, 1968	6 hrs.	Cerebral hemorrhage	Venezuela.
48	44	M	46	F	Sept. 17, 1968	2 days	Acute kidney insufficiency	Spain.
49	16	M	36	M	Sept. 17, 1968	Surviving		United States.
50	49	M	37	M	Sept. 17, 1968	do		Do.
51	57	M	46	M	Sept. 19, 1968	88 days	Lung infection	Do.
52	46	M	17	M	Sept. 23, 1968	12 days	Cardiac arrest	Do.
53	51	M	19	M	Sept. 27, 1968	67 days	Infection/kidney complications	Canada.
54	58	M	16	M	Sept. 29, 1968	4 mos., 1 day	Rejection	Do.
55	21	M	17 (1)	(1)	Oct. 1, 1968	Surviving		Chile.
56	46	M	43	M	Oct. 2, 1968	5 days	Acute heart seizure	United States.
57	57	F	28	F	Oct. 5, 1968	61 days	Pneumonia	Do.
58	54	F	28	F	Oct. 3, 1968	5 mos., 15 days	Inflammation of the small intestines	Do.
59	19	F	35 (1)	(1)	Oct. 15, 1968	15 hours	Complication in blood coagulation	Argentina.
60	50	M	20 (1)	(1)	Oct. 17, 1968	Surviving		United States.
61	42	M	29 (1)	(1)	Oct. 19, 1968	do		Canada.
62	45	F	20 (1)	(1)	Oct. 21, 1968	47 days	Acute rejection	Do.
63	49	F	30	M	do	Surviving		United States.
64	57	M	29	M	Oct. 22, 1968	44 days	Hemorrhage following surgical complications	Australia.
65	19	F	19	M	Oct. 23, 1968	6 days	(1)	United States.
66	42 (1)	(1)	41 (1)	(1)	do	6 hrs.	Cardiac arrest	Do.
67	52 (1)	(1)	49 (1)	(1)	Oct. 25, 1968	4 mos., 3 days	do	Do.
68	35 (1)	(1)	25 (1)	(1)	do	2 mos., 3 days	Rejection	Canada.
69	54 (1)	(1)	20 (1)	(1)	Oct. 26, 1968	Surviving		United States.
70	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Oct. 27, 1968	do		France.
71	45 (1)	(1)	20 (1)	(1)	Oct. 28, 1968	8 days	Pneumonia	Canada.
72	32 (1)	(1)	24 (1)	(1)	Oct. 30, 1968	18 days	Rejection	United States.
73	40 (1)	(1)	42 (1)	(1)	Nov. 3, 1968	4 days	Failure of liver/kidneys	Do.
74	53 (1)	(1)	28 (1)	(1)	do	Surviving		Canada.
75	50 (1)	(1)	27 (1)	(1)	Nov. 5, 1968	7 days	Rejection	United States.
76	25	F	19 (1)	(1)	do	33 hrs.	Progressive weakness of heart complicated by changes in lungs and liver.	Russia.
77	55 (1)	(1)	27 (1)	(1)	Nov. 9, 1968	48 days	Bacterial pneumonia	United States.
78	53 (1)	(1)	15 (1)	(1)	Nov. 11, 1968	38 days	Acute rejection	Canada.
79	34 (1)	(1)	22 (1)	(1)	Nov. 12, 1968	15 days	(1)	France.
80	54 (1)	(1)	40 (1)	(1)	Nov. 13, 1968	7 days	Stroke	Canada.
81	40 (1)	(1)	40 (1)	(1)	do	14 hrs.	(1)	Australia.
82	50 (1)	(1)	38 (1)	(1)	Nov. 16, 1968	Surviving		United States.
83	53 (1)	(1)	50 (1)	(1)	Nov. 17, 1968	40 days	Rejection	France.
84	54 (1)	(1)	18 (1)	(1)	Nov. 17, 1968	Surviving		Canada.
85	56 (1)	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Nov. 20, 1968	3 days	Stroke	United States.
86	47 M	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Nov. 20, 1968	do	Rejection	Do.
87	49 (1)	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Nov. 22, 1968	Surviving		Do.
88	30 (1)	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Nov. 22, 1968	3 hrs	(1)	Chile.
89	40 F	(1)	14 (1)	(1)	Nov. 22, 1968	18 hrs.	Liver ceased functioning	Turkey.
90	37 (1)	(1)	47 (1)	(1)	Nov. 24, 1968	14 hrs.	Irreversible kidney failure	France.
91	48 (1)	(1)	51 (1)	(1)	Nov. 24, 1968	Surviving		Do.
92	26 (1)	(1)	26 (1)	(1)	Nov. 25, 1968	39 hrs.	Cardiac insufficiency	Turkey.
93	56 M	(1)	57 (1)	(1)	Nov. 25, 1968	10 weeks	Rejection	United States.
94	33 (1)	(1)	25 (1)	(1)	Nov. 26, 1968	20 hrs.	Cardiac arrest	France.
95	48 (1)	(1)	40 (1)	(1)	Nov. 27, 1968	Surviving		Do.
96	54 (1)	(1)	23 (1)	(1)	Nov. 29, 1968	13 days	Rejection	United States.
97	54 M	(1)	23 (1)	(1)	Nov. 29, 1968	3 mos., 13 days	Cerebral thrombosis	Canada.
98	38 (1)	(1)	22 (1)	(1)	Dec. 2, 1968	Surviving		United States.
99	40 (1)	(1)	21 (1)	(1)	Dec. 6, 1968	14 days	Kidney failure/pneumonia	Israel.
100	22 M	(1)	30 (1)	(1)	Dec. 16, 1968	43 days	Congestive heart failure	United States.
101	28 (1)	(1)	24 (1)	(1)	Dec. 22, 1968	Surviving		France.
102	28 (1)	(1)	24 (1)	(1)	Dec. 25, 1968	5 hrs.	(1)	United States.
103	50 M	(1)	24 (1)	(1)	Dec. 27, 1968	91 days	Progressive failure of heart	Do.
104	62 (1)	(1)	48 (1)	(1)	Jan. 1, 1969	Surviving		Do.
105	35 (1)	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Jan. 4, 1969	Died on table	(1)	Poland.
106	59 (1)	(1)	14 (1)	(1)	Jan. 5, 1969	37 days	(1)	United States.
107	44 (1)	(1)	54 (1)	(1)	Jan. 5, 1969	7 days	Lung ailment	Do.
108	48 M	(1)	47 (1)	(1)	Jan. 6, 1969	6 days	Brain hemorrhage/pneumonia	Do.
109	52 (1)	(1)	23 (1)	(1)	Jan. 7, 1969	Surviving		Brazil.
110	49 (1)	(1)	38 (1)	(1)	Jan. 17, 1969	3 hrs., 52 min.	Progressive pulmonary hypertension	United States.
111	47 (1)	(1)	13 (1)	(1)	Jan. 23, 1969	3 days	Brain damage/edema of brain	Do.
112	7 F	(1)	6 M	(1)	Feb. 8, 1969	30 days	Lung infection/rejection	Do.
113	43 M	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Feb. 8, 1969	Surviving		Do.
114	36 (1)	(1)	35 (1)	(1)	Feb. 13, 1969	1 day	Vital functions of organs destroyed	Germany.
115	55 M	(1)	24 M	(1)	Feb. 15, 1969	10 days	Rejection	United States.
116	36 M	(1)	57 M	(1)	Feb. 20, 1969	Surviving		Do.
117	58 M	(1)	23 F	(1)	do	do		Do.
118	56 M	(1)	26 M	(1)	Mar. 3, 1969	do		Do.
119	43 M	(1)	24 M	(1)	Mar. 17, 1969	do		Do.
120	38 M	(1)	(1) (1)	(1) (1)	Mar. 22, 1969	1 day	(1)	Germany.

<sup>1</sup> Information not available.

<sup>2</sup> Age in days.

<sup>3</sup> Received 2d transplant Nov. 20, 1968. See No. 87.

<sup>4</sup> Age in months.

<sup>5</sup> This patient received 2 transplants.

<sup>6</sup> Received 2 transplants. See No. 9.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. So that the Members might know what to expect, I might mention last year a \$520 million maximum was available under the formula.

This year that maximum jumped to \$650 million or a \$130 million increase in 1 year. I have just gotten the estimates for next year, and they are \$1,050 mil-

lion. That represents a little over double the amount in 2 years on this program.

Mr. MICHEL. Yes.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I merely want to remark that in spite of the amount of the appropriation it is still about 28 percent of the authorization in impacted areas.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is far from right. It was almost 100 percent last year.

Mr. JOELSON. This year it is 28 percent of the authorization.

Mr. MICHEL. You are talking about the figure that was in our bill.

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. In your bill.

Mr. MICHEL. We are quite aware of that.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It is 100 percent for category A.

Mr. MICHEL. That is right.

#### TEACHER CORPS

So far as the Teacher Corps is concerned we are providing \$21,737,000, a reduction of \$9,363,000 from the request and an increase of \$837,000 above the amount appropriated for 1969. We are told that this is the sum estimated to be necessary to carry the Teacher Corps program at last year's level, including "forward funding" of preservice training.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION

The bill includes \$785,839,000, an increase of \$5 million over the request, and an increase of \$85,452,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The committee made three changes within the total request. First, the request for \$175,600,000 for educational opportunity grants was reduced to \$159,600,000. Second, college teacher fellowships were reduced from \$61,469,000 to \$56,163,000. Third, the amount for direct student loans was increased from \$161,900,000 to \$188,206,000. The action with regard to the reductions for educational opportunity grants and college teacher fellowships is applied entirely to funds available for first-year students and will hold such availability to the 1969 level. The addition of these funds plus \$5 million to direct student loans will also place the fund availability for this program at approximately the 1969 level.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION CONSTRUCTION

The committee has gone along with the administration's proposals for funding construction of facilities at colleges and universities. There is \$43 million in the bill for construction grants for public community colleges and technical institutes. There is \$6 million in the bill for State administration for higher education construction programs, and there is \$11,750,000 for interest subsidy grants, which, together with the funds for interest subsidy grants contained in the second supplemental bill for 1969, will support about \$435 million in loans for higher education construction. There is no money in the bill for direct Federal loans, or for grants for 4-year colleges or graduate schools, other than the interest subsidy grants.

The interest subsidy grants were authorized in the Higher Education Act

Amendments passed in the last session of Congress. They offer a way of helping colleges and universities to build without large Federal outlays. The committee thinks that it is worth giving a try in a period of severe fiscal stringency, when we are trying to hold down Federal expenditures.

Of course, most colleges would rather get a direct Federal grant than go to a bank for a loan. However, if the Federal Government makes a grant, it has to obtain the funds by borrowing in the private lending market.

There are dire predictions that some colleges will not be able to get loans under this program. The committee is adopting a wait-and-see attitude on this. If it turns out to be true, it can be corrected in next year's budget.

The budget places top priority on assistance to the 2-year community colleges and technical institutes, and the committee agrees with this priority.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

The committee bill provides an increase of \$78 million over the budget request and \$109 million over the 1969 appropriations for vocational education.

The 1970 estimate for vocational education was the same in both the Johnson and the Nixon budgets, \$279,216,000. The committee has already indicated the high priority which it places on vocational education by increasing this figure by \$78 million.

The amount recommended by the committee will permit the States to put in effect most of the new programs authorized in the vocational education amendments passed in the last session of Congress, without cutting back on the existing vocational education programs. The committee also added \$10 million for the vocational work-study program, which was not funded at all in the budget request.

The budget problem which has been bothering the vocational educators around the country and producing a flood of mail to Members of Congress is that the vocational education amendments now require the States to set aside 40 percent of their basic grant funds for specific programs as follows:

Fifteen percent for postsecondary programs, 15 percent for special programs for the disadvantaged, 10 percent for special programs for the physically handicapped.

Since the budget proposed about the same total dollar level for the State grant program as 1969, this meant that in order to meet the "set aside" requirements, States would have to reduce support for ongoing vocational education programs. By adding \$70 million to the budget for the basic grant programs, the committee has eliminated this problem.

Other new vocational education programs which are funded for the first time in this bill include: \$14 million for cooperative education, \$13 million for innovative programs, \$2 million for curriculum development, \$1 million for planning and evaluation.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION RESEARCH

The budget shows only \$1,100,000 for vocational education research compared

with \$11,375,000 in 1969. Actually, the reduction in vocational education research is not as great as these figures would indicate.

The Office of Education witnesses testified that, in addition to the \$1,100,000 specifically earmarked in the budget for vocational education research, \$4 million of the funds budgeted for general education research will be spent on vocational education, and the \$2 million budgeted under vocational education for "curriculum development" will be spent for research, for a total of \$7.1 million. Thus, the reduction in vocational education research is about \$4.2 million.

The committee did not wish to increase appropriations over the budget request by earmarking additional funds for vocational education research. The Commissioner of Education has indicated that he is reviewing and reorganizing the whole research program of the Office of Education to make it more effective, and the committee thinks such a review would be highly desirable. We are, frankly, not convinced that the rather substantial amount of money which is going to educational research at the present time is all that its cracked up to be. If, after his review, the Commissioner decides that a larger share of the funds budgeted for research ought to go into vocational education research, he can recommend it in next year's budget.

#### LIBRARY PROGRAMS

Library programs were rather hard hit by the revised budget for 1970:

The 1969 appropriation for grants for public library services was cut in half, from \$35 million to \$17.5 million; and

No funds were provided for public library construction—\$9,185,000 was appropriated in 1969; no funds were provided for school libraries under title II, ESEA—\$50 million was appropriated in 1969; funds for college libraries were reduced from \$25 million to \$12.5 million; funds for training of librarians were reduced from \$8,250,000 to \$4 million; funds for the Library of Congress were reduced from \$5.5 million to \$4.5 million.

The committee felt that these reductions were too drastic, and has added funds over the budget in those programs which seemed to be of highest priority. These are: \$17.5 million for public library services; an indefinite amount for school library resources under elementary and secondary education—a share of the \$200,163,000 available for titles II and III, ESEA, and titles III and V, NDEA; \$1 million for the Library of Congress for acquisition and cataloging of foreign language materials.

The amount in the bill for public library services restores this program to the 1969 level of \$35 million. Our committee did not wish, however, to add to inflationary pressures on the economy by restoring funds for library construction. We think that a deferral of appropriations for construction for a year will not seriously damage the Nation's libraries. The only places in the bill where the committee has added funds for construction are for hospital beds and vocational rehabilitation facilities. We did not feel that libraries fell into the same category of urgency.

## EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

Our bill provides \$84,540,000, reduction of \$1,250,000 from the request, and an increase of \$5,690,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The reduction from the request represents the amount of the increase over 1969 which was budgeted for research. The main increases over 1969 are \$2,055,000 for early childhood programs, \$1,500,000 for regional resource centers, and \$1 million for the deaf-blind centers.

## RESEARCH AND TRAINING

Our bill includes \$85,750,000, a reduction of \$29,250,000 from the request, and a reduction of \$3,667,000 below the amount appropriated for 1969. The big increase in the budget was for the \$25 million for experimental schools which I mentioned very early in my presentation. We say in our report that when this was first submitted to the committee, the written justifications were extremely vague and subsequent oral testimony, while a considerable improvement, left us with the impression that the Department should be given a considerably longer period of time to prepare their plans before any sum of money such as that suggested was made available.

We are not dismissing the proposal as being invalid, for we will have no objection to the use of funds in this appropriation account for planning purposes. And finally, Mr. Chairman, on this item we also disallowed the increase of \$4,250,000 requested for "major demonstrations".

## STUDENT LOAN INSURANCE FUND

The bill includes \$10,826,000, the amount of the request. In accordance with the Higher Education Amendments of 1968, the student loan insurance fund now covers defaults up to 100 percent of the principal amount of the loss on federally insured loans and up to 80 percent of the principal amount of the loss on reinsured loans made by State and private nonprofit agencies. This is, of course, purely an estimate, but seems reasonable in view of the fact that approximately \$2.2 billion in loans will be outstanding in 1970. No appropriation has been made to this fund since 1967.

## NDEA STUDENT LOANS

Now so far as NDEA student loans are concerned we have increases totaling \$26,306,000 over the 1970 budget request.

Our bill provides for an appropriation of \$188,206,000 for 1970 for the NDEA student loan program compared with \$193,400,000 appropriated for 1969. However, the total dollar level of NDEA student loans will increase from \$265,100,000 in fiscal year 1969 to \$277,005,000 in 1970, an increase of \$12 million. This is because collections of loan repayments are going up each year, and these funds are available to the universities to make new loans.

Funds are also available to students through the insured loan program. The budget predicted that \$641,250,000 worth of insured loans would be made by banks and other lending institutions in fiscal year 1969, and that \$794,241,000 worth of loans would be made in fiscal year 1970 or an increase of over \$150 million. There has been considerable doubt as to whether the 1970 estimate will hold up,

since the prime interest rate has risen to 8½ percent, and the law limits the interest which may be paid on insured student loans to 7 percent.

However, the most recent information we have received from HEW indicates that almost \$65 million worth of insured loans were made in the month of June. This is over twice the amount of loans which were made in June last year. The data we have from the Department also indicate that the total loan level for fiscal year 1969 was \$672 million, or \$30 million over the estimate in the budget.

If, as some alarmists are saying, the insured loan program is going to collapse because of the tight money market and the 7-percent statutory interest rate ceiling, the way to deal with the situation is not to increase Federal expenditures by adding more money to the bill for direct student loans, but rather to amend the authorizing legislation at once to remove or raise the interest rate ceiling. We understand that HEW has proposed such amendments to the Budget Bureau, but that they cannot reach agreement on the details. If the administration cannot make up its mind about this, then Congress ought to initiate its own amendments to keep the insured student loan programs going.

Student aid programs are not being cut back in this bill. They are being increased. The total amount for undergraduate student aid programs recommended under the appropriation for higher education increases from \$568,100,000 in 1969 to \$609,917,000 in 1970, an increase of over \$40 million.

This includes the educational opportunity grants, the NDEA student loans, interest payments for the insured loan program, the work-study program, and special services for disadvantaged students, such as Talent Search and Upward Bound. It does not include, of course, the dollar value of insured loans made by banks.

## HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOANS

The budget request included \$15 million for loans to students of medicine, dentistry, and related professions. The bill, as recommended by the committee, would raise this by \$4,781,000 to \$19,781,000. This is \$4,781,000 above the 1969 appropriation.

Even though the recommended appropriation for health professions students loans is higher than the 1969 appropriation, the total amount available for these loans will go down in 1970. This is because funds in the student loan revolving fund are being exhausted, since there have been no sales of participation certificates recently which would replenish these funds. Total available: 1969, \$26,255,000; 1970, \$20,894,000.

The President's budget message indicated that medical and dental students are eligible for the Office of Education's guaranteed student loan program. The administration is presenting proposals to Congress designed to make these loans more attractive to private lenders in the present money market. The budget estimated that the guaranteed loans would increase by about \$150 million in 1970, from \$641 million to \$794 million.

Medical and dental students should

not have difficulty in repaying these loans, since their future income after graduation is likely to be quite high.

## SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE

## GRANTS TO STATES FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Mr. Chairman, this is that better than \$7 billion item I made reference to earlier in my remarks, and will say again that these public assistance payments are almost entirely beyond administrative control, so far as our Federal administrators are concerned.

## WORK INCENTIVES

The bill includes \$129,640,000 the amount of the request, and an increase of \$12,140,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The original budget request was for 164,640,000 and was revised to the lower figure solely on the basis that the program was not progressing as planned.

## GRANTS FOR REHABILITATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

The bill includes \$499,783,000, the amount of the budget request, and an increase of \$130,793,000 over the appropriation for 1969. The main increase proposed in the budget is an increase of \$125,100,000 for basic support grants. This is in addition to the 1969 base amount of \$345,900,000 and will provide rehabilitation services for an estimated 241,000 disabled individuals or an increase of 11,000 over the estimate of 1969. While under the allotment base of \$600,000,000 authorized in the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967, the required increase in the appropriation for basic support would be \$178,100,000, we believe that an increase of over one-third in such a year of fiscal austerity is very generous, even for such a worthwhile program as this.

We disallow \$3,500,000 requested to start a new program of services for migratory agricultural workers, which is consistent with action taken by Congress on a similar request last year, and add this sum to the funds budgeted for rehabilitation facilities under section 12. The budget request included no funds for construction. The committee is earmarking all of the \$3,500,000 for construction of rehabilitation facilities which will cover only a small fraction of the need. Since this is such a small amount, the committee will expect that the Department revise or waive its regulations concerning the geographical allocation of such funds by region and, instead, allocate these funds strictly on the basis of the merit of individual projects and the hearing record will show those we believe to be most meritorious.

## MENTAL RETARDATION

The bill includes \$33,629,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$1,073,000 above the appropriation for 1969.

After adjustments are made for comparability largely because of unobligated balances of funds for construction carrying forward from 1968 to 1969, the funds available for obligation in 1970 are estimated to be \$5,440,000 less than in 1969. This net decrease is made up of a decrease of \$13,582,000 in funds for construction of community service facilities and construction of university-affiliated

facilities, and an increase of \$8,142,000 for services.

#### MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH AND WELFARE

The bill includes \$284,800,000, an increase of \$19,400,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969.

We made three changes in the revised budget. First, we restored the \$2,200,000 increase contained in the original budget for training through university-affiliated mental retardation centers that was deleted in the revised budget. Second, we deleted the increase of \$2,500,000 for research in maternal and child health and crippled children's services, which leaves \$6,200,000 in the bill for this purpose. Third, we deleted the increase of \$200,000 for the research and demonstration program in child welfare, which leaves \$4,400,000 in the bill for this purpose.

#### JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL

The bill includes \$5 million, a reduction of \$10 million from the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for 1969. At the time of our hearings on this budget request, planning grants had not even been made. We would like to know more about the specific plans for this program before proceeding with an increased appropriation.

#### REHABILITATION RESEARCH AND TRAINING

The bill includes \$60 million, the amount of the request, and a reduction of \$4 million below the amount appropriated for 1969.

#### COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The bill includes \$11,500,000, the amount of the request, and an increase of \$8,350,000 above the amount appropriated for 1969. I spoke earlier of the proposal to launch several income maintenance experiments at an estimated annual cost of \$1 million to \$1.5 million for each experiment, so that should be sufficient.

#### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

The bill includes \$28,780,000, a reduction of \$2,720,000 from the request, and an increase of \$1,163,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The amount allowed will support 60 more positions than were authorized for 1969. The revised budget would have provided for 160 additional positions, but we believe that a very creditable job can be done in administering these programs with the amount allowed.

#### SOCIAL SECURITY

Twenty-five million persons are receiving monthly benefits under the social security program. One out of eight Americans are now receiving a monthly social security cash benefit. While retired workers and their dependents are the largest group, almost a fourth are under 60. At the end of 1968, about 90 percent of persons aged 65 and over were either receiving cash benefits or would have been eligible for such benefits if they or their spouses had not been working.

Moreover 95 percent of all older persons in the country have elected to be covered under the voluntary supplementary medical insurance plan which covers primarily the cost of physicians' services.

For payment to trust funds for health insurance for the aged the bill includes

\$1,545,413,000, the amount of the request and \$185,186,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. The request is simply a mathematical calculation of the amount that will be required under the Social Security Act. The increase includes \$152,035,000 for payment to the hospital insurance trust fund for coverage of medicare beneficiaries who are not insured under the social security or railroad systems, and \$33,151,000 for payment to the supplementary medical insurance trust fund to match the monthly premiums of \$4 paid by persons enrolled in the voluntary medical insurance program.

There is \$105 million included in the bill for payment for military service credits, which is the amount of the request, and the same amount as was appropriated for 1969. This appropriation covers the reimbursement to the Federal old age and survivors insurance trust fund, the Federal disability insurance trust fund, and the Federal Hospital insurance trust fund for benefits paid on the basis of noncontributory military service credits of veterans of World War II and certain veterans of the post-war period. These payments are required by law.

For payment for special benefits for the aged the bill includes \$364,151,000, the amount of the request and \$138,606,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. This is another uncontrollable item. It covers the payment of social security benefits to uninsured persons over 72, which was authorized by the 1966 amendments to the Social Security Act.

The limitation on salaries and expenses amounts to \$901,500,000, which is the amount of the request and \$94,008,000 over the amount appropriated for 1969. This appropriation is from the social security trust funds and does not involve any expenditures from general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to extend my compliments to the gentleman in the well, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), as well as to the chairman of the subcommittee and the other members of the subcommittee for the attention which they gave to the work-study program. This has served the country and the students who have participated in the program very well.

Last year we had a mixup as to the understanding of the use of those funds. I am pleased to note that the committee has taken action which should place this program back on a functional basis.

Mr. MICHEL. As I told the gentleman, there was nothing in the budget on the work-study program. However, we have put \$10 million into that particular item.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. Before there is given to the gentleman and to the members of the subcommittee too many congratulations with reference to the high priority which it has given vocational education, I would point out that the figure recommended for appropriation is less than 50 percent of the authorization.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 additional minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. With reference to the program of vocational education the gentleman from Illinois I note that you accept part C of title I of the Vocational Education Act which is the program by which 10 percent of the money is set aside for research and training. However, the principal part of this program in which I am interested—and I realize that later on you put in \$1.1 million for part D of that section—is really the training and dissemination of information on vocational education.

At one time vocational education involved pretty much only cabinetmaking and things of that sort. That is not the case today because there is a tremendous need for the dissemination of information and a need for upgrading the trainees and the teachers in vocational education.

I do not feel that this represents an adequate amount for these purposes.

I was wondering if the gentleman would care to elaborate upon the reasons for including such a low figure for these purposes.

The figure that most people have been talking about is \$34 million in that area.

Mr. MICHEL. I would respond to the gentleman from Minnesota by saying first of all that the Office of Education witnesses testified that it might be cut—\$1.1 million is specifically earmarked in the budget and \$4 million of the funds budgeted for general education research will be spent on vocational education and that \$2 million budgeted under vocational education is for curriculum development and will be spent for research, for a total of \$7.1 million. Thus, the reduction from the 1969 level of \$11,375,000 is only about \$4.2 million. If you take those figures into account you come up with a little different picture.

Mr. QUIE. A little different picture from the \$1.1 million, yes. It is not adequate, but I appreciate the gentleman pointing out the fact that \$7 million will be expended for research.

Mr. MICHEL. Frankly, and for the sake of the record, I might make the point that the other new vocational educational programs which are funded for the first time in this bill include \$14 million for cooperative education, \$13 million for innovative programs, \$2 million for curriculum development and \$1 million for evaluation of the program.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES. As the gentleman from Illinois knows two of our hospitals in the Phoenix area are now engaged in a program with reference to injuries to the spine. The program has generated great interest nationwide as a pilot program.

However, one of the needs involves funds to be used for helping to pay for the treatment of indigent people who have spinal injury.

As the gentleman recalls, I testified before the subcommittee and requested some \$900,000 for this particular purpose as a demonstration project.

Will the gentleman from Illinois tell me whether or not there are funds in the bill which could be used for that purpose?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes. We recall very well the gentleman's very eloquent testimony before our committee which laid this program out to us in no uncertain terms.

We have an item under rehabilitative research and treatment, an item for \$60 million for research.

A review of the testimony that comes from Government witnesses attests to what the gentleman said, and more so, that it is a wonderful program, and that surely within the \$60 million somewhere there ought to be enough to cover this program.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman would yield, I would like to say that the gentleman from Arizona appeared before our subcommittee and gave a much better presentation and testimony than anybody else in support of this program. It is the unanimous opinion of this committee that the proposal of the gentleman from Arizona be carried out by the Department. We know the seriousness of the situation, and we know that it is a good program. The gentleman has contributed much to the thinking of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I would ask the gentleman if it is not true that if you consider the effect of the advanced funding for fiscal year 1970 which was granted by this Congress last year, that the pending bill is \$1.3 billion over 1969 rather than the \$705 million figure as set forth in the report.

Mr. MICHEL. I would say to the gentleman from Iowa that of course I cannot be sure without checking it specifically, but I think the gentleman is generally correct in his statement.

Mr. GROSS. It is \$1.3 billion above rather than \$705 million, as set forth in the report.

Does the gentleman have an estimate of the cost of the package deal that is supposed to be offered here today, or tomorrow? Is it not about \$1 billion?

Mr. MICHEL. I understand it is something in the neighborhood of \$900 million. I believe it is \$894 million. And as I indicated earlier in my presentation I thought that it would be just unconscionable to have our bill raised to that extent when we are in the throes of the financial problem that we have.

Mr. GROSS. And when the bill is already \$1.3 billion over last year.

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman is correct, but I want to say, as I believe has been indicated earlier, that there will be other amendments offered other than that package. That is certainly not the

only thing we have to contend with this afternoon.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman would not think that kind of additional spending would be designed to win the battle against inflation, would he?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me so that I may respond to our friend from Iowa, actually, we are over the 1969 level by only \$154,700,000 in controllables. The gentleman is talking mainly about the uncontrollables, those that we cannot touch.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield further to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. When you speak of controllable and uncontrollable items, the Congress of the United States can control, can it not?

Mr. FLOOD. The public assistance grants are uncontrollable as far as this bill is concerned. They are controlled by the organic law, of course. That is the big problem, and the big item, and that cannot be controlled through this appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no such thing as an untouchable, or an uncontrollable appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course not.

Mr. GROSS. Not insofar as the Congress is concerned, if the Congress wants to change it.

Mr. FLOOD. That is true, but it has to be changed in the organic law. It cannot be, under our rules, in this bill.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman about the cooperative research project, and I appreciate the reluctance of the committee, as recorded in the report, in approving of this suggested legislation. For the information of the Members, can the gentleman define for me—as a result of the committee hearings—the difference between “income maintenance experiments,” and “guaranteed annual income” experiments?

Mr. MICHEL. Well, I must confess to the gentleman from Missouri that it is a difficult differentiation to make, or a clearcut line to be drawn. But as the chairman pointed out, and as I have earlier, and we had the Secretary on the griddle, and we just told him “You know, this Congress will never go for a guaranteed annual income.”

I thought the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG) had a good response one day when he said we wanted a guaranteed work program, not a guaranteed annual income program.

But we have to do something here, and as I said, there is \$9,700,000 here for experimentation on how we can turn this tremendously and rapidly increasing welfare program around and the Secretary keeps on telling us, “We want to concentrate and work on incentives and this is the kind of project we have to have for them and something has to be done and we cannot turn our back on it.”

Mr. HALL. I agree with the need for research. But does the gentleman know of any pilot projects that were ever started that came to a satisfactory end, especially at the behest of Congress?

Mr. MICHEL. I will say to the gentleman, a demonstration project in New Jersey is bearing some fruit by way of information. But here there are only male heads of households participating in this kind of demonstration. What we are talking about is one of the biggest problem areas where there is no man head of the household. That is a wide base area to be further explored.

Mr. HALL. I agree with the definition of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CEDERBERG), but I think the time has come on these projects that we should see if people are willing to relocate to those places where job opportunities are available, before training them and subsidizing them with stipends and benefits galore.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I am in entire agreement, I may say to my friend, that the welfare system as we now have it is a debacle and it is a system that must be changed. Everybody knows that—even the recipients.

The Secretary came to us with this proposal that something has to be done to change the entire facade of the organization and operation of the welfare system in this country. This is the first step.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I appreciate the work of the subcommittee and I would only add that by definition, welfare in terms of social security is a failure.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the attention of my colleagues.

I know others of my colleagues wish to speak on these questions, and there are several items that will be mentioned conceivably in the questions that other Members might have and presentations of other members of the subcommittee and these matters will be covered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) has consumed 41 minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER).

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill being considered by the House today is symbolic of the budgetary and social problems facing our Nation. In this bill, second in size only to the Defense appropriation, we find programs which directly affect every citizen of this country. These programs educate and train our children for the future strength of our economy. They furnish research and resources for improving systems of health care. They investigate the mixed blessings of a modern industrial environment. And they provide assistance, however imperfect, to those of our citizens who cannot help themselves.

The needs in the area of labor-health, education, and welfare are great. Resources are great, but limited. Obviously, the committee had to set priorities.

As every Member on this floor can attest, there is no general consensus across this country today as to how these priorities should be established. The mail we have been receiving has been unanimous in only one respect: a very genuine opinion on the part of each writer that the programs which most directly affect him should have highest priority.

The committee is well aware of this problem. After 10 weeks of departmental hearings, 659 private individuals and organizations and their representatives in Congress stimulated an additional 1,400 pages of convincing testimony. Let me say here I greatly appreciate the hard work and excellent work of our chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the diligence and cooperation of the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

At the end of these hearings, however, the committee had to assume its responsibility. The task was not merely to decide how much to spend on each program; it was how to spend what was available. This the committee has done.

The recommendation before us now represents many compromises on the part of individual committee members which were necessary in a bill encompassing such a broad range of programs. As is evident in the number of amendments to be proposed, some disagreements still exist.

The new budget authority recommended in this bill for fiscal year 1970 totals \$16,651,039,700. This figure represents a decrease of \$705 million below the fiscal 1969 appropriation, but an increase of \$155.8 million above the administration's budget requests. Most of this increase is for hospital construction grants and for certain education programs.

Included in the bill are \$976.9 million for the Department of Labor, \$15.6 billion for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and \$78.4 million for related agencies.

The committee report provides an excellent capsule summary of what we are getting for our \$16.6 billion. I will mention just a few highlights.

The committee recommends increases of \$192 million for the job opportunities in the business sector program and \$44 million for the concentrated employment program. These two programs can go far to bring together unemployed and underemployed people with labor scarce areas in our economy.

The bill includes \$360 million for mental health activities. It was revealed during the hearings that the population of America's mental hospitals has been reduced by 30 percent over the past 13 years, due in large part to our active research programs.

There is an increase of \$44 million over 1969 for the National Institutes of Health.

These are noncontroversial items for the most part and, as a result, receive little publicity. The American taxpayers should know that with their basic health research investment, we now have in operation a program capable of solving the cancer problem; death from high blood pressure has been reduced by almost half over the past two decades; we now have

a national program to prevent tooth decay completely by 1980; the programs to combat cystic fibrosis and kidney disease are making real progress; an effective German measles vaccine has been developed; and experiments in the treatment of Parkinson's disease are very promising.

These are dramatic developments. However, with hospitalization costs increasing 55 percent between 1965 and 1969, and expected to increase by another 15 percent this year, it is evident that basic research is not enough. Thus, the committee recommends \$45 million be spent on health services research and development. It is imperative that the advances accomplished by NIH be translated into health services that are actually available at reasonable cost to the people who need them.

Another step toward better health services was endorsed by the committee. That is the administration's new physician augmentation program, which will increase the number of incoming medical students by 4,000 annually by 1973.

In response to needs pointed out in testimony before the committee and by thousands of letters from our constituents, Funds have been provided for elementary and secondary education library resources; guidance, counseling, and testing; and equipment. Increases are also included for direct student loans, vocational education basic grants and the work-study program, and for libraries and community services.

It is obvious that I have mentioned only a small percentage of the items in this bill. But it is important that our tax-paying citizens know that much is being accomplished in these fields.

I do not agree with everything in this bill. I definitely do not agree with the impacted area education program on which I will have more to say later, as I intend to have an amendment. I would emphasize that given the demands presently being made on our resources, this bill is a responsible, constructive effort to continue our efforts toward a better life for all of our people. The committee has spent many hours studying the details of these programs, both the accomplishments and the remaining problems. I would urge you to consider very carefully any changes which will be advocated later today.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. REID).

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, as a new member of the Subcommittee on Labor-HEW Appropriations, I would first like to pay sincere tribute to our distinguished and able chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), and to our ranking minority member the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). It is a pleasure to serve under the responsible and capable leadership they provide. To serve with these colorful, dynamic members along with other members of the committee makes this an interesting one on which to serve to say the least.

The appropriation bill for the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies

for fiscal 1970, which is before the House today, represents the bipartisan decisions of the members of our subcommittee after over 3 months of intensive hearings. As the seven volumes containing over 8,000 pages of printed hearings indicate, the subcommittee conducted a very thorough investigation of the requests presented. Representatives from the executive agencies, as well as those outside of the Federal Government, made excellent presentations. I am sure all of us are aware not only of the growing needs in the field of manpower, health, education, and welfare, but also the necessity to place these needs in a realistic framework of priorities in view of current budgetary limitations.

It has been pointed out by other members of the committee that this is the largest of the appropriation bills excluding Defense. Naturally, in an appropriation of this size—and dealing with matters which are related so closely and directly to people—there are bound to be honest differences of opinion regarding specific amounts. The needs in all of these areas are great, and many of these programs have much merit. Certainly more funds could be utilized if available, but we must remember that our resources are not unlimited—and we must do our best to allocate these limited funds wisely and where they will prove to be most effective.

In this regard I would like to point out some of the specific areas which have been of particular concern to me and many others. For instance, library services—I am sure we are all aware of the importance of good books and library services in the whole learning process. The assistance given to libraries has proven to be one of the best investments the Federal Government has made in the education field. Therefore, I supported the increase of \$17.5 million over the budget recommendations for library services, restoring the appropriation to the 1969 level of \$40.7 million.

For elementary and secondary education the committee followed the guidelines of the authorization bill passed recently and included in one sum the funds for supplementary educational services, school libraries, guidance, counseling, testing, equipment, and minor remodeling. The bill includes \$200.1 million for these purposes—compared with the budget request of \$116.1 million. These items have been of vital concern to school administrators.

In my opinion, too, one of the most effective ways to strike at the root causes of poverty and discontent and to open new doors for millions of young in both urban and rural areas is to improve and expand occupational education and vocational training. I have supported such programs in the past and feel that the increase of \$78 million above the budget request for this item is a wise investment. The programs of vocational-technical education are among the Nation's best efforts to reduce unemployment and eliminate occupational shortages.

Our subcommittee also heard impressive testimony concerning the programs of the National Institutes of Health. For

instance, 55 clinics are now participating in the National Heart Institute's coronary drug project and have enrolled 8,000 patients in a long-term study of the efficacy of drugs in prolonging the survival of heart attack victims. As requested in the budget, we have included an additional \$1 million to bring this study into full operation. Also, recognizing that cardiac replacement may often be the only hope for a patient with an irreparably damaged heart, the committee further directed the Heart Institute to devote more study to heart transplants and the development of an artificial heart.

Another area of progress is the development of a more effective artificial kidney with proven performance in clinical trials, which will be able to maintain patients with loss of kidney function more simply and much less expensively than the equipment available heretofore.

In addition, I think all of us were impressed by the leading role the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases has played in the development of vaccines against German measles or rubella, the first of which was recently licensed. This disease—while usually very mild in children—can have serious effects when it strikes an expectant mother. It is estimated that the rubella epidemic of 1964 caused some 50,000 abnormal pregnancies, and from 20,000 to 30,000 infants were born with severe birth defects.

I believe no one would question that we have better medical care in this country than anywhere in the world. However, we know there is a critical shortage of trained medical personnel—hospital costs are high and still rising—and there are many diseases for which there is still no cure. This is why it is very exciting when medical science discovers a method of preventing a disease.

In another area, the committee heard alarming testimony from representatives of the National Institute of Mental Health on the use of marihuana and other drug abuses on the part of students—and incredible as it may seem this is even becoming prevalent in the elementary grades. This points up the need for more and better educational programs to demonstrate the devastating effects of drugs.

In a continuing effort to meet the shortages of personnel in the health field, the committee has included \$218 million for the health manpower program. The committee was informed of the administration's plan to encourage a substantial increase in medical school enrollments—also the size and quality of the dental manpower pool. Certainly more physicians, dentists, nurses, and other health personnel are vitally needed.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the bill before the House is a good compromise in that we have made every attempt to establish priorities among those programs which have proven their worthiness for the health, education, and welfare of our people. It was not an easy task under the very difficult fiscal situation which faces our Nation at this time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield

5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, this subcommittee—under the able leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL)—has faced up well to its unenviable task.

This bill, providing as it does over \$16.5 billion for some of the most sensitive activities in which the Federal Government is today involved, is a natural for controversy and protracted debate. This would be so under normal fiscal conditions—whatever those might be, it being so long since we have enjoyed the comparative luxury of that kind of situation that most of us have forgotten. And it is especially so during protracted periods demanding budgetary restraint of the sort we have experienced these past several years.

For it is then that the question of relative priorities—on a program-by-program basis—becomes all important.

By and large, I think the subcommittee has done well—exceptionally well under the circumstances—in sorting all those priorities out, and I would wish to compliment its members for that fact.

But it has faced a dilemma all along with respect to the competing programs funded through this bill for the Office of Education. That dilemma will become more apparent as debate wears on this afternoon, and as we reach the amendment stage. In short, it relates to the probable political fact that, before we finish with this vehicle, the House—and in this instance, I think, in its questionable wisdom—will have voted a good many millions of dollars more for the purposes of the so-called impacted aid programs than the subcommittee has recommended.

I do not know how many millions of dollars more—that remains to be seen. But I think one can safely assume that the final figure for such purposes will be at least equivalent to the amount appropriated therefor for fiscal 1969.

And it is that situation, Mr. Chairman, that impels me to speak on this bill as I now do and, later on, to offer an amendment which I will describe for you in a moment.

But, first, let me make my position clear: Although the impacted aid programs are of some importance to my district—and certainly to my State—I believe that the so-called section 3(b) portion thereof, under which payments are made for children whose parents work, but do not live, on Federal property and the like, to be an ill-conceived program, badly in need of review and revision if not abandonment. Like the summer showers we have been experiencing, its benefits do not fall evenly across the Nation. It does not address itself to areas of demonstrable need—the best illustration of which remains the dollars liberally poured under this section into Montgomery County, Md., where I, as the parent of a public school child, am counted for collection purposes even though I am a property owner in Montgomery County and pay school taxes on that property.

Few such dollars flow into the school

systems in city ghetto areas, and fewer still into rural school districts struggling with the ever-increasing costs of providing their children with an adequate education out of an inadequate tax base.

I am, therefore, in full support of the subcommittee's recommendations in this respect, and will vote to maintain that position when the time comes—and it is this attitude that prevents me, though with some regret, from supporting the so-called Joelson package that may be offered by way of amendment to this bill.

However, if that package proposal does not carry, political realism dictates the probability that the subcommittee's position on impacted aid still cannot be held. And, if that proves to be the case, then we will end up with those programs funded at or above last year's levels while other—and in my judgment more desirable—educational programs will be cut back.

I would like to speak to you now about four such programs. You will find them referred to in the bottom paragraph on page 32 of the report where it is noted:

The Committee has included in one sum the funds for (a) supplementary educational services, (b) library resources, (c) guidance, counseling, and testing, and (d) equipment and minor remodeling.

Then it is stated—and I invite your attention to the report—that—

The bill includes \$200,163,000 for this purpose compared with the budget request of \$116,163,000 all of which was earmarked for supplementary educational centers.

So the subcommittee has attempted to improve on the budget request in this connection—and I congratulate it for that—but what the report does not tell you is that the recommended figure for these combined programs is still \$110,453,000 less than was separately appropriated for these same purposes in the fiscal year just concluded.

The amendment I intend to offer—if opportunity arises—would be one simply increasing the subcommittee figure for these four programs by that \$110,453,000 which, if adopted would bring the funds for these four programs—though still on a combined basis—up to last fiscal year's combined total.

The only difference between my proposed amendment—as just described—and that relevant portion of the so-called Joelson package, is that I would consolidate the funds for these four programs in the same way the committee has, whereas the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) would individually fund—or “ earmark”—them. Such a consolidation would be in accordance with a provision in the ESEA Amendments of 1969—H.R. 514 as passed by the House—requiring the consolidation of such programs beginning in fiscal 1971, but would move that requirement up 1 fiscal year for reasons that seem justifiable.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me also say this: If I thought the subcommittee's position on impacted aid might be held, perhaps I would not offer such an amendment—accepting the indicated cuts in these four programs, unfortunate though that would seem to be, in the interests of overall restraint. But since, as I have

said, everyone seems to feel that there will be full funding for impacted aid, then I feel I must make this effort in an attempt to get our priorities back into some better order.

For these are four good educational programs: The supplemental educational services program, under title III of ESEA, which can be compared to research and development into ways to improve the processes of education—sort of after the fashion of the great experimental stations in agriculture; the highly useful effort under ESEA's title II to improve the library resources of both public and private schools at the elementary and secondary levels, and to provide such schools—on a basis of relative need and not on a per pupil basis—with textbooks and other instructional materials, all of which has been of especial benefit to ghetto schools and the small, rural school districts where money remains scarce for such purposes; the extremely important effort under title V-A of NDEA to improve—or establish—guidance and counseling programs in the schools at such levels as well as in junior colleges and technical institutions, and also to support testing programs in the same institutions, all of which—under the local budgetary pressures now felt by nearly every school board in the land—can hardly be maintained without the continuance of Federal aid at at least last year's level; and, finally, the familiar program under title III of NDEA—a matching program with the States on a 50-50 basis so we know our investment here is being put to good use—under which laboratory and other instructional equipment has been acquired by thousands of school districts badly in need thereof, along with such minor remodeling of the school plant as may be needed to accommodate the same, the need for all of which is an ongoing thing that, again, the States and local districts cannot be expected to pick up.

Mr. Chairman, as one whose reputation for being something other than a "big spender" around these parts ought by now to have been well established, let me say I know \$110,453,000 is still a lot of money. But perhaps not so much, after all, in the relative sense, for we spent \$15.8 million, so I understand, to build that laboratory in Houston where the three Apollo astronauts and their lunar rocks are now quarantined, plus who knows how much more to operate that lab, and we are spending—what?—somewhere around half a billion dollars a week in Vietnam. Looked at in that light this is not so much money.

Besides which, though the subcommittee members—or most of them—will have to oppose my amendment, if I have a chance at offering it, from a reading of the hearings and their comments on the underfunding of these four programs it would appear that they do not all agree that what I would propose is so wrong.

These four programs, Mr. Chairman, have demonstrated their value, the continuing need for them is apparent and, if the impacted aid program is to go forward full speed then so, too, should these; that is my position, and I urge your support thereof at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I will be happy to yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ESCH. I would like to compliment the gentleman from New York on his detailed analysis and wish to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. ROBISON. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. PIRNIE).

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the legislation under consideration today—the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill—is one of the most important measures we will consider this session. As we recall the glory of Apollo 11 and the technology which made it possible, we cannot help but be reminded of the contributions made to that endeavor by our educational system. As we look toward greater human goals we must be sure that we have the tools to accomplish them. Certainly, one of the most critical of these is the Federal commitment to education.

In my view, there can be no lessening of this commitment, and in April I wrote the President urging that his administration maintain the support to education necessary to continue the progress in this field which has been and is continuing to be made. In that letter I mentioned specific areas of great concern to me and called for full funding for both. The Higher Education Facilities Act and the impacted areas program are two of the many items included in this appropriations bill but, in my judgment, they are worthy of special comment.

I was very disappointed that the administration did not recommend any new budget obligations for the construction of educational facilities in 4-year undergraduate institutions. Last year, \$33 million was allocated for higher education facilities construction and we should at least match that sum during the current fiscal year.

It is somewhat puzzling to me that the administration would request and receive \$43 million for the construction of educational facilities at 2-year community colleges and yet not request one penny for construction at 4-year institutions. While there is no question that community colleges of the 2-year variety are the thing of the future and serve a very critical need, our 4-year institutions are also of great importance. My district has a balance of both the 2- and 4-year schools. Both types serve useful and necessary functions, and I believe both should have the opportunity to expand to accommodate their differing constituencies.

The impacted area program interests me, not only because the thousands of children in my district benefit from it,

because it has contributed substantially on a national basis to our educational system. For example, last year over 52 percent of all the school districts in America received Public Law 874 funds. No other Federal program can match this record.

I recognize that there is a great deal of discussion on the merits of this program and I agree that certain alterations in the qualification requirements may be necessary, but eliminating the category B students by not providing adequate funds for it will diminish the quality of educational services to thousands of students. I have long advocated and so testified before the Labor-HEW Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee that the correct procedure is to change the authorizing legislation after indepth hearings.

In the absence of that procedure, it is well to look as this program, not from the view of the Washington suburban areas, but from the standpoint of the small communities who are directly and materially affected by the existence of Federal installations. I would be the first to agree that there is questionable justification for the schools in suburban Maryland and Virginia to qualify for federally impacted area funds for those residents who work in the District of Columbia for the Federal Government.

It should be noted, however, that the original law did not allow the school districts in these suburban communities to receive Public Law 874 funds for those residents employed in the District of Columbia. Only a subsequent amendment authorizing those who were within "commuting areas" made them eligible. In my view, the rationalization for Public Law 874—at least as far as most of the country is concerned—is as valid today as it was when it was enacted; namely, that military installations and Federal properties are not taxable by States or localities, despite the fact that the students of the parents who work on these facilities must be educated by the States and localities. In the absence of providing these communities with the authority to levy taxes on these facilities, we have an obligation which must be met.

Generalizations are always risky and in the case of generalizing from the example of suburban Virginia to Rome, N.Y., in my district, it is like comparing apples and oranges. Adjacent to this upstate New York community of about 50,000 is Griffiss Air Force Base—a large installation estimated by the Air Force to be worth \$125,921,000 in both land and improved structures. The Rome School District receives less than \$1 million in Public Law 874 funds annually, yet if the tax rate currently in force in Rome were applied to Griffiss Air Force Base, the amount would be nearly double the annual Public Law 874 allotment. Furthermore, of the 4,000 impacted students in Rome, 2,800 are in the B category. Under the terms of the bill now under consideration, the Rome schools would not receive a penny for them. While this is a disaster in itself, it would be especially critical because of the fact that all funds would be cut off immedi-

ately. If this program is to be reduced, it ought to be done over a period of years—not in one fell swoop.

As we consider the course to follow, we should all be mindful of the fact that earlier in the year, the Office of Education awarded a \$167,000 contract to the Battelle Memorial Institute to conduct an indepth study of Public Law 874 and to make recommendations for change. The report is due late this year, and unless we are willing to admit that we just threw that \$167,000 of the taxpayers money in the street, we should await the results of that study before either eliminating or broadening this program.

In the meantime, schoolchildren in most of the congressional districts will be returning to school in about a month. The question we answer today in deciding whether to provide near-full funding or the pittance contained in H.R. 13111 is, Will they have the resources necessary to get a good education this school year? That is the question. If we provide the \$585 million necessary for the 90 percent of the entitlement under Public Law 874 for both A and B category students, the answer will be "yes." If we fail to do that, we will have denied educational services to hundreds of thousands of students in every corner of this country. This must not happen and it can be prevented by supporting the amendment to be offered later in the debate to increase Public Law 874 funds for fiscal year 1970 to \$585 million.

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the legislative Committee on Labor and Education, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, again I want to pay my respects to this distinguished subcommittee, and to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD), who chairs the subcommittee, and to all the members of the subcommittee who have worked diligently in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, I well realize that it is a difficult task to work out an equitable solution to all the problems that are presented in such a large bill. It would be difficult under any circumstances and I have no doubt that my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania and the member of the committee would not have brought a bill to the floor with these kinds of cuts for education had the budget surplus picture appeared at the time the bill was reported as bright as it does today. The downturn for education started by the Budget estimate in fiscal 1969 when they decided to cut back funds for certain programs.

The funds in this bill amount to 36 percent of the authorization, and that is all. Thirty-six percent. The Johnson budget of \$3,591,614,000 for the Office of Education has been cut back by the committee more than one-quarter of a billion dollars. This cut takes education almost to the point of destruction.

Mr. Chairman, I fully support the package amendment that will be offered today. Time and again many of my distinguished colleagues in this body have come to me over the years and expressed concern over the mounting welfare costs

and the obvious need for retraining, rehabilitation and remedial-type programs. The costs for these programs are indeed mounting and are a heavy burden for the taxpayer.

In 1965 the Education and Labor Committee sought to do something about them.

I recognize, as I think every Member of this body recognizes—that if we are to reduce the burden of welfare costs—that if we are to eliminate hard-core unemployment which saps the vitality of the economy, if we are to erase the dropout problem—we must begin to do those things which increase educational opportunities in the early processes of education and in those areas which lack the financial ability or the motivation to adequately provide the programs at the elementary and secondary school levels to equip our young people with the basic educational skills necessary for them to enter occupational training, employment or higher education.

Thus, in 1965 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was enacted. The major program among several authorized by that legislation is title I which provides grants to local school districts to strengthen educational opportunities in schools with concentrations of disadvantaged children. Children who are not provided with adequate learning opportunities today will present problems for our country tomorrow.

I have been greatly impressed with what educational specialists and school administrators have said across this land with respect to the importance of this program and the success it is having in enabling our young people to achieve better in school and gain the basic educational skills so necessary in fulfilling a responsible role in our society.

At the same time I think it is clear from the evidence before our Committee and from what I have observed in the school systems it has been my privilege to visit—that the effectiveness of this program has been greatly reduced by our refusal to fully fund it.

Appropriations for title I have been at a level of less than 40 percent of the authorization. If we are really serious about strengthening educational opportunities in our Nation's schools so as to really enable our children to participate fully in the complex technological world of today, title I should be fully funded. The additional amount provided in the package—\$180 million—falls short of doing this, but at least it is a step forward and will permit a continuation of programs, now operating, in the face of rising school costs.

Mr. Chairman, I support this package, because I realize as I think my colleagues do that the educational system of this Nation is a very broad and complex one. In order for there to be meaningful educational opportunities, it is not sufficient for us to think in terms of specialized geographical areas such as we do in the impact aid program or to think of only the grade schools or to ignore the needs of children who have dropped out of school or the needs of children who do not attend public schools.

Nor can we simply look at one segment of the educational process and focus entirely at the elementary or secondary level.

The needs are great in the fields of vocational and technical education—in our newly emerging community college system—and in our colleges and universities.

While the constituency influences upon my distinguished colleagues will incline some to favor one program against another, the fact remains that the children and the parents of each congressional district represented here today have a great stake in what we do with respect to the needs of the entire extent of the education system—what we do to enable young people to have an opportunity for college education—what we do to enable young people to obtain the vocational technical training they desire—what we do to assure young people with the necessary basic skills to enter upon further education and training at the higher levels.

These are the basic reasons that I support a package approach in meeting what I feel to be great deficiencies in the level of funding proposed by H.R. 13111.

The package approach would restore funds for impact aid, bringing it up to 90 percent of the authorization. It would bring our school library, textbooks, and other instruction program, title II of ESEA, to the 1969 appropriation level. It would do the same for the National Defense Education Act equipment program—title III. It would provide funds to the 1969 appropriation level for guidance and counseling programs under title V-A of the National Defense Education Act as well as for the supplemental education centers program under title III of ESEA.

The package approach would provide \$488,716,000 for vocational education, assuring that present programs in vocational education would not be reduced because of the set asides required in the 1968 amendments and further, would enable the States to make substantial progress in providing programs of occupational training for young people now on waiting lists of technical schools.

The package approach would enable grants to be made to institutions of higher education for the construction of undergraduate facilities to accommodate increased enrollments, a program that would be discontinued entirely if the provisions of the Committee bill were allowed to prevail.

The package would provide an additional \$40,749,000 to the National Defense Education Act student loan program to provide a source of financing a college education for many students who are unable at this time to secure a loan under the guaranteed loan program because of the level of interest rates.

If we look at fiscal year 1968, the appropriation was \$1,191 million. Since that time we have had more than 10 percent inflation. We have had added groups of migrant children and handicapped children that must be first supported fully.

School districts are getting partially paid for about 7.2 million children and

we are serving more than 9 million. So by all means the amount of money should be increased for title I. Let me show you the funding history of the pro-

grams affected by the package amendment, as reflected in the table hereby submitted for the RECORD.

The table follows:

HISTORY OF APPROPRIATION OF PROGRAMS AFFECTED BY PACKAGE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 13111

[In thousands of dollars]

	1968 appro- priation	1969 appro- priation	1970 revised budget	1970 appro- priation bill, H.R. 13111	H.R. 13111 plus Joelson package	H. R. 13111 plus package, compared to 1968 appro- priation	H. R. 13111 plus package, compared to 1969 appro- priation
Impact aid.....	486,355	521,253	202,167	181,000	585,000	+98,645	+63,747
ESEA II school libraries.....	99,234	50,000	0	0	50,000	-49,234	Same
NDEA III-A equipment.....	75,680	75,740	0	0	75,740	+60	Same
NDEA V-A guidance and counsel.....	24,500	17,000	0	200,163	17,000	-7,500	Same
ESEA III supplemental centers.....	187,876	164,876	116,393	0	164,876	-23,000	Same
Vocational education.....	284,216	248,216	279,216	357,216	488,716	+240,500	+240,500
HEA construction, 4-year under- graduate.....	200,000	33,000	0	0	33,000	-167,000	Same
NDEA II student loan.....	184,000	193,400	161,900	181,306	229,000	+45,000	+35,600
ESEA title I.....	1,191,000	1,226,000	1,226,000	1,216,175	1,396,975	+205,975	+273,848
Total.....	2,696,861	2,462,612	1,985,676	2,141,860	3,040,307	+343,446	+613,695

Let me now refer to titles II and III of ESEA and titles III and V of NDEA. Here in H.R. 13111, for fiscal year 1970 you are tying these different programs together, contrary to the Green amendment which let the States have the discretion—in H.R. 13111 you provide that the Office of Education shall have the discretion—and in the Green amendment consolidation is effective in 1971—here you make the U.S. Commissioner's authority to allocate these funds effective—now.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I certainly agree completely with the distinguished chairman.

I would like to make clear that under the package amendment which I will offer at the appropriate time, this matter will be dealt with so that the discretion will be taken away from the commissioner of education and specific sums will be allocated for each specific purpose.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey that, what he has said is my understanding of the package amendment and that is just and proper. That is the minimum, in my judgment, that should be expended by this Congress for these various educational programs. I do not think this Congress wants to tear up and destroy title II of ESEA, the library title, and that is what this bill (H.R. 13111) does. It would destroy title II.

The example. The Bureau of the Budget put nothing in the budget for title II, leaving it to the discretion of the Office of Education, and they will not turn one dime loose, in my judgment, for titles that they are in disagreement with.

I say to you, it would be a grave injustice if this Chamber permitted legislation of this type on an appropriation bill, where the standing committee of the House has carefully worked out this situation and heard hundreds of witnesses, and there is no authority in the law anywhere to group these titles together as they have been grouped to-

gether simply because the bureaucrat does not like the library program, does not like the supplemental educational centers, and does not like the equipment title and does not like the guidance and counseling title. Now, that is it. In concluding my remarks let me turn to title V-A of the National Defense Education Act:

The NDEA of 1958 stimulated and strengthened the growth of guidance and counseling services for our nation's children and youth. Then only 13,000 school counselors existed while 38,000 were needed. Now after a decade of Federal support authorized by Congress, we have reached a goal of 37,915. Yet elementary, secondary and vocational school populations of youth continue to increase. More than 70,000 such counselors are needed in our nation's schools and communities today.

NDEA Title V-A funding authorization for fiscal 1970 is \$40 million. A critical need exists today for a substantial appropriation for guidance and counseling at a minimum of \$25 million to the maximum of \$40 million.

Guidance services in elementary schools have grown remarkably with the seed money support of NDEA to the states. In California, Georgia, Illinois, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Texas and elsewhere across the nation, actually hundreds of new elementary guidance programs have developed because of NDEA support.

Counselor ratio to numbers of students which nationally was one to 960 students in secondary schools in 1958 has now been reduced to a ratio nationally of one counselor to 450 students. These gains must be preserved.

The ratio of elementary school counselors to pupils is now one to 6,485 elementary children. Of the more than 26 million pupils in elementary schools in 1967, only 11 percent were receiving guidance services in programs meeting state standards.

In the high schools in 1967 only 64 percent of the 17 million students were reached by approved guidance services.

These tragic gaps in guidance and counseling must be filled. NDEA Title V-A funding at substantial levels is imperative.

The facts for selected states of guidance growth and support stimulated by our Congressional action to provide NDEA Title V-A funding are: (These fiscal 1967 data based on a \$24.3 million appropriation are documented in *Review of Progress*, Title V-A, National Defense Education Act, released July 15, 1969.)

	NDEA funds	State and local support funds
California.....	\$2,200,000	\$34,700,000
Georgia.....	571,000	4,200,000
Illinois.....	1,300,000	13,700,000
Kentucky.....	407,000	2,200,000
Pennsylvania.....	1,300,000	16,900,000
Tennessee.....	486,000	2,900,000
Texas.....	1,400,000	6,300,000
Total.....	7,700,000	80,900,000

It should be noted for these seven states alone that Federal NDEA support of \$8 million stimulated a ten-fold state and local funding support of \$81 million for guidance and counseling services for children and youth.

The task is unfinished; in fact, we have just begun. At least eight critical needs exist which require Federal support and stimulation:

1. Early childhood development must be emphasized.

Research and experience in elementary schools give evidence that services in depth and at the earliest possible age are essential to prevent mental retardation, especially among disadvantaged children; to remove beginning difficulties in learning; and to correct or minimize effects of physical and psychological handicaps. The history of dropouts from high school commonly reveals signs of emotional and learning difficulties that were known and might have been corrected in the first few years of school.

Furthermore, services directed toward early and individual treatment of highly gifted and creative children have the potential of producing the future leaders so greatly needed in today's complex world. The lack of professional help at the right time may prevent a potentially gifted artist from making any contribution to society.

2. A broader concept of pupil personnel services is necessary to meet fully the developmental needs of the individual child.

The concept of "guidance," broadly interpreted, includes all of the services that keep children fit to learn. These are commonly called "pupil personnel services" and usually consist of guidance and counseling, psychological, social work, health, attendance, and sometimes speech and hearing services.

Pupil personnel services are needed by all children because all children face common obstacles in growing up, and many have serious problems. Multiple services are mandatory for those children whose families cannot provide the physical necessities, home training, and psychological support required for normal progress.

3. Effectiveness of pupil personnel services could be strengthened through greater coordination of program whatever their source of funds.

4. New sources must be topped for support personnel.

An increasing number of experiments suggest that pupil personnel services can be enriched and extended to serve more children by the use of para-professionals, aides, or support personnel. Para-professionals from certain socio-economic backgrounds and age groups may be able to help children from similar backgrounds with even greater understanding of their problems than some specialists possess.

5. More research is needed in pupil personnel services.

In the emerging structure of pupil personnel services, it is essential that the organization of services, roles of practitioners, and techniques of helping children and youth be based on valid research experience.

6. Existing services should be expanded for maximum impact.

(a) Guidance services in elementary schools should be increased.

(b) More extensive services should be provided for school dropouts at all educational levels.

(c) Guidance and personnel services in post-high-school education are in urgent need of expansion.

7. More attention needs to be given to the involvement of parents in the guidance process.

Events reported throughout the United States attest to the mounting independence and alienation among youth, and to the failure of educators and parents to understand the changes taking place. Confusion of adults has led to frustration and antagonism, less frequently to sympathy for a generation that is caught between two worlds. The generation gap is real.

At the same time, teachers and parents should be helped to understand and appreciate an informed, sensitive, and determined generation of youth.

8. Greater emphasis upon career development and the relevant use of computer systems is necessary.

The counselor's role in shifting, to the assistance of counselees to plan careers which will allow them to change the nature of their work several times during their lives.

In the near future, it is probable that information about institutions for training and job openings will be programmed into computers along with student data relating to education, abilities, interests, experience, and even values associated with work.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, the city of Anaheim, Calif., has always prided itself on the excellent educational opportunities it has provided for its children. Today, however, this city's educational leaders are seriously facing the possibility of reducing, and in some cases eliminating, valuable programs from their curriculum.

The anxiety of the Anaheim educators is being caused here in Washington since the House of Representatives will today decide whether the students of Anaheim have access to field trips and an updated English language program. The Members of this House will determine whether Anaheim can afford to purchase valuable instructional equipment and continue intradistrict competitive athletic events. The Congress will have to decide whether the youngsters of Anaheim will have the educational advantage of four language laboratories and continued curriculum improvement and enrichment through pilot projects.

I am sure if the schoolchildren and parents of Anaheim were asked if they wanted these educational opportunities there would be little doubt as to the answer. Yet there is considerable doubt about the answer Congress will give.

I expect that in the course of this debate on financing education we will hear the fine rhetoric reminding us of the importance of education to the Nation's future. I have little doubt someone will appeal to us not to shortchange our youth. And someone will remind us of the growing generation gap, and the need to restructure our priorities.

No doubt these are excellent arguments. Many have employed them in the past and I personally believe they are still valid, and relevant to today's debate.

What is unfortunate is that we need to

repeat these arguments at all. Perhaps I have been laboring under a gross misassumption when I believed the Congress had made, some years ago, a continuing commitment to service our country's educational needs.

What I cannot understand, and what the educational leaders of Anaheim and the leaders of thousands of school districts like Anaheim cannot understand is why has the support for education suddenly been withdrawn?

When the Appropriations Committee reports legislation which completely eliminates funds for section B students of Public Law 874, when vocational education, and title I ESEA funds are drastically cut, and when little or no money is made available for needed library services or vital instructional equipment, one can only conclude that our continuing commitment to education is at an end.

If the Appropriations Committee recommendations are followed the credibility of the House will be seriously damaged. The fact the bill was reported with its present contents has undoubtedly eroded confidence in this body's ability to follow through with its commitments.

Obviously more important than the veracity of this institution will be the impact the committee's recommendations will have on educational programs throughout the Nation. At the beginning of this statement I pointed out some of the choices the Anaheim School District faces. I have received similar letters urging my support for full funding from virtually every school superintendent in my district. These letters will appear at the conclusion of my remarks. Thousands of schoolchildren in the 34th Congressional District will find themselves facing a barren school year unless the House restores to 90 percent of authorization the funds for Public Law 874. Multiply my district by hundreds across the Nation and it will not take a prophet to predict the impending crisis in education. If any Member has a doubt about whether to support the Joelson amendment, I suggest he read his mail. The concern of almost every local educator is being heard and it will be a tragedy if we do not respond.

The Washington Post summed up the situation fairly well this morning in an editorial in which it was clearly pointed out that—

Every economical American ought to hope that Congress will approve these proposed increases in aid to education. There is nothing in the least spendthrift about them. They would do no more than meet the fundamental obligation of a civilized society to its younger generation.

President Nixon said when he was campaigning for the Presidency:

When I look at American education I do not see schools, but children, and young men and women—young Americans who deserve the chance to make a life for themselves and ensure the progress of their country. If we fail in this, no success we have is worth the keeping. We are on the brink of failure as the price of parsimony. Generosity affords the only hope for redemption.

The material referred to follows:

ANAHEIM UNION  
HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Anaheim, Calif., July 18, 1969.

Subject: Pending Legislation, Public Law 874  
Funds.

HON. RICHARD I. HANNA,  
Representative, 34th District,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: The Anaheim Union High School District has received, during the past several years, approximately \$200,000 annually under subject Federal Authority to help finance approximately 1,000 pupils educated at this District and classified as subsection 3(b)2 pupils (Pupils—Parent employed on Federal property—pupil not residing on Federal property). We understand that a new fiscal year appropriation in the amount of \$187,000,000 will come to the floor of the House during the week of July 21, 1969. This limited appropriation would remove present entitlement of this District to any funds received under the above law.

Without PL-874 funds this District would have to curtail expenditures of approximately \$200,000. We would have to stop all transportation for field trips and intradistrict competitive athletic events. We would have to reduce desirable expenditures for renewal of instructional equipment and cancel the planned updating of the English language program through the purchase of four language laboratories. We would have to limit our efforts to improve education through pilot projects.

We respectfully request that you support this bill to provide additional funds for the Category 3(b)2 students educated at this district. Your attention to this request is sincerely appreciated.

Yours truly,

R. KEN WINES,  
Deputy Superintendent.

CENTRALIA SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Buena Park, Calif., July 8, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: This has been a very interesting year in terms of school finance, both in the state and on the national scene. As you know, it has been increasingly difficult to get tax overrides or bond issues passed in the State of California during the last few years. The threat of the removal of Public Law 874 funds has added considerably to the strain in terms of financing many of the school districts in California. It is a sort of paradox—everyone seems to want more and better education but seem at a loss to know which way to turn in order to get money to pay for it.

I have before me a pamphlet prepared by Dr. Gordon Harrison, who appeared before the Senate Sub-committee on Education on behalf of maintaining the Public Law 874 for support at its present level. This report indicates that the total entitlements amount to \$45,840,253 and the entitlements for 3B students is \$32,909,678. This is an enormous amount of school support and it could not be replaced in most instances by applying more taxes at the local level because most of us are at the limit of our taxing power at present. We are caught in a squeeze. We must be competitive in salaries to get the people we want, and we must at least try to keep up with the modern approaches to education in terms of program. I imagine that you find pleas and pressures brought to bear upon you by many special interest groups, so you are quite familiar with all sorts of problems of this kind.

We in education would certainly appreciate any help that you can give us in maintaining Public Law 874 support at its present level. In some districts any appreciable cut

will mean severe cuts in educational programs, which will result in doubtful savings to the people we serve in the long run.

We thank you in advance for any help you can give us in this matter.

Sincerely,

PAUL DOSS, Ed. D.,  
District Superintendent.

CALIFORNIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,  
Sacramento, Calif., July 22, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The California School Boards Association requests your support of all approved Congressional programs of Federal aid to education. Last year California schools received over \$230,000,000 from all Federal aid programs currently in existence. This constitutes over 6% of the total support of California public schools. It is imperative for the welfare of California's educational systems that these programs be continued and fully funded.

In addition, the Association is opposed to the inauguration of any new Federal aid projects that would be funded from any of the existing programs currently approved by the Congress. It is the firm position of this Association that new aid projects should be accompanied by new sources of revenue. This is the only procedure that will guarantee that California school districts will not be harmed by a shift in the basis of Federal support.

Your consideration and support of this position is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH M. BROOKS,  
Executive Secretary.

LOS ALAMITOS SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Los Alamitos, Calif., July 23, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: Your support for full funding of Public Law 874, Section 3(b), is crucial for the Los Alamitos School District. If these funds are cut from our recently adopted budget for 1969-70, all reserves will be depleted and we will be left in a deficit position.

In addition, the completion of 202 housing units on the Los Alamitos Naval Air Station will place a heavy financial burden on the district, which is far below state average in assessed value per pupil. Continuation of funds under Section 3(a) is equally vital.

We need your help in support of full funding for Public Law 874.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE PLUMLEIGH,  
Superintendent.

LOS ALAMITOS, CALIF.,  
March 25, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Please support H.R. 514. Extension of section 3(b) of Public Laws 815 and 874 is essential to our school district. Loss of funds from any section of Public Law 874 would be a catastrophe to this school district.

Dr. E. L. GREENBLATT,  
Superintendent, Los Alamitos School  
District.

NEWPORT-MESA UNIFIED  
SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Newport Beach, Calif., March 27, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request you attend hearing on H.R. 514 (Public Law 874) to be held on March 31. This district receives \$100,000 in Federal funds from P.L. 874 occasioned by proximity of El Toro Marine Base and the

Marine Air Facility in Santa Ana, urge continuation of Public Law 874 in its present form as loss of these funds will create severe financial blow in the operation of this school district.

WALTER ADRIAN,  
Director of Budget  
and Business Services.

GARDEN GROVE, CALIF.,  
March 25, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your support of P.L. 874 funds as recommended by committee maintaining 3B category.

DAVID H. PAYNTER.

FOUNTAIN VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Fountain Valley, Calif., April 24, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANNA: We were happy to receive your letter of March 6, 1969 in response to my letter of February 17 regarding funding of Public Law 874.

We have just learned that H.R. 514 was amended on April 16 to delete the entitlement for all Category B students. If allowed to stand, this amendment would eliminate PL 874 funds for our district as well as many other districts in California.

The current entitlement of \$80,470.56 represents an average of \$9.25 for each student in the Fountain Valley School District. Since you are familiar with our district, you can readily see that deletion of Category B students would cause an extreme burden upon the district.

Your efforts in helping to reestablish Category B students, as well as maintaining the Public Law 874 program, will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. WOODFIN, Ed. D.,  
Associate Superintendent.

GARDEN GROVE  
UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT,  
Anaheim, Calif., July 28, 1969.

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA,  
Cannon House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully request your support on inclusion of P.L. 874 subsection 3B2 students in current appropriation bill.

DAVID H. PAYNTER,  
Superintendent.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, today or perhaps tomorrow, we as Members of the House of Representatives will be called on to decide whether we really mean what we say when we advocate a restructuring of our national priorities.

Today or tomorrow we will have the opportunity to either add \$900 million for education or to pass an emaciated education budget providing something like 40 percent of the sums we have so glibly authorized for education.

In short, we will soon be put to the test. Do we really want better schools, better colleges, better research facilities? Or do we want to limp along with decaying school systems, overcrowded colleges and underfunded research?

We have gotten to the moon on the investments we have made in education in the last generation. The question of whether we will be capable of similar technical feats in the next generation will depend largely on whether and how

well we educate that generation. Education costs money. The Federal Government has authorized the expenditure of more than \$8 billion for this fiscal year. Yet, the administration and the Appropriations Committee have suggested that we spend only a little more than \$3 billion this year for education. It was not this sort of pittance funding or our half-hearted commitment which got us to the moon. We devoted enormous sums and 100-percent dedication to the task of a lunar landing.

We cannot and we should not make a lesser commitment to our own children as they prepare for their generation of leadership and new ideas.

Amendments will be offered to the Labor/HEW appropriations to restore funds previously authorized by the Congress for education of the culturally disadvantaged, for school libraries, for equipment, experimentation, guidelines and counseling in our elementary and secondary schools, for vocational education, for college construction and student assistance, for impact aid. These are all vital and important programs providing desperately needed Federal aid to education.

I would like to take just a moment at this time to explain some of the thinking which underwrites the package amendments which will be introduced.

#### ESEA TITLE I

In the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, the Congress provided that statewide programs for disadvantaged students should be 100-percent fully funded, even if the Congress failed to appropriate the full sums authorized by the Congress. Since we have not ever appropriated more than about 40 percent of the sums authorized for title I of ESEA, each local educational agency—that means schools—has received a prorated share well below the authorized levels, yet the statewide programs have received full funding. Because of the increase in the number and size of these statewide programs it is necessary in the current fiscal year to provide \$80,800,000 in additional funds above the committee's bill simply to assure that each local school district in fiscal 1970 receive a Federal payment at least as large as the payment received in previous years.

In 1968 we were provided \$210 for each disadvantaged pupil who qualified under ESEA guidelines. At the funded levels suggested by the administration and the Appropriations Committee, we would be providing only \$170 for each such pupil this year. In short, at the funding level of this bill we would be taking a giant step backward.

And at the same time we are taking this step backward, education costs have been increasing at the rate of at least 5 percent per year. In 3 short years, education costs have escalated more than 15 percent. For this reason, too, under the sums suggested by the committee we would be moving still further to the rear. It is then for reasons of attempting to maintain current funding levels for local schools and to meet the problems of increasing educational costs that we have

thought it appropriate to include more than \$180 million in additional funds for programs to serve educationally disadvantaged students.

#### HIGHER EDUCATION

Two major schemes which provide Federal assistance to our colleges and universities are not working under current conditions.

We have recently created a new program of interest subsidies for the construction of university facilities.

Under this program colleges and universities are allowed to borrow money at commercial rates and then to seek reimbursement from the Federal Government for their interest payments. The trouble is that in 15 or 20 States public educational institutions cannot borrow money on the commercial markets. Thus, in these States the interest subsidy program is of no benefit. Yet, in the administration's amended budget all funds for the construction of facilities at 4-year colleges and graduate schools have been deleted. It seems unconscionable for us to deny our universities funds they so badly need to keep pace with ever increasing college population. It seems doubly so when we have so recently devised a program to provide low-cost assistance to these institutions for this type of construction.

To make our college construction programs work we have included in the package amendments \$33 million for construction at 4-year undergraduate institutions. This is the same sum we appropriated in fiscal year 1969. There is no increase to take care of inflation or the growing demand. We are merely attempting to hold the line.

There is another program of benefit to higher education which has failed entirely. Under the guaranteed student loan program the Federal Government insures commercial banks against losses on loans made to students at qualified 4-year colleges. The law provides, however, that these guaranteed loans are to bear not more than 7-percent interest.

The trouble is that today the prime interest rate is 8½ percent. The banks just are not making loans to anybody at 7 percent. In short, there are no 7-percent student loans for the Federal Government to guarantee.

If we are to continue to provide assistance to college students, we must do so through a program of Federal loans. The best of these programs is a student loan authorized by title II of the National Defense Education Act. The administration has requested \$162 million for this program this year. This sum is considerably under what we appropriated last year.

The Appropriations Committee has recommended an increase in the title II NDEA loan funds to \$188 million. But even with this increase, it is still less than the sums we provided for this program last year.

To get back to where we were last year and to make up for the failure of the guaranteed loan program we just simply need more money. It is for this reason that the package amendments will provide an increase of \$40 million over the

subcommittee recommendation for guaranteed student loans.

#### SCHOOL LIBRARIES

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the amended administration budget for fiscal 1970 provides no funds for school libraries. It provides no funds for school equipment or minor remodeling. It provides no funds for guidance and counseling. It provides diminished funds for education demonstrations.

I find it incredible even with our current fiscal problems that we must cut back so drastically on these basic educational services.

The package proposal for these items does not ask for the moon. It merely provides funds at the levels we appropriated last year. It provides \$50 million for school libraries. It provides \$17 million for guidance and counseling. It provides \$78 million for equipment. These are all the same sums we have expressed a willingness to support in the past. We can surely maintain that support today.

Under these educational service programs we provide the only Federal assistance for outreach programs for our libraries—programs which have brought bookmobiles and librarians to the inner city for the first time. We provide guidance and counseling to youngsters with emotional problems, development problems, and just plain career problems.

Can anyone really say that these are superfluous programs? Can anyone say these are Federal giveaways or a waste of Federal money? I think not. I think we must restore these funds.

#### VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Under the administration budget request we would spend less than a third of the \$750 million authorized for vocational education. We would be appropriating this small fraction of the authorization for vocational education in a year in which we know that a million people will leave our school systems without being able to read and without being able to find a job. We would spend this pitiful fraction in a year in which we know that we are conscious of attempting to cool off the economy in order to reduce the number of jobs. So we know that in this year we will be creating unemployment and we will be turning out another crop of unprepared workers for the job market.

Under the vocational education programs, grants are given to the States to provide job training through established schools, to school dropouts, to those who have jobs but want better jobs, to those who have no skills but recognize the need for skills.

It seems to me that in a year in which we can expect grave pressures on those in the work forces and those entering the work forces to have marginal preparation, we cannot in all good conscience cut back on our efforts to help these people. The least we can do is to provide more funds for vocational education. The package includes \$131 million for this purpose.

#### IMPACT AID

In 1969 local schools received 90 percent of the sums authorized for them under Public Law 874, section 3(b) impact aid program. With this 90 percent

of entitlement funding level we appropriated \$505 million for impact aid. To maintain this 90-percent funding level in the current fiscal year will require the appropriation of \$585 million. The package of amendments provides this sum.

Again, we are only attempting to do this year what we did last year.

Impact aid is a form of generalized aid to education. It provides unearmarked money which local schools can spend entirely as they deem appropriate. These are vital funds.

And while many of us may be concerned that the impact aid allocation formula is not all that it could be or should be, it seems to me clear that until we can be certain that we can obtain this several hundred million dollars in Federal aid for a better program, we must continue to support it.

Mr. Chairman, in the strongest possible terms I urge the support and adoption of the package amendments for the Office of Education appropriations.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in opposition to sections 408 and 409 of this bill.

This effort is repetitious. We have all been through this exercise before during last year's consideration of this bill. At that time, the Whitten amendments, which would have surely turned back the clock to the "separately but equal" era, provoked a heated and lengthy debate and were put down only by a very close margin. This was an important victory for civil rights, and for equality.

Now, we find this issue before us again. The fact that it has reappeared so inexorably is the very reason we must act to defeat it. The renewal of this effort undermines the good that the Congress has done in the name of civil rights, underscores the point that all the laws in the world will not change prejudicial attitudes. The law is the instrument that will effect climates of decency and equality under which free men can live with dignity and honor. These laws must be properly enforced to protect this climate.

It is imperative that we take immediate action to remove sections 408 and 409 from this bill. If we do not, we are paving the way for further prejudicial and discriminatory practices. This bill as it now stands, will drastically reduce the effectiveness of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, by obliterating title VI as it applies to education.

If we are honest, we will admit that we all know these facts. But the monster has reared its ugly head again, forcing us to scrutinize the issues before us. Let us take a close look at these provisions, for they must be clearly understood and rejected for what they are:

Sec. 408. No part of the funds contained in this Act may be used to force busing of students, abolishment of any school, or to force any student attending any secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parent.

Sec. 409. No part of the funds contained in this Act shall be used to force the busing of students, the abolishment of any school, or the attendance of students at a particular school as a condition precedent to obtaining funds otherwise available to any state, school district, or school.

In effect, these provisions are an attempt to perpetuate the blatantly discriminatory

"separate but equal" dual school system concept which was declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court 15 years ago.

They attempt to impose Federal limits on local school board decisions regarding desegregation policies.

They are an attempt to undercut and negate the Department of HEW's enforcement efforts to prevent discrimination in federally aided education programs and to eliminate unconstitutionally segregated school systems.

They speak of busing and forced closings—emotion charged issues inspired to trigger old, obsolete, and irrational arguments. There is in fact, no real issue here. The Federal Government cannot and does not require busing of students as a mechanism to end segregation.

In the same sense, the Federal Government does not force closings of schools. Local districts have in the past resorted to closing schools in order to avoid desegregation. In some instances, schools were closed because they were too inferior and inadequate to continue in operation.

These provisions have little to do with busing and abolishment of schools. Their clever insertion in this bill was to detract from the real issue which is to allow certain southern districts to revert to unconstitutional discrimination and segregation.

In the final analysis, we see these provisions as an attempt to legitimize the "freedom of choice" plan as acceptable and workable means of desegregating schools, even though such plans have proven ineffective and inadequate, a point determined by the courts just last year.

To pass this bill with sections 408 and 409 intact would be tampering with the present civil rights laws. These sections are obstructionist devices representing a blatant denial of our national commitment to end unconstitutional segregation.

This we cannot tolerate. We have fought hard in the past to get responsible and equitable legislation to provide and protect the basic rights of our citizens. It worries and frightens me to think that we have once again come so dangerously close to reversing our position. Can we afford to retreat on so vital an issue at this point in our history?

We are a great nation—a first-rate power abounding in wealth, affluence, and prestige. However, we remain a paradox, for in our greatness we continue to harbor poverty and ignorance which breed dissension and unrest. Not only do we harbor these ills, but today we may take steps to perpetuate them.

We are a troubled nation, a people at unrest. Our only hope, and all of us know this, is through education. How then can we even consider taking steps which will have no effect other than to deprive great numbers of our people of equality of education? How can we in conscience, in fairness, and in justice consider passage of this bill with sections 408 and 409?

This relentless attempt to reinstate these anti-civil-rights measures must be met with relentless resistance. These measures would undermine not only our objectives and goals in civil rights, but our accomplishments so far. We must be

ever mindful of the citizens who suffer the consequences of discrimination and of the society which pays the price of social unrest, unemployment, undereducation, and all the rest of the bitter fruit of a segregated society.

This whole issue is an outrageous attempt to disregard the Constitution, the several properly enacted civil rights laws, the Supreme Court ruling on desegregation and discrimination, and the intent of the Congress as manifested by the defeat of these provisions last year.

The only assurance provided in these provisions is a guarantee of delay, confusion, increased discontent by white and Negro citizens alike, and a renewed and revitalized era of suppression of minorities. We cannot let this happen.

I cannot overstate the seriousness of this question. I appeal to my fellow colleagues in the House for a rational and mature consideration of these issues. And I urge and solicit support for amendments which I will introduce at the proper time to strike these clauses from this bill.

This is an issue of black and white.

A vote against my amendments will be recorded all across the country as a vote against civil rights, against our Negro citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I include the following items on sections 408 and 409.

These compelling materials are an editorial from today's Washington Post, a moving letter from Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and a detailed factual statement on the level of desegregation as found by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The material follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, July 29, 1969]

#### SON OF THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

It has not even been a full year since Congress last dispatched the Whitten Amendment—or thought it did anyway. The Amendment, which is the work of Rep. Jamie Whitten of Mississippi, is an artful bit of legislative language which would, in effect, undermine a number of Supreme Court desegregation decisions and gut Title VI of the Civil Rights Act—its vital enforcement section—so far as the schools are concerned. In October of 1968, Mr. Whitten's Amendment was narrowly rejected by the House. Now it is back: the Labor-HEW appropriations bill coming before the House today once again has the Amendment appended to it, courtesy of the full Appropriations Committee. By tonight there may have been a vote.

Mr. Whitten is chiefly at pains to engineer a congressional blessing for his own district's resistance to the law. Yet his Amendment has a certain surface appeal for Congressmen who ordinarily would not tamper with the Civil Rights Act or the Court's rulings on this question. That is because it seems only to say that HEW may not use its appropriated funds to "force busing," a proposition generally approved by Northern and Southern legislators alike. The hitch is that "forced busing" for the sake of overcoming racial imbalance is already forbidden by law. The really important parts of the Whitten Amendment would forbid HEW from using funds to "force any student attending any elementary or secondary school to attend a particular school against the choice of his or her parents or parent." And HEW would also be enjoined from "forcing attendance of students at a particular school as a condition precedent to

obtaining Federal funds otherwise available . . ." The first effect of the Amendment would be to retrieve the discredited "freedom of choice" plans under which Southern districts were, for the most part, merely playing at desegregation.

The language of the Whitten Amendment has not changed much since last October but circumstances have. It is worth remembering how the Amendment came to be defeated that time around. It was touch and go until Rep. Melvin Laird passed the word that the candidate, Mr. Nixon, did not support the Amendment, but was in fact opposed to it. Perhaps the Nixon Administration, or someone who can speak for it, has a similar last-minute instruction in mind. But up until very late in the game, the Administration has kept its silence. If it is really serious about sending a message to the South to the effect that it does not plan a wholesale retreat on desegregation, then a forthright position against the Whitten Amendment is—to put it mildly—indicated. As of yesterday afternoon, there was no official statement. To let the Whitten Amendment go by without opposition would provide a very clear signal to the South and further undermine the efforts of Mr. Nixon's appointees at HEW.

#### LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS,

Washington, D.C., July 28, 1969.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: When the House votes this Tuesday afternoon on the Labor-HEW Appropriations bill (H.R. 13111), we urge you to vote against the anti-civil rights riders that have been added to it.

A statement we have just issued on behalf of the 126 national labor, religious, civil rights and civic organizations in the Leadership Conference sums up the reasons for our opposition. It declares:

"It is shameful and scandalous that the Appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare has emerged from committee with the same anti-civil rights amendments Congress rejected last year. The sole purpose of these amendments is to destroy the school desegregation program.

"Earlier this month the Administration declared it was 'unequivocally committed to the goal of finally ending racial discrimination in schools, steadily and speedily, in accordance with the law of the land.' If the Administration means that, it has a clear obligation to come forward now and publicly condemn the amendments and work to have them rejected. Every member of Congress who was in the overwhelming majority that voted for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 will have an opportunity now to reaffirm that commitment to first-class citizenship by voting against the Whitten amendments. Every member of Congress who realizes the extent to which the cancer of racial discord is infecting our society should vote against them.

These amendments are an illegal attempt to legislate on an appropriations measure, a blatant attempt at blackmailing members to accept terrible injustice as the price of getting funds for badly needed educational programs. The amendments should be stricken from the bill."

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE MITCHELL,  
Legislative Chairman.

#### SCHOOL DESEGREGATION DATA

[News release of Department of Health, Education, and Welfare]

Preliminary analysis of the 1968 data on school desegregation in the 11 States of the Deep South shows that 20.3 percent of the 2.5 million Negro students in these districts or a total of 518,607 Negro children are attending schools with white children. (Table 1). This figure compares with 13.9 percent for the 1967-68 school year.

TABLE 1.—ALL DISTRICTS REPORTING, FALL 1968  
PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES

State	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>1</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of negro students	Percent negro students
Alabama.....	89	588,639	204,365	15,039	7.4
Arkansas.....	173	376,470	94,791	22,048	23.3
Florida.....	57	1,160,644	282,226	67,961	24.1
Georgia.....	144	883,287	268,044	38,196	14.2
Louisiana.....	50	774,140	299,152	26,354	8.8
Mississippi.....	100	398,725	193,602	13,839	7.1
North Carolina.....	143	1,120,602	330,449	92,028	27.8
South Carolina.....	76	486,509	196,203	29,198	14.9
Tennessee.....	120	843,525	140,287	34,098	24.3
Texas.....	501	2,264,881	306,648	119,259	38.9
Virginia.....	115	992,047	236,023	60,587	25.7
Total.....	<sup>2</sup> 1,568	9,889,469	2,551,790	518,607	20.3

<sup>1</sup> The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the estimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.

<sup>2</sup> Includes all districts with total enrollment over 3,000 students and a sampling of districts with less than 3,000 students enrolled.

At the same time, the data reveals that in the school districts desegregating under the requirements of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 25.6 percent of the one million Negro children in those districts or 272,281 are attending schools with white children.

The overall desegregation figure, 20.3 percent, includes districts desegregating under court orders as well as those desegregating under voluntary plans.

The voluntary plans under which the districts are desegregating have been developed locally and have been submitted to the Office of Civil Rights of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The 25.6 percent figure, contained in sur-

vey data released today by the Office for Civil Rights, HEW's Title VI compliance agency, compares with the 19 percent or 202,794 Negro children reported in desegregated schools in the same districts during the 1967-68 school year. The districts are in the following States: Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia.

All of the school districts in the 11th Deep South State, Alabama, are desegregating under court order.

A comparison of the voluntary plan desegregation progress in the 10 Deep South States for 1966-67, 1967-68 and 1968-69 is shown in Table 2:

TABLE 2.—VOLUNTARY PLAN DISTRICTS<sup>1</sup>  
PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES (3-YEAR COMPARISON)

State	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>2</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of Negro students	Percent of Negro students
Arkansas:					
1966.....	99	173,130	73,545	6,058	8.2
1967.....	124	217,378	82,215	13,821	16.8
1968.....	97	179,755	66,199	14,417	21.8
Florida:					
1966.....	47	296,344	81,917	11,018	13.5
1967.....	41	264,273	76,226	14,213	18.6
1968.....	42	297,726	78,772	25,253	32.1
Georgia:					
1966.....	114	543,254	149,117	11,081	7.4
1967.....	125	588,291	141,208	19,128	13.5
1968.....	115	567,991	146,739	26,975	18.4
Louisiana:					
1966.....	3	20,482	4,301	454	10.6
1967.....	3	19,502	3,853	623	16.2
1968.....	3	20,351	4,168	1,001	24.0
Mississippi:					
1966.....	34	133,234	52,459	2,200	4.2
1967.....	35	150,058	59,898	3,768	6.3
1968.....	40	161,588	65,322	7,842	12.0

TABLE 2.—VOLUNTARY PLAN DISTRICTS<sup>1</sup>—Continued  
PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 10 SOUTHERN STATES (3-YEAR COMPARISON)—Continued

State	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>2</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of Negro students	Percent of Negro students
North Carolina:					
1966.....	102	774,225	244,770	31,339	12.8
1967.....	97	836,452	243,081	40,236	16.6
1968.....	90	724,322	232,896	63,554	27.3
South Carolina:					
1966.....	72	467,868	180,922	9,433	5.2
1967.....	57	349,835	143,975	10,257	7.1
1968.....	70	459,043	182,987	28,207	15.4
Tennessee:					
1966.....	40	171,802	23,466	7,699	32.8
1967.....	43	160,457	30,223	11,550	38.2
1968.....	31	155,674	25,240	12,051	47.7
Texas:					
1966.....	334	886,046	166,341	47,936	28.8
1967.....	323	989,704	177,798	63,008	35.4
1968.....	177	850,013	142,071	62,374	43.9
Virginia:					
1966.....	50	371,386	107,311	18,410	17.2
1967.....	54	431,799	117,148	26,190	22.4
1968.....	53	370,799	119,676	30,607	25.6
Total:					
1966.....	895	3,837,771	1,033,693	145,628	14.1
1967.....	902	4,007,749	1,075,625	202,794	18.9
1968.....	718	3,787,262	1,064,070	272,281	25.6

<sup>1</sup> The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 86 percent of the estimated 10,846,023 public school students in the 10 Southern States. (All districts in the State of Alabama are under Federal court order to desegregate.)

<sup>2</sup> For 1966, a desegregated school was defined as one which had 5 percent or more white enrollment. For 1967 and 1968, this definition was changed to schools which had 50 percent or more white enrollment.

A desegregated school is defined, as in 1967-68, as one attended by minority group children in which at least 50 percent of the students are white.

Preliminary analysis also showed that: 1. Desegregation progress in Deep South school districts desegregating under court orders was sharply below the voluntary plan desegregation figure. Data from court order districts showed that only 11.5 percent or

149,000 of the Negro students in those districts are attending school with white children. (Table 3 below.)

2. In those school districts in the 10 Deep South States which have submitted forms certifying they have eliminated their dual systems (Form 441), 51.6 percent of the Negro students are attending schools with white children.

TABLE 3.—COURT ORDER DISTRICTS<sup>1</sup>  
PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES (2-YEAR COMPARISON)

State	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>2</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of Negro students	Percent of Negro students
Alabama:					
1967.....	113	690,393	232,021	12,528	5.4
1968.....	89	588,639	204,365	15,039	7.4
Arkansas:					
1967.....	10	60,055	20,426	3,516	17.2
1968.....	10	61,503	21,427	3,629	16.9
Florida:					
1967.....	16	766,494	164,894	30,507	18.5
1968.....	12	617,412	143,881	31,149	21.6
Georgia:					
1967.....	4	163,121	83,564	5,730	6.9
1968.....	10	251,367	114,169	8,966	7.9

TABLE 3.—COURT ORDER DISTRICT <sup>1</sup>  
PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES (2-YEAR COMPARISON)

State	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>2</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of Negro student	Percent of Negro students
Louisiana:					
1967.....	43	644,041	255,784	16,771	6.6
1968.....	47	753,789	294,984	25,353	8.6
Mississippi:					
1967.....	36	131,176	78,998	2,405	3.0
1968.....	55	226,811	126,002	5,408	4.3
North Carolina:					
1967.....	14	186,697	59,041	10,496	17.8
1968.....	18	214,199	71,807	17,286	24.1
South Carolina:					
1967.....	2	14,549	6,473	401	6.2
1968.....	6	27,466	13,216	991	7.5
Tennessee:					
1967.....	25	365,166	124,571	11,365	9.1
1968.....	19	302,125	100,992	9,495	9.4
Texas:					
1967.....	13	445,928	124,903	12,163	9.7
1968.....	11	429,178	116,836	18,975	16.2
Virginia:					
1967.....	22	240,653	96,681	12,961	13.4
1968.....	20	215,699	91,381	12,709	13.9
Total:					
1967.....	300	3,708,273	2,273,127	118,843	9.5
1968.....	297	3,688,188	1,299,060	149,000	11.5

<sup>1</sup> The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the estimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.  
<sup>2</sup> For 1966, a desegregated school was defined as one which had 5 percent or more white enrollment. For 1967 and 1968 this definition was changed to schools which had 50 percent or more white enrollment.

These preliminary figures account for approximately 85 percent of the students attending schools in the 11 Deep South States. The reports were to be completed and returned to HEW by October 15, but school districts which account for approximately 15 percent of the students in these States failed to return reports or returned incomplete information.

The only large system which has not yet reported data is Dallas, Texas. Dallas is under court order.  
A breakdown of the extent of school desegregation in the 11 Deep South States for all types of school districts (voluntary plan, 441, court order) is shown in Table 4:

TABLE 4.—PUPIL DESEGREGATION IN 11 SOUTHERN STATES: TOTALS, BY CATEGORY, FALL 1968

Category	Number of districts reporting	Enrollment		Desegregation <sup>1</sup>	
		Total	Negro	Number of Negro students	Percent Negro students
Voluntary plan.....	718	3,787,262	1,964,070	272,281	25.6
441's <sup>2</sup> .....	553	2,414,019	188,660	97,326	51.6
Court orders.....	297	3,688,188	1,299,060	149,000	11.5
Total.....	<sup>3</sup> 1,568	9,889,469	2,551,790	518,607	20.3

<sup>1</sup> For purposes of this fall 1968 tabulation, Negro students are considered to be enrolled in a desegregated school only when the white population of that school is at least 50 percent.  
<sup>2</sup> Includes all districts with total enrollment over 3,000 students and a sampling of districts with less than 3,000 students enrolled.  
<sup>3</sup> The Office for Civil Rights estimates that the data on which the 1968 preliminary analysis is based accounts for 85 percent of the estimated 11,677,684 public school students in the 11 Southern States.

STATUS OF TITLE VI COMPLIANCE—PUBLIC SCHOOL DISTRICTS IN 17 SOUTHERN AND BORDER STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE—OFFICE FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

	Total previous week	Total current week	States																
			Ala.	Ark.	Del.	Fla.	Ga.	Ky.	La.	Md.	Miss.	Mo.	N.C.	Okla.	S.C.	Tenn.	Tex.	Va.	W. Va.
1. Total school districts (2+3+4).....	4,476	4,476	118	390	51	67	195	199	67	24	149	512	156	850	92	151	1,265	135	55
2. Assurances (HEW-441).....	2,994	2,994	11	240	51	3	21	185		15	2	505	31	816		92	921	49	52
3. Court order districts.....	369	369	107	11		16	17	5	54		65	1	17	1	10	20	15	28	2
4. Voluntary plan districts.....	1,107	1,107		139		48	157	9	13	9	80	6	108	33	82	39	325	58	1
5. Districts under review (6+7).....	338	338		47		19	43	5	3	3	15	2	50	10	32	15	73	21	
6. Court order.....						19	43	5	3	3	15	2	50	10	32	15	73	21	
7. Voluntary plans.....	338	338		47															
8. Referred to General Counsel.....	386	390		54		22	101	11	10	1	60		20	2	43	4	48	14	
9. Under G. C. review.....	150	150		33		9	33	11			11		3	2	17	1	26	4	
10. Notice sent.....	43	48		7		3	9				1	4	7		3	1	11	2	
11. Hearing held.....	18	18		1		2	7				1		3		1	3			
12. Hearing decision filed.....	52	52		2		4	15				6		7		8	1	6	3	
13. Termination order sent to Congress.....	3	3				1	1								1				
14. Termination order in effect.....	120	119		11		3	36			10			38		14		2	5	
15. Total enforcement proceeding presently in effect.....	236	240		21		13	68		10	1	49		17		26	3	22	10	
16. Terminated districts returned to compliance.....	73	74	19	2		5		15		21		1		3	2			6	
17. Proceedings dismissed (districts returned to compliance status).....	223	223	52	14		7	24		11		34	1	29	3	29	8	5	6	
18. Total cases initiated (15+16+17).....	532	537	71	37		20	97		36	1	104	1	47	3	58	13	27	22	

<sup>1</sup> 2 districts in Mississippi and 4 districts in Texas, no jurisdiction.  
Source: Operations Division OCR/HEW, and OGC/HEW.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest and admiration to the eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD). I think he deserves a school being erected in his district and named after him, and I hope after I am through today or tomorrow, I will have a school named after me, and perhaps even a college.

I am going to offer a series of amendments, and I would like Members of the House to know these amendments are backed by an extremely wide range of opinion. For instance, we have the U.S. Conference of Mayors, from which we have received a letter, and a companion group, The National League of Cities. It is signed by the mayor of Nashville, Tenn., C. Beverly Briley, and the mayor of San Leandro, Calif., Jack D. Maltester. This is also backed by labor groups such as AFL-CIO, and by almost every distinguished educational group we can think of, and by religious groups.

This is not politically oriented. It is an attempt to try to do justice.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, Jack D. Maltester, whom the gentleman mentioned, is now the national president of the League of Cities.

Mr. JOELSON. Yes. He wrote a very warm letter in support of this package.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain what my amendments would do. With respect to impact aid, it would restore most of the funds authorized to 90 percent, so instead of the amount the committee has recommended, we could have an additional \$398,000,000. With respect to vocational education, we bring that figure up by \$331,500,000.

So instead of the program being funded at only a percentage which is very small, 46 percent of the authorization, we would now go to 63 percent of the authorization.

With regard to title I, we would bring that up another \$180 million, so that instead of being funded for a very meager 38 percent of the authorization it would be funded at 44 percent of the authorization. This is not wild. This is not extravagant. It is still less than half of the authorization.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Why would the gentleman want to fund the impact aid at 90 percent and title I at only 44 percent? Is that not discriminating against the disadvantaged children?

Mr. JOELSON. It is realistic. That is why I do it. I believe by doing this realistically I can get this package passed. I believe it would be better for those kids to have \$180 million more than nothing.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In other words, this package does not represent what is fair, just, and right; it represents only what you can get?

Mr. JOELSON. It represents what is fair, just, and right, and possible; yes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Is it not true that this was a matter worked out in consultation with Members on both sides of the aisle?

Mr. JOELSON. Yes.

Mr. COHELAN. In the hope that we could get a broad basis of support?

Mr. JOELSON. I am very hopeful we will get bipartisan support.

I am skipping, because I have only 5 minutes, but I want the Members to think about the student loan program for a minute. The students cannot get loans from banks because of the high interest situation. They must refer to the direct loan program.

The committee proposed to fund the loan program at 65 percent of the authorization. I would raise that to 83 percent of the authorization.

With regard to college construction, the committee does not give anything. There is an authorization in the amount of \$711 million. I am proposing \$33 million, a meager 4.6 percent.

So I feel that the package I am going to propose later is a reasonable one, one we can all support, and one that will do justice to the schoolchildren of this land.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I compliment the gentleman from New Jersey for sponsoring these amendments. The amendments he will offer are most important to continue to carry out the educational programs—particularly the great programs proposed by the 90th Congress.

As the gentleman knows, a number of his amendments which will be included in the package were offered in the full committee last week, and they were defeated by a relatively small margin of votes. I compliment the gentleman on the package, and I intend to support him in all the amendments he has to offer.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot help making a comment right at this particular point, in view of the remarks by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) as to those organizations which are supporting his package.

I was rather astounded to see that among those sponsoring groups, so-called, are the Appalachia Educational Laboratory, the Michigan-Ohio Regional Education Laboratories, and a whole list of educational laboratories which we have been funding practically 100 percent with Federal money. We have a kind of situation here where taxpayers' money is being used to lobby the Congress for increased money, a shocking conflict of interest.

Following is a list of the supporters:

ORGANIZATIONS SUBSCRIBING TO STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE OF EMERGENCY COMMITTEE FOR FULL FUNDING

Academy For Educational Development, 1424 16th St., NW.

AFL-CIO, 815 16th St., NW.

American Association for Health, Physical

Education and Recreation, 1201 16th St., NW.

American Association of Junior Colleges, 1315 16th St., NW.

American Association of School Administrators, 1201 16th St., NW.

American Association of State Colleges and Universities, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

American Association of University Women, 2401 Virginia Ave., NW.

American Council of Education, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

American Educational Research Association, 1126 16th St., NW.

American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th St., NW.

American Industrial Arts Association, 1201 16th St., NW.

American Library Association, The Coronet—200 C St., SE.

American Personnel and Guidance Association, 1607 New Hampshire Ave., NW.

American Society for Public Administration, 1225 Connecticut Ave., NW.

American Vocational Association, 1510 H St., NW Suite 300.

Appalachia Educational Lab, Box 1348, 1031 Quarrier St., Charleston, W. Virginia 25325.

Association for Children With Learning Disabilities, 627 Allison St., NW.

Association of American Colleges, 1818 R St., NW.

Association of American Law Schools, 1521 New Hampshire Ave., NW.

Association of Classroom Teachers—NEA, 1201 16th St., NW.

Association of Research Laboratories, 1527 New Hampshire Ave., NW.

Association of School Business Officials, 2424 W. Lawrence Ave., Chicago, Illinois 69625.

Catholic Library Association, Trinity College Library.

Center For Urban Education, 105 Madison Ave., New York 10016.

Central Midwestern Regional Educational Laboratories, Inc., 10646 St. Charles Rock Road St., St. Ann, Missouri.

Chief State School Officers, 1201 16th St., NW.

Committee for Community Affairs, 1000 Wisconsin Ave., NW.

Conference of Large City Boards of Education of New York State, 111 Washington Ave., Albany, New York.

Council for Advancement of Small Colleges, 1346 Connecticut Ave., NW.

Council of Graduate Schools, 1875 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

Department of Elementary School Principals, 1201 16th St., NW.

Educational Commission of State, 1860 Lincoln St., Denver, Colorado.

Educational Task Force, Washington Interreligious Staff Council, 2633 16th St., NW.

Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, One Garden Circle, Hotel Claremont, Berkeley, California.

IUE-AFL-CIO, 1126 16th St., NW.

Jesuit Educational Association, 1717 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

Lutheran Council in the USA, 2633 16th St., NW.

Memphis City Schools, 2597 Avery, Memphis, Tennessee.

Michigan-Ohio Regional Education Laboratories, 3750 Woodward, Detroit, Michigan 48201.

Mid-Continent Regional Education Laboratories, 104 E. Independence, Kansas City, Missouri.

National Association of Independent Schools, Four Liberty Square, Boston, Massachusetts 02109.

National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1201 16th St., NW.

National Association of State Boards of Education, 604 Circle Drive, Bryan, Ohio 43506.

National Association of State Universities

& Land Grant Colleges, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

National Catholic Education Association, 1785 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

National Commission for Multi-Handicapped Children, 339 14th St., Niagara Falls, New York.

National Commission for Cooperative Education, 52 Vanderbilt Ave., New York, New York 10017.

National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 9202 Ponce Place, Fairfax, Virginia.

National Council of Catholic Men, 1312 Massachusetts Ave., NW.

National Council of Jewish Women, 1346 Connecticut Ave., NW.

National Education Association, 1201 16th St., NW.

National Faculty Association of Community & Junior Colleges, Room 721, NEA Building.

National School Boards Association, 1616 H St., NW.

New York State Personnel and Guidance Association, State University of New York, 135 Western Ave., Albany, New York.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories, 710 S. W. 2nd, Portland, Oregon.

Regional Educational Lab. for the Carolinas and Virginia, Mutual Plaza, Chapel Hill & Duke Streets, Durham, North Carolina 27701.

Rocky Mountain Educational Laboratories, 120 24th Ave. Ct., Greeley, Colorado 80631.

Saranac Community Schools, 149 Main St., Saranac, Michigan.

South Central Region Educational Laboratory, P.O. Box 6197, Little Rock, Arkansas.

State University of New York, 1730 Rhode Island Ave., Suite 500.

United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Ave., NW.

University of Texas System, 1140 Connecticut.

Upper Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1640 East 78th St., Minneapolis, Minnesota 55423.

Urban Coalition Action Council, 1819 H St., NW.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not ever shocked by the fact that taxpayers lobby the Congress. It happens every day. It is in the very best interest of democracy. Who else should lobby us? Aliens?

Mr. MICHEL. Not at the taxpayers' expense. If the taxpayer himself wishes to do it, fine, but I think this is a situation where the taxpayer is getting racked up for more taxes to lobby for more spending against his will. It is wrong.

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded by the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CONTE).

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support an amendment to H.R. 13111. It would amend the bill to provide additional funding for vocational education in the amount of \$131.5 million.

You will recall that the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was a real turning point. It provided a new foundation from which we have continued to move ahead. In fact, during the 1966-67 school year, 50 percent more persons attended vocational education classes than did in 1963-64.

But we did not stop there. We passed the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. They represented an important next step in the ladder to better and

greater opportunities for more of our people. And they were designed to meet the needs of an increasingly complex and technical society.

Three basic facts were recognized when we considered the amendments last year. First, the emphasis in education has shifted from high school to college. Second, the number of high school dropouts has increased, especially among the disadvantaged. Third, our economy has become so technical that many high school training programs are no longer adequate for a lifetime career.

Mr. Chairman, I can attest from my own personal experience—I attended a vocational high school—to the need for improving the quality of these training programs and for doing it with a total commitment. This need is the result of many factors, foremost among which is the failure of our schools to do as much for the noncollege bound student as they have for the college bound student.

There is another important factor I would like to mention; namely, the very serious domestic crisis we have in our cities. There have been countless reports on the causes of urban unrest. They have consistently maintained that high unemployment and a lack of job opportunities are major causes of the unrest. Perhaps some of you do not realize the extent of the problem. For example, last year it was estimated that the unemployment rate among youth in disadvantaged and minority groups was 35 percent.

We have to do something about this—and now, before it is too late. And we have to do the best job possible. The noninstitutional manpower programs we have are just not the long-term—or in some cases even the short-term—answer. They often tend to frustrate those they try to help. Besides that, they are very expensive when compared to vocational education programs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to see our vocational education programs funded adequately. The budget authority recommended in the bill before us is only 46 percent of the authorization for fiscal 1970. This amendment would increase the budget authority to 63 percent of the authorization. Specifically, budget authority would still be \$277.9 million below the authorized level of \$766.6 million. This increase would, nonetheless, permit continuation of the programs at a respectable level.

Mr. Chairman, I am hard put to think of a better investment in the future of our Nation. By funding the vocational education programs adequately, we will be giving a new life to millions of our youth who for one reason or another do not enjoy the benefits of college. And at the same time, we will be making them productive citizens, ready to meet the challenges of an increasingly technical society.

I am thankful for the opportunity to support this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in the interest of supporting the package amendments.

Mr. Chairman, at a time when still

fresh in our minds are the very recent magnificent accomplishments of our space efforts we appropriately have before us the bill, H.R. 13111, to provide funds for the fiscal year 1970 for the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It is appropriate because this bill is to provide the funds for the federally supported education programs. Of the \$16.3 billion in the bill, a total of \$2.3 billion is provided for education. We have heard many statements here today, with which I wholeheartedly agree, that this figure is inadequate for today's educational needs.

It is an established fact that all of man's achievements, for himself and society, are vitally connected with his education and training. The Congress has recognized the Federal role, the benefits to the Nation, of supporting educational programs. To skimp in providing the necessary funds to fully fund these programs is unthinkable.

Mr. Chairman we are dealing here with funds necessary to educate the youth—our children—of this great Nation.

The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) will propose to increase the amount of funds for the educational programs by approximately \$550 million. I will support this effort, whether it be a package amendment or individual amendments. The House must again show its determination to provide for the education and training of our youth and I urge my colleagues to support this effort.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, those of us who come from districts which have a large involvement with Federal installations find ourselves each year with a fight on our hands to save education funds which the Congress in 1950 voted to authorize our local school agencies.

Some argue that these funds under the impact program should be used to meet other more urgent needs of education such as urban and ghetto education. I would be the first to agree that our country needs to commit more of its resources to the cities and to the poorer communities who lack the tax base to adequately support a good educational system. But in taking that position to urge larger expenditures for education for our poorer disadvantaged children, I do not support the argument that we should in any way reduce our effort of supporting our 4,263 school districts who depend on Federal support under Public Law 874.

The argument that inadequate education of the poorer children who live in the cities is due to lack of an adequate tax base is certainly valid, but it is equally valid and the basis for the Public Law 874 legislation.

It is my personal opinion that the Appropriations Committee is mindful of the needs of our school districts who depend upon impact aid funds provided in Public Law 874. Their failure to provide any funds whatsoever for category "b" children is due to their belief I am told that the funds should be provided for by a

floor amendment. To the extent that this belief is valid I am prepared today to ask for the restoration of our entitlement up to 90 percent of the estimates. It would have been more gratifying to have had the full weight and support of the members of the House Appropriations Committee for our program which affects the lives and education of 45 million schoolchildren in the 4,263 school districts. It is true that only 3 million children are counted in allocating these funds under impact aid, however since these funds are paid into the general school budget once allocated, its denial will deprive the entire 45 million schoolchildren who are part of these 4,263 school systems. There is no possible way in which these school districts could make up the lost funds. In many school districts tax revenues are fixed, and loss of these impact funds will necessarily mean a drastic curtailment of their program.

Since the very beginning from fiscal year 1951, Public Law 874 has received full congressional support for 100 percent funding, except for the last fiscal year where the funding level was set at 90 percent. In the first year of the program, sections 2, 3, and 4 of the program received 96 percent of their entitlement; in fiscal 1955 sections 2, 3, and 4 received 99.5 percent of their entitlement; and in fiscal 1967 sections 2, 3, and 4 received 98.7 percent. These distributions were due to errors in estimates and not because of the Congress intention to fund these programs at any lower level than the full 100 percent of entitlement.

Only because of the budget situation, which incidentally may not be as critical as we have been told, since I read by this morning's paper that we had a \$3.074 billion surplus at the fiscal year end on June 30, 1969, I have agreed at this time to ask for only 90 percent of our entitlement for fiscal 1970. If the fiscal year 1970 budget situation appears to improve further by early next year, I intend to rise at the appropriate time to ask the House to consider a supplemental appropriation to raise the funding level to 100 percent of our entitlement.

In my own State of Hawaii during our 1968-69 school year there were 17,131 students whose parents lived on and worked on Federal property. My latest figures from the Hawaii State government show that there are 57,791 military dependents in my State. These 17,000 children who live on base are covered under category "a" of Public Law 874. While it is true that the Appropriations Committee has provided full funding for these children under Public Law 874, what is not widely known is the fact that this so-called full funding pays for less than 50 percent of the cost of educating these children. The formula in Public Law 874 provides that these "a" children shall receive 50 percent of the average per pupil cost in the school year 2 years previous. This means that for the 1967-68 school year, the average per pupil school costs used are those costs for the 1965-66 school year. Thus while the average per pupil costs for the 1967-68 school year in Hawaii was \$637.32 in calculating what was due these "a" children we had

to use \$538.33 as the cost base which was what the average was 2 years previous.

Further since we do not receive the full costs, but only 50 percent of costs, instead of receiving 50 percent of costs in the 1967-68 school year, or \$316 per pupil, we received only \$269.12 per pupil; \$269.12 comes to only 42 percent of the actual average school per-pupil costs which the State of Hawaii received in that school year for the education of our "a" children. The balance of 58 percent was paid by the State of Hawaii.

We have justified over the years our continuance in this program only because the funds we received from the category "b" children were such that the State cost of educating the "a" children was subsidized by the "b" category funding. If "b" funding is denied, a State subsidy of \$7 million for the cost of educating only the "a" children, will have to be borne immediately this fall by the State. This could not be done without jeopardizing the quality of education for the 180,000 children in the total school system. Thus we would be left with the possible necessity of transferring the education of the "a" children to the Federal Government as is provided for such cases by section 6 of Public Law 874. With 100 percent funding of the "a" and "b" children under Public Law 874 Hawaii would receive \$11 million, but our total current school costs beginning September 1969 will be \$13 million just for the "a" children above. However the appropriations committee has provided Hawaii with only \$5.7 million for the "a" children. It is impossible for the State to find the \$7.3 million needed to maintain the on-base schools for the "a" children, unless the category "b" funds are fully provided.

This is my case for full funding for category "b" children under Public Law 874. I urge this House to look upon this program as essential to the maintenance of the quality of education for 45 million children in America. I know of no one who would jeopardize the welfare of these children, and I hope that when the time comes for these funds to be added to this bill, that this will be the consideration upon which the House acts to restore these much-needed funds.

I thank the chairman of this subcommittee for his generous allotment of time to me.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, as is the case with most of us whenever we rise in support of specific funding legislation, my purpose is somewhat a selfish one on behalf of my district. It is by no means the sole reason that I am concerned with the impacted areas' funds; for the problem which my district faces is one that is shared by every section of the country which contains Federal installations. My district is perhaps better off in this regard than some and undoubtedly in a worse position to others. I am not here to make comparisons, simply to state the case as it concerns the people who have sent me here to represent them.

Because of its strategic location the First District of Virginia has a heavy concentration of defense establishments and numbers of other supporting Federal

installations. Some of these have large numbers of dependents living on them, but there are far more civilians working on these establishments who live in the civilian communities and whose children must be educated in the local school systems.

It is true these Government workers pay local real estate taxes on the homes they own. They pay sales taxes, state income tax, buy automobile licenses, and in general contribute to regular tax revenues like all other citizens with one notable exception. Their employer pays no tax on the real estate which he occupies and no tax on the volume of business which he does.

I would like to show you the cost to one locality by giving you one small set of figures from one of the 11 local Governments in my district. One county, which happens to be the most heavily impacted county in my district, is the smallest county in Virginia in land area. It contains a mere 78,000 acres of land. Of this small area almost 31,000 acres are owned by the U.S. Government. This is just under 40 percent of the total land area of the county. This means that almost 40 percent of the normal real estate tax base of this county is exempt from taxation.

How could any section of the country expect to operate if 40 percent of its major source of revenue is cut off. This is a prime example of what these impacted areas are faced with. This is why I feel it is imperative that we in the Congress accept a rightful share of the cost of educating the children of those who work for an employer who is exempt from taxation.

And then, too, whether or not you agree with the philosophy of category "b" funding, there is another important factor which should not be overlooked.

These school districts, which have been depending on these funds for years, have received no warning that they will be cut off. Their plans have been formulated and their budgets made. For many of them, it will be too late to appeal to their localities for more money. To cut them off this quickly would be most unfair and would be detrimental to our national educational effort.

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing more important that we can do for our country than to provide a quality education for every American. There is, however, a threat to quality in education which was not recognized in the appropriations bill presented to us today. The drastic reduction of \$5 billion in programs authorized by the House and the amount recommended in H.R. 13111 would break faith with our children and shatter the credibility of Congress and an administration which was elected on a pledge of full support for education.

I am disappointed that President Nixon did not lend his support to the long-established obligation of the Federal Government to assist with school financing in federally impacted areas. It appears the President has been influenced by those who feel Public Law 874 is outmoded. I would like for them to help me explain to the taxpayers in my district just why it is outmoded. These are taxpayers who are paying the lion's

share of the cost of educating the children of Air Force families, Marine Corps and Army families, who live in the communities surrounding the bases in my district.

Most of these families live in modest homes which return, in property taxes, only a fraction of the costs of educating the children who live in them. Even fully funded, section 3B pays only half the cost of educating these children. With this section eliminated, as recommended by the President and the Appropriations Committee, an intolerable burden will be placed on those families, and on the other taxpayers in those areas. Keep in mind that the burden will fall the heaviest on enlisted men of our military services who are trying to support their families on their limited military pay. They are the ones who will have to make up the difference, in the form of increased taxes on their homes, if they happen to own their homes, or in higher rent if they do not. In some school districts, even this will not be possible, because they are already operating at the statutory limit of the property tax rate—and these are among the highest rates in the Nation. The only alternative they will have, if we do not fund section 3B, will be to fire teachers, increase the size of classes, cut down on the purchase of textbooks and other materials—in other words, offer those children a second rate education.

It is not fair to require federally employed families, military and civilian, to live in communities where they cannot obtain a good education for their children. It is foolish economy, and it could be disastrous to the generations who would be deprived by our shortsightedness.

I find it hard to believe that the President and this Congress are so insensitive to the need that they cannot recognize the danger. If Federal school aid to federally impacted areas is outmoded, I would like to know what they have in mind to replace it. I believe that studies are being made to determine the type of program needed to replace Public Law 874. That is fine. But until these studies have been completed and new programs devised, we must continue Public Law 874, with both sections 3A and 3B fully funded.

I ask my colleagues to join in support of this amendment—or substitute—which will provide the money our schools must have to continue the most important job in America today—the job of educating our children.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the Committee on Appropriations for bringing out a bill which at least increases the appropriation for education to the extent of \$123 million over the budget request. It shows that the committee recognizes there was a mistake made in the budget for education and that it was too low.

Mr. Chairman, my own feeling is that the committee is still too low for what is needed. When you look at the educational needs in America today, one of the major

mistakes which the administrations have made in the last couple of years has been reducing the appropriation for education. The Congress made the mistake last year to go along with the education appropriation cuts.

Once a school gets geared up for a certain amount of Federal money, then they depend on it for the future, and they budget for that purpose, and it is very difficult for them to pick up that money from either State or local sources.

One of the principles that we should maintain is when we begin funding at a certain level from the Federal Government that we ought to continue that. If it is too high, we should not have gotten into it in the first place.

So, when the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) talked about those four programs that were packaged at about \$200 million in the committee bill, that figure is still \$110 million less than was appropriated last year, and we ought to bring it up to last year's figure.

Last year it was cut from the year before. The year before, fiscal year 1968, it had been even \$80 million higher for those four titles. So I think the least we can do is reinstate the four titles, library resources, equipment, supplemental centers, and guidance and counseling, to that \$310 million appropriation level of 1969.

I hope that my colleagues will support that amendment when it comes before the House.

There are two areas in which we need to move in order to avert what is virtually a crisis situation in education. One is the national defense student loan program, since the guaranteed loan program in which the banks make money available to the students, is just not working now. The prime rate of interest is higher than the statutory limit of the guaranteed loan program. Therefore the only help we can give to the poor students—the ones who come from poor families—is under a tried and true program that has been in operation since 1958, our national defense student loan program. I believe an amendment to bring the NDSL appropriation to \$229 million is the minimum we can do.

Another area in which we ought to move above any level that has existed before is in vocational education, because so many of our young people today do not have the skills that are necessary to secure a job. It is estimated that only one out of six has received any skill training by which they could secure a job after they have finished school. There are many who are dropping out of high school because their education appears irrelevant to them. Vocational education is relevant. There have been dramatic changes since the 1963 Vocational Education Act was adopted, and we provided the legislation and the authorization in 1968. Congress has provided good vocational education authorization for the young people who are in our secondary schools, and the area vocational schools, but insufficient appropriations.

The proposal I have heard some of my colleagues talk about, which is completely unreasonable to me, is the \$80 million increase in impacted aid over and

above what it was last year. That is to me an unacceptable part of the Joelson package.

Now, I do not blame those of you who want to see a substantial amount of impacted aid in their congressional district, and who are taking up the task of their school superintendents to maintain the expenditures of last year, but to go \$80 million above last year is completely unreasonable, because last year was more than a \$100 million increase over the year before.

In 1968 the appropriations for school funds in federally affected areas was \$414 million, and the amount last year was \$520 million. In fiscal year 1968, because of the budget deficit that the Federal Government had run into, the Committee on Appropriations had cut the appropriations from \$530 million down to \$414 million. So last year the effort of the gentleman from Hawaii was to bring it up to about that level that the Committee on Appropriations had set it at before the reduction due to the financial difficulties.

Now, this year the proposal is to go even higher than \$520 to \$585 million for Public Law 874 plus \$15 million for Public Law 815.

With all of the needs in education—and there are dramatic needs—if we are going to set sound priorities for the use of Federal money, I do not see how we can possibly decide to put in for an additional amount of money for impacted aid above last year. I realize that you have the votes to set it at the level of last year's figure of \$520 million but \$600 million would mean an increase of \$186 million in 2 years.

I grudgingly will accept last year's figure of \$520 million. But I hope you will not go any further than that but rather appropriate increased amounts for programs with higher priorities.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred and thirty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FREY) such time as he may desire.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, 19 years ago the U.S. Congress recognized the Federal Government's responsibility for the impact which certain Federal activities have on local educational agencies in areas where these activities occur. The committee report—H.R. 7940, Public Law 874, 81st Congress, second session, Report No. 2287—stated clearly the philosophy of the Federal Government as follows:

Section 3 of the bill seeks to compensate school districts in reasonable amounts for the cost of educating children who, because they reside on tax exempt Federal property or because their parents are employed on such property, do not in effect pay their own way. The underlying philosophy of this section is that the Federal Government, as a property owner, should pay to each local educational agency which furnishes education to children residing on or whose parents are employed on Federal property an amount. Under this principle, Federal payments to school districts are more closely related to

the "burden imposed" than to the value of the Federal property.

This program was first funded in 1951. Last year was the first time that the 4,235 school districts throughout this country who have relied in various degrees on this program did not receive 100-percent entitlement. The amount necessary for full entitlement for fiscal 1970 is \$650 million. The budget as proposed by former President Johnson and accepted by this administration is for \$187 million, while the Appropriations Committee voted for a \$202 million figure. In both instances, the payments under section 3(b) for children whose parents work, but do not live, on Federal property are entirely eliminated.

Both the administration and the majority of Appropriations Committee members apparently feel that parents living off Federal property do provide for their children's education by paying county property taxes on their homes. I would like to point out that a large percentage of the revenue from property taxes which goes to education is paid by business and industry. In impacted areas, this critically needed revenue paid by industry is not realized from Federal facilities, which pay no taxes.

It does not seem fair to require local taxpayers to absorb the major costs of educating children from federally employed families. Likewise, it does not seem fair to children of nonfederally connected families to decrease the quality of education in an area through massive Federal impact.

Two counties in the Fifth Congressional District I am privileged to represent in Congress clearly show the severity of this problem. In both Orange and Brevard Counties, the greater majority of Federal employees and their children do not live on Federal property. While Orange County would lose approximately \$1,000,000 in aid under the present provisions of section 3B of Public Law 874, Brevard County would lose more than \$4,000,000.

Brevard County, the home of the Kennedy Space Center, had a total of 16,972 students enrolled in the public school system in June of 1959. Today, the enrollment has increased by 245 percent to 58,599 students, 29,956 of whom are federally connected while the remaining 28,643 are nonfederally connected. Only approximately 2,000 of the so-called federally connected students are living on Federal property. Therefore, if the proposed recommendation is enacted into law, the county will receive \$600,000 and will lose \$4,137,900. I do not think I have to point out to you what this loss would mean to the school system in the county.

The school boards in these counties feel they cannot meet their responsibility to provide an adequate education to all children without their full Federal impact aid funds. Even those of my distinguished colleagues who feel that funds to the "b" category children should be eliminated would, I hope, want this done in an orderly fashion and over a period of time. To do otherwise would be to destroy the public education system in many areas of the country.

I therefore call on my fellow House

Members to act within the intent of Congress and vote for the full restoration of the impact aid.

(Mr. HOGAN (at the request of Mr. Mr. MICHEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, providing education for our children is to give them the greatest gift of all: the means to make their own way in the world. But a halfhearted backing of their education is no gift at all—but rather a denial of their future and that of our Nation.

Unfortunately, this is what H.R. 13111 does. Many of the programs which are necessary in making education a purposeful and meaningful experience are gravely neglected by this bill.

For this reason, I will support amendments which will increase funds for our schools and colleges in such programs as impacted aid, school libraries, educational equipment and materials, vocational education, guidance and counseling, construction grants for colleges, and national defense student loans.

We cannot expect our primary schoolchildren to have a full educational experience if the schools they attend have poorly stocked libraries, outmoded equipment and materials, and little or no guidance staff. We will have to take the blame if this generation of schoolchildren does not have the chance to perform to the best of its ability.

We cannot expect our industrial needs to be filled, nor insure the employability of our youth if we neglect vocational education. In our present economy, the unskilled are not needed; the highly skilled are in short supply. We could remedy this by giving vocational education the support it warrants.

Furthermore, we cannot expect our colleges and universities to provide our future leadership, if we do not give both the student and the institution the support they so desperately need. This year the need for an increase in national defense student loans is especially needed. The soaring interest rates on bank loans make it difficult for both middle-class students and the increasing number of students from poverty groups to finance higher education. Direct Government loans are necessary if we expect those students to enter college this fall.

We must make a firm commitment to effective education. We must keep faith with our youth. We must not become the Congress which broke faith with the Nation and jeopardized its future.

I am fully committed to reducing expenditures by the Federal Government, but as far as I am concerned education is not an area to move backward in the interest of fiscal economy.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he desires to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HORTON).

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, the bill that is before us now, the labor, health, education, and welfare appropriation bill, may be the most important bill the 91st Congress will consider. This legislation is so crucial because it is symbolic of our intentions over the next 12 months to make good the Federal promise of meaningful and adequate resources needed to solve domestic problems.

There has been much criticism leveled at programs which have been labeled "patchwork" approaches to the problems of poverty, unemployment, and underemployment—programs which treat the effects and not the causes of these problems. But no one can question that the very best possible assurance that these problems and their detrimental effects on people and on society as a whole will be reduced or eliminated is to insure that young Americans, particularly the disadvantaged, are given the educational opportunities they need to achieve their full potential as productive, tax-paying citizens.

We realized several years ago that this kind of educational opportunity could only be made available on a nationwide basis with substantial Federal help. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Higher Education Acts, the Vocational Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, the International Education Act, the Education Professions Development Act, the Health Manpower Act and many others are legislative landmarks to our commitment to Federal education assistance at many levels and in many spheres.

Our enactment and extension of these laws and the funding authorizations they contain constitute a continually reinforced Federal promise to provide certain kinds and amounts of education assistance to State and local government and to educational institutions. Because many of the education facilities and opportunities in both urban and rural areas of America are seriously deficient, and because to a man, the States and localities and privately funded educational systems and institutions are facing severe limitations in available revenue and financial resources, the fulfillment of this collective promise to help educate our people is the most important item in our Federal budget.

When the new administration took office, the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare wisely sought meaningful increases in many categories of education aid in the 1970 budget. Soon after the press reports of these sought-after increases, it was reported that Secretary Finch was being instructed by the Budget Bureau to cut the level of education aid requests by as much as 5 or 10 percent. Even the increases which Secretary Finch sought would not have brought 1970 funding levels up to the implied promise of the authorization bills. But they would have been sufficient to serve notice on the educators and on the families of America that this Government intended to pursue educational excellent in this country, even at a time of budgetary difficulty. Instead, the cutbacks were sought, compromised and recommended to Congress. In effect, the needed national commitment to fulfilling these promises was postponed at least another year by budget planners, in the face of rising inflation and a tight budget. I have no quarrel with the goal of a balanced Federal budget during a serious inflationary period. My only quarrel is with the priorities which had to be employed in order to produce rec-

ommended cutbacks in crucial education programs. I cannot, in conscience, place education after farm subsidies, or after the ABM, or after public works, or after costly new weapons systems and countless other budget items which, despite their worthy nature, cannot supersede the need for providing the world's best educational opportunities for American youngsters.

I commend the Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee for restoring some \$123 million of requested cutbacks. And I further concur with the administration's and the committee's judgment and the impacted school aid program should be trimmed, as the lowest priority program and as one of the most costly Federal education programs. But I cannot agree that our outlays for education aid in general should fall short of 1969 expenditures by more than half a billion dollars. If this bill is passed in the same form it was reported by the Appropriations Committee, it would mean a deep cut in the most crucial education programs.

Programs for library assistance and construction, for education of disadvantaged youngsters in inner-city schools, for desperately needed work-study grants and student loans to open college doors to deserving students who otherwise would never achieve their potential, for higher education facilities, for innovative title III programs which can find new ways of retrieving children now lost to productive society because of a hostile environment—all of these must be given the resources they need to have impact.

School systems today are faced with a funding squeeze at every turn. Where annual budgets are increased, larger and larger portions of the increases are eaten up by either higher teacher and staff salaries or by higher enrollment, leaving little or nothing to improve the quality and impact of the education program. In fact, many schools are having to phase out so-called low priority aspects of their education program, such as athletics, physical education, driver education, after-school clubs and activities and others. At the same time that local and State resources are becoming scarcer, it is proposed that the Federal aid portion of local budgets now also be trimmed back. These Federal funds are the only education funds which schools must spend on program improvement and enrichment. Without them, and without these funds in sufficient quantity, some schools can do little more than keep their doors open from September through June, and some cannot even accomplish that.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am taking a considerable amount of time to express my concerns about this bill, but I do not feel there has been a more crucial debate since Congress convened in January.

While there is not time to read all of the many constituent letters I have received urging full funding of these programs, I would like to read a partial listing of public officials, educators and knowledgeable citizens in my district who have expressed their concerns to me

about the future of education assistance commitments. The nationally known superintendent of the Rochester city schools, Dr. Herman R. Goldberg has spoken with me at length about the importance of following through on ESEA commitments in title I and title II programs. Others whose counsel I value include Robert R. France, associate provost of the University of Rochester; Harold S. Hacker, director of the Monroe County Library System; Carl Hallauer, chairman of the board of Bausch & Lomb, Inc.; Joseph J. Kolczynski, district vice principal, Clyde-Savannah Central School; the Very Reverend Charles J. Lavery, C.S.B., president of St. John Fisher College; Evaline B. Neff, director, Rochester Regional Library Council; the Right Reverend Monsignor William Roche, superintendent of schools for the Diocese of Rochester; James T. Ryan, president of the board of trustees of the Rose, New York Free Library; Mrs. Pauline P. Spare, secretary of the Wayne County Library System; and Dr. Byron Williams, director of services of the Genesee Valley School Development Association.

At least 50 more educators, parents, and concerned citizens both within and outside my own district have written or wired urging my support of adequate funding of Federal education programs. These people, for the most part, see the deficiencies and the benefits of education every day of their lives, either through the eyes of their youngsters who attend school, or as professionals responsible for our educational system.

Their appeal is not a selfish one. These people are not indifferent to the problems of inflation and Federal budgeting. They are in a position to identify a high priority national problem and to seek what they believe is a proper and adequate response to this problem from the Federal Government. We must respond to this need—at all levels from Headstart and kindergarten through graduate and post-graduate studies—by supporting significant increases in the most crucial of these programs. There is no better, surer way to treat the cause of our domestic and urban ills than to invest today's tax dollars in the futures of millions of soon-to-be tax-paying Americans, some of whom, without this investment, would have merger features at best, to look forward to.

I urge my colleagues to place on education assistance the importance and priority it deserves and to support efforts to adequately fulfill the promises we have made to strike, through education, at the root of human problems in America.

(Mr. FISH (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope the House will increase the HEW budget presently before it in several needed areas.

There are several gaps in the appropriation bill before us—total omissions if you will. Nothing at all is directly appropriated in this bill for ESEA title II school library funding, NDEA title III equipment, NDEA title V guidance and counseling. Nor for higher education con-

struction for 4-year undergraduate institutions. All of these items should be funded to at least fiscal year 1969 level.

I further believe the vocational education appropriation must be increased. The need is real and present for occupational training programs for the disadvantaged as well as providing funds for vocational educational research, essential in developing new teaching methods.

Student loan funding at 62 percent of what Congress has authorized is far too low and also must be raised. This is an investment in America.

(Mr. PELLY (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, in connection with H.R. 13111, providing appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal year 1970, I wish to indicate my support for full funding of educational programs. I have set my highest priority this year on education because to me education is basic to most of our domestic problems. With a budget surplus as of June 30, of \$3 billion, I am encouraged now to support funds to re-establish previous program levels for school libraries, national defense educational equipment, and guidance and counseling and college facilities and to provide needed funds for Public Law 874—impact areas aid—and vocational education.

I actively support the package amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) which includes an additional \$894,547,000 for education.

This is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, but I am told each Apollo flight to the moon will cost the taxpayers \$350,000,000, and the amount called for in this amendment is less than the cost of three of these space flights. Yet the value to all Americans is beyond measure.

I strongly urge support of this amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MINISH).

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in qualified support of H.R. 13111, the bill to appropriate \$16.6 million in fiscal year 1970 for the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies. I certainly hope the House will act today to increase the woefully inadequate funds provided in this legislation for education and for libraries.

The education of the youth of our Nation should hold the very highest priority for the Congress. Through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Library Services, and Construction Act, and other landmark progressive, farsighted legislation, we have committed ourselves to the goal of quality education for all Americans. We cannot now shirk our responsibility in this important field.

The measure before us contains funds providing \$155.8 million more for fiscal 1970 than requested by the Nixon administration. In education, the committee has increased the budget request by

\$123.4 million. But the administration had already drastically cut the Office of Education from its fiscal 1969 level—from \$3.7 billion to \$3.2 billion. The committee action, therefore, restored only a small fraction of the actual dollar reduction from 1969.

Many vital programs are affected by these shortsighted economies. For example, although the committee has allowed \$188.2 million for the NDEA loan program, or \$26.3 million more than the amount requested by President Nixon, this is \$5.2 million less than was appropriated for the 1969 fiscal year and comes to only about two-thirds of the certified needs of our institutions of higher education. I regret the committee's decision to reduce the amounts requested for the educational opportunity grants and for the NDEA fellowships program. This is no time to dilute our commitment to afford an opportunity to all able, eager young people to secure a higher education, and make a valuable contribution to our society.

Another shocking cut is contained in the appropriation for construction of community facilities and construction of university affiliated facilities for the mentally retarded. These funds have been reduced \$13.6 million below last year's figure, and, if left intact, will have a catastrophic impact on programs for the mentally retarded throughout the Nation. In New Jersey, for instance, the voters last year approved a \$5 million bond issue to finance 60 percent of the construction cost of community facilities for the mentally retarded. The other 40 percent was to come from the Federal Government. Of course this will prove impossible if the program is not adequately funded.

The allocation for library resources, materials and construction is similarly insufficient. Despite the existence of 40,000 schools in our Nation without their own library, no funds whatsoever are provided for library construction in the coming fiscal year. Over the past 3 years, through the assistance of this legislation, New Jersey has established 300 new public school libraries, while 1,998 libraries have increased their acquisitions. Yet there is still a crying need for library assistance in my State. In my own congressional district, the city of Newark recently came perilously near to closing its city library due to a lack of funds. The city of East Orange will shortly be faced with a critical situation if these cuts are allowed to stand. This city's predicament is illustrative of that confronting many other communities. The excellent East Orange Library, which serves seven communities with a population of 292,000 has greatly augmented its services in recent years and there has been a tremendous increase in the use of all the services. The library building which was originally built in 1903 with an addition in 1915 is approximately one-half of the space actually needed now and one-third of the space needed by 1980. As Mr. Eugene M. Fahey, president of the library's board of trustees, has commented:

With all the additional advantages we have been able to offer through federal and state aid, a new building is essential. Federal rec-

ognition of this need through a grant of construction funds would give a considerable boost to our building program. It is unbelievable that libraries, and especially public libraries who serve the whole public, should be cut from Federal Aid when our people need access to the best educational materials and information available.

In his 1967 education message to the Congress, President Johnson said:

I believe that future historians, when they point to the extraordinary changes which have marked the 1960's, will identify a major movement forward in American education.

The former President was correct. In the 89th Congress alone, more quality education measures were enacted than ever before in the history of our country.

We are now confronted with the following choice: Do we continue to move forward, building upon our accomplishments, or will the 1970's someday be characterized as an era of "a major movement backward in American education." The education funds in H.R. 13111 provide us with a very poor start indeed. I believe this unfortunate situation can be altered, and that we should begin the alteration today by increasing substantially the appropriation for the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, no nation can be both ignorant and great. How can we continue, in good conscience, to allocate more than \$80 billion for the defense of a country which proposes to spend only the barest minimum on the education and enlightenment of its citizenry. I urge my colleagues to support the effort which will be made today on the floor to increase the dangerously low level of funding for education programs.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. ABBITT) such time as he may require.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of section 407 of the bill presently before us.

I commend the House Appropriations Committee for including provision in the Labor-HEW appropriations bill to prohibit the use of Federal funds to provide assistance to those who engage in campus disorders. This is a matter of grave national importance and one with which this Congress needs to deal forthrightly before the resumption of classes in the fall.

Many of our people are profoundly concerned about the widespread campus disorders which occurred during the last term and judging from statements made by some of the militant leaders of student groups, it would appear that a resumption of these confrontations can be expected next fall.

Literally millions of dollars in Federal funds are being spent in college campuses all over America. Loans are going to individual students; research grants are going to professors and students; and millions of dollars are being spent in capital improvements and development projects at many institutions.

It is vital that the Federal interest be protected and it is inexcusable that in the face of recent history the Federal Government should be put in the position of subsidizing those who are creating disorder.

Anarchy has reigned on many cam-

pus and administrative personnel have been harassed and literally driven out of their offices. The ROTC program has been placed in serious jeopardy and military research projects of various kinds have been picketed and threatened. To say that there is no Federal interest is in fact to close our eyes to the situation that confronted us last year.

Figures provided by the Office of Education indicate that at practically all of the educational institutions which were involved in disorders last year, a large percentage of the student body was receiving student loans. It has also been widely reported that at some institutions most of those who were actively involved in the disorders were receiving Federal aid of one kind or another. It is ridiculous that the Federal Government should be put in the position of subsidizing those who are undermining its authority and creating disturbances which, carried to their logical conclusion, would mean the closing of the institution which they are attending. It seems to me that Congress not only has a responsibility to see that Federal funds are properly administered but also to protect the rights of those law-abiding students who are being frustrated in their attempts to secure an education.

The whole purpose of Federal education programs is to enhance and increase the educational opportunities for young Americans. To have one segment of college students causing disruption and threatening the operation of the institution while the remainder of the student body is prevented from pursuing their normal activities is defeating the purpose of the program.

Certainly I do not relish the idea of any extension of Federal authority. I do not want to see the Federal Government controlling our colleges nor do I feel that Federal officials should be telling college administrators how to run their schools. I do feel, however, that it is incumbent upon Congress to take such steps as are necessary in order to see that Federal funds are properly spent. This does not mean that Federal funds will be withdrawn or that the operation of the institutions will be unnecessarily bothered. It simply means that Congress will be saying to those who participate in disorders that they are doing so at the risk of losing their entitlement to Federal financial aid. As long as there is no disorder and the college programs are carried on as they are intended to function, there will be no implementation of this section. However, if disorders erupt, those who participate will have to pay the penalty. I think this is only just and fair and is indeed necessary in the situation we now face.

I strongly support the provisions of section 407 and hope that they will remain in the bill.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said about the need for further input of part of our national resources into education.

I certainly agree with that, over a period of time. However, I think there are two other considerations that are

very important, for the good of education. The first is how fast we increase individual programs. I would remind you, that the moon shot cost \$24 billion; but we could not have put the \$24 billion into 1 year's appropriations in 1962 and done the job. You have to build a good program over a period of years.

The same thing is true of some of the other educational programs. They have to be increased at the proper rate so that the money can be used efficiently and so that it does not merely incorporate into inefficient systems more money to do the same kind of job they have been doing.

Vocational education is in point. I am strong for vocational education, but you may founder this program if you try to double it each year for 2 years. Many of the States in most need of upgrading programs are not ready. It must be done at a rate so the effective systems can be channeled more money and the ineffective systems will not get the money until they do the job.

In addition, I wish to mention the fact that it is important how you get the money, because the Budget Bureau has been under stress, especially the last 2 years, to find ways to avoid the debt limit and to avoid showing up as an expenditure certain funds. For this reason, with regard to college construction, they came up with the idea of using interest subsidies as a complete substitute for grants and loans. This might be all right if it were not for the fact that colleges cannot use more bonded indebtedness. They have in this appropriation a little item of \$11,750,000, of which over \$7 million is for the first year on a contract that will cost this Government over \$300 million. This is in lieu of \$107 million in grants and loans.

It will cost three times as much to use interest subsidies than for appropriations for the amount in the Johnson budget. I tell you here today that \$107 million given this year in grants and loans will do the colleges and universities more good than it will to go in debt for over \$300 million for interest subsidies. They do not want more indebtedness. If they try to float more bonds on top of what they have to float anyway, interest rates will skyrocket. What they must have are some grants and loans.

In addition, I want to mention that I was somewhat disappointed on some matters, but I go along with the committee usually because a committee member must make whatever adjustments a majority will accept and try to work these things out. I would like to see more money for loans to college students. At the appropriate time, I shall offer an amendment to provide more aid to college students.

There are 126 items in this bill. There is no chairman who could come in with a bill of 126 items and satisfy all the Members. The fact that most opposition seems to be concentrated on only four or five items is really a great credit to the chairman of the subcommittee, and I think these things should be taken into account, to look at the overall bill instead of just picking out certain items

and saying, "The bill is bad," because they do not like a particular item.

Overall this bill increases and shifts some money to places that badly need funds and also supports the budget requests for a large number of items.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I wish to commend him for his emphasis on the student loan program. I do believe it is one way in which we can stimulate education in a proper way and still create responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, the pursuit of educational excellence is a noble venture demanding our continuing attention and support. There is no more worthy domestic objective than the attainment of an environment in which equal and full education opportunity is available to all of our citizens.

The emphasis—first, last, and always—must be on quality. But we must also be concerned with quantity. It is not merely desirable, it is essential that we make it possible for our greatest national resource—our young people—to travel the road to new and higher plateaus of achievement. It is in their interest, it is in our long-range interest, it is for the good of all mankind that we pave the way for individuals to journey as far as their abilities and ambition permit.

Fortunately, we are endowed with a great number of young people who are academically prepared and properly motivated for higher education. They are eager to learn and anxious to apply themselves. Unfortunately, far too many of these bright and promising youths never reach their full potential because they don't have the financial backing needed to pay their way.

For millions of young Americans, the cost of a college education is prohibitive. Their parents, engulfed in an inflationary whirlpool that makes it difficult, and in some cases impossible to make ends meet, are not able to provide the needed dollar assistance. The result is an American tragedy of the first order. We all ultimately share the loss when prospective scholars are denied access to an academic environment and the knowledge they enthusiastically seek. Who knows which one of these might someday contribute significantly to solving the problem of war, disease, famine, and deprivation?

Congress long ago recognized the Federal Government's obligation to assist deserving students who wished to continue their education. Since enactment of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, millions of dollars have been made available for undergraduate student loans and graduate fellowships and loans. The national defense student loan program has been an outstanding success, it has passed the test of time and has demonstrated its value in support of our continuing quest for educational excellence. Much has been accomplished, much more remains to be done—the task is unending.

The measure before us provides in ex-

cess of \$188 million for the NDSL program. That sounds like a lot of money, and indeed it is, but it is not enough. There is a completely justifiable need for more dollars to permit an expanded program to reach more deserving people and I urge my colleagues to give this matter serious thought. I sincerely believe that an examination of the facts will prompt the support required to amend this measure by earmarking an additional \$40 million to the NDSL program in fiscal year 1970.

The facts and figures of the NDSL program—past, present, and projected—speak more eloquently about the urgent need for additional funding than all the rhetoric we are able to muster in this debate.

The bill under consideration calls for \$188,206,000 for the NDSL program for fiscal year 1970, only a slight decrease from the \$190,000,000 which was available last year. On the surface, logic would dictate an unemotional response to these figures, a variation from one year to the next of less than \$2 million in such a sizable program, especially during a period in which every effort is being made to hold the line on Federal spending, is not very dramatic. In the absence of any compelling arguments to the contrary, one would almost be prompted to applaud what would appear to be fiscal restraint. However, there is more to the story.

I have received a great many letters from constituents who point out that their children have sought financial aid to attend college but have been told that while they qualify for aid on the basis of need, aid will not be forthcoming because funds are lacking. Each year I anticipate receiving a few such letters because I recognize that there is a limit to the amount of money available for the NDSL program and it can only go so far. But this year the mail has been enormously heavy. In checking with my colleagues, I learned that they were having a similar experience. This prompted me to delve deeper into the problem. What I was able to uncover has led me to support the plea for more NDSL funds.

According to student loan specialists with whom I have conferred, there are presently on file "approved" requests for \$268,191,099 in NDSL funds for the 1969-70 academic year, the year covered by this measure. This is the total amount requested by students and prospective students who have been determined in need of outside assistance in order to pursue higher education. The approval does not mean the applications will be funded, it merely means the applicants are eligible, based upon need, for a portion of the funds which will eventually be appropriated by the Congress.

Now let us review some very important figures. On the one hand, this bill contains a request for roughly \$188 million for the NDSL program in fiscal year 1970 and on the other hand, it has been clearly established that there is an urgent need for over \$268 million to fund already-approved applications for assistance during the same period. There is a difference of \$80 million between what is called for and what is needed. It would appear that the proposal I am supporting

only goes halfway toward meeting the need. This is not the case.

First of all, I am advised by officials of the Office of Education that there will be approximately \$23 million in carry-over funds from fiscal year 1969. Mainly these funds were obtained through repayment of loans by students who borrowed to get through college and now are earning their way in the outside world. It must be remembered that this is not a grant program, it is not a massive giveaway, it is a loan program and there is an obligation to repay. At this point I would like to add that the default rate is minimal, less than 3 percent are 1 to 3 years in arrears.

Second, during the next fiscal academic year, more loans will be repaid, bringing in additional money to the program, money that will be available for future student financial assistance requests. According to educated estimates, \$85 million will be coming in through this process. However, because the repayments are scattered throughout the year, not all of this \$85 million will be utilized since much of it will not come in until after the semester is underway when the applicants will have abandoned their plans for college.

The additional \$40 million requested in the amendment, added to the \$23 million carryover from last year and the amount of money that will become available during the coming year through repayments will bring the requests for aid and the amount available more nearly in line. Such action will be a great service to our people and a worthy investment in our future.

Before closing I would like to bring to the floor one more statistic. It is a projection that I hope will never become a reality. If we fail in our effort to provide the \$268 million required to fund the applications for NDSL loans on file, an estimated 45,000 young Americans will be denied the opportunity to explore new horizons through higher education. We will deny them and in the process rob ourselves.

If an individual has confidence in himself, if he is academically qualified, properly motivated and willing to gamble on his future by borrowing to finance an advanced education, we should support him. It is a gamble that in the long run will pay a big return for us all.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, few if any, measures coming before the Congress equal the importance and impact to and upon the continued and expanding progress and security of this Nation than the measure now before us to grant appropriations to the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related Federal agencies.

All of us are deeply concerned, of course, about the proper operation of each activity within these major units of the executive department of the Government, and all of us are, I think, very specially concerned today about the full and proper functioning of the particular programs coming under the direction of the U.S. Office of Education. We are very particularly concerned with these programs simply because of their tremendous effect upon and meaning to American youth at a turbulent point in

our national history. Under these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the basic legislative challenge facing us today, in our consideration and decision on this bill, is our determination of the priority position in Government spending that will be granted to the educational needs of our American youth in the fields of formal, occupational, and vocational educational training and development and related areas of student loans, college facilities, school equipment, library services and materials and impact aid.

Mr. Chairman, every Member here is, I know, rightly and patriotically concerned, as I am, about our urgent legislative obligation to insure the most prudent spending of the taxpayers' money and each Member must meet that obligation in accord with his own wisdom and conscience.

On this score, practically every major educational organization, as well as most labor, library, and scholarship groups, have registered emphatic belief that, in this bill before us, the committee-proposed appropriations for the proper educational encouragement and development of our youth are regrettably inadequate. They have all registered their further and intense conviction that increased fundings in such vital educational areas as student loans, construction facilities, impact aid, library materials under title II of ESEA, improving the quality of instruction in programs of title I of ESEA, vocational education, and providing equipment under title III of NDEA should be reasonably increased, because of advanced costs and justifiably projected school system planning, in my district and throughout the country, to or above the 1969 fiscal year levels, if these programs are to be continued with any substantial significance or real vitality in meeting the very urgent needs of our youth today.

In order to adequately fulfill these needs, appropriate amendments will be offered. In my judgment, the amendments represent a realistic and responsible effort to fulfill our congressional promises to the Nation's youth, while remaining within the stringent standards of true economy in present and long-range national commitment.

For my own part, therefore, I intend to support these amendments to increase funding for the educational programs and objectives I have outlined. I intend to do so because I conscientiously believe such an investment in our American youth and in the future of this country is a profoundly wise and prudent investment that eminently merits inclusion among the very highest spending priorities to maintain, improve and expand our national integrity, progress, and leadership for world peace.

I also and most earnestly hope that the great majority of the Members here, after full consideration, will, in their wisdom, see fit to approve the proposed increased funding of these educational programs, authoritatively held to be essential for their true effectiveness in the national interest, now and in the future.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a few words concerning the Equal Employment Opportunity

Commission in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. Since the day the Commission opened its doors, it was besieged by individuals seeking redress from employers because of alleged job discrimination.

As the public grew more aware of the activities of the Commission, and as the Commission's jurisdiction was expanded to include employers of 25 or more, the number of charges pending before the Commission increased dramatically.

Due to this tremendous workload and occasional harassment by recalcitrant EEOC foes—the Commission has found it impossible to obey the mandate given it by Congress—to process all cases within 60 days from the date of filing. Indeed, the period it takes to process a charge now is nearer to 2 years.

Two years, Mr. Chairman, means more than just an administrative backlog. It means that a man with a family who is denied a job because of his race must wait 2 years before the Commission can even attempt to right this wrong.

It means that a woman who is denied equal pay because of her sex, must wait 2 years before any attempt to obtain what is rightfully hers is made.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress of the United States has passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This body has declared that it is unlawful to discriminate in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, and national origin, and we have charged the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with enforcement of this law.

Can we now, in good conscience, deny the Commission the wherewithal to do its duty? If we do so, Mr. Chairman, we are breaking faith with all of our citizens who are protected by this law. It is a pleasure for me to support the amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the able members of the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. These men have labored long hours in the face of pressure from all sides to put together the bill we will consider today. I am proud particularly of the work they have done with respect to education. This subcommittee has seen the need for funding the many vital programs that will widen the horizons of America's young people and will make the best education possible available to the greatest number. Their attention to the entire scope of education meets with my hearty approval and, I am sure, the approval of educators across the Nation.

I take great pleasure in pointing out one of the very significant if not one of the major aspects of the appropriations bill before us today. I refer to the appropriations for the Office of Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Within the schedule of funds recommended to the full House is an item of particular importance to me as its prime advocate. I refer to the appropriation of \$10 million for vocational work-study programs.

The importance of this program cannot be overemphasized. We are lending a hand to the students who need it the most and we are most likely to use that money to the advantage of themselves,

their communities and, ultimately, this Nation. These students are the ones for whom college is not practical but whose abilities and talents must not be overlooked. They are the students from disadvantaged homes where, in many cases, training beyond high school would be financially impossible. These are the students for whom training in a needed skill will yield indefinite social and financial returns. These are the students who have dedicated themselves to developing a career in a field of established economic value but who might be consigned to the role of unskilled labor were help not available to them.

In my State of Minnesota, as in many other States, there are many fine vocational-technical schools in which many bright, energetic, and determined students may develop skills in auto mechanics, aircraft technology and maintenance, electronics and radio-television repair, appliance maintenance, and many other skills. These same schools teach medical and dental technicians their trade. They educate a great many of our nurses and policemen. In short, vocational and technical education for many is the alternative to quitting school after high school graduation.

In addition, many of these same schools provide programs for those for whom high school graduation was impossible. Economic problems at home, illness, family tragedy, and other reasons cause all too many of this Nation's prime resource to drop out of school before graduation. In Minnesota, the vocational-technical schools help these students to get their high school equivalent degree and then proceed with further programs aimed at skills and abilities our communities need so desperately.

The \$10 million figure is small in terms of the good it can do. This program functions where it is increased in its significance by the determination of the students who take advantage of the help they get because they understand the advantage they are given. It is increased again by the dedication of the teachers who work in the program realizing that their contribution will pay off handsomely in years to come.

Mr. Chairman, the money is the same as was appropriated last year. Last year, however, the program was listed under the Neighborhood Youth Corps where it was all but forgotten. It may not have been sound judgment to place the program under NYC and, because of administrative difficulties, the program was nearly lost. I testified before the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee in May asking that these funds be returned to the Office of Education where they could again be directed toward the students who so desperately need them and so diligently use them. I am very much appreciative of the moves made by that subcommittee toward that end.

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Chairman, we are confronted by a massive challenge in the form of an administration effort to financially eviscerate many ongoing Federal aid-to-education programs. Immediately upon taking office, the President cut approximately a straight 10 percent from the Office of Education budget left

to him by his predecessor. This came to about \$370 million.

Not content with such potentially disastrous fiscal surgery, President Nixon then proceeded to cut the heart out of Government aid to libraries, completely eliminating one \$42 million program. And \$12 million sought for guidance and testing was totally eliminated. Impact aid to poorest school districts is slated for drastic deprivation of funds. These cuts will imperil schooling for needy children, college construction grants, college student loans, vocational education, guidance, counseling, and purchases of school equipment.

Simultaneously, schools and colleges around the entire Nation are inexorably running short of funds. Up to now, Congress has appropriated only about one-third of total funds authorized for their aid programs. In short, it is plain for all the Nation to see that this administration is boldly making war across the board on existing Federal programs which directly aid all levels of education in this country. No program has been spared some surgery. None has emerged truly intact. All are threatened by this giant step backward.

Does the President actually envision what will transpire if Federal aid to impacted school districts is set at the present \$318 million below actual appropriations for fiscal year 1969? Does he really understand what cutting out all aid for school library books and materials will mean to so many? Does he know what will happen if all funds for title III and title V of the National Defense Education Act are deleted, as he presently recommends? Has he full comprehension of what his massive cuts in funds for public library services and college library materials will mean?

Surely, we must spend at least as much in fiscal year 1969 as we did in fiscal year 1968 for these programs. The President hailed the triumph of American technology and education in the form of the recent landing on the moon. By what means does he think this was accomplished? Did we surpass the Soviets by good looks and good will?

There are some extremely short memories downtown these days. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson fully realized what had to be done with American education on all levels. Laboriously and painfully, the Nation made a supreme commitment to educational excellence. Congress and the entire Nation reaffirmed it in a series of aid to education acts allowing National Government to allocate major sums to upgrade and totally develop educational potential of our Nation. The fruits of these efforts are today self-evident. We have only to look to the moon, and note that it was not a Russian but Neil Armstrong who took that first step.

A "giant step," he called it. Forward was the direction. That single step was a monument to America's dedication to education. Does the President propose to take as giant a step backward in American education to compensate for Armstrong's step forward on the moon?

Shall we abandon our commitment as a nation to educational excellence by Government's faltering example? Is this

to be seriously contemplated? Is it to be suffered quiescently by the American public? Is ground so tortuously gained to be given up so blithely?

This Congress must act to save Federal education programs by government from dismemberment by the administration. Once lost, this ground shall not be regained with ease. Who shall suffer? Children of the land. Dedicated students. Teachers and librarians. Our future. Our heritage. All shall be that much weaker for each education denied—each library unbuild—each unfilled classroom—each dollar unspent. There can be no compromise whatsoever.

For these reasons, the cuts must be restored and these programs continued at least at fiscal year 1968 spending levels.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13111 is a good bill in many of its provisions, going far in providing for the health and welfare of the people of this Nation. However, I believe in several instances it falls short of the needed funding to reach the true goal in education. Although I support H.R. 13111, I will rise to support those amendments which will give true funding and a proper priority to our educational requirements which also include the many library services and I urge my colleagues to restore a sense of priority to the Nation's education needs.

As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I opposed all cuts for education on the grounds that until we commit ourselves to a meaningful investment in education, we cannot begin to solve the crisis of our cities or poverty in rural America.

H.R. 13111 appropriates \$3.3 billion for the Office of Education, a reduction of \$800 million from the fiscal 1968 appropriation, a reduction of \$400 million from the fiscal 1969 appropriation, and an increase of only \$123 million for the revised budget request.

Among the more drastic cutbacks are the reduction of funds for title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act covering school library books and materials and a 50-percent cut in funds for public library services and college library materials under the Library Services and Construction Act—title I—and the Higher Education Act—title II-A.

The need for belt-tightening and restraint in Federal spending is recognized by the great majority of Americans, but I cannot understand why we tend to cut basic programs like education which affect the cycle of poverty and every social goal of our Nation.

This summer New York City announced that a number of public libraries would be closed this fall as a result of the lack of Federal or local funds. This appropriation bill would sign the death certificate for those libraries in Queens, Brooklyn, and other areas of New York City.

Cuts in the National Defense Education Act—titles III and V—will deprive high schools of needed equipment and guidance counseling assistance. How can we justify these reductions and still maintain that we are meeting our responsibility to set priorities?

The revised budget request from this

administration would have eliminated all funds for school library books and materials. The Appropriations Committee has restored a token amount but we must do more. I favor an increase in the Office of Education budget which will raise the appropriation to the fiscal 1968 level of \$4.1 billion and I urge my colleagues to support the amendments which would restore education to a high place on our list of national priorities.

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to express my alarm and dismay at the amounts which the committee has recommended to fund the education programs of this Nation. The amounts recommended bear little or no relation to the actual needs of the Nation and even less resemblance to the amounts which we so carefully deliberated and decided on when the authorization legislation for these programs was considered. The simple fact of the matter is that while the Nixon education budget requests were some \$5 billion below the authorized spending level for our education programs, the committee bill only reduced this gap by between \$100 and \$200 million. Thus, we still have a situation in which the amounts we will be asked to approve for our education programs in H.R. 13111 are a pittance—they are over \$4 billion below the amounts we have authorized and about \$300 million below the minimal education budget which was submitted to us by the outgoing Johnson administration with its apologies.

I know there will be many, many amendments offered to this bill to restore some of the money which we must have if our education programs are to be maintained as viable programs. If these amendments are not successful, we will have let down the Nation. I believe the people of the United States expect us to be pennywise, but on the other hand they certainly do not want us to be pound-foolish when we are considering the funding levels for programs which could well mean the difference between success and failure for millions of American youngsters in their quest of the American dream. Education, as we all know, unlocks the limitless doors of opportunity. Without the funds which are absolutely essential for our education programs to do the job, these doors will remain closed for many of our children and the toll in terms of unfulfilled ambitions and resentment toward the systems will just not be worth the few pennies that might be saved by being pennywise with these most urgent of all governmental programs. How can this Nation, which sent a man to the moon and back such a short time ago, sit idly by and watch its representatives in the Congress show such little concern about the Nation's desire to win the battle to improve the minds of all its citizens through education.

I believe that our national priorities are mixed up. Education has to have the top priority. For, without an educated people what can this great Nation hope to achieve? Our constituents are being asked each year to shoulder heavier and heavier tax burdens by almost every level of government. Education is one of the areas in which they deserve to see a concrete return on their investment in terms of an effort on a sustained basis by the

Government to improve the minds of their children. Adoption of the administration's education requests which have largely been endorsed by the committee could well set our educational system back some 50 years. I believe that we cannot afford such a foolish situation at this crucial juncture in our history.

There are many, many areas which are not funded at near what they should be by H.R. 13111. Here I would like to comment on three of them. First of all, I recognize that the committee increased the amount of funds available for the title II ESEA program and the other programs which we consolidated when we considered H.R. 514 earlier this year to continue the authorization for the Elementary and Secondary Act programs. The increase certainly is a step in the right direction; but it comes nowhere near the level at which these programs were funded in the 1969 fiscal year nor the \$1 billion level at which we authorized these programs to be funded.

The simple fact of the matter is that the funds for this group of programs will have to be increased by some \$110 million to reach even the low level at which they were funded last year. If the committee level of funding for these programs is approved, the city of Philadelphia will lose up to \$500,000. This is divided almost equally between the public and nonprofit private schools in the city.

Since the 1965-66 school year, the public elementary and secondary schools in the city have received over \$1.5 million in title II money. Even though they suffered a reduction of 50 percent in the amount they received last year as compared to the prior school year, much has been done with even these limited funds. Prior to the availability of title II money, the book collections and programs of existing libraries in the Philadelphia school district were grossly inadequate. At the time, there was an average of about two library books for each child. National and State standards call for a minimum of 10 books per child. Even though these schools still are not up to standard, through the assistance which the title II library resources program has provided, these schools have now an average of five books per child. In addition, title II funds have made libraries available to many children who had never even been in one before. The accessibility and availability of a wide range of instructional materials, so essential to the needs of modern education, have also been made available through the programs.

The same situation has occurred in the nonprofit private schools in the city. Four years ago, the city nonprofit private schools were seriously concerned about the lack of library resources in its schools. Through the title II programs, more books have been made available, more schools now have access to books and also many parents have volunteered their time to help staff the library facilities. For the first time, there has been a willingness on the part of parents to contribute not only their time but their limited funds so that additional library resources could be provided in addition to those which the limited Federal funds

from the title II program were able to provide. Since the Federal Government was doing its part, parents reasoned they should do theirs. The completely inadequate funding level for this program which the committee bill suggests will, no doubt, cause these parents to lose faith in the Federal Government's pledge to help those who help themselves.

On the matter of the committee suggestion with regard to funding of the program of assistance for school districts with concentrations of Federal employees, I can only confess that once again this year, as I have been since I became a Member of Congress, I have been completely baffled by the position of the administration and the committee with respect to funding the portion of the program which provides some reimbursement for school districts for the cost of educating youngsters whose parents work on Federal installations. If the amounts which the committee has suggested are approved, the school district of Philadelphia will lose about \$3½ million. No longer, under the terms of the legislation we are now considering, will any money be provided to the school district for the 15,000 children which it educates because their parents work on a Federal installation and live in the city. The impacted areas program is one of the least complicated programs of educational assistance which we have. It ought to be continued in operation at its full funding level. If it is not, I fear that in urban centers throughout the Nation there will be a taxpayers' revolt, the likes of which we could not imagine. If the city of Philadelphia loses \$3½ million from its general education fund, it will mean additional taxes paid by my constituents. I believe their taxload is already too heavy, and I will do my utmost to see to it that they do not have to shoulder any heavier burden.

I could go on and on about the inadequacies of the committee bill, but I will not at this time. Just let me add that the administration and the committee have failed miserably to fund those programs which are designed to return something to the middle-income taxpayers. The library resources program, the impacted areas program, the student assistance programs, the higher education facilities construction programs, all have been reported at funding levels which will cause a severe dislocation in the educational community and the Nation as a whole. Therefore, I urge all my colleagues to remain on the floor today and act when the votes are counted to put education where it belongs, as our highest national priority.

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my objections to the proposed reductions in funds for education and libraries. I am particularly concerned with the recommendations to eliminate money for elementary and secondary library programs under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is my understanding these funds were cut last year by nearly 50 percent in many cases and the complete elimination of them now will place added financial burdens on school districts already fighting to keep from being

swamped by the tidal wave of rising taxes and inflation.

In the 20th Congressional District which I represent, we have approximately 20 public school districts, several of them in urban areas where municipal governments also are forced to increase taxes year after year.

These school districts, despite the fact that they are nearing the limit of their taxing capacity, still must plead with the State and Federal governments for more funds in order to remain competitive with their more affluent neighbors. The money is vital if the urban districts are to attract a better caliber of teachers and improve existing educational programs.

These districts depend on State and Federal grants if they are to furnish the quality of education demanded by the Constitution and deserved by the child. They cannot be expected to meet this obligation if such help is cut off. This results in a heavier financial load on the districts which as a matter of course must be shouldered by the individual taxpayer.

I need not remind you gentlemen of the hue and cry being raised today throughout the Nation for tax relief. The outcry is unprecedented. I am sure that each of you has received as I have, mountains of mail calling for Congress to institute such relief and quickly.

I fail to see where eliminating the library funds will help the taxpayer. In just five of the 20 school districts in my area, the funds total \$33,000. I realize that this is a mere pittance when compared to other expenditures being considered by the Congress, but these funds provide educational materials for 32,000 children and their education cannot be measured in dollars.

I might also point out the school enrollment in these five districts does not include another 6,000 parochial students who use public school library facilities.

I have checked with educators in these five districts and they have expressed deep concern over what the elimination of these funds will do to their educational programs.

How can we equip our children for the competitive world of tomorrow when we take away their tools of knowledge today?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address the House as to the merits of the pending budget appropriation for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

We have spent billions of dollars putting man on the moon and millions of dollars in aid to foreign countries, but we have done little to assure that all of the American people are able to provide for their own welfare. We have recently allowed the schools of our Nation to slow their move in the area of desegregation of the public schools. Let us not also allow our Commissions to slow their moves toward an end to discrimination. As the leaders of the Nation and the makers of laws that govern all our citizens, we have failed to bring all our citizens up to a level of subsistence and dignity when it is our sworn duty to uphold the Constitution by doing exactly this.

The minority groups of this Nation

have not been incorporated into any long- or short-range involvement concerning the improvement of their situation, and they cannot be left without any solutions to their problems.

In the face of the civil disturbances during the past few years, I find it hard to believe that there can be any question as to our responsibility. We must now take this opportunity to let America know that we are running the Government in behalf of all of the people.

Welfare, poor education, and civil disturbances all contribute to the continuing alienation of the minorities from the mainstream of American life. It has cost the American people more to run the welfare organization than it would cost to support the efforts of the EEOC in ending job discrimination which is the cause of the heartbreaking circumstances responsible for welfare recipients. A poor education only contributes to the dejected circumstances of minority groups, but with equal job opportunity, the poorly educated can become a functioning part of our society instead of an economic burden.

The President's Commission on Civil Disorders discovered that many minority group Americans feel so alienated that they can only resort to violence as a means to effect the response from the establishment needed to resolve grievances.

Civil unrest is part and parcel of this administration, and if we continue to ignore the unfortunate conditions of the minority groups in the country, we will find ourselves using nerve gas instead of tear gas in order to stop civil disturbances. We must now abolish even the need for tear gas, for we have other solutions if we will use them.

Let us move forward together. Let us be part of the solution and not part of the problem. I urge you to endorse the EEOC budget proposal and make a concrete step toward ending discrimination in employment. Then we may say in truth that we are moving the country forward together.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, while the debate today will naturally center around the question of the Federal Government's adequate and responsible level of funding for public education throughout the United States, I want, at this time, to raise the question of our Federal commitment toward programs to alleviate the incidence of the lifelong burden of mental retardation.

My home State of New Jersey has a mental retardation planning board that has the special responsibility of coordinating local, State, and National programs that affect all mental retardates in the State of New Jersey.

The Federal Government's commitment toward helping local and State efforts in the field of mental retardation has only recently been recognized.

In fact, money for construction of facilities for the retarded first became available in 1965, and staffing funds were first authorized in fiscal year 1968 and the first appropriation of \$8.3 million was only released in fiscal year 1969.

I believe it is factually clear that the Federal Government's interest and re-

sponsibility in offering aid and assistance to local and State program efforts in the field of mental retardation has been developed late in time and short in cash. With that background in mind, I would like to unequivocally state that the Nixon budget, instead of making up for lost ground, carries us back to the day when a national program for aid to mental retardates was only a dream.

Mr. Chairman, I support, as a matter of principal, the concept that our appropriation for educational and vocational rehabilitation ought to match the original authorization. I view measures relating to these subjects as items of highest domestic priority. I want to conclude my remarks by a simple statement of hope that this Congress will not renege on its flowery rhetoric of years passed, and yet its very practical outlook of what is best for the American public by appropriating the maximum amount of funds for education and social rehabilitation.

This, of all times, is not the time to lose heart. Without objection, I would like to enclose a statement from the Mental Retardation Planning Board of the State of New Jersey:

STATEMENT OF THE MENTAL RETARDATION PLANNING BOARD OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

The Mental Retardation Planning Board of the State of New Jersey wishes to express its concern regarding the serious retrenchment at the federal level of programs for the mentally retarded. The proposed budget for the Division of Mental Retardation in the Rehabilitation Services Administration, Social and Rehabilitation Service, of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare illustrates the situation. The requested FY 1970 budget totals \$39,129,000 compared with the FY 1969 estimated budget of \$44,569,085, a decrease of \$5,440,085. In addition, only \$33,629,000 of the \$39,129,000 represents new monies, the balance being transferred and unobligated funds which are being forwarded.

This budget decrease has serious implications for state and local program development in the field of Mental Retardation. The policy determinations implicit in these budget reductions represent a great weakening of Federal commitment towards support of essential research and services for retarded persons and their families. If we allow this to go unnoticed we would not be fulfilling our responsibility as members of the Mental Retardation Planning Board to both the providers and consumers of mental retardation services.

The Mental Retardation Planning Board finds the retrenchment in programs and services for the mentally retarded in the FY 1970 federal budget recommendations untenable. The Board seeks to make the drastic effects of this proposed austerity perfectly clear, and particularly the disparity between the appropriation request and the actual amount authorized by Congress.

The Mental Retardation Planning Board believes that the FY 1970 budget recommendations constitute a monumental danger to the continuation and improvement of services to the retarded and their families. The Board urges that all action necessary to reverse the reduction of programs and services be taken so that our commitment to the human and civil rights of the retarded may be more fully realized.

APPENDIX

The following data are appended to highlight the current crisis:

Under the *Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act*, as amended, grants are allowed for both the construction of facilities and for initial staffing with professional and technical personnel. Money for construction of facilities for the retarded first became available in 1965, for which the full authorized amount of \$10 million was appropriated and released. As of December 31, 1968, 242 projects had been funded nationally. Of these, 55 projects are completed and in operation, 101 are under construction and 86 projects have been approved and are now in the architectural planning stage. Estimated total cost of these projects is \$143.5 million and the estimated Federal share is \$43.3 million.

The federal authorizations for this construction program through FY 1969 total \$97.5 million. However, only \$61.5 million has been appropriated of which only \$5.5 million will remain to be obligated in 1969-70, the lowest carry over of any year to date. The Nixon Administration budget request for new construction money for the period 1969-71 is only \$8 million (the lowest appropriation to date) against an authorization for \$50 million for 1970.

The Mental Retardation Planning Board sees in the following summary of budget figures (in millions of dollars, rounded) an erosion of the once-firm federal commitment to the construction of facilities for the mentally retarded:

Construction	1967	1968	1969	1970
Appropriation authorized (new funds).....	\$15.0	\$30.0	\$30.0	\$50.0
Appropriation requested by President.....	15.0	15.0	6.0	8.0
Appropriation enacted by Congress before cutback.....	15.0	18.0	6.0	.....
Allotment basis after cutback.....	15.0	12.0	12.0	8.0
Carried over from previous year.....	11.7	12.6	11.5	15.5
Transferred from mental health.....	3.3	3.6	2.0	.....
Actually obligated including carryover and transfer.....	15.7	16.7	20.5	.....

<sup>1</sup> Estimated May 1, 1969.  
<sup>2</sup> Estimated.

The 1970 budget request for construction funds, then, totals \$13.5 million (\$8 million requested plus \$5.5 carry-over) compared with the 1969 figure of \$18 million, a decrease of \$4.5 million. And this in spite of the fact that federal officials estimate 1,500,000 retarded persons nationally need facilities and services not presently available to them!

Construction grants are made on a formula basis, with a matching formula of approximately 60% local and 40% federal funding. The following table records the federal funds authorized and the funds actually made available to New Jersey to date for construction under the amended *Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act*:

Fiscal year:	Funds authorized	Funds actually made available
1968.....	\$859,723	\$328,075
1969.....	863,800	330,780
1970.....	1,439,667	195,564
Total.....	3,163,190	854,419

On the basis of the federal commitment to participate in the development of community facilities for the mentally retarded, New Jersey designed a programmed plan for 21 county day care centers and other community facilities which proved so attractive that the people of New Jersey voted in the Fall of 1968 to invest \$5 million of their own capital in this construction program. The

people of New Jersey, then, have earmarked \$5 million, some portion of which would be their 60% matching funds. The federal funds now proposed to match the \$5 million total \$854,419 (not 40% but 16%)! The proposed federal retrenchment for FY 70 means instead of the \$1,439,667 authorized by Congress, New Jersey is confronted with the prospect of \$195,564. The total funds made available, then, for FY 68, 69 and 70 are less than the authorization by Congress for FY 68.

This erosion of federal commitment is not only a grievous reversal of pledges to the retarded, but may make impossible the implementation of the program to which the populace has dedicated \$5 million. To suffer this shrinkage is not only to outrage the retarded and their families and to embarrass State officials who carried this program to the people, but it is to call into question the confidence of the people in a federal commitment. It should be carefully remembered that the people of New Jersey have invested \$33 million in institutionalized construction in the past 5 years. In May 1964 there were 1357 retardates wait-listed for admission to a State institution. So the people of New Jersey built the Woodbridge State School and the Hunterdon State School. And this May 1969 there were 1203 retardates on an institutional waiting-list and 516 retardates additionally are privately placed on a purchase-of-care basis. The people of New Jersey believe they are meeting their commitment to the mentally retarded and their families. Where is the federal response?

The Mental Retardation Planning Board views as critical that:

(1) Appropriations requested for construction in Fiscal Years 1968, 1969, and 1970, have fallen far below authorizations which in turn have run well below need as estimated by the President's Panel on Mental Retardation in 1962.

(2) Since allotments are made among the States, with a requirement that no State receive less than \$100,000 a year, the first \$5 million appropriated is absorbed in meeting this requirement, making the allotments to the larger states disproportionately small.

(3) Since the construction funds are available for a two-year period many States encumber a significant portion of their allotments in the second year of availability of the funds. In FY 1968, the Bureau of the Budget did not release the full amount appropriated in the year of appropriation. As a result the "carry over" funds from the first year coupled with the appropriation for that year, make it appear that a substantial amount of funds are available. This tends to create an impression of higher cumulative expenditures than has, in fact, been made. For example, the 1970 budget appendix shows \$18 million to be obligated in FY 1969 and \$13.5 million for 1970. However, the appropriation for FY 1969 is \$12 million with \$11.5 million carried over from FY 1968. The FY 1970 budget requests an appropriation of \$8.0 million with an estimated \$5.5 million to be carried over from FY 1969.

The Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, as amended, also makes grants for the initial staffing of facilities with professional and technical personnel.

The staffing funds were first authorized in FY 1968, and the first appropriation (\$8.3 million against \$10 million authorized) was released for FY 1969. As of May 1969, 285 applications had been received, requesting Federal funds in the total amount of \$14.4 million for the initial year.

The Nixon Administration revisions did not affect the Johnson Administration budget for staffing for FY 1970, i.e., requests are for \$5 million for new staffing grants, and \$7 million for the second-year continuation of grants initiated in 1969 when New Jersey received \$251,459. By contrast, the original authorization for FY 1970 for new grants is \$14 million; the appropriation requested is \$5 million.

This request represents a decrease of \$3 million from last year for new programs. It is perfectly clear that these monies will, in no way, meet the needs of the 50 states. The budget figures (in million of dollars, rounded) for the staffing program are as follows:

Staffing	1967	1968	1969	1970
Appropriation authorized (new grants only).....	( <sup>1</sup> )	\$7	\$10	\$14
Appropriation requested (new grants only).....	( <sup>1</sup> )	0	8	5
Continuing grants.....	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	7

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

To propose to reduce further funds for staffing is to make ludicrous this component of the program. As stated above, New Jersey received \$251,459 in 1969-70 staffing grants. The FY69 operating budget of the community facilities for the retarded constructed in New Jersey over the past two years was \$882,078 and \$1,220,300 has been budgeted for FY70. It is seriously doubted that the \$200,000 New Jersey would receive under the proposed FY70 budget would cover the cost of administering the new facilities for the retarded for the construction of which the people of New Jersey voted \$30.1 million of its own capital in the 1968 bond issue approvals.

The proposed FY70 budget will also sharply penalize New Jersey under the *University-Affiliated Facilities* construction program. The Medical School of Rutgers, The State University has submitted an application to construct a Mental Retardation Diagnostic and Evaluation Center (as part of the Rutgers Psychiatric Institute of the developing Rutgers University Medical Center) under Part B, Title I, P.L. 88-164. The projected cost of the Diagnostic and Evaluation Center is \$1.6 million, of which \$1.2 is sought from federal sources, and \$4 million will be Rutgers-provided. In the proposed FY70, federal budget there is no request for construction of *University-Affiliated Facilities*, compared with a 1969 funding estimate of \$9.1 million!

The Mental Retardation Planning Board finds the federal retrenchment, particularized in the foregoing instances, spread across all FY 70 budget requests for programs and services for the mentally retarded and their families. This retrenchment is found in program areas such as: Residential Care of the Mentally Retarded; Training of Personnel for the Service of the Retarded; Vocational Rehabilitation; Special Education.

Even in the *Research* area, where the \$126,000 requested for FY 70 does not differ from the 1968 and 1969 budget figures, the Mental Retardation Planning Board is gravely concerned. It recognizes that these monies can fund only three research grants throughout the nation and that, to date, very little research emphasis has been placed on social and behavioral research or on the evaluation of existing programs. The Mental Retardation Planning Board gives applied research a high priority and considers \$126,000 for support of critical social, behavioral research and program evaluation as totally inadequate.

The Mental Retardation Planning Board of New Jersey finds the reductions in the proposed FY 70 budget for programs and services for the retarded and their families less than responsible and potentially disastrous. In keeping with its mandate, the Board so alerts its publics among whom it importantly numbers its legislative representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for general debate having expired, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary for the Office of the Solicitor, \$5,978,000, together with not to exceed \$144,000 to be derived from the Employment Security Administration account, Unemployment Trust Fund.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

To carry out the Clean Air Act, as amended, and the functions of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare under the provisions of section 48(h)(12)(C)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (80 Stat. 1508, 1512), including hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft, \$93,800,000.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am surprised and disappointed that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended a reduction of \$2 million from the budgeted funds for air pollution activities. In the context of appropriations for health-related programs, funds earmarked for air pollution research and control have special significance. Every dollar the Nation invests in finding solutions to the problem of air pollution is an investment in preventive medicine, because improvements in the control of air pollution ultimately will reduce illness and death from chronic diseases associated with exposure to polluted air. Thus, a dollar invested in seeking solutions to the air pollution problem may save the Nation many dollars in expenditures for the care and treatment of chronic disease victims, not to mention the savings that will accrue from keeping people healthy and productive.

I note that the Committee on Appropriations has recommended that the proposed \$2 million reduction be taken out of funds for air pollution research and development activities. I am informed by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that this cutback will result in a delay in the development of a process for reducing the sulfur content of coal. Representing the largest coal-producing State in the Union, I am impressed with the important work which needs to be done. This particular process would be of substantial value in the Nation's effort to control sulfur oxides pollution. It would help to make low-sulfur coal available to fuel users whose facilities are not suited to other means of dealing with the sulfur oxides problem. Thus, this process would have the two-fold advantage of permitting continued use of the Nation's coal resources while also contributing to progress toward cleaner air.

In summary, restoration of the \$2 million would be a bargain from more than one standpoint. It is a bargain that I

believe the Congress and the Nation cannot afford to pass up. Accordingly, I hope that these funds will be restored to the budget for air pollution activities.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL CANCER INSTITUTE

For expenses necessary to carry out title IV, part A, of the Public Health Service Act; \$180,725,000

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YATES: On page 18, line 13, strike out "\$180,725,000" and insert "\$185,149,500".

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment seeks to restore the appropriations for the National Cancer Institute to last year's level. I would like to offer amendments that would continue those appropriations.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count.

One hundred Members are present, a quorum.

The gentleman from Illinois is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the committee has provided all the funds in the budget requested by the National Institute for Cancer, but the budget for the National Institute for Cancer is ridiculous. It provides less funds than were provided last year and the Institute is more active. The Nixon budget is woefully inadequate.

The budget for this Institute is approximately \$6 million below the appropriation for last year. And that appropriation for last year is below the budget for the Institute for the previous year. We keep going down year by year in the appropriations not only for the Institute for Cancer but for all of these Institutes.

Does it make sense to cut back the appropriations for a National Institute that is doing a good job?

If Members will look at the report, on page 15, they will find the committee statement that the Institutes are doing an outstanding job. It wants the NIH to brag a bit about themselves. It says:

The Committee has found NIH spokesmen almost prudishly restrained in claiming credit for the research accomplishments of its grantees. This reticence does both NIH and the medical research community a serious disservice. In the present climate of opinion the high dividends paid by investment in research must be well-advertised if its support is to compete successfully with other urgent demands on the public purse.

Mr. Chairman, the Institutes are doing a remarkable job and it is incredible to me that the committee should cut the budget, for in effect that is what is being done. Do I have to recite the achievements already gained? New advancements which have been made in research in the field of cancer have been demonstrated time and again. There was the Pap test for women, which reduced drastically cancer of the cervix. Skin cancers have been treated. We are on the verge of a breakthrough in chemotherapy, yet

in this bill vote "no confidence" in the Cancer Institute.

Can one imagine what this budget would have been like had the predecessor to our friend from Pennsylvania still been in office? I have great respect for my friend, Mr. FLOOD, who is chairman of this subcommittee. He does a very good job. But when I think of the HEW appropriations bill, I remember the great Congressman from Rhode Island, John Fogarty. We all recall his fights on this floor to provide funds for the Nation's health. The National Institutes of Health were built by his eloquence, his sincerity, and his integrity. It was he who fashioned this remarkable institution. It was he who fought through the House, with your support, the research money that inaugurated a new concept of research, a massive effort to eradicate the killing and crippling diseases that plague mankind. Restoring adequate funds to carry on this fight would be a realistic tribute to our late beloved friend, John Fogarty.

There is no reason to cut these programs back. We must vote our confidence in these institutions by voting at least the same level of appropriations they had last year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the House support my amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I remind you, Mr. Chairman, we are talking about the Cancer Institute. If there is anyone in this room who knows more about cancer than I do, I should like to hear from him. Can you imagine me being a party to damaging, retarding, injuring, or casting a shadow upon anything having to do with treatment or research on the killer cancer? Me? That is nonsense.

The emphasis of the Johnson administration and the emphasis of the Nixon administration has now been placed upon delivering service, taking the research and putting it at the bedside of the person who needs that treatment. So there have been some small reductions in these research activities.

However, let me remind you that there is \$180,725,000 for research, and related activities, in cancer now. This committee, led by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, under no circumstances, would permit anything drastic to happen to research in cancer.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and suggest and hope it will be defeated.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. One hundred and seven Members are present, a quorum.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN).

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I just want to commend the gentleman from Illinois on his fine statement with regard

to John Fogarty whom I succeeded in Congress.

I support the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) in his efforts to restore the appropriations for the National Institutes of Health to the level of spending at which they are this year. I am sure the committee will support them in their efforts.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TIERNAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, some years ago when the appropriations for the National Institute of Cancer was under attack, John Fogarty defended that appropriation in eloquent speech in which he said:

I do not know how much we have expended on cancer research. I do not care. I do not know whether it is \$100 million or \$3 billion, but if any part of that was a help in finding this new technique in diagnosing cancer in a stage early enough to cure 100 percent of cancer of the cervix in women, every dime that we have expended has been well expended by the Congress of the United States.

Dr. Sidney Farber, of the Children's Hospital of Boston also appeared before our committee. He is an outstanding expert, not only in this country but in the world, in the field of leukemia which is cancer of the bloodstream, especially in children. He was the man who pioneered in the use of antifolic compounds in the treatment of leukemia. He has used these compounds to treat one boy since 1947. He discovered their use in Boston, with the help of funds from this appropriation, if you please. As a result of that discovery, for the first time in medical history a young boy afflicted with acute leukemia is still living after 10 years. How much is his life worth? I do not know, but to me it is worth every dime we have put into these programs over the past 10 years.

The Institutes stand as a living memorial to the greatness of John Fogarty. They will continue to be dynamic, constructive organizations so long as adequate appropriations support its research efforts. Without funds, the Institutes must wither. The research teams built up so painstakingly over the years must be disbanded and their work disrupted. The tendency now is in the direction of retrenchment, rather than advancement. That must be checked.

Mr. Chairman, let us not move backward. I am asking \$6 million in my amendment to bring the level of cancer research to the same level for the next fiscal year as it is for this fiscal year. The Institute for Cancer is doing outstanding work. The committee agrees, but unfortunately it accepted the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget which cut the funds.

I think that this House ought to vote its encouragement to the National Cancer Institute by at least placing it at the same level as it has been for this current year. I hope the members of the Committee will sustain my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. YATES) there were—ayes 23, noes 78.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair-

man appointed as tellers Mr. YATES and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 59, noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### NATIONAL HEART INSTITUTE

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, necessary to carry out title IV, part B, of the Public Health Service Act, \$160,513,000.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended to offer other amendments to increase the appropriations for the other National Institutes which suffered reduced appropriations but in view of the action just taken by the House I have decided not to offer them. I believe their level of funding should at least be equal to this fiscal year's level but I do not think the House is in a mood to increase the appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### HEALTH MANPOWER

To carry out, to the extent not otherwise provided, sections 301, 306, 309, 311, title VII, and title VIII of the Public Health Service Act, \$218,021,000: *Provided*, That the amount available for scholarship grants to schools of nursing for the current fiscal year under such title VIII shall include, in addition to funds appropriated herein, funds appropriated for nursing educational opportunity grants for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, but not allotted to States for that fiscal year.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. REID of New York: On page 21, line 8, after "Public Health Service Act," strike out "\$218,021,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$232,821,000".

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, the budget request for loans to medical students under the health professions student loan fund is almost 50 percent below the money available last year. The gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL) and I are jointly offering this amendment on page 21, line 8, to strike out the figure of \$218 million, and to insert \$232 million.

This amendment will provide an additional \$14,800,000 for loans to medical students under the Health Professions Student Loan Fund—part C, title VII, of the Public Health Service Act.

The appropriation must be increased by this large an amount for two reasons. First, the need for loan funds is already far outrunning the money available. There are 100 medical schools in this country with a total enrollment of 34,018. The schools have requested a total of \$20,983,026 for loans for this fiscal year. The budget allots \$7,924,353 of that request. This is just about half of what was available last year and about one-third of what is needed to insure that enrolled students and new students will be able to continue or begin their medical education. Some 23,000 students received loans last year and if the appro-

priation is not increased, many thousands will have to drop out or not enroll at all because of terminated or reduced loans.

The additional \$14,800,000 would maintain support to schools previously participating in this program at the 1969 level; provide support for new schools entering the program for the first time; and allow for expanding enrollments of continuing schools, particularly for needs of disadvantaged students being admitted to first year classes. A total of \$17,943,353 would then be available for the loan program.

The second reason that the appropriation must be increased is that the report accompanying this bill directs that the increase in scholarships for health professions students—about half of whom are medical students—be transferred to the loan program. For several reasons, I believe it most unwise to do this, and, while the parliamentary situation under which this bill is presented does not make it possible to amend the bill in this regard as this item does not appear in the bill itself, the legislative history of this amendment will show that the loan fund appropriation is increased by sufficient funds to allow the scholarship moneys not to be transferred, thereby leaving the scholarships at the same level as the budget requested.

The scholarship funds cannot be transferred, first of all, because the awards have already been made for the new school year. We are, in effect, directing medical schools to tell students who are counting on scholarships that what they were told last month must be rescinded. This is an unconscionable breach of faith on the part of the Congress. Second, these scholarship funds are needed to give such aid to all four classes of students. Until fiscal year 1970, only three classes were covered. With the increase of \$4,781,000 that the budget requested for this fiscal year, the fourth class would also be covered as intended in the basic legislation.

The administration had hoped that the guaranteed loan program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would be able to assist many medical students whose health professions loans would be reduced or terminated. That hope has unfortunately not proven to be a fruitful source of funds because the tight credit market is making it exceedingly difficult for any students to get loans under this program and because the reduction in loan funds was made known to medical schools only earlier this month—some 6 weeks before the new school term begins. Whatever guaranteed loans might have been available have long since disappeared, and medical students are left but a short time before school begins with no source of support.

The Department of HEW estimates that we need 52,000 more physicians right now, and that by 1976 we will still need 41,000. Our 100 medical schools now produce about 8,500 graduates a year—clearly an insufficient number. The administration, in its budget request, indicated its interest in encouraging the physician augmentation program in order to produce some 4,000 additional doc-

tors by 1973. This is indeed a laudatory objective but I cannot understand the logic in financing this program by taking \$5 million from the funds allotted to medical student loans, as the report directs on page 30. Frankly, I do not understand how it is proposed that these additional medical students—not to speak of present medical students—are to finance their education if the loan funds are reduced.

Many students have expressed eloquently the hardships they are undergoing to finance their medical educations, and the greatest deprivation, if not termination of their careers, that will ensue from a reduction in loan funds. Such a situation will surely not close the gap between the number of physicians this Nation needs and the number we are now educating. It is simply the most shortsighted and cheap sort of economy to cut in half the funds that enable potential physicians to be trained.

I should like to insert in the RECORD at this point a paragraph from a letter I have received from Dr. Harry Gordon, dean of the Albert Einstein College of Medicine in New York, and a table of the appropriation history of medical student loan funds. Dr. Gordon writes:

It is appalling that the Federal and State Governments have not taken into consideration the fact that there is an increasing number of minority group students unable to support their education and an expanding number of students from low and middle income families who find it extremely difficult to attend medical schools. At a time when we have become increasingly aware of our acutely understaffed medical services, this will have a socially undesirable effect on our recruiting policies for health expansion.

#### MEDICAL STUDENT LOANS

	1968	1969	1970
Number of medical schools.....	93	98	100
Enrollment.....	34, 018	35, 962	37, 558
Medical schools request for loan funds.....	\$16, 885, 425	\$19, 030, 340	\$20, 983, 026
Appropriation.....	\$14, 736, 357	\$14, 240, 726	\$7, 924, 353
Students receiving loans.....	23, 255	23, 000	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Not available.

Source: Public Health Service.

Mr. Chairman, I will not belabor the figures except to say when our Nation is able to send men to the moon and make such a magnificent achievement as that, this is hardly the time to cut back on needed scholarships and loans for our doctors, especially since there is a shortage of doctors throughout the country.

It is time to keep faith with our medical students. I would urge the House to add these rather modest, additional funds to the bill so that medical students will be able to complete their courses and we will be able to keep faith with those who are trying to become doctors and serve our Nation.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. In almost every medical school of this country, and in thousands of homes of medical students, basic decisions about future doctors are being made today and throughout this summer. It is now less than 2 months before medical schools

resume for the 1969-70 year. Yet many students, and their schools, do not yet know how they will finance next year's schooling.

This situation results from several unusual factors which affect medical education. First, training for medicine is an arduous, lengthy, and very expensive undertaking. Second, doctors, once trained, are very well paid. Third, scholarship and loan aid for medical students has always been very limited because both private and public sources have been understandably, though regrettably, reluctant to help students who eventually will earn handsome incomes.

These factors in turn contribute to several serious problems in providing the medical care our country needs and deserves. Physician production has fallen increasingly short of our requirements. The doctors we do produce are selected from a too-narrow economic and social segment of our population. Too many doctors' sons become doctors. Social attitudes of medical care as a privilege, of the sanctity of fee-for-service as the only way of providing medical care and similar narrow values tend to become perpetuated in each successive generation of doctors because of the selection process for medical schools.

To face these problems, Congress gradually undertook programs both to increase physician production and to provide for more scholarship and loan programs for a wider variety of medical students. These programs, and these students are in a situation today which borders on desperation.

The administration seriously underestimated the results of attempting to economize on medical student loan funds. Under this misunderstanding, a funding was proposed for these funds which cut loan availability by about 50 percent.

Schools which had been encouraged by Congress to increase medical student enrollment discovered one morning this spring that their enrollment for September 1969 would almost certainly be reduced, in some cases drastically, by the administration's reduction in loan funds. These schools have already been advised of these proposed cuts. Medical school deans are confused and dismayed by these events. Students and their families are searching desperately for funds so that their education can proceed.

The administration's calculations in reducing the health professions student loan fund was based on an assumption, now clearly repudiated, that the guaranteed loan program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would provide funds to medical students who would no longer need the health professions loan fund. The rise in the prime rate of interest and the general scarcity of private loan funds for educational purposes, made this assumption a cruel, though unintentional, deception for medical students.

When medical schools announced that existing loan funds would be reduced this fall, students went to local banks for guaranteed loans. There was simply no money available. Today, these students still have no fair prospects for financing their education in the school year which starts in 2 months.

To abandon these students to disrup-

tion or termination of their medical studies is unthinkable. To rely on the private credit market is impossible. The solution must come in additional funds for loans for medical, and other students, whose careers in medical care are both a public responsibility and in furtherance of a public good.

My colleague from New York (Mr. REID) and I have prepared an amendment to provide funds for the health professions student loan fund sufficient to insure the operation of that program at the fiscal year 1969 level. A sum of \$14.8 million is needed for this purpose. This amount, we should recall, is not for grants or scholarships to students but for loans which are repayable.

The \$15,000 to \$20,000 which medical school training costs is a burden which society must share if we want to improve our medical care system by providing more and better doctors. Medical students have already had the considerable expenses of college training to finance by the time they start their specialized studies. After medical school they have 3 to 4 years of internship and residency training. To allow this long and costly burden to fall on students and their families alone will perpetuate the present inbred system of medicine and deprive our country of those new sources of health manpower we need so badly.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Before we vote, I urge every Member to consider our past commitments to improved medical care which this amendment will help preserve and confirm.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you will recall that in my statement earlier in the day, I went to some lengths to point out how this committee has shifted the emphasis from research to delivery and to service.

There is an increase in the bill, over 1969, of \$46 million for training doctors, dentists, and nurses, and \$41 million for construction of facilities where these students, studying to be doctors, nurses and dentists, can be trained—we have no quarrel with this, we are all for it and we put it in the bill.

Let me point this out to you. On this very item that is the subject of the pending amendment, this committee raised the budget \$4,781,000. Further than that, the Nixon budget came in at \$15 million—the Johnson budget was \$20 million. This committee, because of the reasons I stated earlier, because we do believe in training and teaching doctors, nurses, and dentists, and building facilities for them, has done this.

We applied the rule of reason again, after consulting the experts who best know. We raised this item over \$4,700,000, practically equal to the Johnson budget of \$20 million, because of the reasons I have stated and stated earlier.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa, who is well experienced in this program.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I agree with what the gentleman from New York has said, except for one thing, and that is his statement that we did not

increase these funds. We did. It is a little difficult sometimes to see exactly how these things are handled. What happened is that the administration proposed a big increase in scholarship money. We took that money and put it into loans. We believe that as long as there is not enough money for all the students who want it, we ought to emphasize loans instead of scholarships, because this money will come back and be used again at some time in the future.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. It is my understanding that we are taking money from the scholarship program for the loan program. The problem is that there have already been commitments to certain students that scholarships would be provided.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It would not affect them one iota, because every dollar provided last year for scholarships is in the bill. All we took out was the increase in scholarships.

Mr. REID of New York. If the gentleman will yield further, it is my understanding that the medical schools of the United States have asked for an increase of \$10 million. The reason I have requested an increase to \$14 million is that the committee has transferred, if I understand correctly, \$4 million from scholarships to loans, and the increase in the commitments in terms of classes that now exist would require an additional increase of \$10 million. So there would be need for \$14 million in scholarships to maintain the medical schools at the levels that were set.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. If the gentleman will yield further, I do not know what somebody asked, but I know that we took the extra money that they wanted for scholarships and put in into the loan program. There will not be any reduction in the scholarship money previously provided. Our agreement in the committee was that we ought not to provide an increase in the scholarships, but to put the money into the loan program.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman from Iowa has stated the record and the facts. There was no intention on the part of the subcommittee under any circumstances to cut the scholarship program below the 1969 level.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I would like to say a few words in support of the amendment. As a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which deals with substantive health legislation, I can tell you that one of the prime reasons for the tremendous increase in medical costs that we are experiencing all over the country is the inadequate numbers of doctors and inadequate facilities to train doctors to service the people who have medical needs.

In the medicare program and the medicaid program we supplied a vastly increased number of dollars with which people can pay for services, and that in-

creased number of dollars is chasing an inadequate number of doctors, thus bidding up the prices all over the country. This is a classic case of inflationary pressure.

If you want to do something to provide adequate medical service for people who are not presently receiving it—if you want really to do something to decrease medical costs—there is no better way you can do it than to provide funds for the additional medical training set forth in the amendment of my colleague from New York.

I earnestly urge your support for the amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OTTINGER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REID of New York. Is it not a fact that there was a commitment to provide increased funds in the sum of \$4.7 million for scholarships to enable all four classes to get scholarships, and that an additional \$10 million, at the minimum, is necessary to provide loan funds close to the amount requested by the medical schools? Is it not correct that the effect of our action today would be to make it impossible for some of the students in their third year to complete their fourth year in the medical curriculum, and, therefore, the effect is to break faith with these students and actually cut back on the number that would be trained had this \$14 million been made available?

Mr. OTTINGER. That is my understanding.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The fact is that that would have happened if we had not shifted funds; new students would have gotten scholarship money, and others may not have. We restored the money so the third-year students could get the money.

Mr. REID of New York. It is my understanding that transferring the \$4.7 million will hurt students presently enrolled and all I am asking now is that we consider maintaining the amounts necessary so that those who have completed a portion of their medical training can complete their final years.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION

##### ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

For carrying out titles II, III, V, VII, and section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, \$254,163,000; of which \$200,163,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II and supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act of 1965 and for equipment and minor remodeling and State administrative services under title III-A and guidance, counseling, and testing under title V-A of said Act of 1958 (to be distributed in accordance with regulations promulgated by the

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare); and \$29,750,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act of 1965.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL: On page 25 strike out line 9 and all that follows on page 25 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For carrying out titles II, III, V, VII, and section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, \$254,163,000; of which \$200,163,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II and supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act of 1965 and for equipment and minor remodeling and State administrative services under title III-A and guidance, counseling, and testing under title V-A of said Act of 1958 (to be distributed in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare); and \$29,750,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act of 1965.

"For an additional amount for grants under title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1970, \$205,360,700: Provided, That the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants therefor within States shall not be less than 92 per centum of the amounts allocated from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation to local educational agencies in such States for grants.

"For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), and the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), \$521,067,000, of which \$505,900,000 shall be for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by said title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and \$15,167,000 which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act of September 23, 1950."

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that the paragraph which it amends has not yet been read.

May I be heard on the point of order, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognized the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, when the amendment was offered, the Clerk had finished reading the paragraph which begins on line 9, page 25, and concludes on line 24, page 25.

At that point amendments to that paragraph were in order. But the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois does not change so much as a comma in that paragraph; it repeats it absolutely verbatim. It is not an amendment to that paragraph. It is only in subsequent paragraphs that any amendment is made.

As a matter of fact, it goes on through another paragraph without any change whatsoever before it makes an amendment. The amendment does not come until the paragraph beginning on line 9 of page 26.

I would make the point of order, Mr.

Chairman, that the gentleman from Illinois will have to wait until that paragraph is read before he can offer an amendment to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I submit that really all I am doing is adding to that first paragraph; therefore, it is very much in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has considered the arguments both for and against the point of order. The Chair sees no inconsistency in the gentleman's amendment repeating the paragraph on page 26 which the Clerk had not yet read. It is a different paragraph, but the Chair feels that the following paragraph can be consolidated with an amendment to the total paragraph.

Mr. O'HARA. Before the Chair rules, may I be heard further on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman further.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, under the rules of the House, when a bill is to be read by paragraph and a Member wishes to amend a paragraph that has been read and several succeeding paragraphs he is permitted to offer an amendment at the time the first of those paragraphs is read that he wants to amend and then at the same time give notice that if his amendment, which goes beyond the first paragraph and into several others, is adopted he will move to strike the succeeding paragraphs.

In the first place, the gentleman from Illinois gave no such notice, but let us not dwell on that. Let us dwell on the danger of upholding the amendment he is offering.

The gentleman from Illinois, I am sure, will agree that he makes no change whatsoever in the paragraph just read; absolutely no change.

If the Chair is going to hold that one can offer an amendment at any place one wants in the bill in order to get a provision that comes a page later, or two pages later, or 10 pages later—and that is what he has done; he has offered an amendment here that changes nothing but gets at something on the next page—and if we are going to say that the precedents of this House say one can offer an amendment any place and repeat some language until it gets to the thing he wants to amend, we are heading for legislative chaos, Mr. Chairman.

I believe this is a very serious problem, and I most earnestly ask the Chair to carefully consider his ruling, because otherwise it might be possible to offer an amendment to repeat the language for the next 25 pages until it gets to the thing one seeks to change. I believe it is terribly important that this amendment be considered out of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. On the amendment?

Mr. HANNA. On the point of order pending.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be heard on the point of order.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, would I be correct in assuming that in the event

amendments of this type were allowed, where you repeat language and then make changes further on down in the bill, that those persons desiring to change that language which has been incorporated in toto without change would have to make an amendment to the gentleman's amendment in order to be appropriately given recognition? If that is so, it indicates another problem which would arise in this kind of an amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, may I be given the opportunity to comment on the point of order and urge disallowance of the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me, first, that obviously that part of page 26 between lines 8 and 22, inclusive, are all germane to the subject matter of this legislation.

Second, according to the format of the bill H.R. 13111, you will notice that between the first paragraph that begins on page 25 and the second paragraph that begins on page 26 there is no numerical division by title or subtitle or otherwise.

Third, let me point out, as I understand the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) in the preparation of his amendment he was careful to strike out the language which is included on page 26, line 8, entitled "School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas." So in effect he was considering not only paragraphs on page 25 and paragraphs on page 26 which are all germane, but there is no breakdown in numbers or in articles as far as this portion of the bill is concerned.

Therefore, I think it is logical and is sound reason for disallowing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair is presented with a most difficult ruling at this time. He has resorted to a precedent in "Hinds' Precedents," volume V, page 404, paragraph 5795, which reads as follows:

When it is proposed to offer a single substitute for several paragraphs of a bill which is being considered by paragraphs, the substitute may be moved to the first paragraph with notice that if it be agreed to, motions will be made to strike out the remaining paragraphs.

The Chair notes that the gentleman from Illinois did not give such notice. The amendment goes beyond the paragraph which has been read and in effect modifies a paragraph which has not yet been read.

The Chairman, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The amendment in the form in which it is offered is not in order.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the paragraph just read which is a simple substitute to several paragraphs of the bill dealing with the Office of Education, and I hereby give notice that after the amendment is agreed to I will make a motion to strike out the paragraphs appearing as follows: the paragraph on page 26, lines 1

through 7; the paragraph on page 26, lines 8 through 22; the paragraph beginning on line 13 of page 27 and extending through line 21, on page 28; the paragraph beginning on line 22, on page 28, and extending through line 17 on page 29.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 25 strike out lines 9 through 24 and substitute in lieu thereof the following paragraph:

"For carrying out titles II, III, V, VII, and section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and titles III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 \$364,616,000; of which \$50,000,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II of said Act of 1965; \$164,876,000 shall be for supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act of 1965; \$78,740,000 shall be for equipment and minor remodeling and State administrative services under title III-A of said Act of 1958; \$17,000,000 shall be for guidance, counseling, and testing under title V-A of said Act of 1958; \$29,750,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act of 1965; \$5,000,000 shall be for dropout programs under section 807 of said Act of 1965; \$9,250,000 shall be for planning and evaluation under section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967; and \$10,000,000 shall be for bilingual education programs under title VII of said Act of 1965. For an additional amount for grants under title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1970, \$386,160,700: *Provided*, That the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants therefor within States shall not be less than 92 per centum of the amounts allocated from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation to local educational agencies in such States for grants. For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), and the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), \$600,167,000, of which \$585,000,000 shall be for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by sections 3, 6, and 7 of said title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and \$15,167,000 which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act of September 23, 1950. For carrying out titles III and IV (except parts D and F), part E of title V, and section 1207 of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, titles I and III of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, as amended, titles II and IV of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 421-429), and section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935, as amended (7 U.S.C. 329), \$859,633,000, of which \$159,600,000 shall be for educational opportunity grants under part A of title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 and shall remain available through June 30, 1971, \$63,900,000 to remain available until expended shall be for loan insurance programs under part B of title IV of that Act, including not to exceed \$1,500,000 for computer services in connection with the insured loan program, \$154,000,000 shall be for grants for college work-study programs under part C of title IV of that Act (of which amounts reallocated shall remain available through June 30, 1971), including one per centum of such amount to be available, without regard to the provisions in section 442 of that Act, for cooperative education programs that alternate periods of full-time academic study with periods of full-time public or private employment, \$43,000,000 shall be for grants for construction of public community colleges and technical institutes and \$33,000,000

shall be for grants for construction of other academic facilities under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 which amounts shall remain available through June 30, 1971, \$11,750,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for annual interest grants under section 306 of that Act, \$222,100,000 shall be for Federal capital contributions to student loan funds established in accordance with agreements pursuant to section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and \$12,120,000 shall be for the purposes of section 22 of the Act of June 29, 1935. For carrying out the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1241-1391) (except part E of title I), and section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, \$488,716,000, of which not to exceed \$357,836,000 shall be for State vocational programs under part B and \$40,000,000 shall be for programs under section 102(b) of said Vocational Education Act of 1963, including development and administration of State plans and evaluation and dissemination activities authorized under section 102(c) of said Act, and \$10,000,000 for part H of said title I, not to exceed \$1,680,000 for State advisory councils established pursuant to section 104(b) of said Act, \$13,000,000 for exemplary programs under part D of said Act of which fifty per centum shall remain available until expended and fifty per centum shall remain available through June 30, 1971, \$15,000,000 for consumer and homemaking education programs under part F of said Act, and \$14,000,000 shall be for cooperative vocational education programs under part G of said Act.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, would the Chairman or the gentleman from New Jersey clarify whether the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey was offered as a substitute or as an amendment to the section?

Mr. JOELSON. If the Chairman will permit me to reply to the gentleman from Michigan, I would state to the gentleman from Michigan that it is an amendment which is a single substitute to several paragraphs of the bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. It is an amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. A substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) would be in order if offered by someone?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that a substitute for the amendment would be in order.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), the entire package, is defeated, would it then be in order to amend different sections in this area, in this whole part?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state

that if the amendment is defeated, why, of course, we would be right back where we started.

Mr. MICHEL. And open to amendment at any point?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraphs would be read, and they would be open to amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the entire substitute, as I understand, is open to amendment at any point, but insofar as the bill is concerned is the paragraph on page 25 which was read by the Clerk also open to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes to explain this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Where is a copy of this amendment so that we may know what we are doing?

Mr. JOELSON. There is a copy at the desk.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Is that not the usual procedure so that the Members may know what we are doing, and to have a copy of an amendment as long and as complicated as this?

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman will yield, I am asking for an additional 5 minutes so that I can explain my amendment to his satisfaction. If I have not done so, I will ask for another 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would suggest the gentleman ask for permission at the end of his first 5 minutes.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, during general debate, in order to indicate the widespread support for my proposal, and that it was not limited to one party or to one segment of the economy or limited to one type of interest. I gave the names of some of the sponsors and I think I should do that again.

Today I received a letter from the U.S. Conference of Mayors warmly endorsing the proposal signed by Jack D. Maltester, mayor of San Leandro.

I also received a letter from the National League of Cities signed by the mayor of Nashville, Tenn., C. Beverly Briley.

Included in the list of organizations in support of this proposal, there is the AFL-CIO, the American Association of Junior Colleges, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, the American Federation of Teachers, the American Library Association, the American Vocational

Association, the Catholic Library Association, the Lutheran Council in the United States, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, the Council of Catholic Men, and the National Education Association.

There are others, Mr. Chairman. There are some 50 to 60 sponsors.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to explain what my proposal would do.

First, let us start with the largest item, which is impacted aid. My proposal would increase by \$398 million the recommendation of the full Committee on Appropriations. This would provide sufficient funds for 90 percent of the authorizations. I must confess I am very puzzled by the committee approach which now says, "We will fund you for the people who work on the Federal property and who live there, but if they live across the street, they are not covered."

I think this seems to be just folly. So my proposal would be to lump these two together and to fund them as one. So the appropriation would be an increase over the House committee, as I said, of \$398 million.

Going to vocational education, my proposal would increase the committee proposal by \$131,500,000.

But I would like to point out to you that the bill, as authorized by the Committee on Education and Labor, would provide a figure that even with my amendment would come up to a figure only 63 percent of the full authorization.

Going to title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that is ESEA, I would increase the figure of the House committee by \$180 million. But I want to point out very clearly that even with the increase I have proposed, the percentage of the total authorization is 44½ percent, less than a half of authorization even with my increase. The committee would fund only 38 percent of the full authorization.

Now we go to this one group containing four items. One is title II of ESEA pertaining to school libraries; title III of NDEA concerning equipment; title V, of NDEA providing for guidance and counseling; title III of ESEA, providing for supplemental centers. The full committee did what, to me, is an absurd thing. They did not fund each item. They took one lump sum and then they said to the Commissioner of Education, "You divide it up as you like. No matter what you do, it is OK with us."

What I would do is to provide funds for each one of these items specifically: \$50 million for school libraries; \$78,740,000 for equipment; \$17 million for guidance and counseling; and \$164,876,000 for supplemental centers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. JOELSON was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. JOELSON. We also propose to increase two items for higher education. I am very, very disappointed to have to tell you that with regard to construction, the committee, although they were authorized \$711,360,000, appropriated not one penny—nothing. I would propose to ap-

propriate \$33 million. Do you know what percentage of the total authorization that would be? 4.6 percent of the total authorization.

Again, going to student loans, I do not have to tell you, for I am sure you have received letters, that young people who want to go to college cannot get loans from banks because of the high interest rates. I propose an increase for student loans so that instead of funding the program at 62 percent of the authorization, as the committee would have you do, I would fund it at 83 percent, which would be an increase in the appropriation of \$40,794,000.

I might also let you know that even with my increase, many of the items would not be increased. In title II, school libraries are not increased over the appropriation for 1969. Title III, for equipment, not increased over fiscal 1969, even with my amendment. Title V, for guidance and counseling, not increased over 1969. Title III, for supplemental centers, not increased over 1969. And higher education construction not increased over 1969.

We hear about taxes. I want you to know, and I am sure you know, that the school bills are paid by the local taxpayer; the little guy, the little homeowner. The money will have to be spent for local education. What we are saying to the little homeowner is, "You are strapped. You are against the wall. The Federal Government has greater resources than just you little homeowner, and we are going to help you out." So we are not really raising more taxes; we are just distributing the load.

I would like to remind you that we have an authorization bill here. We just cannot turn everything over to the Appropriations Committee, and I am a member of that committee, but we must not give it the right to decide everything because then we would not need any legislative committees.

Mr. Chairman, when I leave Congress, if I am remembered for a week or two, I would like to be remembered as an advocate of educational opportunities for our youth. I am sure you would, too. I think it is good Government. I think it is good politics. I think that is what the people want. It is our way of expressing faith in our young people, our way of acknowledging their potential, and helping them to realize it is to supply the money that I am urging. I ask you, please, to join me in this constructive effort.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey particularly for increasing substantially the amount for student loans. Let me explain why.

Last year when a young lady by the name of Jean Johnson graduated from a high school in my district, and because she graduated with honors, I sent her a letter of commendation and urged her to continue her education through college. Today she sent me a letter in which she said she desperately wants to go to college but can only do so by tak-

ing advantage of the student loan program the Congress has previously authorized. However, try as she did, she could not find a financial institution in the entire Twin Cities area that will grant her a student loan, even though there is statutory legislation to that effect on the books.

Mr. Chairman, she went to the 10 leading financial institutions in the Twin Cities metropolitan area. The biggest financial institution said if she had 1 year of college and had a substantial savings account at their bank, then they would talk to her about a student loan. Sorry you do not qualify.

The second financial institution said if she had been a customer of their bank and had a savings account for 6 months they would consider her request. Sorry.

The third one said they were sorry also, but all the money for student loans had been used up.

The fourth one said they were sorry, all they do is provide installment loans and installment loans only.

The fifth one said they had discontinued participating in the student loan program in April 1969.

The sixth and seventh institutions of finance said they were sorry but student loans were of no interest to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has again expired.

(On request by Mr. KARTH and by unanimous consent, Mr. JOELSON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the last institution said they were sorry, they do not sponsor the student loan program at all, and they never had.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only way this young lady can continue with her education.

I commend the gentleman from New Jersey and certainly indicate my strong support for his amendment, because there are so many other Jean Johnsons around the country who will not be able to go to college unless we do something more substantive in the student loan program.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his comments.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the package of amendments offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). This package would mean about \$1,050,000 in urgently needed additional aid to Buffalo schools.

Let me state the specifics:

First. Under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the board of education of Buffalo would receive \$500,000 more than the present bill calls for. The level in the bill as it now stands does not even meet rising salaries and costs. Buffalo would have to curtail programs for the disadvantaged. It is already planning to cut all programs and eliminate several programs. Among the victims, without the Joelson amendments, would be Buffalo's "early push"

program. Similar to Headstart, it has been so successful in Buffalo that it has been designated by Washington as a "Follow Through" city. Other victims would be the remedial reading programs in Buffalo and other compensatory programs.

Second. Under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, all schools in Buffalo, public and parochial, would stand to gain \$200,000 for books and other library materials.

Third. Under title III, as it now stands, Buffalo will lose about \$25,000 for instructional equipment material such as audio-visual aids, foreign languages and the like.

Fourth. Under the National Defense Education Act and VA, Buffalo would lose about \$80,000 as the bill now stands which is desperately needed to improve guidance counseling services. The ratio of guidance counselors to students in Buffalo now stands at one counselor to 400 boys and girls. It should be one counselor to 250 young people.

Fifth. Under Elementary and Secondary Education Act, title III, Buffalo expects it would have to curtail innovative and experimental programs to the tune of \$60,000.

Sixth. Under vocational education, Buffalo would stand to lose \$25,000 under the present bill. This would mean that needed equipment at Buffalo's seven excellent vocational and technical high schools would not be purchased. It costs twice as much to educate a youth in a vocational school, but New York State provides nothing extra. In the opinion of Buffalo's School Superintendent, Dr. Joseph Manch, every high school should offer vocational education so that every student could have it available to him.

Seventh. Under impacted area aid, Buffalo would stand to lose \$160,000 as the bill now stands. This is \$160,000 that has already been budgeted as anticipated funding. I should note here that the Buffalo Board of Education estimated that for this present fiscal year it would need \$6,000,000 more just to carry out the same programs as last year on the same level. But it got only \$16,000 more. The State failed in its responsibility and compounded the emergency.

So that the total comes to \$1,050,000 that is desperately needed by the schools of Buffalo, I hope the House will see its way clear to passing the Joelson amendments.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. Specifically, the focus of my remarks will be directed to title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The legislation is aimed at remedying some of the deficiencies in the area of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and/or published instructional materials existing in our Nation's schools. In fiscal year 1969 there was appropriated in support of this legislation \$50 million out of an authorization of \$162.5 million. For fiscal year 1970, against an authorization of \$200 million, the committee has recommended that no specific amount be appropriated in support of title II, but rather that funds for this purpose be included in a general

fund that would cover not only title II of ESEA, but title III of ESEA, and titles III-A and V-A of NDEA as well. In fiscal year 1969 there was appropriated in support of all these titles a total of \$311.61 million. The committee recommends that we appropriate in fiscal year 1970 the sum of \$200.16 million to support all these titles. Since this is \$110.5 million under fiscal year 1960 levels, it is clear that title II of ESEA will suffer a severe blow if the committee recommendation is accepted by this body.

All evidence clearly established a continuing need to fund title II ESEA at substantial levels. As of March 1968, there were 36,000 public schools in our Nation that lacked library facilities. Increasing enrollments are placing more and more demands on those school library facilities which already exist.

Texts and other instructional materials, already in short supply in many school districts, are bound to become obsolete through extended use if funds are not available for replacement. While the Joelson amendment will not provide funds sufficient to overcome these deficiencies, it does insure—to some extent—that programs under title II will not be allowed to backslide to a point where gains made in the last 5 years will be canceled out. I, therefore, urge you to vote yes for the Joelson amendment and for the youth of America.

**SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL FOR THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON**

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 25 beginning with line 9 and continuing to line 17 on page 26, insert the following:

"For carrying out titles II, III, V, VII, and section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, \$254,163,000; of which \$200,163,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II and supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act of 1965 and for equipment and minor remodeling and State administrative services under title III-A and guidance, counseling, and testing under title V-A of said Act of 1958 (to be distributed in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare); and \$29,750,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act of 1965.

"For an additional amount for grants under title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1970, \$205,360,700: *Provided*, That the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants therefor within States shall not be less than 92 per centum of the amounts allocated from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation to local educational agencies in such States for grants.

**"SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS**

"For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 13), and the Act of September 23, 1950,

as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), \$521,067,000, of which \$505,900,000 shall be for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by said title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and \$15,167,000 which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act of September 23, 1950."

Mr. MICHEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read inasmuch as it is the same as the amendment I previously offered.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MICHEL (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be considered as read inasmuch as it is the same as I offered previously.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would suggest the gentleman explain the meaning for his request. There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, it is only in the interest of time.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman explain the meaning of his request? Does the gentleman wish to tell the committee what he told the Chair just now?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I simply asked unanimous consent that my substitute for the amendment be considered as read, inasmuch as it is in the same form as that which I offered previously.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman make the announcement about striking out later paragraphs in the bill?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, there is no need for that kind of announcement. I have offered an amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, further reserving the right to object, did the gentleman make the announcement that he will serve the same type of notice I served, that this is the same type of amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the circumstances of the gentleman's amendment, he does not have to serve that notice.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request, and ask that the substitute amendment be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk concluded the reading of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his substitute amendment.

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. If the substitute amend-

ment of the gentleman from Illinois prevails, is the remainder of the title still open to amendment, which would have been amended if the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) had prevailed?

The CHAIRMAN. If the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is agreed to and the Joelson amendment as thereby amended is agreed to, then there are some remaining paragraphs which have not been read and they would be next for consideration and subject to amendment.

Mr. QUIE. So the announcement of the gentleman from New Jersey that subsequently those further paragraphs he would move to delete would no longer prevail; is that correct?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not faced with that situation. If a motion to delete the remaining paragraphs is made, that would be for the consideration of this Committee.

**PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY**

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield for that purpose?

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask if this is coming out of my time?

The CHAIRMAN. It is coming out of the gentleman's time.

Mr. MICHEL. If the gentleman would consent to an additional 5 minutes, I would yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make that request?

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MICHEL was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

The CHAIRMAN. Now does the gentleman from Illinois yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOELSON. If the gentleman's amendment should carry, what would he move to delete?

The CHAIRMAN. If action is taken on the Michel substitute amendment and it is agreed to, and then the Joelson amendment is agreed to, then we would proceed to read the succeeding paragraphs which have not been read and amendments of various kinds may be made to those paragraphs.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a further parliamentary question?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Does your amendment refer to any subject matter not contained in my amendment?

Mr. MICHEL. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. JOELSON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. MICHEL. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey has sweetened up his package here for those 385 Members in this House who get a little piece of that action, that is, the federally-impacted aid money. In our bill we held to the budget request of \$202 million, but we recognized that these 385 Members would probably want to do something additional for their districts with respect to impacted aid.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield to the original author of the amendment to increase that amount up to last year's level, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SHRIVER) and have him take the ball at this particular point. Before doing so may I say that the first part of my amendment here would hold the committee figures to our \$84 million increase for the four categories of Supplementary Educational Centers, library resources, guidance counseling and testing and equipment and minor remodeling.

Mr. PERKINS, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MICHEL, I am sorry. I have to yield to my friend from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment will restore \$318.9 million to the Public Law 874 program. This would make \$505.9 million available for school assistance in federally affected areas which is the same amount as appropriated for 1969.

Nearly 19 years ago the Congress established a program of Federal assistance to school districts which were affected by Federal activities. The program recognizes the inequity of forcing local taxpayers to pay the extra costs of educating an increased enrollment of new pupils as a result of expanded Federal activities in local school districts. The number of Federal installations used as a basis for Public Law 874 funding in fiscal 1968 was 5,601; 85 percent of these were military bases. Payments are also made under Public Law 815 to assist in constructing schools in areas where enrollments are increased by Federal activities. The request for this item in fiscal 1970 is \$15,167,000.

The Public Law 874 program is based primarily on two categories of children. Those who live on Federal property with a parent employed on Federal property are "a" pupils, and children who either live on Federal property or live with a parent employed on Federal property are "b" pupils. The amount paid for the "a" category child is roughly one-half of the yearly per pupil cost, and the amount paid for "b" category children is roughly one-fourth of the cost per child.

This year the committee has accepted the administration's request for \$202,167,000 for the impacted-area programs. This would include \$154.7 million for category "a" children, \$32.3 million for the full cost of educating 52,400 pupils under section 6, and \$15.2 million for Public Law 815 construction costs. No funds are provided for category "b" pupils.

According to testimony before the committee, there are approximately 2.5 million children in the "b" category, or about 5½ percent of our total number of elementary and secondary school pupils. Actually, 52 percent of all public school children attend schools receiving this aid. The elimination of "b" funds has created a pending crisis for local school districts. They are, in many cases, awaiting action by Congress on this matter to determine local tax levies for the coming year. Failure of the Congress

to restore these funds to their 1969 level could mean the difference between holding the line or increasing property taxes in many school districts.

I have heard the argument that category "b" parents contribute to the upkeep of these schools through State sales taxes, but it is well known by those who pay the bills that the major source, by far, for education expenses is the local property tax, not the State sales tax. At any rate, many of these category "b" school districts are inhabited by low-income enlisted personnel with large families and stays of short duration. Many of these bases provide post exchanges for these low-income people, thus removing a large part of local income from these installations and from State sales tax income.

It is depressing to note that with the reported recommendation, after the \$32 million for section 6 is taken off the top, the remaining funds would pay only 28 percent of full entitlement if both "a" and "b" children are included.

If these programs were to be funded in full for fiscal 1970, a total of \$650.6 million would be needed. In addition to this, the low-rent public housing amendments which were added to the education authorization by the house earlier this year would add nearly one-quarter of a billion dollars per year to this program. Also, if full entitlement were granted for the construction program, that would add nearly \$65 million to the bill.

On a number of occasions in the past, I have supported funding of this law up to full entitlement. These days, however, are not ordinary.

The difficulties in obtaining Senate passage of the surtax extension only serve to add weight to the burden of inflation. I believe it would be irresponsible at this time for the house to add \$145 million included in a so-called full-funding amendment.

Such action may also be impractical. If the full-funding amendment is adopted, it would be probable that the full amount would not be allocated by the Bureau of the Budget. We have faced that problem before. Thus, local school districts still would not know what to do about their local tax levies. We would at least be on firmer ground with this amendment which holds fiscal 1970 spending to the fiscal 1969 level.

Over the years, the impacted areas program has proven to be one of the most effective and least-complicated programs providing Federal assistance to education. We all know there are some inequities in this program. For example, there are many wealthy counties in the country, such as suburban communities outside Washington, D.C., which are large beneficiaries of this aid when, in fact, Federal activities in the area constitute tremendous economic advantages for those school districts.

My own children have been counted in Fairfax County, Virginia's allocation of funds, and I own my home and pay most of the taxes of the State and area, so there is not any real impact upon the school system because of my employment on Federal property. There have been several studies advocating a change in

the impact aid program. There is presently another study being conducted. Changes, however, should be made by the legislative committee after hearings and careful consideration, not by the Appropriation Committee—nor in an appropriation bill.

Last year, we appropriated \$200,000 for an evaluation of the program to determine whether or not the payments were too high or too low in some categories. The survey will be completed in December by the Battelle Memorial Institute of Columbus, Ohio. We should wait until those recommendations are made before making major funding changes, be they increases or decreases.

I believe that restoration of Public Law 874 funds in the same amount as voted in 1969 is a reasonable and responsible compromise at a time when we are endeavoring to fight inflation. It also honors the longtime commitment of the Federal Government with 4,235 school districts in the country which have relied in part on this 19-year-old program. I urge you to support this amendment. It is reasonable; it is responsible in this point of time and with the fiscal problems we face; it is the proper compromise while we await the studies and the Legislative Committee's consideration of changes in this program. It does not violate any prior commitment.

We are endeavoring to fight inflation. This action would honor the long-term commitment of the Federal Government to the 4,235 school districts in the country which have relied, in part, upon this program for the period of 19 years.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the members of the Committee to support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. MAHON, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL, I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON, Mr. Chairman, there seems to be some considerable uncertainty and confusion as to just what is pending before us.

Let me ask the gentleman from Illinois: Is it true that with respect to this portion of the bill, he is proposing no change in the bill as it is printed and as it is before all of the Members of the House? He is making no change whatever, except that he is adding \$319 million above the budget for impacted aid.

Is that the only issue involved and is that the only change being proposed by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MICHEL, The chairman is altogether correct.

Mr. MAHON, I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I strongly support the gentleman's substitute.

Mr. MICHEL, As I indicated in the first part of my statement—

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Will this \$319 million proposed by your amendment take care of the so-called category "b" schools?

Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. Chairman, will the

gentleman from Illinois yield to me in order to respond to that question?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. It would.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. If the gentleman will yield further, at the same level of funding for 1969?

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further; no, not the same level of funding because we do not know how many students there will be, but at the same rate of category "a" students.

Mr. MICHEL. The category "a" and "b" students would be at the same level.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. In other words, there would be no change in their status?

Mr. MICHEL. There will be no distinction between the two.

As I started to say, in the first part of this amendment we added \$84 million to the four items where there was only \$116 million for supplementary educational centers and nothing for library resources, guidance and counseling and equipment.

In summary what we added in committee and what I am proposing to add for impacted aid we are \$402 million over the budget on the items included in my substitute.

I am certainly not proud of supporting those kind of increases, but I see the handwriting on the wall and would much prefer this to the \$894,547,000 increase as proposed by Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute and in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). I say this because it seems to me that if one listened carefully to the argument of my beloved and distinguished chairman of the full Appropriations Committee and to the response of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), the ranking minority member on the Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee, one should vote against the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat that if one listened to the arguments advanced by the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee—a giant of this Congress, or any other Congress, for that matter, and a man I love and admire—and if one listened to the response of the gentleman from Illinois, a distinguished and highly respected Member of Congress known for his diligent work on the Appropriations Committee, it would appear that their comments are really in support of the Joelson amendment rather than in opposition. I say this because the only aid-to-education program in which they appear to be passionately interested is the one that offers financial assistance to federally-impacted school districts—the one that has elicited the support of 385 Members of this body, as the distinguished gentleman has cited, because they have some kind of military installation in their areas.

So they are concerned about federally impacted areas—and justly concerned. I feel that all 385 Members have a right

to believe the Federal Government must honor its commitment to provide financial assistance under Public Law 874—not only for category "a" students but for category "b" students as well.

That is enough on impacted areas. All of you know this issue well. All of you know how you are going to vote on it.

But I think we should be just as concerned—just as passionately concerned—about the poor, the disadvantaged, the disinherited millions that live in the Nation's rotting ghettos and ruined countryside towns. The programs that would help the children of these millions to realize their educational goals would be given at least a modicum of financial strength under the amendment sought by Mr. JOELSON. Programs such as ESEA, title II and title III; NDEA, title III and title V; vocational education, higher education grants, and the student loan program would continue stimulating education in the United States if Mr. JOELSON's amendment carries. These programs are the ones we should fund most amply because they are the ones that will eventually help solve the country's major problems—poverty, unemployment, injustice, and all the social ills that attend a lack of educational opportunity.

Mr. Chairman, I do not come to the well of this House with a bleeding heart; nor do I come here as one who is impressed with what we spent on aid-to-education 5 years ago or 10 years ago.

I come here only to urge that we accept our responsibility to fund education programs as adequately as possible. The problems faced by our school systems are mounting. They are difficult. They are complex. One of the best ways to help solve them is in the legislation now before us.

So we should stand up and be counted on the funding of education programs that the legislative committees have strived so hard to develop over the past years, and with which the Labor-HEW subcommittee has cooperated so well over the same period of time.

We must not compromise our Nation's school systems.

The sweeping cuts sought in fiscal 1970 Office of Education programs would jeopardize the school systems responsible for educating American children, and, in turn, would jeopardize the very future of the United States.

It would be the most arrant brand of false economy to carry out wholesale budget cuts in aid-to-education programs—programs, that school systems throughout the country need, to meet their responsibilities in this era of increasing social and technological sophistication.

Such cuts, in fact, would be tantamount to taking a \$5 oar away from a boatsman struggling to row \$5,000 worth of cargo across a river. "Sorry," we would have to say to him. "But we have to do this in the interest of economy."

In 1965 we made an historic commitment to the improvement of education at all levels and to the expansion of educational opportunity. I think that the question confronting us today is whether we are willing to compromise that commitment.

In 1965 President Johnson proposed

"a program to insure every American child the fullest development of his mind and skills." Subsequently in his education message he declared:

We want this not only for his sake . . . but for the Nation's sake. Nothing matters more to the future of our country; not our military preparedness, for armed might is worthless if we lack the brainpower to build a world of peace; not our productive economy, for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government, for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

These remarks set the tone of the 90th Congress. They reflected, too, the depth of our commitment and signaled a new direction in Federal aid to education. Someone has suggested that children do not fail but rather that schools fail our children.

Education deficiencies so blatantly clear by 1965 would seem to substantiate this claim.

Then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Celebrezze and Commissioner of Education Keppel both underscored the close relationship between education attainment and family income. At that time enrollments in elementary and secondary schools were expected to increase by 4 million within the next 5 years. It was also estimated that almost this same number of young people would drop out of high school before receiving their diplomas.

The greatest education deficiencies were then and are now in the schools that serve the children of the poor in the heart of our large cities and in many rural communities.

No less an educator than our present Commissioner of Education and then Commissioner of Education in the State of New York, James E. Allen, Jr., underscored the seriousness of the situation. No one painted a more vivid and disturbing picture of the plight of schools that house the children of racial minorities and of the economically deprived.

Commissioner Allen said:

It is abundantly clear, that a society committed to the principle of equality and with the means to achieve it, must act swiftly and massively with measures appropriate to the need.

I agree with Commissioner Allen. I, too, believe that we have the means to achieve educational equality. But the proposed HEW budget certainly does not reflect that capability. As Commissioner of Education in New York, Mr. Allen noted that even with the full funding of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act it "would be only a modest beginning on a tremendous task." I believe that this is applicable on a national scale.

That is why I am wholeheartedly supporting the package of amendments introduced by Representative JOELSON.

The authorization for fiscal year 1969 for title I of ESEA was \$2.184 billion and slightly over half of that amount was appropriated. For fiscal year 1970 some \$2.359 billion is authorized, yet the administration is asking for only \$1.226 billion. The Appropriations Committee seeks even less—only recommending \$1.216 billion.

The amendment sought by Mr. JOEL-

son would increase title I appropriations to nearly \$1.4 billion for fiscal year 1970. With elementary and secondary enrollments skyrocketing, I do not see how we can expect education agencies to maintain, even their present efforts, for disadvantaged children on a lesser amount.

Another revision Mr. JOELSON proposed would maintain intact the individual appropriations for titles II and III of ESEA and titles III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act.

H.R. 514 as passed by the House this year would allow a combined appropriation for these titles. The danger of this approach has been demonstrated in the meager budget request of only \$116,163,000—all of which has been earmarked for title III of the ESEA.

It is extremely difficult for me to understand how the needs and accomplishments of other titles can be conveniently ignored. There are pages and pages of testimony from all sources in the 1965 ESEA hearings concerning the importance of books, libraries and educational equipment in the education process.

The proposed budget would seem to indicate that these have now become low propriety items.

The testimony before an Appropriations Subcommittee on this cutback of library and equipment funds was weak, indeed. The gist of the Office of Education's reasoning was that since so much has already been accomplished under these programs, and since we have, what was termed a "very constrained budget," we could put these programs aside for a while. However, one administration witness went on to say that, "I would suspect, in subsequent years, we would come before you and reiterate the importance of using Federal resources to help purchase books, equip libraries, and provide equipment to the schools."

None of this makes sense to me. I believe that it is necessary to make specific appropriations for each of these programs or some—quite obviously, will be cut back entirely.

Financial jargon such as "a year of stringent budget" and "realigning of our priorities" and "constrained budget" is simply begging the question.

Many of HEW witnesses before the Appropriations Subcommittee are the same people who testified 4 years ago on the pressing need for greater Federal support for elementary and secondary programs, for college facilities and student aid, for expanded public libraries, for better vocational education programs.

If our educational needs were critical 4 years ago then they are no less critical today. I do not believe that the needs of our disadvantaged, handicapped, migrant, Indian and Spanish-speaking children, of our potential dropouts, of our potential college and vocational school students can be economized.

I vigorously support the amendment to appropriate \$50 million for title II of ESEA, the same amount appropriated last fiscal year; to appropriate \$78,740,000 for title III of the NDEA, a figure also equal to last year's funding level; to appropriate \$17 million for title V of

the NDEA; and to appropriate \$164,876,000 for title III of ESEA.

Aid to federally impacted school districts, the districts charged with educating the children of Armed Forces personnel and Federal employees, is still another program that must be adequately funded. Yet the legislation now before us seeks a fiscal 1970 appropriation of only \$202,167,000, a sum that would assist in the education of category "a" students, but that would wholly ignore category "b" students.

In enacting Public Law 874, the law authorizing financial assistance to impacted school systems, the Congress recognized its responsibility to help thousands of communities throughout the Nation.

These communities, faced with soaring school enrollment rates spurred by manpower buildups in the Armed Forces and the defense industry, are caught in a financial squeeze, of almost unprecedented severity.

Military personnel and defense workers are often transients living on Federal installations or in rented apartments, contributing very little to the tax base of a community. The school systems responsible for educating their children have drafted budgets and educational programs with the assumption that the Congress would honor its commitment under Public Law 874.

Major budget cuts in this program would create educational chaos in these school systems.

Chicopee, Mass., for example, is a city in my congressional district that must educate the children of personnel at nearby Westover Air Force Base. This community would be shortchanged by hundreds of thousands of dollars if category "b" is not funded. Other communities in my district would be similarly hard hit—Springfield, Ludlow, Wilbraham, the Hampden Wilbraham School District, Granby, South Hadley and Belchertown.

For the sake of these communities, and thousands more like them throughout the country, I urge adoption of the Joelson amendment proposing \$585 million for Public Law 874.

Several areas of post-secondary education have been subjected to the slash of the budget cutter's knife, areas where I do not believe we can afford to economize.

Vocational education has become increasingly more important in the past few years because the need for post-secondary education has become increasingly more important.

It is just as necessary to provide adequate vocational education to motivated students as it is to provide high quality, higher education for qualified students. Legislation enacted by the 88th Congress in 1963 provided a major thrust forward in achieving this goal. Efforts were reinforced by extensive amendments in 1968.

The Vocational Education Act and its amendments can accomplish little, however, if we fail to provide adequate funding. That is why Mr. JOELSON's proposed amendment would appropriate a sub-

stantial increase, for vocational education programs over last year's amount. Under the amendment \$488,716,000 would be available for vocational education in fiscal year 1970.

Another area in which we must maintain at least last year's level of funding is the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. The proposed budget calls for phasing out grants for the construction of undergraduate facilities, and would substitute instead, some \$11,750,000 for annual interest grants on construction loans obtained from private sources.

Building costs have been skyrocketing in the past few years—moving upward at a rate approaching 12 percent annually. Spiraling college enrollments make it undesirable at this time to consider the phasing out of this program. The proposed amendments would appropriate the amount of \$33 million for fiscal year 1970, the same amount appropriated last year.

One final program that would be strengthened by the amendment package is the NDEA student loan program.

The administration's budget seeks only \$161,900,000 for the loan program—\$31.5 million less than last year. The committee recommendation is that the program be increased to \$188.2 million for fiscal year 1970.

In any testimony or study I have ever read the NDEA student loan program has been lavishly praised particularly because it enabled many students to pursue their educations. The NDEA loan program is focused on the needy student, the one who would not be able to attend college without such assistance. And there are many such students.

The cost of higher education is putting college farther and farther out of the reach of increasing number of students. I do not believe that the existence of an insured loan program obviates the need for the NDEA student loan program. If anything, the tight money market and the reluctance of many banks and lending institutions to participate in the program dictate that we not only maintain the NDEA student loan program but that we expand it.

The Joelson amendment would appropriate \$229 million for fiscal year 1970—a modest increase.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that all of us are alarmed by the overheated economy and its inflationary trends. This necessitates a tightening of our belt.

Certainly we must scrutinize the budget very closely this year. We must eliminate waste and duplication. We must reconsider the expansion of existing programs and the initiation of new ones.

I would hope, however, certain fundamental goals are not subject to cutbacks. Educational excellence and opportunity are two such goals. We have undertaken to achieve these goals. We must not compromise them!

The Joelson amendments merely maintain our present effort in education. They would simply prevent us from backtracking. If we are to have the future scientists, educators, doctors, elected officials, trained technicians, and informed citizens, we must support our schools.

I strongly urge my colleagues to join

me in supporting the Joelson amendments.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOLAND. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I am disappointed in the action of the Appropriations Committee in dealing with certain areas of the budget for the Office of Education.

The committee's recommendations follow pretty much along the line of the revised budget of the Nixon administration.

But these recommendations, to my mind, ignore the facts of life with regard to the financing of many of our school systems today.

The details of school budgets are not new to me. I formerly served on the common council of my home city of Buffalo, N.Y., which handles the budget for the Buffalo school system.

Since I am particularly familiar with the current crisis in the Buffalo school budget and its relation to the current appropriation bill, I am going to use the Buffalo situation as my example.

Let me be specific:

On ESEA I, the committee has recommended \$3.8 million—about the same amount allocated in fiscal 1969. This is not nearly adequate for fiscal 1970. I believe the amount needs to be increased at least 7 percent just to cover the cost-of-living factor. If Buffalo is held to the fiscal 1969 allocation, it will mean that Buffalo will be forced to curtail programs for the disadvantaged and to cut or eliminate other programs. The costs of education are not static, they are increasing; it is essential that the Federal share be increased to at least maintain the status quo for our local school budgets.

On ESEA II, the proposed fiscal 1970 appropriation provides no funds and this will mean a loss of \$200,000 for library resources in the Buffalo school system. The effect of this cut is obvious.

On NDEA III, there is no allocation for fiscal 1970, which will mean a loss for the Buffalo system of about \$25,000 for instructional equipment and materials. Another backward step.

NDEA V-A also is not funded under the bill, which will mean a loss of about \$80,000 for the Buffalo system being used to improve guidance services. This is a program which we most certainly cannot afford to curtail.

ESEA III does receive certain funding in this bill, but it is our understanding that the amount is not adequate and probably will require curtailment of innovative programs.

The most serious budget setback for Buffalo and many, many other communities in the Nation is the slim budget allocated in this bill for impacted area aid.

The allocation of \$187 million is only about one-fourth of what is needed. The need is for \$650 million. If the proposed allocation in the bill is not increased, it will mean a loss of Buffalo's entire allocation of about \$160,000. Please note this is only six figures. Yet, to our school budget in Buffalo it is significant and will

produce a deficit in our current operating budget. Indeed, this is the only general Federal aid used as support for current operations.

Mr. Chairman, I hope sincerely that the House will increase these budget items for the Office of Education because of the vital importance to our individual communities which already are having severe budgetary problems.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to include the text of a statement which was made June 26 to the Senate Subcommittee on Education by Dr. Joseph Manch, Buffalo superintendent of schools, in testifying on public housing amendments to Public Law 874. While this is not directed specifically to the bill now before the House, it outlines the problems which our city is having in trying to meet the educational needs of our young people.

The statement by Dr. Joseph Manch, Buffalo, N.Y., superintendent of schools follows:

#### STATEMENT OF DR. JOSEPH MANCH

As Superintendent of schools in Buffalo, New York, I have long been interested in proposals to achieve equity in federal-state-local partnerships in financing large city schools. One major element of such a move toward equity is the recognition of federal impact in the large cities.

When Congress amended Federal Law 874 several years ago so that Buffalo's substantial numbers of federally connected children were to be recognized in the aid formula, a step toward justice was taken. The step was aborted, however, when Congress failed to underwrite the cost of the plan with the necessary appropriation.

The following two years the funds were made available and Buffalo received aid for those children whose parents served the federal government. Now I note with deep concern that the present budget stance in Congress would eliminate Buffalo and many other districts entirely from participating in PL 874 funds next year.

When in 1967, it was suggested that Federal school aid be paid on the basis of public housing in the large cities, I strongly supported such a move in testimony before this committee. Again in 1968 and still again early this year, I, along with our School Board President, confirmed this support in statements before the House Education Committee and the Big City Council of the National School Boards Association.

Let me recapitulate our position.

Low-rent public housing produces concentrations of socially and economically disadvantaged families whose children relate primarily to each other. The result is to reinforce the cycle of disadvantage and to add to the already costly problem of meeting the special educational needs of these children.

It is not yet possible to quantify the excess social and educational cost resulting from this advertency, using objective and conclusive data. If we judge the educationally disadvantaged child to be one who is academically retarded at least 1 year, however, then it can be estimated that the cost of erasing that disadvantage is at least the current average cost of a year's schooling—\$900 per pupil.

The Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority reported in September 1968 that federally-aided housing developments in Buffalo include 4,231 units occupied by families whose median income is \$2,628. The largest proportion of these families is on the welfare rolls, broken families outnumber standard families, and the proportion of non-white families is considerably greater than the citywide

average. Approximately 4,200 children of school age live in these housing units.

Ironically, as special educational needs are fostered and reinforced in a public housing situation, the means to a financial solution are simultaneously weakened. This results from the fact that such property is excluded from the tax rolls and the property tax is the mainstay of local revenue for both city and school purposes.

Federal payments for these properties in lieu of taxes amount to \$220,000, but none of this is available to the schools. If these federally-aided developments were subject to taxation, however, they would produce over \$1.1 million in property tax revenue.

In summary, the factors of added needs and reduced resources which I have just outlined mean an added cost burden of some \$1,000 per pupil. The federal government, through ESEA Title I, and New York State, through its special urban education aid, are at best supplying about \$200 towards financing this added cost.

It is recommended, therefore, that federal legislation be adopted to provide payments recognizing the federal impact on school financing that results from such public housing. In this respect, I would support Senate bill 2834 by Senator Javits or Senate bill 2147 by Senator Eagleton, with the single reservation that neither appears to provide sufficient funds to recognize equitably the federal responsibility in this matter.

For ease of data-gathering, a bill such as S. 2834 basing payments on housing units rather than pupils, would be more operable, although municipal housing authorities could be required to report data in either manner.

In any event, I would urge this committee to recommend and support legislation which would have the federal government assume its proper share of school support, particularly in this situation where federal responsibility is so clear.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in general debate I did not have time to go over some of the things contained in the package amendment. I would like to emphasize them at this time.

Also I would like to take this opportunity to concur in the very eloquent remarks of my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. BOLAND) because they absolutely square with the facts.

You will recall that this morning we sent out a letter fully supporting the package amendment, along with the major education, religious and labor organizations.

We recognize that the sums requested in the amendment do not fill the entire \$5 billion gap between the present authorizations and appropriations. However, the Joelson amendment will at least permit the continuation of ongoing programs and more adequate funding of others such as impacted aid, vocational education, and title I ESEA and NDEA student loans.

This letter, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, was signed by seven members of the Committee on Appropriations and most of the members of the Education and Labor Committee.

What I would like to do in the few minutes that I have is to stress something that I am terribly interested in. That is indeed a package, most of which receives widespread support throughout

the community among our schools and colleges.

**ESEA—TITLE I**

But I would like to speak for a minute on title I. In the ESEA Act Amendments of 1967, the Congress provided statewide programs for disadvantaged students should be 100 percent fully funded, even if the Congress failed to appropriate the full amounts authorized by the Congress.

Since we have not ever appropriated more than 40 percent of the funds authorized for title I of ESEA, each local educational agency, and that means the schools, has received a prorated share well below the authorized levels.

Yet, the statewide programs received full funding.

Because of the increase in number and size of these statewide programs, it is urgently necessary for the current fiscal year to provide \$80,800,000 in additional funds above the committee's bill simply to insure that each school district in the fiscal year 1970 receives a Federal payment at least as large as the payment received in previous years.

For example, in 1968 we provided \$210 for each disadvantaged pupil who qualified under the ESEA guidelines.

At the funded levels suggested by the administration and our subcommittee, we would be providing only \$170 for each pupil this year.

In short, at the funding level of this bill, we would be taking a giant step backward and at the same time that we are taking this backward step costs of education are increasing at the rate of at least 5 percent a year. As I told the committee and as I said during general debate, in my own congressional district we are in a terrible condition.

We cannot even pass a school bond issue or raise. People talk about Federal aid to education. Where are we going to get the money? Sixty percent of the children in the Oakland school system are blacks, and we cannot get local government to support the kind of finances that are required to maintain the standards of our public schools. What ESEA is all about is to help disadvantaged students and to help the schools in districts serving these students. Many of these school districts exist throughout this country. In 3 short years education costs have escalated over 15 percent. It is for this reason that, under the suggestion of the committee, we would be moving still further to the rear.

It is for these reasons of attempting to maintain current funding for the local schools to meet the problems of increasing educational costs that we felt it necessary to appropriate and to include more than \$180 million additional funds for programs to serve the educationally disadvantaged kids.

**HIGHER EDUCATION**

On higher education—and I come from a community with a great university, the University of California at Berkeley—two major schemes which provide Federal assistance to our colleges and universities are not working under current conditions. We recently created a new program of interest subsidies for construction of university facilities. Under

this program colleges and universities are allowed to borrow money at commercial rates and then to seek reimbursement from the Federal Government for their interest payments. The trouble is that in 15 or 20 States public educational institutions cannot borrow money at the commercial market rate. These institutions need direct Federal grants for construction.

For these and many, many more reasons I strongly urge the defeat of the Michel substitute and the adoption of the Joelson package amendment.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROBISON TO THE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MICHEL

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBISON of New York to the substitute amendment offered by Mr. MICHEL of Illinois:

"Strike the figure \$254,163,000 and substitute in lieu thereof the figure \$364,616,000, and strike the figure \$200,163,000 and substitute in lieu thereof the figure \$310,616,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate having some order, if I could, because the situation already is confused enough without it becoming further confusing by virtue of the fact that Members cannot hear me.

What my amendment to the Michel substitute would do would be best understood by you if you would all turn to page 25 of the bill, which language has not been changed by the Michel substitute, and if you will then read on page 25 of the bill down to line 13 thereof, you will find the figure \$254,163,000. My amendment to the Michel substitute would increase that figure by \$110,453,000.

Then, on line 14 of the same page you will also find the second figure of \$200,163,000. My amendment would also increase that by the same \$110,453,000, making that figure \$310,616,000.

Precisely what does this do? What this amendment to the substitute would do would be to raise to fiscal 1969 levels the appropriated funds for the four programs shown and lumped together by the committee in the bottom paragraph on page 32 of the report where the committee refers to them as being: first, supplementary educational services; second, library resources; third, guidance counseling, and testing; and fourth, equipment and minor remodeling.

The bill, as the committee report states, includes \$200,163,000 for this purpose—or these purposes—compared with the budget request of \$116,163,000. But what the report does not tell you is that the committee figure is still \$110,453,000 below the funds appropriated for these purposes in 1969.

Mr. Chairman, what my amendment to the Michel substitute would do, then, would be to bring the moneys to be appropriated for these four valuable, necessary and ongoing education programs up to the same appropriation levels they had in fiscal year 1969, just concluded.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier today, I am not an admirer of the impacted aid program, particularly section 3(b) thereof. But it is as evident to me, as it is to everyone here, that the amount the subcommittee recommended for impacted aid is going to be substantially increased, either to the Michel figure or that proposed in the Joelson package.

And if it is, Mr. Chairman, then it is my position that these four programs that I have just mentioned, programs that have demonstrated their value—and the continuing need for which is apparent—if the impacted aid program is to go forward full speed, ought to go forward at full speed as well.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman for his amendment. I have serious misgivings about the Michel substitute amendment and the original Joelson amendment as well, but if the Michel substitute is to be adopted, clearly these four titles deserve to have increases in money available also.

I support the Robison amendment and congratulate the gentleman for having offered it.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Chairman, earlier this year, Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of the Cleveland public schools, told the House Education and Labor Committee that the major problems in urban living as they relate to education are isolation, poverty, unemployment, and drabness.

With a school enrollment of 153,000 children, Cleveland contains only 7 percent of the total school population in Ohio. However, Cleveland schools enroll 30 percent of the total number of children in Ohio who receive public assistance. The demands on the city, therefore, to provide even greater educational opportunities for their young people are tremendous. The city of Cleveland has recognized this challenge and has embarked on a series of innovative and effective programs to broaden the educational experience of its pupils. In their efforts, the city has utilized Federal funds for a wide variety of elementary and secondary education programs. In fiscal year 1969, the city's budget reached \$5.5 million for just title I programs from the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is well known that Cleveland is heavily dependent on Federal financial assistance to meet its critical program needs and I intend to do all I can to see that these requirements are met. Cleveland schoolchildren have benefited from a vast array of federally sponsored programs. If approved by the other body, authorized impacted aid funds will benefit over 15,000 Cleveland children alone who reside in low-income housing and attend public schools in Cleveland. In addition, thousands of youngsters have profited from special instruction at supple-

mentary educational centers, from up-to-date library books and materials, guidance counseling, and new educational equipment. The excitement of learning has been a wonderful experience for the thousands of disadvantaged children who have participated in these programs and the wonders of knowledge continue to offer unlimited possibilities for the undereducated.

I speak specifically of these programs only to emphasize their tremendous importance and to alert my colleagues to the danger of their impending demise.

The administration, in an effort to reduce its educational costs, excluded funds for school library materials or equipment for elementary and secondary schools. Neither did it request any money for counseling and services. It appears that little thought was given to the value of these programs when budget priorities were made because if any consideration had been given to the obvious educational advantages derived from these services, the full amount authorized by the Congress would have been requested. In an attempt to do justice to these vital programs, I recently joined with several other Members in urging the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations to restore the educational and library budgets to their fiscal year 1968 level. Although sympathetic, the committee chose to include in one sum the funds for these three programs together with funds for supplementary educational centers. The bill thus provides for \$200,163,000 to be appropriated for this purpose, an increase of approximately \$84,000,000 from the administration's request for supplementary centers. While this action was certainly a major step forward, it is not, in my opinion, the most desirable method of funding these programs. Under the "package" amendment, however, offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey, these programs would be funded separately and at a higher level than presently provided in the bill. The Joelson amendment restores these programs to their fiscal year 1969 levels and appropriates \$50 million for school libraries under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; \$78,740,000 for equipment under title III of the National Defense Education Act; \$17 million for guidance and counseling services under title V of the National Defense Education Act; and \$164,876,000 for supplementary educational centers under title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In each instance the needs are even greater than provided for by this amendment. It is evident that the continuation of services is absolutely essential to those institutions which currently have operating programs, but it is of the utmost importance to stress the need for these services at schools which have felt the Federal financial pinch and have not yet been able to participate.

Education is the most precious opportunity we can provide to our young people and it is vital that we continue to advance the progress we have made thus far. This is why it is positively crucial for the Joelson amendment to pass. We

recognized the pressing responsibility we had to our young people when we authorized almost \$5 billion more for education than what is called for in House Resolution 13111. The Joelson amendment is the very least that we can do for our constituents since its primary purpose is to insure that certain programs receive the same amount of money this year as last. In five areas, it simply keeps programs at their fiscal year 1969 level. In the areas of impacted aid, the Joelson amendment provides for 90 percent of the money originally authorized by the Congress. I have already mentioned the more than 15,000 Cleveland children who benefit from these funds. Close to \$3 million has been authorized by this body to meet the needs of these Cleveland pupils and the failure to appropriate the necessary funds for this program would severely reduce the number of children who stand to benefit from it. We must not allow aid to impacted areas to be cut back. We must not permit the program to be crippled. Instead, we must give it our resounding support.

Our efforts should not be limited to the programs I have described. Our losses to our young people and ultimately to our Nation, would be considerable if the Joelson amendment is not approved in its entirety. We must recognize the consequences that would be inevitable should this amendment fail. The progress that has been made on local, State, and Federal levels because of these programs would be halted. When children have had a taste of the wonders of learning, we cannot destroy their desire for more. We must nourish it.

This year I have received an unusual large number of letters and telegrams from educators in Ohio. The tenor of these messages is the same throughout—deep concern that vital educational programs will be crippled by the Congress. I have heard from elementary and high school teachers, college professors, librarians, guidance counselors, and vocational educational instructors as well as the students themselves. Everyone is frightened that all the good work we have accomplished will be undone. This apprehension is easy to appreciate because it unfortunately is too realistic a possibility.

In addition to these programs, there are other valuable programs that deserve special mention. The Joelson amendment seeks to implement those portions of the 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act which call for occupational training programs for the disadvantaged, and funds for vocational educational research. The necessity for effective occupational training opportunities has become increasingly apparent in recent years and last year's act was written in response to the growing awareness of the importance of vocational training in our society. We cannot now fail to fulfill those amendments which we so enthusiastically approved 1 year ago.

The student loan program under the National Defense Education Act has enabled millions of people to obtain a college education. Students at all levels from high school graduate to Ph. D. candidates are eligible for long term, low interest loans approved directly by their colleges.

The rapid rise in interest rates has seriously reduced the availability of guaranteed loans and has made it absolutely imperative for additional funds to be made available for direct student loans. The \$229 million figure in the Joelson amendment will permit many students to continue their college education and will also enable freshmen in financial need to participate in the program. Many of the young people who have worked for me have been able to attend college only because they had NDEA loans. There is no question that this program, particularly this year, must be expanded to meet the swelling enrollments of our colleges and universities.

Elementary and secondary schools, vocational institutions, colleges and universities in Cleveland and all around the Nation will be watching closely today to see what the House of Representatives does regarding educational funds. Cleveland has an urgent need for all the programs I have described. To combat the problems of isolation, poverty, and unemployment it is incumbent that we endorse the entire package amendment, not just segments of it. I urge the Members to give this amendment their unqualified support.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. His amendment would add nearly \$900 million for vitally needed educational programs.

It is disheartening for me to think that while we are spending \$20 to \$30 billion a year in Vietnam, billions more in space, and untold millions in such widely diverse projects as research in chemical warfare and new weapons systems, we seem not to be able to afford the paltry sum of \$900 million for the education of our children.

The glaring need for a reordering of our Nation's priorities has never been in more evidence than it is today when one looks at the figures in H.R. 13111. I submit to my colleagues that there is no greater need, no more fruitful an endeavor, no more necessary a task, than the continuing upgrading of the educational systems that are made available to our Nation's youth.

I urge all of my colleagues to consider this amendment in the light of what it can realize for tomorrow. For it has been said that "the youth of a nation are the trustees of posterity." Let us not play partisan politics with the best hopes for our country and the world.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBISON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) and commend him for giving the Members opportunity to register their support for these vital programs. I must confess, however, serious reservations about both the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and the substitute of the gen-

tleman from Illinois. The former provides for an increase in Office of Education programs of \$894.5 million over the amount provided for in H.R. 13111—Labor-HEW appropriations for fiscal year 1970. This amendment provides for the above increase in a package which covers nine major areas of education appropriations. The Michel substitute increases the impact funds to last year's appropriation level.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question but that all of us here are vitally concerned that the best possible education be provided for our Nation's schoolchildren and that the Congress do all in its power to provide the financial assistance to our State and local education agencies which is necessary to make this education available. At this particular time, however, the Congress also has a solemn obligation to the citizens of this Nation to bring about a reversal of the inflation which is so rapidly reducing the purchasing power of their dollars. Not only is inflation the cruelest tax of all upon our citizens' hard-earned incomes, but it substantially increases the costs of such vital programs as those education programs we are considering in the Congress today.

Thus the task before us now is to find a way to fulfill our obligations both toward the educational needs of our schoolchildren and toward the fiscal responsibility which is absolutely essential in order to control inflation. This obviously poses a difficult problem and one which, in my judgment, cannot be solved by attempting to meet our responsibilities to education on a combination, or package, basis.

Included in the package amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey are funds for ESEA title I for the education of children of low-income families; impacted area aid; vocational education; NDE student loans; supplementary centers; guidance and counseling; library resources; equipment; and college construction. Because many of us do not see equal merit in each of these appropriation areas and because of the obligation to fiscal responsibility referred to above, it seems to me that we ought to deal with these appropriations on a more selective basis.

In specific reference to some of the education programs included in Mr. JOELSON's amendment, I would fully support increased appropriation requests for such vital programs as vocational education, NDEA student loans, funds for title I of ESEA, and library funds.

Vocational education programs have always received my full support in the belief that they are a vital answer to our Nation's crucial problems of unemployment and poverty. Increased funds over the amount provided for in H.R. 13111 are particularly essential at this point to implement the 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments, including those important provisions which call for occupational training programs for the disadvantaged.

In enacting title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the Congress similarly sought to meet these problems by providing financial assistance to local educational agencies for the education of disadvantaged children.

The provision of additional funds for this program would not only improve the quality of instruction for participating students, but would allow the expansion of the program to include more needy children. It is my understanding, however, that even with the additional funds provided for in Mr. JOELSON's amendment the program will still be underfunded by as much as 60 percent.

The NDEA student loan programs have enabled countless students, who would not otherwise be able to do so, to complete their college educations. With the ever-increasing costs of higher education, together with the rapid rise in interest rates on loans, more Federal funds must indeed be made available to insure the successful continuation of this important program.

Compared with the above important programs, however, an increase in appropriations over that provided for in H.R. 13111 for impacted area aid cannot in my judgment be justified in the face of our current fiscal problems. In many cases the school systems benefiting from impacted area aid are already receiving taxes from those Federal employee families which enable them to qualify for the aid. As a result of this program many taxpayers in other places are being required to pay for the education of both their own schoolchildren and those children being schooled in Federal impacted areas.

In reiterating the need to carefully consider all these appropriations in the light of our responsibility to control inflation, I would like to close by calling attention to the President's recent call for congressional support in his efforts toward greater fiscal responsibility at the Federal level. In signing the Second Supplemental Appropriations Act for 1969 on July 22, the President directed the executive departments and agencies to make further spending reductions of \$3.5 billion in order to conform to the expenditure ceiling established in that act. The ceiling of \$191.9 billion on spending for fiscal year 1970 is \$1 billion below the President's expenditure recommendations of last April. In the President's words, however—

The new ceiling will be of little help in keeping federal spending under control—if the Congress that imposed it does not cooperate actively with the Administration in meeting it.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF IOWA TO THE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Iowa to the amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 2 line 26 delete all beginning with "\$33,000,000" in line 26 on page 2 through line 4 on page 3, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$87,000,000 shall be for grants for construction of other academic facilities under title I of the Higher Educational Facilities Act of 1963 which amounts shall remain available through June 30, 1971, \$20,000,000 to remain available until expended shall be for grants for construction of graduate academic facilities under title II of the Act, \$3,920,000 to remain available until expended shall be for annual interest grants

under section 306 of that Act \$229,100,000 shall be for Federal capital contributions to student loan funds."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the JOELSON amendment is very unfair to higher education. The increases for higher education facilities in the JOELSON amendment are very negligible as compared to what they should be.

The big bulge in the student load in this country is not in the elementary grades. It is in the colleges. That big bulge in elementary grades has passed. We did not do enough during those years, but those children did not stay that age. They moved on and are now in college or soon will be. Between now and 1975, we will have a 50-percent increase in the need for college facilities. It is not the elementary students where we are going to have the bulge. It is the college level.

This JOELSON amendment has a mere \$33 million in it for college facilities. That is only what was provided last year, and last year it was reduced drastically, because some money was shifted over to some other categories and because of the Expenditure Control Act. A very minimum amount needed is \$107 million. That was the amount that was in the JOHNSON budget. This is a piker amendment as far as colleges are concerned. They are shifting from funds needed for the college level and putting it in other categories.

In addition to that, on the student loans, the very minimum needed is \$229 million in the student loan fund. We have considerable evidence that the Department was very wrong on the amount of loan funds needed, but since that time we find there is even more need than was assumed at the time these hearings were closed, and we marked up this bill.

So I have added some money for student loans in this amendment.

Another thing we talked about is the interest subsidy. I agree with what the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN), said about this interest subsidy program. Some of the institutions cannot use it at all, but it is going to cost three times as much to go the interest subsidy route as it would under my amendment. The \$7 million in here for interest subsidy is going to cost this Government \$300 million over a period of years, and it will not do them as much good as the \$107 million I have put into this amendment.

I suggest that the priorities on higher education are very much out of kilter in the JOELSON amendment. I urge the adoption of this amendment to the JOELSON amendment.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I agree with the gentleman. My recommendations for higher education, for construction and for the NDEA student loans are very meager. That is why I cannot understand why the gentleman is supporting the bill, which has nothing. At least, meager as my amendments are, they are more than is in the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The gentleman is

very much in error. The bill provides \$188 million for student loans and we increased the budget on that item and I made it clear in the full committee and everywhere else that I am for more money in these two categories and I am very disappointed that the gentleman would let these other people run away with money needed for higher education.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Do I correctly understand that the gentleman's amendment does not affect adversely any increases in the Joelson amendment for elementary and secondary education?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. It deals only with college facilities and student aid in the form of loans.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman would increase only the higher education features, and the amendment does not affect adversely the Joelson amendment in the other features.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. There is one additional feature. It takes out the authorization for additional interest subsidy contracts which would cost \$300 million, and the colleges and universities cannot use it as well as \$107 million in grants and loans.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I want to commend the gentleman for his amendment, which I believe is urgently needed by higher education in connection with this bill. I support his amendment and support the Joelson amendment once this amendment has been added to it.

Mr. Chairman, news in this morning's newspapers of a \$3 billion surplus in the past fiscal year reinforces my conviction that we can afford to give education a higher priority than it has been given in the appropriation bill now being considered.

The dollar amounts carried in this bill approximate 1½ percent of our Federal budget.

That percentage should be doubled by this Congress, and we should be allocating at least 5 percent of our Federal budget to education within the next 3 years.

We should also provide advance funding to eliminate the uncertainties that continue to hamstring orderly administering of Federal aid programs in our schools.

I will support the efforts of Chairman PERKINS of the House Committee on Education and Labor to secure full funding of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and will vote for the so-called Joelson amendments to provide full funding of the impacted districts and to supplement budgeted funds for higher education, vocational education, library services, and other ESEA programs.

In my judgment, it will be pennywise and pound-foolish economy of the worst kind to cut back on our student loan and scholarship assistance programs at this time, particularly in view of the encouragement we have been giving low-

income youth to continue education after high school.

The need for a higher level of funding for construction assistance to college and to vocational and technical schools have never been greater, and are compounded by today's high interest rates.

The most compelling need of all, I believe, is found in the elementary and secondary schools of the country, where we have begun to open the doors of full educational opportunity to millions of children living in lower income areas of the Nation—and must increase our efforts, rather than cut them back at this time.

Let me call your attention to some of the views of educators and school leaders in my own State of Oklahoma:

Here in summary, are the views of some Oklahoma educators on the critical issue of Federal funding before us today:

L. R. Harrington, Rogers County Superintendent of Schools—Title II ESEA: "A cut back here would drastically reverse what we have been programming for the future for girls and boys of this county . . . These funds are vital to the educational need of the schools in Rogers County. Whenever a good thing is removed from our schools, the girls and boys are the ones that really get hurt."

James E. Sooter, Coordinator, Vinita City Schools—Title II ESEA and Title III NDEA: "The acquisition of these instructional aids have enriched and upgraded our curricula offerings. It is my opinion that these programs are vital to educational needs in our Oklahoma schools. Education has many problems and retrenchment is not the solution to any of them."

B. J. Traw, Superintendent of Vian Public Schools: "Without Federal Aid it would be impossible to operate the Vian Public School."

Mrs. Billy M. Douthitt, Librarian, Picher Public Schools—"Our town is a former mining town on Indian land, and our school funds are very inadequate. In 1964, our school library was very poor with outdated books. After these years of Title II, there has been noticeable improvement."

Cliff Hudgins, Superintendent, Stilwell Public Schools—P.L. 874: "It would be hard for me to list all of the industries which the Federal Government is subsidizing. But tell me truthfully is there any of these any more important than the education of the youth of our nation?"

Frank Beck, Jr., Principal, Porter Public Schools: "A dollar spent for guidance and counseling services now will later save many dollars in institutional care."

Mrs. Lela Parkhurst, Counselor, Vinita High School: "If the gains that have been realized the past years are going to be pushed aside in this sweeping economy move, I wonder where we are placing our values."

Harold W. Jones, Principal, Picher Elementary School—Title II, III, V: "These agencies, since they were started . . . have done more for Picher Schools in 4 years than has been done in all the other 33 years that I have been in the system . . . Through funds furnished by these agencies we now have a central library . . . a science and mathematics room with a qualified teacher, a reading laboratory for grades 1, 2, and 3, playground equipment, a small gymnasium and a testing program. We have also received help through Title I, to feed the 30% of our students who eat free in the school cafeteria. The money that we have received has been spent wisely, with the thought in mind of getting those items which would help the largest number of children for the longest period of time."

Robert O. Williams, County Superintendent,

ent, Mayes County—Title II, III, and V: "The elimination of these Federally financed education programs would . . . be a great loss to our schools. I feel these Federal programs are vital to the educational needs in our Oklahoma schools."

C. T. Mustain, Superintendent, Commerce Public Schools: "Some cuts may be mandatory for sound fiscal responsibility but surely education needs more, not less help."

D. D. Creech, Oklahoma State Superintendent of Schools: "Reductions . . . would be fatal for the education programs in some of these school districts . . . the State Department of Education . . . couldn't possibly absorb this kind of a reduction in funds without a critical curtailment of services and personnel."

Marvin B. Traw, Superintendent, Westville Public Schools: "With Title III funds we have been able by matching these funds to purchase much needed equipment and supplies in the areas of math, science, English, reading, history, civics, and geography. . . . With Title V funds we have provided a testing program for every junior high and senior high student . . . to provide counseling services . . . Title II . . . funds . . . we have been able to raise the quality of instruction and the standard of our schools with the use of better and more up-to-date instructional materials. Many of our students are from low income families. Few students have access to good books other than through our school library . . . We have endeavored to use these funds to the best advantage of all our students."

W. Leslie Wald, Coordinator of Mathematics, Muskogee City Schools—Title II and III: "We are not a rich district and the withdrawal of these funds would place a great hardship upon the district and will deprive children of the poor district . . . of many of the instructional and supplemental materials needed to give them a well-rounded up-to-date education."

Claude Eubanks, Superintendent of Roland Public Schools: "I am very much against the proposed cuts to three of our Federal School Programs—Title II ESEA, Title III NDEA, and Title V NDEA. We are struggling now! We don't necessarily need more federal programs . . . We simply need 100% funding of the programs we do have."

William T. McCarty, Superintendent, Eufaula Public Schools—P.L. 874: "It is the feeling of those of us in the impacted areas that this just cannot be allowed to happen. Any of these proposed changes would drastically affect our school district. It is extremely urgent as far as we are concerned that P.L. 874 be left as is."

Sister Ann Rosera, Muskogee Christian Learning Center—Title II: "Financially our school cannot afford to provide its own library resources. We need the help of Title II, ESEA. Since Title II started our help from the government has decreased yearly instead of being increased and now there is the possibility that it will be cut out all together. We definitely need an increase in the help of the government rather than no help at all as is being proposed."

Sister Bridget Anne Parisi, Principal, Muskogee Christian Learning Center—Title II: "Since the initiation of this funding by the Federal Government, our students have been able to utilize twice the amount of library materials previous to its instigation. It greatly concerns me that this service is in danger of being terminated."

Resolution of the Board of Regents for the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical Colleges: ". . . the delay in implementing Phase II in the College Program for the State will result in increasing cost and the denial of opportunities for college education to many Oklahoma citizens."

Robert B. Kamm, President, Oklahoma State University: ". . . if Federal funds are not available, Phase II of the College Pro-

gram for the State of Oklahoma will be seriously curtailed."

The University of Oklahoma Regents: "The people of Oklahoma have extended themselves to a maximum in their efforts to borrow against anticipated sources of revenue to meet the needs of a rapidly escalating enrollment . . . To accomplish this proposed building program it will be necessary for the University of Oklahoma to have access to federal funds to supplement the anticipated allocations from the recent state bond issue and gifts from private individuals and corporations."

Irvin Hopson, Director of Financial Aid, Panhandle State College: "You have urged us to seek out the economically handicapped student with talent and to assure him that if he wanted to go to college he could get financial help from his government. We have done so and now that we have him planning to come to college we get a notification from HEW cutting our NDEA allocation 31% from what it was last year. What do we tell the student?"

Joe McCormick, Head Student Financial Aid, Oklahoma State Tech: "Oklahoma State Tech provides very needed opportunities to the youth of Oklahoma and the nation in the field of technical and vocational education. Student Financial Aid can play a very important role in providing such opportunities to the disadvantaged youth of Oklahoma. To accept reductions in our financial aid program now would be very disturbing not only to me but to many Oklahoma students that could be helped."

Gary L. White, Assistant Director for Student Loans, Oklahoma State University: "We have been encouraged . . . to seek out the student from the low-income areas of Oklahoma, and urge him to attend college through the benefits of the federally funded programs. If the anticipated level of funding for next year is to be a reality, we will have to turn away many of these people that we have urged to attend college."

Mr. Chairman, these are only a few of the many, many views I have heard in recent weeks, as the time for debate on this bill drew near.

I have talked to one school superintendent in Oklahoma who tells me his school term will be cut by more than a month, if we do not restore the cuts in education funds that are contained in this bill.

Another superintendent has told me his school year will be shortened by nearly 2 months, if the cuts are not restored.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure this is a story that could be told in many parts of the country.

We cannot afford the kind of economy that is recommended in this bill.

The Nation cannot afford it.

Future generations cannot afford it.

We must restore the funds that assure to education the priority our children deserve.

I urge all Members to vote accordingly.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. In summary, Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add about \$114 million this year but save \$300 million over a period of years.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. JOELSON. I believe it is a good amendment. I would be happy, if I had the power, to accept it.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I am always glad to have the gentleman's support.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to say to the gentleman I did not have an opportunity to complete my remarks on higher education, but they concur perfectly with what the gentleman has said.

I want to explain that the package amendment proposed was done in consultation, trying to win agreement. So far as my personal feelings are concerned, they are exactly the same as those of the gentleman, and I personally will support his amendment.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, sitting and listening to the various amendments and substitutes which have been offered, and listening to the arguments made in behalf of the various substitutes and amendments, I believe the only responsible amendment or substitute to be approved here today or tomorrow is the amendment or the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

I must say that I am almost overwhelmed by the inconsistency of some of the actions taken and statements made here today in light of what was done within the last month or so by some Members of this body.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, a good friend of mine, a fine Member of this body, urged every Member here today to stand up and be counted to vote for more money. I did not hear anybody—in the main those who are urging that we spend more money—telling people to stand up and be counted to provide more tax money to pay the bills.

It is about time we get a little consistent around here.

Now we are even faced with another situation—and I am for it—which is the requirement for a tax reform bill. That will be on the floor of the House next week, and I am for that. At least with such legislation on the agenda and hopefully approved we can count on support for the surtax.

However, some of you are here today urging that we spend on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey \$580 million more than the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). Most of you who are urging that an additional \$600 million be spent are the ones who are fighting or have fought any increases in taxes to pay the bill. It is about time you be a little consistent. Let me add this—

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to.

Mr. ALBERT. Did I understand the distinguished gentleman from Illinois who offered this amendment to indicate that the impacted area money would be a bonanza? Is that not what he said in general debate? And if he did, is this amendment being offered to promote impacted area aid or to circumvent the Joelson amendment?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I think it is being used as a practical solution to the problem of 385 Members who have impacted area aid programs in their districts to get them to be reasonable and rational in the consideration of our Federal fiscal problems.

Now let me go on to one further thing and then I will close. I would like to ask some of the Members around here a question. On July 9 the House approved a \$191 billion limitation on expenditures for the current fiscal year. As far as I know, there was no vote in opposition to that or certainly no recorded vote in opposition to it. There were few voices raised in opposition to it on that date. Now some of you are wanting on this occasion, through the Joelson amendment, to add \$580 million that was not budgeted and which in effect would not be included within the limitation of \$191 billion. Talk about standing up. Did you mean what you said on July 9 in that limitation? Are you not going to provide any money in necessary taxes to pay the bills? I think you ought to be consistent, I think you ought to be rational, and I think you ought to be constructive. To take this kind of action on the Joelson amendment today or tomorrow or whenever you do it I think would be irrational, confusing, and inconsistent. I just hope that a majority of the Members of this body will be practical enough and constructive enough and consistent enough to support the Michel amendment and beat everything else. That is the proper way to do it.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind the gentleman that on the supplemental appropriation this one member of the Committee on Appropriations took vigorous exception to the ceiling. It was voted on by a voice vote there. We even went further than that and offered a substitute to that which would include the Department of Defense in any ceilings that were set.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Did the gentleman from California try to get a roll-call vote?

Mr. COHELAN. I certainly did.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. The gentleman could have. There was no problem about it.

Mr. COHELAN. We had great difficulty. The gentleman is quite aware of it. However, the record stands for itself. I am trying to say that I have been getting a whale of a record here this afternoon of people talking about what is controlled and what is not controlled. That is exactly why I am voting for this.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I think some clarification of the situation is in order.

The Committee on Appropriations recognized that there would probably be additional funds provided for impacted aid. We granted the budget estimate, but we decided that the House itself would want to work its will on the impacted

aid issue. So, we reported the full amount of the estimate.

Now, in the substitute which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), it is provided that we increase the budget estimate for impacted aid by \$319 million, making the total about one-half billion dollars—about \$521 million. That is the situation on impacted aid funds.

I have always supported impacted aid funds, as many of you have. I recognize that the program has many deficiencies, but there does not seem to be any practical way to cope with it other than by changing the existing legislation. So, I shall vote for the Michel substitute and the additional \$319 million.

Now, the Michel substitute does something else. It adopts the committee recommendation to go above the budget in the sum of \$84 million to meet a need about which many of you have heard. That is the \$84 million which would go for library resources, for guidance counseling and testing, for equipment and minor remodeling, and for supplementary educational services.

These additional funds should make this bill acceptable. The grand total of the bill as submitted to the House is \$156 million above the budget requests. With the Michel substitute it would be nearly one-half billion dollars above the budget.

We have been talking about not raising taxes. We have not been talking about increasing expenditures, but about expenditure limitations. This package, it seems to me, is as far as we should consider going under all the circumstances.

I hope no one will be stampeded by the thought that the decision on the Michel substitute will foreclose any attempt that may be made to provide additional funds for education. We are talking here only about pages 25 and 26 which include about \$1 billion. We are not talking about page 27 which has \$95 million for the Education Professions Development Act and which will be subject to amendment.

We are not talking about the \$22 million for the Teacher Corps which will be subject to amendment.

We are not talking about higher education. That item still remains to be considered and amendments will be in order when we get to that paragraph.

Vocational education is not involved here. We can also work our will on that at the appropriate time.

Mr. Chairman, I would earnestly hope and trust that we can vote down the additional amendments which would add still another one-half billion dollars above the budget, in view of the fact that there are limitations to the resources which are available.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Yes, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I would raise the point, however, that those four titles and the paragraph that is being amended by both the Joelson and Michel amendments, that if the Michel amendment is adopted then the Committee would not

have an opportunity to raise the figures for equipment, library resources, guidance, and counseling. Therefore, the Robison amendment will be necessary to add to the Michel amendment.

Mr. MAHON. That is another angle, of course. If you want to vote for more for these purposes then, of course, you have the opportunity in the Robison amendment.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. The gentleman from Texas read off a whole series of things that are yet to come up which could be raised. Is the gentleman implying that he is going to support some increases in appropriations for any or all of those items?

Mr. MAHON. I am going to stoutly resist any such additions to the bill. This bill includes more than \$16 billion and I think adding one-half billion dollars above the budget is certainly far enough to go.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

(On request of Mr. FLOOD, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MAHON was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. COLMER).

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very intently, as one of those who are interested in the impacted areas, as some 380-odd Members, according to the statement of the gentleman from Illinois are interested.

The thing that impressed me about all of this debate and on the amendments, and particularly the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), is that I am reminded of the old Aesop fable about the dog that was crossing a bridge and had a bone in his mouth, and he saw an image in the water below the bridge of a bigger bone down there, and dropped the one that he had in his mouth in order to get the miraged one. Thus he lost the bone he had.

It seems to me that those who are interested in the impacted areas should vote down the Joelson amendment and then approach these other matters as they come up. Let us not lose the real bone in an effort to achieve the miraged unrealistic larger one.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has again expired.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be reserved by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mrs. MINK. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the pending amendments and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 204, noes 76.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will now proceed to note the names of Members who desire to participate in the debate under the 1-hour limitation of time.

Members who wish to participate in debate will please remain standing until their names are noted and will other Members who do not plan to participate in debate please be seated.

The Chair will note the names of Members standing.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. Evidently a quorum is present.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the order limiting debate to 1 hour be vacated.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. ARENDS. I object.

## MOTION OFFERED BY MR. FLOOD

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the order to limit debate to 1 hour be vacated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to vacate the order.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present. I would like to have a count on it.

The CHAIRMAN. It is evident to the Chair that more than 100 Members are present and the Chair will not count. A quorum is present.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my demand for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may do so only by unanimous consent.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the request for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GERALD R. FORD)?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. FLOOD and Mr. GERALD R. FORD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 70.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on pending amendments and amendments

thereto terminate in 2 hours, the last 5 minutes to be reserved to the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I submit there are so many Members here who in good faith want to speak 5 minutes or so against this, that we should not be deprived of that opportunity. If there are no more than 40 Members who want to speak, perhaps we could do that, but if there is a move to take all the time, then I think we ought not to agree to that request. I just think we ought to find out how many Members would like to speak on this title of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state there are approximately 72 names at this time on the list.

Mr. PERKINS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I will have to object.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I be heard?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for 2 hours. That is a long time.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would ask the gentleman to make this request tomorrow. There may not be as many people who want to speak tomorrow. For instance, I have a very burning desire to make a speech tonight about consistency, and I may not have such a strong desire tomorrow. I know there may be some other Members who will feel about it in the same way.

I think if the gentleman would make his request tomorrow, we might be able to get it limited to 2 hours, or maybe less. No one knows how many will want to speak tomorrow.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 13111) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks in the general debate on this bill (H.R. 13111).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### CHANGE OF LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise the House that tomorrow the bill H.R. 13080, the extension of surcharge withholding tax rates for 15 days, will be taken up as the first order of business, under a closed rule with 1 hour of debate.

#### TECHNICAL CORRECTION OF MICHEL SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I offered as a substitute for the Joelson amendment be technically corrected to read:

Amendment by Mr. MICHEL, offered as a substitute for the amendment proposed by Mr. JOELSON: On page 25, strike out line 9 and all that follows through line 22 on page 26 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For carrying out titles II, III, V, VII, and section 807 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended, section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, and title III-A and V-A of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, \$254,163,000; of which \$200,163,000 shall be for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials under title II and supplementary educational centers and services under title III of said Act of 1965 and for equipment and minor remodeling and State administrative services under title III-A and guidance, counseling, and testing under title V-A of said Act of 1958, to be distributed in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and \$29,750,000 shall be for strengthening State departments of education under title V of said Act of 1965.

"For an additional amount for grants under title I-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for the fiscal year 1970, \$205,360,700: Provided, That the aggregate amounts otherwise available for grants therefor within States shall not be less than 92 per centum of the amounts allocated from the fiscal year 1968 appropriation to local educational agencies in such States for grants.

#### "SCHOOL ASSISTANCE IN FEDERALLY AFFECTED AREAS

"For carrying out title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. ch. 13), and the Act of September 23, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 19), \$521,067,000 of which \$505,900,000 shall be for the maintenance and operation of schools as authorized by said title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended, and \$15,167,000 which shall remain available until expended, shall be for providing school facilities as authorized by said Act of September 23, 1950."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### LEGITIMATE FOUNDATION ACTIVITIES ARE BEING WRONGFULLY ATTACKED

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 min-

ute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the time is fast approaching for a showdown on the tax reform bill to be soon reported out by the Committee on Ways and Means. Most of the measures forthcoming from that able and hard-working committee I will wholeheartedly support. The reforms are long overdue and correct many of the inequities in our tax system.

However, I oppose certain of the recent decisions made by the committee with respect to the tax treatment of private foundations. I understand there may be additional revisions made by the committee but at this time, I am opposed to:

First. The decision to place a tax on the investment income of private foundations;

Second. The decision to prohibit a private foundation from providing funds for vote registration drives;

Third. The decision to prohibit a private foundation from engaging, directly or indirectly, in any activities intended to influence the decision of any governmental body; and

Fourth. The decision to prohibit a private foundation from making grants directly to individuals for certain educational purposes.

All of these changes single out the private foundation as opposed to churches, schools, and foundations receiving the bulk of their funds from governmental units or the general public.

All of these changes go beyond anything recommended by the Johnson and Nixon administrations.

All of these changes are punitive and discriminatory with no relation to genuine tax reform which admirably closes loopholes and raises revenues.

It angers me that many who have long sought to deny the Federal Government a role in matters of social concern now seem bent on denying that same role to private charitable foundations which often provide the only alternative to governmental action. I suspect some people just do not want any institution, public or private, to challenge the status quo. They should not be allowed to prevail by using tax reform as a smoke-screen to restrict the scope of charitable programs during this period of domestic crisis.

I take great pride that there are over 1,000 foundations located in my congressional district representing 40 percent of America's philanthropic wealth. I shall urge consideration be given to the modification or elimination of these measures before a tax reform bill is reported out by the committee or passed by this House.

The public interest is well served by the tax reform efforts of Chairman MILLS and his committee. There have been abuses by some foundations, particularly the small single donor type, and I am supporting the proposals of the Ways and Means Committee which deal with them. One important reform deserving of support is the proposal now being considered which would bar the payment by any foundation of any fee

or honorarium to any public officeholder on a local, State or Federal level.

However, the public interest is not served by a vindictive assault on the philanthropic efforts of private foundations. They can not adequately defend themselves—we in Congress must come to their support. The record of the overwhelming number of foundations engaged in philanthropic work has been exemplary and their good works ought not to be curtailed.

#### TAX REFORM FIRST, THEN SURTAX EXTENSION—PERHAPS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, again requests are heard from the administration that we extend the most unfair levy of recent times—the 10-percent surtax. I feel tax reform must come first at all costs. The Nation demands it. Our citizens require it. A glance at the erosion of our prosperity and economic vitality in the past 6 months reveals inability of the administration to come to grips with the real problems besetting our economy.

When this administration took office, unemployment had hit an alltime low. Prosperity was the order of our day. Interest rates were within reasonable bounds. Some precedence was being given to social priorities. The business community seemed confident, reflecting our overall situation in daily surges of common stocks. How quickly times have changed.

As of today, the prime interest rate has soared to an alltime modern high of 8½ percent, penalizing tens of millions of lower- and middle-income citizens. Banks record vast profits, enticing borrowers into their offices to borrow at such rates. The administration accepts their specious argument that these exorbitant interest rates are in the interest of curbing inflation. The efficacy of their argument is shown by an inflation that rages on and ever on. Food prices skyrocket. Loans are refused. Basic industry feels the pinch. Let us see them blame all these ominous portents on previous administrations.

Simultaneously, our business community is beginning to stagger. Lagging confidence is reflected in a plummeting stock market, which seems to be spelling out "recession" in plain language. Odd, is it not, that once again the touch of these gentlemen revives old economic fears of our past? Already unemployment rates are inching upward, first among black Americans—eventually reaching out for jobs of many others. Is it hindsight to remember Mr. Humphrey's campaign predictions that this would happen? Do we not hear a few echoes from a depression- and recession-cursed past?

Ignoring domestic priorities, the administration plunges onward. On all sides we see slashes in basic programs. A general 10-percent cut in aid to education and libraries. Job Corps emasculated. Clean-water funds hamstring.

The sad list goes on and on. Yet the piece de resistance is still to come.

All over America, millions have at last awakened to the unrivaled scandal which is our tax system. Favoring vested interests who have punched loophole after loophole in our tax laws, we are hagridden by a doubletalk-ridden morass which penalizes lower- and middle-income citizens. From across the land the cry is heard ever louder, tax reform of the most all-encompassing sort. Does this administration pay any attention to such demands? Does it show responsiveness to a truly national request? Look at what its priorities are for your answer.

Surtax extension is the title of the blinders worn by the gentlemen downtown. Needs of the mass of Americans being intolerably squeezed between millstones of inflation and taxes go unanswered. All these people are concerned with is continuation of the most unfair tax in recent history. It is a tax aimed at further penalization of the average citizen.

If we extend the surtax without first obtaining reform, we shall never obtain tax justice for our people. For myself, I shall not vote for extension for a single day until the most comprehensive tax-reform measure in recent history is signed into law.

#### CRIME WAVE REQUIRES ACTION NOW

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the seriousness of Washington's crime is pointed up again today with the report that even the U.S. Courthouse here has had to place security locks on its self-service elevators because of complaints ranging from molestation of secretaries in the building to the theft of equipment from court offices. Just last week it was also reported that the White House Police will take over protection of foreign embassies because of harassment, vandalism, and crime which the city police are unable to control.

It is a sad state of affairs when the city is unable to provide for the safety of foreign visitors. It is even more critical, however, that American tourists are not safe in their own Capital City and that the residents of the city are in constant threat.

During the campaign last fall the American people heard a great deal about the Washington crime problem, and the failures of the then Attorney General. I listened, and I agreed for the most part, since I had long before brought these matters to the attention of the Congress as had other concerned Members. But now we have a new Attorney General, a new chairman of the city council, and a new President. And we have an even greater crime problem, with June reflecting a 23.9 percent increase over the same month last year.

The President and his Attorney General, and their reappointed mayor and

new city council president, must take action now to begin a fight on crime using existing authority.

The President may be able to walk down the street safely with Secret Service protection, and foreign diplomats may be safer with White House Police guarding their doors. But even the President's own private secretary has been a victim of a burglary. The ordinary citizens of this city, and the tourists who visit here, have every right to expect a major effort to end this lawlessness now.

It has taken 5½ months to get a crime bill from the White House to the Capitol, and it is sufficiently complicated and controversial to take the rest of this year for consideration. Local police are not able to fill existing vacancies, much less start on the new proposed authorizations.

The people of this city and this Nation look to the new administration for the kind of action that was indicated in the campaign oratory last fall. A 23.9 percent increase in crime in 1 month is not tolerable.

#### MEMBERS INTRODUCE ANTIPORNOGRAPHY LEGISLATION

(Mr. WOLFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, my constituent mail in recent weeks has reflected a sharp rise in unsolicited pornography, being sent through the mails. These pandering advertisements, many of which are aimed at young people, are increasing not only in volume but also in the repulsive nature of the enclosures.

Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation, cosponsored by 24 other Members, to place a severe financial burden on those who mail such unwanted pornography. Under the terms of the bill, the smut merchant sender would have to pay double postage and administrative costs when the recipient returns such unsolicited filth.

This entire problem has been complicated by certain recent Supreme Court rulings and it is imperative that we act to control these disreputable mailers the only possible way—through their pocketbooks.

I appreciate the cosponsorship of the Members named below and invite others to join us. Under leave to extend my remarks I also wish to include a copy of the legislation and its cosponsors.

H.R. 13168

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the return to the sender of pandering advertisements mailed to and refused by an addressee, at a charge to the sender of all mail handling and administrative costs to the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 4009 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Postmaster General shall return to the sender all pandering advertisements mailed by the sender in violation of the Postmaster General's order under this subsection, at a charge to the sender*

of the cost of the return of such advertisements, plus an additional charge, allocable to the sender as determined by the Postmaster General, sufficient to reimburse the United States for its administrative costs under this section."

COSPONSORS OF ANTIPORNOGRAPHY  
LEGISLATION

Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Anderson of Tennessee, Mr. Andrews of Alabama, Mr. Baring, Mr. Blackburn, Mr. Carver, Mr. Chappell, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Duncan, Mrs. Hansen of Washington, Mr. Horton, Mr. Kyros, Mr. McKnealy, Mr. Matsunaga, Mr. Melcher, Mr. Moss, Mr. Price of Illinois, Mr. Rarick, Mr. Rees, Mr. Vanik, Mr. Wright, Mr. Zion, Mr. Derwinski, and Mr. Murphy of Illinois.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. I think I could make a suggestion as to one way you can cure the mailing of this pornographic literature through the mails and this is what I intend to do: Tell the recipients to mail it to the residence of the Justices of the Supreme Court.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLFF. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the gentleman upon the introduction of the bill to which he has made reference. I and my colleague from Florida have introduced a similar bill and I hope we can get some action on it because, certainly, it is a critical situation.

Mr. WOLFF. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

DRUG SMUGGLING PRESENTS IN-  
CREASINGLY SERIOUS PROBLEM

(Mr. DE LA GARZA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative from the 15th Congressional District of Texas, which borders on the Republic of Mexico, I am sadly aware that the smuggling of marihuana, heroin, and other illegal or dangerous drugs across the border from Mexico to the United States presents an increasingly serious problem.

In a special message to Congress, President Nixon called attention to the fears and worries of Americans concerning the illegal use of drugs—especially among young people. The President specifically stated that drug abuse "constitutes a national threat to the personal health and safety of millions of Americans." He cited a frightening 800 percent increase in juvenile arrests involving the use of drugs between 1960 and 1967 and noted that "half of those now being arrested for the use of drugs are under 21 years of age."

The International Good Neighbor Council, a notable organization that concerns itself with problems common to the United States and Mexico, took cognizance of this situation in a resolution recently adopted by its Interna-

tional Affairs Committee. This resolution, suggesting that wide publicity be given to the severe penalties attached to crimes of drug abuse, urged the U.S. Customs Service and the Departamento de Aduana Fronteriza of Mexico to post large and legible signs in suitable locations at all ports of entry warning people of the possession of illegal drugs when crossing the Mexican-United States border.

Copies of this resolution have been forwarded to the appropriate authorities of the Governments in Washington and Mexico City, with the request that increased attention be given to this grave problem and that the two Governments work together in every possible way to stop the illegal traffic in marihuana, heroin, and other illegal drugs—a traffic which poses deadly danger to our young people.

Public officials in the Republic of Mexico, fully aware that much of this traffic is conducted across their national border, are greatly concerned, as I learned when I took the matter up at the United States-Mexico interparliamentary meeting in Mexico. We can count on their cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, the time is due, and past due, to launch a comprehensive and coordinated attack on this problem.

With that purpose in view, I have introduced H.R. 13031 designed to help prevent and control narcotic addiction and drug abuse. The bill proposes authorization of Federal aid in the construction, staffing, operation, and maintenance of facilities for the prevention and treatment of narcotic addiction and drug abuse; in the development of professional and other personnel; in the support of appropriate demonstration projects relating to narcotic addiction and drug abuse, and in the conduct of needed research, study, and experimentation.

My bill would provide increased Federal funding under the Community Mental Health Centers Act to cover costs of operation and maintenance, with coverage extended to meet staff expenses. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make grants, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Mental Health Council, to develop specialized training programs for the prevention and treatment of drug abuse and to conduct surveys and field trips to evaluate the adequacy of State programs in this area. Grants also would be authorized for specific purposes to State or local agencies and to public or nonprofit agencies.

This bill would establish an Advisory Committee on Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs to assist the HEW Secretary, this committee to consist of 12 members of diverse professional backgrounds, including the fields of pharmacology, psychiatry, psychology, and other behavioral sciences, and representatives of the drug manufacturing and distributing business.

Mr. Speaker, evidence appears every day in the media that no element of American life has immunity against the threat of the drug problem. No parent can be certain that his children are safe.

This matter is critical. Effective Federal action must be initiated now.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO TESTI-  
FIES BEFORE DISTRICT OF CO-  
LUMBIA CITY COUNCIL ON CRIME  
INSURANCE

(Mr. ANNUNZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, on May 21, 1969, I introduced H.R. 11512, the Small Business Crime Insurance Act of 1969. Since that time, 93 Members of the House, on a bipartisan basis, have joined with me in cosponsoring the legislation.

At this time I will not go into a detailed explanation of the bill since that was done when the legislation was first introduced. Basically, however, the legislation would provide for the direct writing of crime insurance to small businessmen by the Federal Government. The coverage would be handled through the Small Business Administration.

The problem that the small businessman has in obtaining insurance is commonplace throughout every major city in our country. It is a particular problem here in the Nation's Capital where small businessmen in the northeast and southeast sections of the city have found it impossible to purchase insurance.

The Government Operations Committee of the District of Columbia City Council has been holding hearings on insurance problems in the District of Columbia for the past week.

Today, I appeared before that body to discuss my proposal and to ask for the support not only of the District of Columbia but of every city and town in the United States.

I have included in my remarks today a copy of my testimony this morning as well as a press release concerning the legislation. These two documents will serve to keep Members of the House current on the status of the legislation:

INNER-CITY SMALL BUSINESS WILL PERISH  
WITHOUT INSURANCE HELP PREDICTS CON-  
GRESSMAN ANNUNZIO

"Congress and the White House must decide whether or not small businessmen will be able to keep their doors open in our major cities," Congressman Frank Annunzio (D., Ill.) told the Government Operations Committee of the District of Columbia City Council today.

Testifying on the need for adequate crime protection insurance, Annunzio said that without crime insurance, "we will not have small business in our major cities."

The Chicago Democrat told the Committee that insurance companies will not write crime coverage in major cities, and in Washington, it is almost impossible for a small business in the Northeast or Southeast area to obtain crime insurance. He added that even if the policies are available, the premiums are three or four times higher than the standard rate.

In order to correct the problem, Congressman Annunzio has introduced legislation which has been cosponsored by a bipartisan group of 93 Members of the House of Representatives, calling for the direct writing of crime insurance for small business by the Federal government. The insurance would be written through the Small Business Administration and would be available to small

businessmen who cannot obtain the insurance at reasonable rates through private insurance companies.

Congressman Annunzio, who in 1967 authored successful legislation to study the impact of crime upon small business, warned the Committee that "unless crime insurance at reasonable cost is available to small businessmen, the time is not too far off when there will be no small business in our inner cities. The trend has already begun and it is time now to take action."

The insurance industry, Congressman Annunzio explained, has completely turned its back on the need for crime insurance by small businessmen. He told the Committee that although insurance representatives had promised him two years ago that they would come to grips with the problem, nothing has been done.

"For this reason," said Congressman Annunzio, "I have introduced the Small Business Crime Insurance Act of 1969, which provides for the direct writing of crime insurance for small businessmen by the Small Business Administration."

Although the Annunzio legislation calls for an initial \$50 million loan from the Treasury to start the insurance program, Congressman Annunzio does not feel that the money would have to be spent. "The funds would merely serve as a reserve since there would be premium income flowing into the insurance pool from the very beginning and the only time the Treasury funds would have to be tapped would be in the event that losses exceeded premium income," said Congressman Annunzio. He added that even if losses do exceed premium income, Congress and the White House must be prepared to appropriate the money to make up the differences or write the end to small business in our inner cities.

Congressman Annunzio predicted that with proper supervision and regulation, the program would be self-sustaining since the legislation would allow the Small Business Administration to require small businessmen to improve the risk factor of their business as a condition to obtaining insurance. Under such a plan, SBA for example, would tell a grocery store operator that it will only insure his market if he obtains a burglar alarm. Congressman Annunzio has also asked the Small Business Administration to provide low-cost loans for the purchase of such protective devices. "For too long," Congressman Annunzio said, "the insurance industry has sold policies with the attitude of a man who only wants to hold the winning ticket on a lottery. If a merchant in Northeast called an insurance company and asked for burglar coverage, he would not be able to get a policy, but if he asked for earthquake insurance, I am certain he would be sold the policy immediately. For such a policy in the Washington area would, indeed, be a winning ticket for the insurance company."

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE FRANK ANNUNZIO, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, SEVENTH DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS, BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY COUNCIL ON INSURANCE PROBLEMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, JULY 29, 1969

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before this Committee to discuss the insurance problems facing small businessmen in the District of Columbia, particularly the effect that crime has upon the problem.

In the simplest terms, the problem is that small businessmen in certain areas of the city, particularly in the Northeast and Southeast sections where small businessmen have found it virtually impossible to obtain insurance for crime-connected losses, or if such insurance is available, it is at rates three to four times as high as standard rates. The problem is not unique in the Washing-

ton area. I think we can safely say it is prevalent in every major city in the United States, at least that is what the flood of letters that I have received on crime insurance indicates.

Quite clearly, Mr. Chairman, something must be done if small business is to survive in our major cities. I do not come here as a prophet of doom or gloom but I do feel quite certain that unless crime insurance, at reasonable costs, is made available to small businessmen, the time is not too far off when there will be no small businesses in our inner cities. The trend has already begun and it is time now to take action.

I first began work on this problem in 1967, when I introduced the Small Business Protection Act to provide for a study to determine the best ways that small businessmen could protect themselves from criminal acts.

I do not contend that the study is the solution to the crime problem but rather that it does set out areas of investigation where a majority of efforts should be concentrated in solving the problem. I am unhappy that the study devotes too much space to the statistical side of crime against small business and not enough space in telling the small businessman how to safeguard his property from hoodlums and vandals.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Chairman, that your Committee will not fall victim to the statistical syndrome that seems to arise whenever the question of crime is raised. At this point, we do not need studies to show that crime is, indeed, a problem to small businessmen. We can learn this by picking a newspaper from any metropolitan city. In fact, in many cities, including Washington, the crime rate has risen to such an extent that the newspapers do not have enough space to devote to crime stories but, instead, must summarize the crime news on a "boxscore" basis, much the same way the statistical aspects of the Senators' baseball games are reported.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to go into psychological reasons for the crime increase nor do I wish to attempt to affix the blame for the problem. We have heard a great deal about who is responsible for controlling crime. I do know one thing though. It is not the small businessman who is responsible for the crime rise; it is not the small businessman who can crack down on the increase of crime; but it is the small businessman who is paying for the effects of criminal acts. If ever there were an innocent victim of crime, it is the small businessmen of our country.

Mr. Chairman, when I introduced my crime study bill in 1967, I did so in hopes that it would cause the insurance industry to do something about making crime insurance available to small businessmen. When I introduced the study bill, a member of my staff received a telephone call from an insurance executive inquiring whether the bill contained any provision for a direct program of government insurance. The insurance executive was told that the bill did not contain such a provision but that if insurance was not made available that my next step would be in that area. The insurance executive assured my staff member that would not be necessary since the insurance industry was ready to come to grips with the problem and to find ways to help the small businessman.

That was more than two years ago, Mr. Chairman, and we still have not seen any progress on the part of the insurance companies. For this reason, I have introduced the Small Business Crime Insurance Act of 1969, which provides for the direct writing of crime insurance for small businessmen by the Small Business Administration. This legislation has been cosponsored on a bipartisan basis by 93 Members of the House of Representatives. Let me take just a minute or two to discuss a few highlights of my bill. The legislation quite simply would establish a new position in the Small Business Administration—the Associate Administrator for Insurance. The Associate Administrator,

working in conjunction with the Small Business Administration Administrator, would establish a schedule of insurance premiums based on the needs of the small businessmen and the type of risk to be covered. To be eligible for the insurance coverage, a business owner would have to qualify as a small business under the size standards set by the Administration, and, as in the case of Small Business Administration loan program, the small businessman would have to show that he is unable to obtain insurance at reasonable rates and terms.

The funds for the insurance pool would be obtained with a \$50 million loan from the Treasury Department. As premiums were paid, the funds would be placed in a separate revolving fund within the Small Business Administration. At the end of each year, the amount of claims paid during the year would be deducted from the revolving fund. An adequate portion of the remaining money would be set aside for reserves and the balance would be used to repay the loan from the Treasury Department. Eventually, as the reserves increase, there will no longer be a need to borrow funds from the Treasury and the program will become self-sustaining.

Since the money obtained from the Treasury will be a loan and not a grant, this program will not cost the taxpayers any funds except for the personnel administration of the program, and I do not feel that this is too great a price to pay for assisting small businesses. To me, Mr. Chairman, the most important aspect of this legislation is its simplicity. Since it does not provide for the creation of a new bureau, agency, or department, there would be a minimal delay in establishing the insurance program and it could be in operation as quickly as the regulations were established.

In the beginning, the insurance coverage would be limited to coverage for losses due to criminal acts. This would still give the insurance industry the opportunity to write other forms of insurance for small businesses and, hopefully, correct some of their premium inequalities. However, I want to make it clear that if the insurance industry does not exercise its responsibility in this area, then I will offer an amendment to the legislation to provide for the direct writing of all small business insurance. I would add that, based on past experience, I am not optimistic that the insurance industry will cooperate.

Although the legislation calls for an initial loan of \$50 million from the Treasury Department, such a loan could be, in reality, a paper transaction. The funds would merely serve as a reserve since there would be premium income flowing into the insurance pool from the very beginning and the only time the Treasury funds would have to be tapped would be in the event that losses exceeded premium income.

I personally do not feel that, except for perhaps the start-up period, that there will be losses in excess of premium income. But for the sake of argument, let us consider that there may be losses in excess of income. We must be prepared to make a value judgment. If we do not provide the insurance coverage, we will not have small business in our major cities. That is the value judgment that Congress and the White House must make. And, if we lose these small businesses because we are unwilling to appropriate the money to get the program started, we will be the victims of an economic mistake for every time a small business closes its door, we lose tax revenues at the city, county, state and Federal level. My bill speaks of an appropriation of \$50 million. But Mr. Chairman, that is but a drop in the bucket compared to the amount of money that would be lost if small business is allowed to die in our cities. On the other hand, I feel very strongly that we will make the government insurance program a self-sustaining operation. My legislation would give the Small Business Administration power to require small businessmen to improve the risk factor of their business

property as a condition to obtaining the insurance. Thus, the SBA might tell a grocery store operator that it will only insure his market if he obtains a burglar alarm. I have also asked the Small Business Administration to make low-cost loans for the purchase of such protective devices. Or the Small Business Administration might require bars to be placed across a clothing store's display windows during non-business hours before it would insure the store.

Before the Small Business Administration can loan money to a small businessman, the loan applicant must show that he is unable to obtain the money from other sources on reasonable terms. The same procedure would be followed in handling the insurance. The small businessman would have to present proof to the Small Business Administration that he is unable to obtain crime insurance at a reasonable premium. Thus, SBA would not be competing with the private industry since private industry will not handle this type of insurance. Therefore, the charge of government interference cannot be made. I think it is quite clear from the apathy expressed by the insurance industry in the two years during which I have waited for them to take action proves my point quite clearly.

In order to cut down on the manpower and red tape, it is my plan that the government insurance will be sold through commercial insurance agents who will pay a fee to the government to be licensed to sell this insurance. Of course, we will have to make certain that we have agents in every part of the city who are accessible to the small businessman. The same procedure can be used by processing claims. It should be remembered that the insurance agent is also handicapped by the reluctance of insurance companies to write crime insurance. If the agent cannot sell policies, quite simply, he cannot make a living. While the plan to write direct government crime insurance may be new, it is not without precedent. We already have government insurance for home mortgages, bank deposits and crop damage. These programs have been highly successful. The mortgage insurance has been one of the main reasons why Americans enjoy the highest standard of living.

In review, Mr. Chairman, allow me to draw on a small piece of history. When Congress first considered the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, it was during the height of the depression and was shortly after the famous bank holiday in which thousands of banks across the country failed. When the Congressional sponsors of the bank deposit insurance bill first introduced the bill, they were ridiculed and almost laughed off the Floor of the Congress. The argument was made that such a program would bankrupt the country, since the government could not stand to pay all of the bank losses. But the bill was finally passed and instead of bankrupting the country, the federal deposit insurance program has resulted in the strongest banking system in the world. We must have faith that the same thing can be accomplished for small business.

In conclusion, let me say that I reject, categorically, the insurance industry's arguments that they cannot afford to write crime insurance. Insurance companies are making record profits. In fact, the insurance industry is much the same as the Nation's banking industry, which contends that it has to raise interest rates because of the shortage of money. However, bankers neglect to tell their customers that bank profits are at a record high.

For too long, the insurance industry has sold policies with the attitude of a man who wants to hold only the winning ticket on a lottery. If a merchant in Northeast called an insurance company and asked for burglary coverage, he would not be able to get a policy but if he asked for earthquake in-

urance, I am certain he would be sold the policy immediately. For such a policy in the Washington area would, indeed be a winning ticket for the insurance company.

I do not believe that small businessmen represent losing tickets. For this reason, I hope that the Small Business Crime Insurance Act of 1969 will become law and I ask the help of this body and every citizen of Washington, D.C., to making it a reality.

#### BOB MATHIAS—A CHAMPION SEES TEXAS

(Mr. BELCHER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to visit the 18th Congressional District of Texas over the past weekend. Together with my colleagues from the Committee on Agriculture, I participated in a very thorough and well-organized tour of the agricultural community in the Texas Panhandle which is so ably represented by my good friend Bob PRICE.

During our visit we saw many examples of excellence in agriculture—cattle feeding—milo production—irrigated vegetable production, for example.

Included in our group which visited this championship area of American agriculture was a sports champion who once brought fame to our Nation and who now represents the 18th District of California.

I am, of course, referring to my distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from California, BOB MATHIAS.

In the Sunday edition of the Amarillo News Globe there was a story about BOB MATHIAS and his visit to Texas. I include this story in the RECORD at this point:

ROBERT BRUCE MATHIAS, A CHAMP REVISITED  
(By Carlton Stowers)

As a youngster struggling toward manhood in rural West Texas I spent a good deal of time entertaining thoughts of what future achievements might be mine—millionaire, President of the United States, and perhaps most important of all, Olympic decathlon champion. For good measure I also planned to marry Mitzl Gaynor and be the first man on the moon.

The mere fact that there stands no bronze statue of myself on the Runnels County Courthouse lawn is stark testimony to the fact that I never realized any of the above goals.

I knew, I suppose, that my chance of gaining any great wealth was somewhat bridled by my financial bloodlines and, since I could hardly stand the idea of wearing a tie for even the two hours Mother required each Sunday morning, I was aware of the hard time I would have ever becoming President. Mitzl Gaynor never even gave me a second glance and, well, you can see what happened on the moon deal.

Which left the Olympic decathlon championship; something which I thought maybe I still had a shot at. Particularly after I had set a new all-time Runnels County indoor and outdoor record for seeing "The Bob Mathias Story" the most times. The more I watched, the more I realized the 1948-52 Olympic champ and I had a great deal in common.

After all, didn't Bob's folks make him take a nap two hours every day after lunch even if the rest of the kids in Tulare, Calif., made fun? And, wasn't he addicted to oatmeal cookies and a little scared of real girls? And like old Knute Rockne once pointed out,

didn't he put his pants on one leg at a time just like me?

This amazing parallel of Bob Mathias' athletic career and mine ended, alas, when I stepped on the field of battle. Thus another ambition bit the dust.

Viewing my plight with the advantage of retrospect, I can, with a minimum of rationalizing, see where my final failure was not so great as you might be led to believe. Goodness knows there have been a lot of men who have lived in the White House. Wall Street can't keep up with the number of millionaires. And Mitzl's love life is no secret.

You could take the number of 17-year-old kids who have won Olympic championships, however, count them, and have several fingers to spare. Which is to say Bob Mathias was a youngster who was a man before Graduation Day. You name it, he could do it. Run, hurdle, pole vault, high jump, throw the javelin, broad jump and Heaven knows what all. He's the kind of guy they talk about when they call an athlete versatile. Pressure? Bob Mathias thrived on it.

He made up his mind to take a shot at making the '48 Olympic team four weeks before the decathlon trials and wound up amazing 70,000 fans in London by defying the rain, long hours and a Frenchman named Ignace Heinrich to capture the gold medal, thus becoming the youngest track and field performer to ever step to the top of the winner's stand.

For good measure he turned the trick again at Helsinki in 1952. In between he led Stanford to the host spot in the Rose Bowl. When he returned from London, President Truman was there to shake his hand. They changed the name of his hometown to Mathiasville. Paramount Studio signed him to a contract after his competitive days were over, saying that no one but Bob Mathias himself could handle the lead in his own life story. They signed up Ward Bond to play the role of his coach and wound up taking every cent of my soda pop bottle money before the movie left town.

Still a striking figure at 38, Mathias, now a Congressman in his homestate, has spent the weekend as a guest of fellow politico Bob Price, touring the agricultural accomplishments of the Panhandle. Just looking at him one still gets the idea that he could do just about anything he sets his mind to do. That's how it is with the true champions.

Which is a way of saying that, though I never quite managed to achieve some of them, you can't say I didn't set my goals high enough.

#### MOON SAMPLES BELONG TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. BRAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the first moon samples brought back to earth belong, by right, to the American people—all the citizens of our Republic—and it is to them these samples should go before any are given away to foreign heads of state. I am introducing a bill today providing for this.

Of course, it is completely understood that none will be given to anyone until scientists have had ample time to thoroughly examine them. Dr. Robert Jastrow, one of our most eminent astrophysicists, has called the moon the "rosetta stone of the planets" and it is believed some of the deepest secrets of creation itself will be unlocked through examination and analysis of this less than 100 pounds of rock fragments.

Use any figure you wish for the ultimate cost of Apollo 11—\$25 billion, or more, or less—but the hard fact remains that the billions required came from one source, and one source alone: the pockets of the American taxpayers. Therefore, by right, our citizens have first claim on them.

This is especially so since I firmly believe that all of our citizens, with the exception of a sour-grapes collection of professional soreheads, are immensely proud of what has been achieved in this solely American endeavor, and feel their money was well spent.

In time, I am sure, museums throughout the country will have for permanent display samples from the moon—if not from Apollo 11, then from subsequent flights. But, for the Apollo 11 samples, next only to the urgent scientific need for them, it is most important that they go to the people whose money, faith, and yes, prayers, made bringing them back to earth a reality.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation providing that as soon as practicable, after scientific requirements have been fulfilled, and at a time to be determined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, one sample be delivered to each Governor of each of the 50 States, for permanent display in, and to be permanent property of, the State and its people. Place of display is to be determined by the Governor. Many of our State capitals are centrally located, and besides, having 50 locations in the American Republic where these samples could be seen would make it much, much easier for Americans to see them firsthand.

The American people gave their Government the money that made it possible to get these samples. The Government of the United States owes it to its citizens to make it as easy as possible for them to see just what their money achieved.

Following is the text of my proposed bill:

H.J. RES. 844

Joint resolution providing for distribution of the Moon samples brought back by Apollo 11 to the Governors of each of the fifty States

Whereas Apollo 11, the most significant achievement of mankind in all of his recorded history, to date, was a solely American undertaking and endeavor, and,

Whereas the American taxpayer made it possible by providing the billions needed, and

Whereas by virtue of this, right of ownership is of Apollo 11's Moon samples is unequivocally invested in the American people; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That as soon as practicable, after necessary scientific requirements of study, examination and analysis have been fulfilled, and at a time to be determined by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and before any part of these samples shall be delivered by the Government of the United States into the permanent possession of any foreign government, one sample in quantity or shape suitable for public display shall be delivered to the Governor of each of the fifty States. These samples are to be retained as permanent property of the States, and shall be placed on permanent, public display in such

a manner and at such a location as the Governor of each State shall determine.

#### SOVIET NAVAL SQUADRON IN THE GULF OF MEXICO

(Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a naval squadron of the Soviet Union today is cruising in the Gulf of Mexico. It is the squadron of seven ships which left Havana Sunday after helping Fidel Castro note the Cuban Communist celebration of July 26.

It is the squadron which steamed south along our east coast earlier this month and which ventured into the Gulf of Mexico just before the Havana stop, sailing to within about 400 miles of New Orleans.

Today the squadron has split up. The ships are all traveling in a westerly direction, four of them about 500 miles west of Key West, one submarine tender about 300 miles west of Key West, and the two other ships not far south of the tender.

This latest evidence of the growth of Soviet sea power follows the well-planned schedule the Kremlin set up shortly after the Cuban missile crisis in 1962 exposed Moscow's need for naval strength.

They sent ships into the South Atlantic for the first time in 1967. In 1968 they made their first voyage into the Persian Gulf and Indian Ocean.

Today they are in the Gulf of Mexico with a 4,300-ton guided missile cruiser with eight launchers for Shaddock surface-to-surface missiles with a range of about 450 miles.

I have been speaking of the significant growth of Soviet sea power, including all its elements of naval strength, merchant marine capability, fishing fleet, and oceanographic capacity, for 4 years.

Its significance is exceedingly great in terms of our overall national security.

Permit me to quote just one way of saying it, taken from the report of June 1969, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies of Georgetown University called "Soviet Sea Power":

The timely presence of Soviet naval units at a scene of local instability involving U.S. interests could restrict the actions of Washington or cause U.S. allies to lose confidence in the will of the United States to react in support of political forces favoring U.S. interests.

The magnitude of this is even more clearly seen in the light of yesterday's report of the special Armed Services Subcommittee on the Pueblo incident. That report found that the U.S. "military command is now simply unable" to respond swiftly to the needs of a major crisis.

All of this is clear indication, if we needed any new indication, that we must give far greater attention to sea power as a requisite of our national security.

#### STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF INCREASE IN EDUCATION FUNDS

(Mr. MOLLOHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed comprehensive amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, it authorized \$766 million for the fiscal year 1970 to implement that program. The Congress did so in the knowledge that there were more than a million children who had left high school before graduation and in the knowledge that many many more needed special skills as a prerequisite for useful employment.

Yet, we are asked to provide less than half of the money necessary to fulfill our commitments under this legislation. This is nothing short of a national disaster. There are many things in our national budget that can be postponed even though they are necessary but education is not one of them.

How do you tell a young man or woman "come back for job training next year, we don't have the money this year?" Yet, this is exactly the effect of appropriating less than half of the money needed.

The hard, cold facts are that the crime rate among the young people in this Nation is sky-rocketing and the unemployment rate among the young people is the highest of any category. In the cities the unemployment rates runs up to 30 percent. The correlation of unemployment and crime is too close to ignore.

This appropriation is the most important piece of legislation that this House will consider so far as my State of West Virginia is concerned, because 60 percent of those graduating from high school are not going on to college and they must have advanced skills to be effective in today's labor market. Yet, where West Virginia should be receiving nearly \$9 million, this appropriation will cut that in half.

West Virginia cannot afford that loss and the Nation cannot afford that loss either. Our labor needs are dynamic—they change and are changing rapidly. But high school education is still geared largely to college preparation. As a result, vocational education is of highest priority for providing a useful education to everyone.

#### PROHIBITING STATE AND LOCAL INCOME TAXES ON OUT-OF-STATE RESIDENTS

(Mr. HUNT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, there has been no other time in memory that public opinion has been so unanimous in protest of high and inequitable taxes at all levels of government. There is no relief in sight. Instead, virtually every taxing jurisdiction in the Nation is persistently seeking new sources of tax revenues. Where the voters have had the opportunity to express themselves by referendum, an opportunity afforded only at the State and local levels, the trend in recent years has been to reject new taxes. Federal taxes are not subject to the final approval of the public except to the ex-

tent that each of us must ultimately answer to his electorate. But there exists still another situation in which the individual who is taxed has no vote or representation, and this is the case of State and local income taxes on out-of-State residents.

My attention was first drawn to this problem because of a local condition affecting several thousand of my constituents who work in nearby Philadelphia. It must first be noted that New Jersey does not levy an income tax. Neither does Pennsylvania, but in that State, political subdivisions are empowered by State law to impose income taxes on all persons whether they are residents, nonresidents (of the city, but residents of the State), or out-of-State residents. There is no distinction made among these classes of taxpayers as all are required to pay the tax at the rate of 3 percent on gross income. I might add that the 3-percent rate became effective on July 1, 1969, and was an increase of 33 percent over the 2 percent immediately prior to that date and a 100-percent increase over the rate first established by the Philadelphia Income Tax Ordinance of December 13, 1939.

In response to this problem, and not unmindful of the pitfalls in dealing with any tax legislation, I reintroduced a bill, H.R. 849, to prohibit any State or political subdivision of that State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State. Insofar as such taxes are imposed on out-of-State residents, I believe this is a subject for the consideration of the Congress in view that the taxes so imposed are interstate in application, presenting a clear-cut case of taxation without representation, and the only body with the jurisdiction to resolve this issue is the Congress in the absence of voluntary and cooperative action among the States.

Subsequent to this legislation, it has become increasingly apparent to me that the injustice of the Philadelphia wage tax on New Jersey domiciliary residents is not singularly unique. There are 11 other States that do not levy an income tax at present wherein similar conditions exist or are likely to occur. Each of the 50 States has dealt with the taxing of out-of-State residents as it has seen fit. More recently, the prevalence of this problem surfaced with the introduction of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1969. For the first time, it includes a title cited as the "District of Columbia Nonresident Tax Act," which provides for the imposition of a tax on commuters based on income.

In all fairness, Mr. Speaker, Congress has made the first substantive move on the problem of taxes levied by States on the incomes of out-of-State residents with the adoption of the so-called Smith of Iowa proposal in the form of an amendment to the Interstate Taxation Act. While the nature of the amendment, which essentially prohibits double taxation of individual incomes by more than one State, indicates a legitimate concern of the Congress and is a step in the right direction, I firmly believe the issue warrants further serious considera-

tion. For example, the amendment leaves unresolved the plight of taxpayers in 12 States, where an income tax is not imposed, who work in a State where such taxes are levied. Furthermore, and perhaps more fundamentally, it does not concern itself with the issues of taxation without representation or double taxation in the sense that regardless of the primary revenue source, be it property or income taxes or a combination thereof, there is a class of individual taxpayers that pays a high property tax in the absence of State or local income taxes while at the same time paying an income tax at the full rate in an out-of-State taxing jurisdiction without the benefit of an offsetting credit.

It is argued by those taxing jurisdictions which tax nonresidents that such individuals receive certain public benefits for which they should share the costs. This argument is not without merit, but there exists no national standard by which State and local taxing jurisdictions may fairly and equitably apportion the tax burden between residents and out-of-State residents taking into consideration the relative benefits derived by each class. In this context, my proposal may seem drastic, but I believe the situation to be serious enough to justify drastic action with a view to devising and implementing new approaches respecting the taxing of out-of-State residents. Merely because commuter taxes have not been voided by the courts and are easily administered does not relieve us of the responsibility to represent the interests of a voiceless class of taxpayers with a legitimate grievance.

In my earlier remarks on the subject, I stated, "With respect to taxation versus benefits, I am fully cognizant of the fact the courts have consistently recognized that equal tax burdens do not necessarily require equal benefits. I do not infer from the attitude of the courts in this regard, however, that it is a mandate to any taxing jurisdiction to gouge the helpless taxpayer, especially the nonresident who has no voice at the polls or representation in the disposition of his tax dollar. Rather, I believe the courts view this issue of taxes versus benefits as one to be resolved as fairly as practical by the political instruments of government."

Returning once again to the legislative proposal to provide for a commuter tax on nonresidents of the District of Columbia, this is a unique situation in that Congress will have the opportunity to pass upon the issue. Because of the initial intent of the legislation to encompass all taxing jurisdictions in the Nation, I am today introducing a new bill to perfect its coverage by including the District of Columbia.

I am encouraged that others share my concern over this problem and list the following new sponsors of this legislation: Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. SCHERLE of Iowa, and Mrs. DWYER.

We respectfully urge the House Judiciary Committee to give this legislation

a fair hearing in the interest of those taxpayers whose only recourse is now through the Congress.

#### ACTION BY THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

(Mr. HANNA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, at a time when there are so many things that are being pointed out that are going wrong with the world, it is kind of a refreshing experience to find some things that are going right.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware of the great prospective benefits that our exploration on the moon have created. However, not so many of us are aware of another very important step in terms of the position of the United States and its prestige among the nations of the world. The adoption by the IMF of special drawing rights, SDR's, as they are called, is one of the things that has been accomplished quietly and out of the spotlight which, I think, down the corridor of history will stand out as being a landmark accomplishment in terms as to where the world is going and how it is going to be able to live peacefully and prosperously in the future. I think that the gentlemen who have brought this about are to be highly commended. They have brought silently, but through patient and persistent effort, constructive change in our times.

To move dramatically ahead in facilitating the great growth of trade between nations the major European traders had to first be persuaded to drop the "Linus blanket" of the old gold exchange standard. The new SDR's will be based upon a percentage of gold backing but they will multiply the effectiveness of the limited world gold reserve held by the IMF.

In the recently adopted new program the industrial nations have agreed to subscribe to \$9.5 billion in SDR's over a 3-year period. In addition, they have committed themselves to doubling of their quotas from \$4 to \$8 billion when and if these steps are ratified by the IMF. This will give extended leverage for the growth of trade and it achieves an important though diluted goal sought for years by the U.S. representatives in the IMF and in the Treasury.

There remains now the two other major goals the United States rightly seeks. First flexibility in the currency exchange rates. A greatly needed improvement to avoid wild speculations in currencies and hot money flows which so upset the stability and long-term predictability necessary for trade improvement on the one hand and reduction of domestic politics as an operative fact in international trade on the other hand. Second, we need to get broader concessions for emerging nations in the financing of trade and development.

Let us hope Mr. Speaker that these improvements will add to the luster of the present success quite soon.

I would like to see us mark this as one

of the accomplishments that we have found for a positive country a positive position in the future.

**TRUTH IN LENDING: A TRIBUTE  
TO PAUL DOUGLAS**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MIKVA) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 truth in lending became a reality. Any man who has suddenly found himself imprisoned by debt because he did not understand the fine print knows the import of this occasion. His gratitude belongs above all to one man, a man for whom July 1 was the coming to fruition of a dream of fairness in the loan market, and the end of a long fight against powerful interests, a man without whose long, lonely struggle truth in lending might never have come to be. I refer to my most distinguished constituent, former Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois.

For 7 lonely years two forces had been opposed on the battlefield—the powerful business and creditor interests on the one hand and the consumer, represented by Senator Douglas, on the other. Each year for 7 years Senator Douglas reintroduced his bill, wrote article after article, and made speech after speech in support of it, driven by his own sense of justice and by the importunings of the desperate consumer. And each year for 7 years hearings were held and investigations made, piling up more and more evidence behind the economic necessity for the bill. And each year for 7 years the constant pressure of those who would be hurt by fair lending practices laid the bill on the committee table.

Senator Douglas was not totally alone. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson saw the need for legislation in this area and endorsed truth in lending in general terms. But the Senator's fight was no less frustrating for their support. In 1964 it was only the voice of the Senator from Illinois which was to be heard crying out on the Senate floor against the forces of resistance to truth in lending; it was only the voice of Senator Douglas announcing that during the next scheduled meeting of the committee he would call for a vote by the committee on the bill which had long been before it. The next scheduled meeting was canceled. For another year the chamber of commerce had had its way.

And so it was for 2 more years. More hearings, more speeches, more recommendations to the subcommittee. And then the vagaries of politics removed Senator Douglas from the scene.

In 1968 truth in lending was passed and now it has become a reality. But let us not forget the man who kept this matter before the public conscience. Let us not forget the man who can watch with pride from his present role as active citizen as his dream becomes reality—Senator Paul Douglas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and that the gentlemen from Illinois, Messrs. ANNUNZIO, YATES, and PRICE, be allowed to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my good friend and colleague, Hon. ABNER J. MIKVA of the Second District of Illinois for taking this special order today in order to mark the date, July 1, 1969, that the Consumer Credit Protection Act went into effect, as well as to pay tribute to Hon. Paul Douglas, the distinguished former senior Senator from Illinois.

Congressman MIKVA, since his election to the 91st Congress, has displayed a keen insight into the legislative problems affecting not only the people of his district, but of Illinois and of our Nation as well. I congratulate Congressman MIKVA for his dedication to the legislative process and for the outstanding service he is giving as a member of the House Judiciary Committee and the 91st Congress. The people of the Second District of Illinois are justifiably proud of the significant contribution he is making as a Member of this body.

It is indeed appropriate that Congressman MIKVA has taken this special order to note the outstanding contributions to this country that Senator Douglas has made, foremost among which is the truth-in-lending law which became effective on July 1, 1969.

More than any other man in this country, Paul Douglas has been responsible for setting consumer credit on the road of simplicity and full disclosure. As an economics professor at the University of Chicago, Paul Douglas first proposed uniform language for stating the rates charged on consumer credit.

Later, in the U.S. Senate, he continued his fight for full disclosure. He proposed, late in 1959, to his staff on his Banking Subcommittee that a bill be drafted and supported which would bring uniformity out of the confusion and deception which were almost universal in consumer credit charges. Through all of the subsequent years of hearings and debates, he consistently maintained that the simple annual percentage rate was the basic language for disclosing the price of consumer credit. His insistence on this fundamental prevailed, and today all extensions of credit to consumers must be made in the same language.

Senator Douglas can truly be called the father of the truth-in-lending bill for it was he who first conceived the idea and guided its progress through the early turbulent years when so many objections were raised to his proposal. During the 18 years that Mr. Douglas served in the Senate, he was a pioneer in the fight to achieve truth in lending. On many occasions he stood alone, but he never wavered. Thanks to his efforts, this month, for the first time in the history of our country, the open disclosure of the financial facts of transactions has become a reality. Now the families of the Nation have been given the means to acquire the information with which they may make consumer credit truly productive, each for himself, and together, for the whole economy.

I am certainly pleased that as a member of the Consumer Affairs Subcommit-

tee of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I was one of the sponsors of the truth-in-lending bill which was enacted into law by the Congress of the United States.

The Congress did not expect all consumers to change overnight into rational and expert shoppers for credit when truth in lending became required of creditors. But the Congress did know that without truth in lending, consumers never could become rational and efficient in their use of credit, in their decisions about when to save and pay cash and when to postpone payment. The Congress, therefore, has made possible the rational and efficient use of income and credit by requiring creditors to make uniform disclosures, in language which permits comparison of sources of credit, and of the costs and gains of credit and of savings.

The open disclosure of the financial facts of transactions is going to make financing consumer transactions more productive for consumers, and more profitable and generally smoother for the efficient creditor.

Mr. Speaker, today as we mark this milestone in the financial development of our country, it gives me great pleasure to congratulate my friend of many years, Senator Douglas, not just for the part he played in achieving open and honest disclosure of consumer credit, not just for what he has contributed in the fields of social security, full employment, minimum wage standards, and civil rights, not just for his present contributions as chairman of the National Commission on Urban Problems, but for his championship of the cause of social justice during the entire span of his career of public service. For more than 50 years, he has battled for the poor and the downtrodden and the disadvantaged regardless of race, creed, or color, and he is continuing that fight today.

The magnitude of Senator Douglas' efforts in behalf of the people of America was aptly summed up by former Vice President Hubert Humphrey when he said in Chicago in 1966, "There is no Member of the Senate today who has his name stamped on more major issues, major bills, and major legislation than Paul Douglas."

I take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to Senator Douglas for abundant good health and continuing fruitful service in behalf of the people of America.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to say a few words about Senator Paul H. Douglas. Beginning this month, the major provisions of the Consumer Credit Protection Act will go into effect. Though the act was passed after his Senate career came to a close, truth-in-lending legislation bears that unmistakable stamp of Paul Douglas. Because of his unflinching efforts, millions of Americans will be spared the scourge of unscrupulous credit practices.

The Consumer Credit Protection Act is characteristic of Paul Douglas because of its fundamental rightness. The idea that citizens, especially poor citizens, could be hoodwinked into committing themselves to financial obligations without an adequate understanding of the size and du-

ration of debts which they were incurring is alien to the canons of elementary fairness. Paul Douglas understood that and undertook a lonely fight against a whole panoply of hostile interests who would be served by a perpetuation of the abuses in the consumer credit industry.

The fact that truth-in-lending legislation is now a part of the law of the land stands as testimony to the perseverance and moral vision of Paul H. Douglas. But those of us who know Paul Douglas well cannot be surprised by that victory, because we know him to be a valiant, dedicated man—a man who realizes that even an idea whose time has come requires hard work if it is to become law.

Though Paul H. Douglas no longer spends his time on Capitol Hill, he is anything but inactive. Last year, he published a book entitled *In Our Time*, which is a remarkable discussion of contemporary America and the challenges that must be met if the American dream is to be made a reality. The book contains the combination of scholarship, pragmatism, and indignation out of which Paul Douglas fashioned his exemplary Senate career. His work on various councils and advisory commissions provides him with a continuing forum from which to challenge America's conscience.

Paul H. Douglas commands a measure of respect afforded few men. I can well imagine the satisfaction he must feel as the legislation he masterminded and for which he fought takes effect. Millions who will benefit from his truth-in-lending legislation may never know who their benefactor was, but those of us who watched it evolve will not forget the man who made it possible.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, nothing gives me greater pleasure than to join my colleague from Illinois who has arranged for this special order to pay tribute to the one man who led the often lonely fight for truth-in-lending, the beloved former Senator Paul H. Douglas of Illinois. Paul Douglas more than anyone else set the stage for the eventual enactment of this important consumer law. Despite the innumerable obstacles that he faced during the tortuous course of the Credit Protection Act's legislative history, Paul Douglas has been able to see the day when his vision has become reality.

I served in the House with his devoted wife, Emily Taft Douglas and I first met Paul Douglas at the end of World War II when he returned home with a battle wound suffered as a marine in the South Pacific.

The truth-in-lending law he authored is a measure of his worth as a public servant. It reflects his deep abiding trust in the people and his unswerving devotion to the public good. His legacy of excellence in pursuit of this legislative goal has nurtured those who have followed him in the fight for truth-in-lending. Our distinguished colleague from Missouri, the Honorable LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, the Honorable WILLIAM PROXMIRE, carried forward the work begun by Paul Douglas.

Truth-in-lending is tied in the minds of Congress and the public with the name

of Paul H. Douglas. Rarely has any legislation so justifiably borne the name of one man as has truth-in-lending, the antecedents of which always were referred to as the Douglas bill. This was not a bill prepared in a department or sent up the Hill to find a sponsor, or the product of some school or some lobby. The central idea of the first and the subsequent truth bills came from Paul Douglas' mind and hand.

He described the contents of the first bill for the draftsman. He held firm to those ideas against all proposals of half-way disclosure, without the yardstick of the annual percentage rate.

In developing the truth-in-lending bill, Paul Douglas' approach, which is reflected in the act which now is in effect, was essentially to minimize Federal interference and control. He could have proposed an act which would make the Federal Government the regulator of every aspect of consumer credit—the rates charged, the terms permitted, the treatment of defaults, et cetera. But instead, he sought the limited objective of requiring all those who extend credit to state the price of credit in the common language of the grade school textbooks and of the home mortgage, to state in full the cost of the credit, and to make all of these disclosures before the consumer become liable for the debt. He sought disclosure of the facts in language which all can learn and understand, which is the same from retailer to retailer, retailer to banker, banker to sales finance company, et cetera; and then left to the informed consumer in the marketplace the responsibility of using his income and the credit resources available to him for the greatest benefit. In the first weeks of discussion of the first bill, Paul Douglas proposed that the Federal Government step aside from enforcing the terms of the act whenever a State enacted and enforced a disclosure statute of at least equally high standards.

Paul Douglas set the tone of the discussion of truth in lending at his first hearings, when he sought statements of people, who had experience with the personal aspects of consumer credit, rather than seeking academic and statistical analyses which would try to show, for example, that the business cycle was a product of consumer credit.

The practices which had grown up in the various branches of consumer credit were shown to produce bewilderment, confusion, and unnecessary and wasteful expense to all consumers who used credit. Paul Douglas' approach to aiding them to use credit productively was to require that information be disclosed to them, so that they might learn to act independently to gain the greatest benefit from the resources they could secure. Truth in lending began as an aid to the ordinary family to seek its own welfare and the welfare of all—of the efficient creditor and the ethical merchant—by their own actions based on adequate information.

Consistent with the Senator's approach, all interested parties were invited to appear at hearings in Washington in 1960, 1961, 1962; then, in the next 2 years, hearings were held outside of

Washington, in order to provide opportunity to many more consumers than would be able to finance a trip to Washington for a few minutes of oral testimony. These investigations were basic to the Truth-in-Lending Act.

Truth-in-lending brings the benefits of factual communication to transactions running to more than \$100 billion per year, where comparisons always have been more than most people could manage, either because disclosures were not made in time to permit consideration before the consumer went into debt, or were made in terms special to a trade and which were unlike those used by the possible alternative source or credit. As consumers accumulate the information necessary for full judgment of when and where to use credit, their incomes will go farther for them; the efficient retailers and lenders will gain a greater share of the market; and the more productive economy will lower costs to consumers.

Paul Douglas' record of accomplishment is not limited to consumer affairs. The truth-in-lending victory is not a unique event in his career. It is merely a part of his overall record of solid achievement and an example of his philosophy that the business of government is to serve the people. Whether it is conservation, tax reform, welfare, urban affairs, civil rights, social security and medicare, or government waste, Paul Douglas has been in the forefront of the efforts to improve the quality of American society.

Paul Douglas is a man of the people. The truth-in-lending law exemplifies his devotion to the people. It is a long-sought measure of protection for the American consumer.

In closing, I would like to say how proud I am that I have been able to serve in the Congress with Paul Douglas. He has given me inspiration, and his integrity and vision have made him a legend in his own time.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to join my colleagues in emphasizing the importance of the truth-in-lending legislation and to pay a well-deserved tribute to former Senator Paul Douglas, who perhaps more than any other individual is actually responsible for this legislation.

It has been my privilege to know and work with Paul Douglas for many, many years. Personally and professionally he has reached distinguished heights in many fields, but there is probably none in which he took as dedicated and determined an interest as in legislation for the protection of the average citizen in his everyday dealings in the marketplace.

Paul Douglas is an absolutely honest man himself and he is dedicated to truth in every area. Even though this legislation was enacted after he had left the U.S. Senate, his years of tireless effort are almost certainly responsible for its ultimate success.

#### HIGH SPEED GROUND TRANSPORTATION PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PICKLE) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, nearly 5

years has passed since we first set up the research and demonstration project for the high speed ground transportation project. Over 1 year has lapsed since the Congress authorized a demonstration site for the high speed ground transportation project. Although we have at long last seen the start of the Metroliner service between here and New York, this is still not a project fulfilled as originally contracted.

Almost every week accusations, reports, surveys and denials are issued by the railroad companies, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the equipment manufacturers, the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation and the Department of Transportation—each either surveying and viewing with concern and alarm, but most of them generally wallowing in a roadbed of timidity, uncertainty, and delay.

Regularly, the newspapers in the northeast corridors piously editorialize about the need for more passenger service and usually speak with disdain of the weaknesses of the ICC or the railroad companies' lack of vision.

While all of this analysis is going on, we still have not selected a demonstration site. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is the key weakness of this entire program: DOT has not yet recommended or selected a site to commence the demonstration of the various means of developing techniques that we know must be brought forth.

We must have new techniques for moving large bodies of people, particularly in the thickly populated urban areas. The new Metroliner service is a great improvement. The 110 miles-per-hour trains that have reduced traveling time between Washington and New York by almost 1 hour are the greatest improvement. We have new cars and somewhat improved roadbeds. The Pennsylvania Central Railroad primarily, as well as manufacturers, have reason to be proud of the advances thus developed, but I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the real answer in the high-speed ground transportation problem does not lie alone in improving the present system, that is, wheels on trains. The real answer lies in developing some means of tracked air cushion vehicles, linear electric motors and tube vehicles. We do not know what will be the best system, and while we must continue to improve the present methods, the ultimate answer lies in developing some type of new system that will shoot people quickly between big cities and at a reasonable cost. Before we can really produce this system, it seems to me that we must have a demonstration site.

And yet, DOT and the High-Speed Ground Transportation Office have refused to assume meaningful leadership in this field. As I will point out later, some recommendations have been made by subordinates but no one has bitten the bullet, no one down the street has really measured up to the responsibility. What makes it more disappointing now is that there are strong rumors that inaction on the site selection is based on political motives. I understand that new guidelines have been recommended to determine the methods for selecting a site and that these new procedures or

guidelines are broad enough that the Secretary of Transportation can choose one of these sites strictly on a political basis. I do not believe the Secretary of Transportation would want to be placed in that position.

If that is the situation, Mr. Speaker, that is a reprehensible state of affairs. I therefore call on the House Commerce Investigating Subcommittee to call before it responsible officials to ascertain if these statements of recommendations have been made. It is not enough to say that we need new surveys and research analysis now. What we need instead is action. If we had a site to actually build the demonstration project, we might get underway. We were promised a year ago by DOT that this would move forward quickly and yet the entire project is now frozen on the tracks. If we wanted to do something immediately, we could put into operation the rapid train service already developed in Japan or we could demonstrate the air cushion tracked vehicle as in France.

There is plenty of knowledge available to start this type of project, but a combination of negative thinking has locked us in.

It is for that reason that I think the entire responsibility of the project should be given to one department—the DOT—with a clear mandate from Congress that something be done about it. A close examination of this project today would probably show as much bumbling confusion and uncertainty as any project which has come down the tracks in recent years.

It is for this reason, Mr. Speaker, and it is against this setting that I wish to address the House today on our serious transportation crisis.

The day-to-day routine and necessities of our urban society are pointing more and more to the fact that we will have to have new innovative steps in transportation unless we are satisfied to become bogged in our own mire of congestion. The problem is not simply a problem of highway congestion; of airport and airway congestion; nor of a declining rail passenger outlook.

Instead, it is a problem of deciding whether we will see the problem and deal with it rationally or simply let the times and events carry us listlessly on.

It does not take a great deal of foresight to know that we cannot continue for the future in the same vein followed in the past.

Air service in the so-called northeast golden triangle has already reached the point on some runs at which it is quicker to drive. But at the same time, we see recent studies by offices of the New York Highway Department showing that by 1980, Manhattan will need an additional 60 lanes of freeway in and out to provide adequate service.

In my view, we simply cannot tolerate this kind of uncontrolled expansion. New and more efficient ways of moving people must be found, and the strong indications are that the answer will be in one form or another of high-speed ground transportation.

Congress agreed to look into this possibility almost 4 years ago when final approval was given to the Department of Commerce transportation research pro-

gram, Public Law 89-220. The report of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee indicated a relatively clear picture of the problem:

It is unnecessary to set forth here at length the evidence respecting the overburdening of these facilities. Every Member of the House personally has experienced the inadequacies of our crowded air terminals and facilities, has observed the overcapacity loading of our highways, and is well aware of the demand constantly being made for the enlargement of both types of facilities. But what every Member has experienced and what he has observed is as nothing compared with what lies ahead.

The time has come to see whether passenger traffic on the ground can be made attractive to people; to see whether it is possible to provide facilities that are convenient and economical and which people will use; to see whether this kind of transportation might relieve air congestion and save on the cost of additional air facilities.

In short, Congress saw the problem and made a commitment to solve it. We enacted an intensive research and development program to examine the feasibility of alternative forms of transportation. The program was complete with demonstration projects, and later test sites, to give us a fully tested system for determining both economically and technically what answer was best.

In large measure, the work to be done under this program was analytical and research in nature.

But at the same time, there were two projects which were quite firmly planned at the time the 1965 act was passed, and two others later appeared.

These projects were: First, the demonstration rail project initially between Boston and Providence, R.I., and later extended to New York; and second, the demonstration rail project between New York and Washington. The two which later appeared are: First, a project to determine the operational practicality and feasibility of piggybacking private passenger cars from Washington to Florida; and second, a high speed ground test facility to examine problems found in relation to tracked air cushion vehicles, linear electric motors, tubed vehicles, and other advanced technology.

Mr. Speaker, the original program was for 4 years, with June 30, 1969, slated as the expiration date of the act.

Possibly, the Congress and the Departments of Commerce and Transportation were a little overoptimistic in their estimates as to how much work could be done within this period of time. One factor is that the step-ups in the Vietnam situation was not anticipated, with the consequent cutback in funding. But the long and short of it is that the timetable was missed by a mile.

The emphasis and attention Congress brought to the area of high-speed ground transportation soon became frustrated in the performance of the contractors. To listen to the problems encountered by the car builders and suppliers, and the Penn Central Railroad, and DOT is like a primer of confusion.

First, the problem was an industrial one: the railroads and their suppliers, faced with the need to update their technology, found that they had completely underestimated the problem and the demands which it would make. In short,

there was the problem of an industry drained of resources having suddenly to come alive.

That alone, might not have been insurmountable; Americans are supposed to be engineering experts. But that was not all. In addition to technical problems, there were legal problems and institutional problems which proved just as dilatory. On October 12, 1968, the Washington Star reported that the New York-Boston demonstration had been hit by "a mountain of minor problems." The operating line, the New Haven Railroad, was threatened by a Federal court order to shut down, unless taken over by the Penn Central company; because of a labor disagreement between the New Haven and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, the cabs of the cars demonstration run had to be rebuilt to make room for a fireman; and finally, the trustees for the New Haven said they would not sign any contract that committed the bankrupt railroad beyond the date of its sale.

By mid-November 1968, the situation had become so log-jammed that on the New York-Washington demonstration, Secretary of Transportation, Alan Boyd, was reported as threatening to drop the project. As reported in the Washington Star on November 12, 1968:

UNITED STATES THREATENS TO DROP FAST TRAIN PROJECT

(By Stephen M. Aug)

Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd, unhappy over a continuing battle between two railroad-equipment suppliers, has threatened to pull the government out of the New York-Washington high-speed passenger-train project.

Boyd's remarks—in a letter to Sen. Gordon L. Allott, R-Colo.—brought a flurry of conflicting statements over whether any work was even being done on the high-speed cars.

Boyd charges that work had stopped on cars with defective Westinghouse meters. Penn Central Co., which is to operate the trains, said it is testing two Westinghouse-powered cars. Westinghouse said it hadn't touched the cars since Aug. 26.

A spokesman for the Budd Co. said the company had not worked on the Westinghouse cars since it returned them to Westinghouse last Aug. 26. Budd was selected by Penn Central to build the cars.

If the Westinghouse statement is true, it could be next August before its 20 coaches

are operating—at least according to testimony before a Senate subcommittee.

If the demonstration project ultimately proceeds without the 20 Westinghouse cars—as Penn Central says it may—the result could be that only snack-bar coaches and parlor cars with limited seating capacity would be available for the high-speed runs, which already are more than a year late in starting. The New York-Boston section of high-speed train service is not involved in the threatened pull-out.

The article later goes on to explain:

MOTORS AT ISSUE

The problem centers about Westinghouse motors supplied for 20 so-called Metroliner cars that were built by Budd. When the motors are started, a sudden in-rush of electric power results in short-circuiting, a Penn Central spokesman said. Such a problem does not exist with respect to 30 cars having General Electric Co. motors.

Until now, Budd has blamed Westinghouse for supplying faulty motors, and Westinghouse has claimed that Budd built cars that are too heavy for the motors—in effect, that Budd didn't follow the specifications.

Unfortunately, this is the kind of bottleneck that seems to be the general rule in connection with the high-speed project. By early 1968, we were to have had operational the two northeast corridor demonstrations, and by the middle of calendar 1969, the auto-on-car Florida project was to be operational.

The New York-Boston, the first demonstration project to open, got underway 6 months to a year late; the Penn Central began operating Metroliners a little over a year late, and it has not yet become operational on a full scale.

I am of course concerned over the time we have lost on these two demonstrations. Also, I cannot understand why the Florida project has not spent all the money appropriated for it prior to fiscal year 1968. This is a good project and one which in my opinion should not be sacrificed so quickly. From reports appearing in the papers this week, I am led to believe that this money will be spent on boxcar development, rather than on something which might help in the passenger area. I cannot understand the railroad's continuous desire to push freight activities to the disregard of passenger service.

Admittedly, Congress did reduce the funding under this program, but it cer-

tainly did not give cause to believe that the idea had been abandoned.

Also, on the project dealing with the high-speed test site, more progress should have been made. This is the only project in which all of the critical elements reside within the authority of Government offices, and yet this is one of the slowest to develop.

The latest word I heard from the Department of Transportation was that the test facility project is being delayed to consider the possibility of including in the same test site, programs necessary under automobile testing programs. That might sound like a good and economical objective, and yet DOT has been looking at this possibility for over a year and a half now. In hearing before the Transportation Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee on April 25, 1968, the following colloquy took place:

HSGT TEST FACILITY

Mr. BOLAND. On the test facilities you spent some time on that. Do you have any indication from the Federal Highway Administration that they would be interested in the joint use of a test facility such as you propose?

Mr. NELSON. The most likely possibility for a joint use of the Federal Highway Administration is in the facilities that they may set up under the traffic safety program. We have approached them several times and until recently we have been informed that they were not in a position to know for sure what kind of facilities they wanted. I understand that within the last month or several weeks that they have begun to focus on precisely what their needs are going to be, and we have arranged for a meeting with them to talk about the possibilities of joint use.

Mr. BOLAND. There is some indication on the part of a lot of people that the Federal Highway Administration, particularly the Highway Administration itself, does require some test facilities for the development of vehicles which can stand some of the impacts which occur in accidents today. Now you indicated the requirement of \$950,000 for the proposed high-speed ground test transportation facility. This amount is for the building itself, for the support building.

Mr. NELSON. Well, it is more than the support building. It is, for example, for the acquisition, I believe, in that first year of a crane that will be able to remove the vehicle from the track and put it in the shop. I think I have a complete breakdown here.

Mr. BOLAND. Supply that for the record.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.  
(The information requested follows:)

5-YEAR PROGRAM—TEST FACILITY

	Fiscal year—							
	1968	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974	
Engineering.....	315	150	250	250	350	300	200	Prepare construction bid packages, master planning, supervision of construction, fiscal year 1969, LIM and TACV; fiscal year 1970, 3-foot-diameter tube; fiscal year 1971, power collection and communication fiscal year 1972, full-scale tube; fiscal year 1973, mag. suspension.
Construction:								
Access road, construction and maintenance.....		25	150	50	50	50	50	Includes snow removal.
Buildings.....		300		150	180	150		Fiscal year 1969, main building; fiscal year 1971, tube vehicle support buildings; fiscal year 1973, additional support buildings for tube vehicles; fiscal year 1972, power and switch station.
Security.....			50	50	50	50	50	Includes security personnel; fiscal year 1970, fencing for LIM and TACV tracks; fiscal year 1973, fencing for 20-mile tube track.
Cranes.....		75			50			Fiscal year 1969; LIM and TACV; fiscal year 1972, tube vehicles.
Utilities.....		25	25	75	75	100	125	Power, water, sanitary, telephone, and heat.
Snow-ice maker.....			150					
Instrumentation: Equipment and Installation.....		100	200	100	100	200	100	
Maintenance:								
Mobile equipment.....			275	25	50	50	75	Track grinder; crane; snow removal equipment; automotive equipment.
Shop machine tools.....		75	150	100	150	100	50	Drill presses; lathes, millers, and small tools.
Electronics.....			50	25	25	25	25	
Labor.....			100	150	150	200	250	
Operation-test support: Labor.....		200	400	400	450	500	600	
Total.....	315	950	1,800	1,375	1,680	1,725	1,525	

As the above statements show, Dr. Robert Nelson, the Director of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation, did indicate that the Bureau of Public Roads was considering the possibility of joining in the test site. But at the same time, the material he submitted for the record indicated that the project would be far enough along in fiscal 1969 to warrant the expenditure of substantial amounts of money for construction and access roads.

There has been no such construction, and moreover, there has not even been the selection of a site. I question now whether there has been or is now contemplated any serious action to select a site. This is a flouting of congressional intent and direction.

Possibly one of the strongest reasons for this delay is that the responsibility for selection of the test site was taken from the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation last October and placed in the Office of the Secretary of Transportation. At the time this change was made, a selection process had already been completed. A great many sites had been examined, and it was certainly possible that a reasoned selection could have been made.

At appropriations hearings in April 1968, Dr. Nelson indicated that they had looked at over 100 sites, about 25 of which warranted careful examination. One site with which I am quite familiar lies just to the north of my congressional district in Texas. It seems to fill the requirements on most all points. I am not in a position to know whether it came out as the top contender, but at least it, and I assume several others, were very much in the running.

Some of the background which went into the question of site selection prior to this October 1968 transfer is set out in the following discussion in the appropriations hearings in 1968:

Mr. MINSHALL. How many sites have you actually looked at now and can you tell us where they are?

Mr. NELSON. 25,000 acres in more or less a square is very difficult to find.

Mr. BOLAND. Except in Nevada.

Mr. NELSON. But that land is not available because the AEC and the Air Force have taken over a good part of it.

But we have looked at well over 100 sites. Obviously, a very large number of them were rejected almost immediately because they were impractical. But we have looked very carefully at about 25 sites. We are in the process of reducing that now to about five. We will give a very careful engineering evaluation to about five sites.

Mr. BOLAND. You will select a site this year. Is the item of \$950,000 you have in this budget for the purpose of constructing buildings with reference to the site?

Mr. LANG. Yes, and that is all.

Mr. BOLAND. So you will select a site this year?

Mr. LANG. It should be understood that we don't plan to physically occupy all 25,000 acres, but in order to get the oval track, the center of which we don't need at all, we need the 25,000 acres.

With this much work having gone into it, I cannot understand why we are still left without a site to continue the testings.

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned earlier, I can see no good reason for this kind of delay. We have seen delays throughout

the high-speed test program, and I believe it is time that Congress give greater support to this program. We have a strong duty to ask questions and demand answers.

The original program was designed to run for 4 years, and there were certain things which were to be completed within that time. It was expected that the demonstrations would have been operational and providing information to determine "the public response to varying levels of speed, cost, comfort, and convenience of improved passenger service." That is how the demonstrations were described in the August 1965 report of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Also, that report indicated that:

During the actual demonstration of improved service, statistical tests would be conducted to find out what are the changes in the pattern of passenger utilization.

A significant amount of work was completed on the project by the 4-year deadline, but because of technical problems in the supply industry and cutbacks in funding, the program had to be extended.

During the latter part of 1968, at the request of the Department of Transportation, Congress considered and enacted H.R. 16024, Public Law 90-423, a 2-year extension of the program. This extended the termination date to June 30, 1971, just a little less than 2 years from today.

What I would like to know now is where we will stand 2 years from today. My fear is that this program is not being given the attention and emphasis it deserves either from Congress or the White House. There is not the spirit of urgency at administration levels that exists every day on our Nation's freeways and airways. There is not the push here that was felt when President Johnson announced the HSGT program 4 years ago and Congress determined that we needed more work in the field of ground transportation.

The bill extending the program through 1971 established authorizations which were designed to get us back on the track, but we are not even seeing budget requests which meet these authorizations. For fiscal year 1970, of an authorization of \$21.2 million, the HSGT project under the Johnson budget was earmarked for \$17 million; under the Nixon budget, for \$14 million.

The program which started out as a recognition of the fact that a lot of catchup was needed, is ending up as a program which has had top-level neglect and which consequently could not withstand the pressures of the budget reducer's knife.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is important now that Congress make a strong effort to instill a greater sense of urgency and give it greater resources.

In all fairness, I would like to present a portion of the evidence submitted by the Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation in support of its request last year for an extension of the program. On the two northeast corridor demonstration projects, this is the statement they make concerning the delay involved:

The timing of both the Washington-New York and the New York-Boston demonstrations of rail passengers service deserve an explanation.

Undoubtedly in the winter and early spring of 1966 when the demonstrations were being set up an optimistic view prevailed as to the time that would be required for the engineering, the building and the testing of new equipment. Considering that none of the equipment suppliers had built equipment of this kind before delivery commitments could not be based on prior experience. Nevertheless the car builders for both demonstrations accepted in their contracts penalty provisions for late delivery. Based on the estimates of time of delivery for equipment starting dates were set for the demonstrations. In the case of the demonstration between Washington and New York the time required for up-grading of the roadbed was thought to be the critical element and it governed the starting date. In April 1966, before the contract for the building of the Washington-New York demonstration cars was awarded, the Department of Commerce and the Pennsylvania Railroad agreed that "... the demonstration was expected to start in October 1967."

About 8 months after the award of contracts for construction of the equipment it became apparent that the Budd Co. would have difficulty in delivering equipment on time for the Pennsylvania Railroad to start the demonstration on October 29. A decision had to be made on the Railroad and the Government as to whether to hold to the original starting date. The Government took the view that an extra effort should be made by the Budd Co. to get equipment built as soon as possible. On this basis the Government agreed to pay for overtime and extra costs incurred by Budd up to a total of \$220,000. Also the Government insisted that October 29 be retained as a target for starting the demonstration and public statements were made to that effect by the director of the Office of High Speed Ground Transportation.

Very clearly at this time the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Budd Co. and the electrical suppliers had very serious doubts that enough equipment could be ready for service by October 29. The office of High Speed Ground Transportation is responsible for holding to the original starting date.

The Government believed that there was an urgency (and there still is) to get the information which would be provided by the Washington-New York demonstration and in light of this urgency that it was desirable to set an early date for the start.

The measure of success or failure, however, in getting equipment designed, built, tested and into operating condition expeditiously should probably rest more on a comparison with the time required to carry out their similar projects than on whether or not an early estimate of time of delivery was met.

In making this determination it should be understood first that there is not an easy basis of comparison between this equipment and other rail passenger equipment which has been built in recent years. The electrically propelled cars which are to operate between Washington and New York are the most technologically advanced ever built. The complexities in the control system have required much more testing than was anticipated.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the technical problems do, of course, give partial justification for the delays. But I do not think it is adequate reason to excuse the lack of support for this program.

At this point, I believe what the program needs more than anything is that the entire Office of High-Speed Ground Transportation demonstration project, including work on the high-speed ground

test site, be transferred from the Federal Rail Administration to the Office of the Secretary of Transportation.

Apparently, it will take this kind of muscle to get all of the related offices in agreement. I understand this possibility has been discussed and that the reason given for not making such a transfer is that the demonstration projects were associated in the public mind with the railroads. But it appears that the advantages we stand to gain from such a transfer outweigh the problems of associating the demonstrations with the Federal Rail Administration.

If a move of this nature were made, then I submit that Congress would be in a better position to oversee this program and to follow its progress. Secretary Volpe has stated a strong desire to improve our transportation picture both in the air and on the ground. If this is to be done, I believe Congress will be willing to assist.

The problem to this point has been one of getting adequate support for the project both in the executive branch and through congressional funding. I hope this picture improves substantially in the future.

But to get the problem off dead center, it is going to take more than just one branch of Government making noise about the need for high speed ground transportation. It will take a cooperative effort and a great deal of dedication.

I think the HSGT work deserves the prestige of being directly responsible to the Secretary. The organizational questions were not specifically spelled out in the initial legislation in 1965. But we must realize that the program is more than just a new-type railroad project, and that by being in the Federal Railroad Administration it does not necessarily receive the attention it should.

The program in its inception was meant to be a bold, innovative endeavor. It was meant to confront a very real and critical problem. I hope now that we are not losing sight of this.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the demonstration site for this high-speed ground transportation project has not been recommended or selected because subordinates down the street want to "restudy" the project and establish new guidelines, perhaps based on guidelines that would allow the Secretary of Transportation to make the site selection on a political basis. I recommend that the site be selected and we eliminate the confused line of administrative authority by transferring the entire responsibility to the Secretary of Transportation. Moreover, I think it is time that proper officials be called before the House Commerce Investigating Subcommittee to receive answers to these charges and to give the committee a full accounting on these developments.

It is well and good for the newspapers to lambast the ICC for allowing passenger service to be discontinued when indeed, the ICC is probably the only agency that has kept the passenger service alive at all. Though many discontinuances have been allowed, we still have a skeleton of passenger services. I agree with the ICC that we should establish a national need for passenger service, but assuming this study and blueprint, we

are still years away from accomplishing our task because of the delays which we are experiencing now. There are a lot of individuals and agencies at fault: And the Congress is not blameless. But I think we ought to stop this business of pointing a finger at the ICC or the railroads or the manufacturers and establish a clear objective that this demonstration project will get underway and that clear responsibility be given to one department. Until that happens we are still traveling on the same old roadbeds, bumping over the same rough grade crossing and rolling over basically the same oval wheels.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE of Illinois). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### INFANT MORTALITY AND NUCLEAR TESTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HOLIFIELD), is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 22, 1969, I spoke about the "instant" experts in this country who will speak for hours on any subject, whether they know anything about the subject or not. We have a classic example of a radiation physicist who speaks like an epidemiologist, radiobiologist, and physician. This paragon of knowledge will expound for hours on any subject—you name it. This year the subject happens to be infant and fetal death—due to the fallout of strontium-90. If you want to get a point home, hit the mother in the crib. These accusations are extremely serious because they have been irresponsibly tied to the ABM.

The so-called expert to whom I am referring is Dr. Ernest J. Sternglass, a physics teacher at the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Sternglass' major thesis is that the strontium-90 in the fallout of fission products causes an increase in fetal and infant deaths. He states that he developed this thesis by recently examining the fallout from the first nuclear detonation—Trinity—on July 16, 1945. He is wrong from the word "go."

In articles and TV appearances—the last being his appearance on the "Today" show, Thursday, July 24—Dr. Sternglass has made very frightening statements concerning fetal and infant mortality, attributing the cause to radioactivity. At the conclusion of my remarks I would like to include the transcript of the "Today" show covering his appearance and the transcript of the Monday, July 28 show in which Dr. Sagan, of the Palo Alto Clinic, an authority on radiation and a former member of the Atomic Bomb Casualty Commission, and Dr. Storer, Scientific Director for Pathology and Immunology of the Oak Ridge National

Laboratory, appeared to present the scientific facts on the matter.

First of all we would like to point out that Dr. Sternglass' information with respect to the direction of fallout resulting from the Trinity shot in Alamogordo, N. Mex., in 1945 is incorrect. By the testimony of his own reference, which is a book called "Day of Trinity" on page 253, it states:

The main cloud went north from the site of detonation and finally wrapped itself around Gallinas Peak, 65 miles to the north there to break up and disappear for good.

Dr. Sternglass states that the cloud passed eastward and settled in the southern tier of the United States, that is, Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia, and the Carolinas.

The cloud, in fact, went north-northeast, as established by weather data and fallout measurements, corroborating the data in the book "Day of Trinity." These were collected by the people who participated in the shot itself and by representatives of the Weather Bureau. While the major deposition of fallout was in New Mexico itself, smaller portions of the cloud did pass northward into the States of Colorado, Nebraska, and Kansas.

The infant mortality experience in New Mexico itself, the State that received the heaviest fallout from the Trinity shot continued to decline steadily until 1958—13 years after the Trinity shot, when the rate of decline slowed.

Dr. Sternglass, whose title is professor of radiology and director of radiation physics at the University of Pittsburgh is not a physician. He is a physicist. As such, his background and experience in the area of study of infant mortality is limited.

Dr. Sternglass' thesis is that infant mortality which had been declining at a rapid rate prior to the early 1950's then slowed in its rate of decline. This he refers to as the "leveling off effect," which he attributes to fallout. If one examines individual States throughout the United States one sees a great discrepancy between the arrival of fallout and the leveling-off effect. In some States the leveling-off effect occurred long before the testing program began. In other States, the leveling-off effect, as in New Mexico, occurred many years afterward.

Infant mortality indeed has continued to decline in the United States with the exception of 2 years, 1957 and 1958, when there were slight increases considered by the U.S. Public Health Service to be associated with the coincident influenza epidemic. Dr. Sternglass, in referring to infant mortality rates as "excess," implies that rates have been climbing. This is untrue. They have indeed been declining steadily. No physician I know of supports Dr. Sternglass' contention that infant mortality rates should have indefinitely continued to decline at the rate they were declining prior to the early 1950's. Physicians are unanimous in believing that at some still unknown level there must be a basic threshold or basement level of infant deaths below which we cannot hope to go. These deaths will be due to uncontrollable genetic causes, accidents, or diseases as well as causes still not understood.

The levels of radiation to which the

U.S. population was exposed from fall-out have been relatively small. Best estimates are that the increased exposure due to fallout when added to background radiation has added less than 5 percent to the total, and strontium-90 probably accounts for only a few percent of the genetic dose due to fallout. The question of harmful human effects to exposed populations from such levels of fallout have been carefully evaluated by a number of national and international organizations.

Dr. Sternglass' views on the effects of radiation run counter to the conclusions of objective scientific evaluations including extensive reports of the United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Radiation, the reports of the National Academy of Sciences, and the reports of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Epidemiologists are in agreement that to analyze this kind of a problem one would need to expound, without recourse to the infant mortality data, a specific hypothesis predicting when the change in infant mortality would be anticipated in various geographic locations. Having done this, one would then examine the data for the various geographic locations to observe how often the hypothesis is supported and how often it is not supported. This would need to be done for areas in which increases are anticipated as well as in areas in which they are not anticipated. Unfortunately, Dr. Sternglass did not do this.

Dr. Sternglass has written a magazine article which, according to an advertisement, might influence the ABM argument. His military and weapons expertise is as deficient as his medical expertise. Dr. Sternglass' colleagues, who also write for the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, should have told him that a 2-megaton fission ABM warhead would so mess up the sky that a radar would have difficulty seeing through it. Therefore, the ABM warhead must have something less than 2 megatons of fission. Where now will he get his 10,000 to 30,000 megatons of fission?

Also, since the long-range ABM warhead will be detonated exoatmospherically, it will take many years for the fission products to reach the earth's surface, and this means the entire earth's surface—so that we are talking about concentrations like millicuries per square mile.

Portions of the transcript from the July 24 and July 28 "Today" show follow:

TRANSCRIPT OF TAPED RECORDING OF A PORTION OF THE TODAY SHOW, JULY 24, 1969

Mr. DOWNS. This is Thursday, July 24th. It is Today. Barbara Walters is here. I am Hugh Downs. Frank Blair will bring you the news in just a few moments.

This half of the hour we have a guest, Dr. Ernest Sternglass. He is of the University of Pittsburgh, a man who has studied the problem of nuclear fall-out, and he concludes that it poses immense dangers, far beyond anything we have previously believed, to future generations. His conclusions have been disputed. Now we will be looking forward to talking to him.

Nuclear fall-out as a cause of lung cancer and leukemia has long been established. Defense planners take their probable rate into account when they calculate lives to be lost in a nuclear war. However, our guest today

is a radiologist who says that the really massive dangers of fall-out have been overlooked, and that they may be far greater than anything we believed.

The threat he is talking about is to human reproduction and his argument is every time a nuclear blast releases debris into the atmosphere the lives of countless thousands of children, not only unborn but not yet conceived, are in deadly jeopardy. His evidence is new and has not been widely substantiated, and the Atomic Energy Commission says flatly that his conclusions are not borne out by the facts, but we think it should be heard, especially in view of our guest's claim that it has a vital implication for the current debate over the antiballistic missile system.

Before we talk with our guest, this graph may be helpful. I want you to take a look at it. This line—you will see a line here. This is years going down here. This is deaths—per thousand. Ranges from 10 to 60. The line does not go down to zero. If you take a close look at the line, you see it shows what our guest says was expected to happen in our time to infant mortality—that it would drop off dramatically. There was every indication that would happen, and it did until early 1950's.

But impose these indicators of periods of bomb testing. The first was the A-bomb test here that took place in 1945—right—and the Nevada and Pacific tests of the 50's. This is thermonuclear in the 60's.

Then the dots that we superimpose now are the actual rate of infant mortality. You see how it was falling off below this line here, and on down through—there is a little delay there, but now it rises. It doesn't actually rise, but the fall-off is not as fast as was expected. You see the correlation that our guest's research points toward.

Then this map—the site of the 1945 A-test—shows the distribution. This is the site here and the distribution of the fall-out by the prevailing winds. By 1950 in this tier of southern states, the downward trend and rates of death of infants under one year slowed down from what was expected—not the deaths, but the rate, the downward rate. In the rest of the country the rate continued to drop, and our guest says the cause was genetic damage caused by nuclear fall-out.

We are going to introduce our guest, Barbara, if you want to give a proper introduction, we have a lot of questions to ask him.

Miss WALTERS. Our guest is Dr. Ernest Sternglass. He is Professor of Radiology and Director of Radiation Physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine.

His studies have been presented and disputed at several scientific conferences, and he published articles on his findings in the April and June issues of the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists, and in Washington yesterday, Dr. Sternglass appeared before a panel of concerned congressmen.

Dr. Sternglass, scientists have warned us long ago that nuclear radioactivity can cause bone cancer and leukemia. Now you are saying this fear is dwarfed by the damage to human reproduction. As I recall from reading some of your articles, it is the children in future generations are born smaller, weaker than other children, not that they are necessarily born with deformities. So it is very hard to trace these weaker children to the radioactive fall-out.

In your opinion, what does this fall-out do to the reproductive process which causes these smaller, weaker children?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Well, apparently, according to studies on experimental animals that were performed in Sweden by Dr. Luning at the Swedish Research Establishment, it seems to affect the division process of cells in the early stages of the embryo's development causing, among other things, excess fetal deaths when injected into the male mouse, and apparently reducing the chance for resistance to disease and things of that sort.

Mr. DOWNS. I have to ask you on that

southern states thing where you showed path of fall-out, hasn't there been an increase in poverty in those areas lately that would account for the effects on infant mortality rather than radio activity?

Dr. STERNGLASS. No, not in that sense. In fact, the argument has always been that it has been the movement away from the poor South into the urban centers of the North that has led to, supposedly, this increase or this failure of infant mortality to go down.

Furthermore, there is another way in which we can show that it is not related to poverty because it declines with distance out to the Atlantic, exactly as we now know nuclear fall-out intensity decreases in the wedge states. It declines from 25 percent increase above normal to 15, to 10, to 5 with increasing distance away from New Mexico.

Mr. DOWNS. Does it follow the inverse square law?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Not quite. Somewhere between the inverse first and the inverse square law. It is described in the book of Nuclear Weapons Effects.

Mr. DOWNS. I see. What do children of—I won't say genetically damaged parents, but those whose reproductive mechanism may be damaged, what do those children die of?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Mainly of infectious diseases because of an apparent lower ability to form antibodies and to resist infections and to recover. Another thing is, of course, congenital malformations, another is simply immaturity, underweight. We know that in the United States for many years now, relative to Europe, children have been consistently born underweight, and that by itself—2 or 300 grams—almost doubles the chance the infant will not make it in the first year.

Miss WALTERS. Doctor, let me ask one question just for clarification. In recent years, in the years since atomic bomb testing have the infant mortality rates increased to that degree so that our scientists say something must be wrong somewhere?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Yes, in fact this noticeable change in infant mortality had been a source of worry for the Public Health Service for many years. They have held international conferences on the subject and tried to discover what the cause was without being able to do so.

Mr. DOWNS. I was just going to say the Atomic Energy Commission called us yesterday. They were concerned about your appearance on the program today. They say that their experiments with animals show that there are no damage to offspring at all from parent animals given strontium 90 in those low dosages that we get.

What makes you so sure their research is wrong?

Dr. STERNGLASS. It is not a question of being right or wrong. You have to do this on millions of animals and at very low doses to see this kind of effect. No one has as yet been able to do such experiments, but the experiments on animals carried out by Dr. Luning and Nelson in Sweden have shown chromosome damage and abnormalities in the offspring of mice in Sweden, and more recently at the University of Utah with tritium and Germany using tritium, which is another product of nuclear bombs—that in every case the embryo has been found to be at least 20 to 50, or possibly a hundred times, more sensitive to internal radiation than to external x-rays completely upsetting all our calculations as to what would happen in a nuclear war.

Miss WALTERS. Doctor, the Atomic Energy Commission does have its own tests and its own research. If you are so certain that your research is correct, how do you explain their opposition?

Dr. STERNGLASS. For many years, the Atomic Energy Commission, like every other scientist had really believed, as I did too, that there were not likely to be very serious effects on our population. I did not discover this until last October myself, and I've been

interested in this problem for at least ten years. In other words, it was totally unexpected.

Mr. DOWNS. How do your findings relate to the question of whether the United States should build an anti-ballistic missile system? What are your feelings about that?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Well, you can look at it this way. According to these figures that we now have on our computer calculated program, one in a hundred children apparently died, one in a hundred of children born, as a result of 200 megatons of fission products released during all of the period of testing.

But we are now talking about massive strikes of 20,000 megatons. If one wants to shoot them down, one needs tens of thousands of megatons to try to detonate these things before they hit their target, but the fall-out from the ABM's being long-lived strontium 90 would spread around the world in a matter of 10 days to 2 weeks, and, therefore, reach Russia and cause the Russian children to die in the next generation thereby representing effectively national suicide for Russia if they launched such an attack.

Mr. DOWNS. Would that make you in favor of the ABM?

Dr. STERNGLASS. No, in the sense that the shelter program, if it had been carried through, by now would have been totally ineffective against these long range radiations, and the ABM program would merely introduce more and more and more of this biological poison into the atmosphere.

Miss WALTERS. How do you feel about something like radiation from x-ray?

Dr. STERNGLASS. I think my studies show that, fortunately, we are very lucky that external x-rays from x-ray machines are much less serious than internal isotope produced radiation due to ingested strontium 90 which comes into your body with, like the calcium you need to form your teeth and bones and so on. So internal strontium 90 now appears to be far more harmful than any external radiation.

Mr. DOWNS. If I understand correctly, external radiation, when it is turned off, that is the end of it.

Dr. STERNGLASS. Right. That is the fortunate part about it.

Mr. DOWNS. Internal radiation continues—

Dr. STERNGLASS. Continues with you for years and years and, in fact, it would take 28 years for it to die down to one half of its intensity. In other words, it would be with you for centuries if it were to be released into the atmosphere.

Mr. DOWNS. In the case of the Panama Canal and the use of nuclear blasting for something—peaceful uses—that sort of thing, does this, in your mind, pose a hazard?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Yes, I believe it is a very serious hazard. It has not been possible to find ways to eliminate the fission products or to prevent them from escaping when the bombs are detonated close to the surface, and you have to do that to dig a ditch.

Mr. DOWNS. What about bomb testing deep underground?

Mr. STERNGLASS. That is much less harmful.

Mr. DOWNS. I read a newspaper article where you said—

Dr. STERNGLASS. It to can be if it is done in a highly populated area. It is a question of where you do this thing. If you do it out in the Nevada desert and under carefully controlled conditions, then the hazard is very much less.

Miss WALTERS. Is this what you discussed yesterday when you met before Congress?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Yes, as a matter of fact, Mr. Hollifield was there, who has been one of the top people in the program to bring to the attention of the American people the various potential hazards of nuclear weapons and nuclear war. In fact, he was very concerned and said, "You don't really need these long range effects to make it evident that a

ten thousand megaton attack by either side would essentially represent the end of society as we know it, in light of all these things."

I think the argument now is more or less one of degree. I think most scientists are agreed today that because of the tremendous sensitivity of the early developing mammal—and all of us are mammals—we are simply a hundred times more sensitive than any of the computer programmed studies in the past had ever imagined.

Mr. DOWNS. Thank you, Dr. Sternglass. In closing, I should say Dr. Sternglass' interpretation of facts is challenged by the Atomic Energy Commission and other scientists. But thank you for appearing today.

#### TRANSCRIPT OF A TAPED RECORDING OF A PORTION OF THE TODAY SHOW, JULY 28, 1969

Mr. DOWNS. Last Thursday one of our guests was Dr. Ernest Sternglass, who is Professor of Radiology and Director of Radiation Physics at the University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine. He said that nuclear fall-out causes great damage to human reproductive cells and that this increases infant mortality.

We pointed out at the time the Atomic Energy Commission disagrees with that, and to present the other side we want to talk now with two scientists who have worked directly for the AEC, but who now have positions with related agencies. They are Dr. John Storer, who is Scientific Director for Pathology and Immunology in the Biology Division of Oak Ridge National Laboratory, and Dr. Leonard Sagan, Associate Director of the Department of Environmental Health, Palo Alto Clinic in California. I want to welcome both of them to Today.

Barbara and I asked Dr. Sternglass some questions and we want to ask you some now. We had a graph at the time, which I have learned since had been destroyed shortly after, but you who saw it remember that the graph Dr. Sterngrass brought showed a projected rate of decline of infant mortality—what was expected for about a decade or a little over a decade. And the actual decline in infant mortality didn't conform to that line. It went a little bit higher in connection, he said, with some of the atomic testing starting with the Bikini H Bomb testing.

It is clear that you don't believe the levels of fallout that anyone has yet received can cause any reproductive damage but I understand you also see no link between fall-out and the incidence of bone cancer and leukemia. What is the story on this and why do you believe that it is not dangerous?

Dr. STORER. Let me preface our remarks by pointing out, Hugh, that a tremendous amount is known about radiation. Radiation has been studied for 70 years, and it has been studied intensively for the past 25 years, not only in this country but throughout the world.

There is general agreement among scientists that radiation is probably the most thoroughly studied and best understood of all man's environmental hazards. It is against this background of accumulated information, as well as some specific criticisms we have of Dr. Sternglass' interpretation, that is the basis for disagreement.

To go back to your specific question, there is just no evidence that the very small amounts of radiation have caused leukemia or bone cancer any place in the country or any place in the world.

Mr. DOWNS. In any higher incidence than would have occurred, you mean, in normal life.

Dr. STORER. That is correct. There is just no evidence.

Mr. DOWNS. The background count has increased slightly, but I understand percentage-wise that would be miniscule compared to what would be required to do damage.

Dr. STORER. The increase is about 4 percent

over what naturally occurs and what has always been with us, and if we include radiation exposure from medical uses and put that average in, then the radiation dose from fall-out would amount to one or two percent of what the average dose is to an American.

Mr. DOWNS. You don't argue that none of the fall-out is at all dangerous, do you? You say "of human hazards" so you link it as a hazard and say it has been studied.

Do you want to try that Dr. Sagan?

Dr. SAGAN. I don't think that is really a question any more argued. I think scientists now almost universally agree that the levels of radiation to which the American public was exposed from the fall-out source have been harmless.

Mr. DOWNS. How would you account then for Dr. Sternglass' graph that did show that, in fact, there was—this is hard to explain—a slowing up of the decline of infant mortality? What other causes could—

Dr. SAGAN. I think the information on that graph is entirely correct. It rather falls apart if you examine information state by state. For instance, there are a number of states in which the plateauing or leveling off, as you call it, occurred much before fall-out appeared, and contrary-wise in other states leveling off didn't occur until many years after the fall-out.

Mr. DOWNS. I see, so this was an average.

Dr. STORER. This is an average and gives an appearance that doesn't hold up very well on closer examination.

Mr. DOWNS. You think maybe there is coincidence that it coincides—

Dr. STORER. That is exactly what I think. It is coincidence.

Miss WALTERS. Doctor, I remember recently we had a guest—and I don't remember his name—who had written a book about the industrial uses of atomic energy and was concerned that they affected the human being and now Dr. Sternglass has added his report, and yet you say scientists, if I understood you correctly, are almost in complete agreement that fall-out is harmless.

Are these people just mavericks—just one or two among thousands? Is that what you are saying?

Dr. STORER. You have to, Barbara, consider dose levels. At high doses there is no question but that radiation can be damaging. It can produce leukemia and cancer, but these levels that we are talking about that occurred with fallout are really quite trivial. There is no evidence that they produced any of those effects.

Mr. DOWNS. We are going to be back in a moment with our guests because there are some other questions to ask, but right now this is Today on NBC.

We will go right back now to talking about the effects of fall-out and so forth. Public fear is not to be dismissed lightly, and we tend, as the public, to be afraid of things that are unfamiliar, and we can at times be out on a limb. I am sure that the manufacturers of thalidomide at one point felt it was a pretty safe thing, and they turned out to be resoundingly wrong.

In the case of certain radioactive things where there is a half life of over 5,000 years as in the case of one of the carbon isotopes, what if there was an error? It would be almost not correctable, and I think this is the reason people are afraid? Is there any danger that we might be out on a limb that we just don't know about at this time?

Dr. STORER. I don't see how we possibly could be in view of all the research that has been done in 70 years—

Mr. DOWNS. Because it is more studied—

Dr. STORER. We know a great deal about radiation effects.

Miss Walters. The other day, on Thursday, when Dr. Sternglass was on, he cited a Swedish study, I believe, in which he said strontium 90 was found when they tested mice. Strontium 90 was carried to their pelvic bones, and they were found to suffer damage in their reproductive cells and that these

tests had been reported and confirmed by scientists.

How do you explain that?

Dr. STORER. We agree that is precisely the case in that study. That was a well conducted study. But he neglected to point out that the range of the radiation from strontium is very short. It travels a very short distance. A mouse is a small animal—like so. The reproductive tissue is close to the bones in a mouse so the reproductive tissues can be irradiated from the strontium in the bone, but in the larger animal, such as man, reproductive tissue is out of the range of strontium radiation.

Mr. DOWNS. And that would only be concentrated in a bone like the pelvis.

Dr. STORER. That is correct.

Miss WALTERS. It would not just sort of seep into the body and affect the organs?

Dr. STORER. It goes to the bone—concentrates in the bone.

Mr. DOWNS. One other thing, Dr. Sternglass had a graph showing fall-out going across those southern states where he showed a higher incidence of infant mortality.

Do you want to comment on that?

Dr. STORER. Yes, that would be a persuasive argument except for the fact the fall-out didn't go in that direction. It went north—northeast up through New Mexico, a corner of Colorado and on into Kansas.

New Mexico has had higher levels of fall-out through 1954—nine times, as a matter of fact, more than the southern states and yet that is a state where Dr. Sternglass reports very little what he calls excess deaths. This another inconsistency in the argument.

Mr. DOWNS. I see. Did you want to add to that, Dr. Sagan?

Dr. SAGAN. No, I did have a comment I wanted to add to John's answer to Barbara's question—

Mr. DOWNS. We have only a few seconds—

Dr. SAGAN. In respect to those rates that is a question again of dose. The dose those rates received would be enough if given to man, to kill a man—

Mr. DOWNS. So it wasn't a parallel—

Dr. SAGAN. It was a massive dose.

Mr. DOWNS. Thank you very much. We have have to take a station break now.

We will use our last few moments to review what our guests said. Dr. Storer and Sagan said two things which I really hadn't thought too much about, but it is certainly worth repeating, I think, regarding atomic energy and the dangers of fall-out and how thoroughly studied it has been. First of all there is nothing new about radiation. We have been subjected to radiation since there has been man and the earth from cosmic radiation and so forth. So it is not new.

The faint increase due to the amount of nuclear activity we have had, they say is negligible and one of the reasons for public alarm, which is proper—the public should be informed and take an alert view of these things—is because it was introduced to atomic energy by the bomb, which is a destructive thing. But there are certainly other uses for atomic energy and perhaps what we will get rid of really is the tendency to destroy ourselves and each other and not merely try to get rid of the atom, which is here with us for the rest of time.

#### PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. RHODES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, certain apprehensions have been expressed by the Indian community concerning the possible abridgment of their property rights and rights of self-government under the Civil Rights Act of 1968. Due to

the manner in which the Indian provisions were enacted—without any hearings held in the House—a number of amendments to that act may be in order.

Today I am introducing legislation along with 10 of my colleagues representing the six Western States with over 70 percent of the Nation's Indian reservation population which will clarify, to some extent, the rights of the American Indian under this act.

First. This bill makes it clear that title II of the act—25 U.S.C. 1302—shall not be construed to affect tribal sovereignty or property rights secured by law or treaty except to the extent expressly set forth in that title.

Second. The bill would also extend from July 1, 1969, to July 1, 1973, the deadline before which the Secretary of the Interior is required to complete the model code of Indian offenses provided for in title II.

Third. The bill makes it clear that the model code will apply only to those tribes that have adopted it through the action of their tribal council or appropriate legislative body.

The Senate passed an identical bill—S. 2173—on July 11, 1969, and I am hopeful that the House will promptly enact this needed amendment.

#### TEAMS OF TRAVELING MAGAZINE SOLICITORS LEAVE BURDEN OF GUILT ON LEGITIMATE SALESPEOPLE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROONEY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for the last few months I have been speaking out on consumer abuses brought about by the deceptive practices of many door-to-door magazine solicitors. The record of methods they have used in duping the consumer with deceptive schemes is unfolding in disgusting detail. The economic burdens they have placed on the consumer also are well documented. The full impact of the practices of unscrupulous magazine solicitors cannot only be measured by the hardship placed on the consumer. Their methods have also had an impact on reputable companies selling products door to door.

In examining the impact of their activities on responsible direct sellers, we find that the unethical salesman has created pressures for legislation at the State and local levels to regulate and control door-to-door selling. As is usually the case, the companies striving to uphold quality marketing practices must suffer the consequences of the activities of the rascals in the marketplace. After a team of magazine solicitors moves into an area, disrupts the community with deceptive practices and sales techniques bordering on outright harassment, they leave for the next town with the police and other Government officials demanding the licensing of all door-to-door salesmen.

Since the magazine solicitor often has moved on, the licensing requirement falls the hardest on residents of the community earning their livelihood or supplementing their family income by selling

the products of reputable companies. The efforts to regulate the unethical salesman do not, unfortunately, exempt the Fuller brushman, the Avon representative and representatives of other fine companies.

Even at the State level the unscrupulous door-to-door salesman has caused more and more legislation to be sponsored condemning his practices and creating a burden on the legitimate salesperson as well.

It is clear that fraud and deception in the marketplace not only affect the consumer but also have an adverse effect on legitimate companies at the same time. We can only protect the consumer and legitimate business by eliminating the unethical practices. Local licensing is not the desirable solution. The fraud and cheat leaves town after his economic rape of a community, leaving the consumer and the legitimate salesperson with the burdens of his deception. One answer to this problem lies in strict enforcement of existing laws and beefing up the powers and staffs of agencies charged with the responsibility of bringing to justice the practitioners of fraud and deception. Both the consumer and the legitimate businessman would welcome such action.

Mr. Speaker, I have been pressing the magazine subscription sales industry and the Federal Trade Commission to deal with this problem.

My own investigation of deception and fraud in the door-to-door sale of magazines demonstrates clearly that more rigorous action is needed. I look with hopeful anticipation to the Federal Trade Commission for firm action to deal with the magazine sales frauds which flourish today, despite an FTC-endorsed industry code of fair practices.

The existing code-enforcement program is not working. But the FTC has the authority to achieve what the code has failed to achieve. The faith of the consumer and the legitimate businessman is at stake and cannot be dealt with lightly.

#### THE UNITED STATES-WEST GERMAN OFFSET AGREEMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the United States and West Germany have just concluded another agreement to offset the foreign exchange costs of the 220,000 American troops, and their dependents, in Germany. Under the agreement, America's nearly \$1 billion annual balance-of-payments costs of this commitment is to be offset on the order of 80 percent by West German purchases in the United States of \$760 million a year for 2 years.

In a remarkable editorial of July 20, 1969, the Chicago Tribune discusses the illusory nature of such an offset agreement. The Tribune relies largely upon a study by Dr. Joseph Aschheim of George Washington University, published in the April 1968, hearings of the Joint Economic Committee. That study contains the following conclusions:

First. The foreign-exchange cost of the American military presence in Germany

has continued unrequited by the Bonn government in spite of United States-German offset agreements since 1960. In other words, the offset agreements have essentially been window dressing.

Second. In addition to imposing a balance-of-payments burden, our defense presence in Germany imposes on American taxpayers a still more important fiscal burden of several times the size of the balance-of-payments burden.

Third. Granting that the United States is equally as interested in the American military presence in Germany as is the German Government itself, the fiscal burden of this presence should be shared on an equal, 50-50, basis between the two countries.

Fourth. Such equal sharing would amount to cash reimbursement of the U.S. Government by the German Government in the mark equivalent of at least \$2 billion annually.

It is unnecessary to agree with Dr. Aschheim's precise suggestion for 50-50 sharing of the budgetary cost, or with his suggestion that West Germany alone, rather than West Germany in concert with other interested NATO powers, should do the requiring. Yet there needs to be an answer to his central point: The American budget, and the American balance of payments, should not bear the entire real burden of what is essentially a joint venture in the security of Europe.

The Chicago Tribune editorial follows:

#### TWO BIRDS WITH ONE STONE

For several years now the American public has been witness to an astonishing economic paradox. The giant among free nations in economic as well as military power, the United States, has been watching its currency weaken on world markets in the face of one governmental measure after another intervening in the freedom of private payments. This weakening of the dollar threatens the very existence of the present international monetary system, for an American devaluation would endanger the reserve-currency status of the dollar, still the world's leading reserve currency.

In contrast, the free successor to our principal vanquished adversary in World War II, the Federal Republic of Germany, has emerged over the last decade with the strongest and most coveted currency in the world. Indeed, the strength of the German mark has been a growing source of an embarrassment of riches to the German government. Having been upvalued in relation to the dollar once already, the mark has been the repeated object of sizable speculation on the prospect of a second upvaluation, most recently this spring.

Preceded by a massive rise of Germany's gold reserves while United States gold reserves have been declining, the recent refusal of the German government to upvalue the mark has become an object of major controversy in the German government itself, as well as in the German public generally. In May, a group of about 100 German economists, including some of Germany's most prominent university professors, addressed and open letter to Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger, expressing their dissatisfaction and disappointment with his refusal to upvalue the mark. Similarly, influential pressures for mark upvaluation from other countries are bound to rise.

Germany has been a persistent source of both official and unofficial suggestions to the United States that the United States government put its fiscal house in order. Germany certainly shares with the United States a major stake in preventing the collapse of

the international monetary system. In return, what should the United States counsel its German ally to do in regard to mark revaluation? No country has a greater interest in Germany's foreign exchange policy than the United States. The United States cannot, and it must not, be silent on this subject.

Official American influence has been exerted on the side of mark upvaluation. The Tribune regards this American stance as a blunder, itself the result of persistent hoodwinking of the American public by the United States department of state, grown to the dimensions of a national scandal.

For a generation now, Germany has been the locus of a substantial American military presence. Even since Germany joined NATO as a full-fledged ally of the United States, some 220,000 American troops (and their dependents) and some of the most advanced American military equipment have remained on German soil. Germany, of course, is not the only military and political beneficiary of this American presence; the United States is no less a beneficiary. Yet the American taxpayers alone have been paying the costs of this presence.

Under the impact of the United States' balance-of-payments and gold-drain problem, Germany entered a series of annual agreements with the United States, with the avowed aim of offsetting the United States' dollar drain attributable to United States defense expenditures resulting from the American military presence in Germany. From 1960 through 1967 these "offset" agreements had gone virtually without public attention, with tacit faith that the United States state department had fully looked after American interests in its annual renewal of these agreements.

It was not until December, 1967, that the joint economic committee of Congress commissioned Dr. Joseph Aschheim, professor of economics at George Washington University, Washington, D.C., to study the economic nature and operation of the "offset" agreements. The results of his study were published in April, 1968, as "The Dollar Deficit and German Offsetting," constituting part IV of the committee's hearings on the President's economic report. His findings, also summarized by Dr. Aschheim in a letter to the Voice of the People last June 17, amount to nothing less than an indictment of the state department of being a party to an economic fraud upon the American people. At the same time, his findings suggest a constructive proposal for a simultaneous and equitable resolution of the United States and German balance-of-payments problems.

Specifically, Dr. Aschheim's study shows that whether the so-called "offsetting" under the agreements was by German arms buying or by German lending, it was no more than window dressing. In other words, no economically genuine offsetting was instituted by the agreements at all. From the German viewpoint, the agreements were a masterstroke of German shrewdness, outwardly conveying the impression of their title, "offsetting agreements," while substantively being empty, or as the German saying goes, "Ein Tittel ohne Mittel" [a title without power].

Furthermore, Dr. Aschheim's study shows that the attempt to imbue offsetting-by-buying or offsetting-by-lending with substance would be economically irrational, because it would imply a misallocation of resources for both parties. As acknowledged pace-setter in the liberalization of international trade, the United States should hardly be a party to agreements that palpably imply misallocation of resources.

Finally and most importantly, Dr. Aschheim's study shows that the United States' balance-of-payments burden due to the American military presence in Germany is but a fraction of the fiscal burden upon

American taxpayers directly due to this presence. He finds that, at the very least, this fiscal burden amounts to 4 billion dollars a year. Because both the United States and Germany are beneficiaries of the American military presence in Germany, he proposes an equal, 50-50, sharing of this burden between American and German taxpayers. Thus, every year, according to the Aschheim plan, the German finance ministry should reimburse the United States treasury in the mark equivalent of 2 billion dollars.

Even such future reimbursement would still not begin to be restitution for the minimum of 15 billion dollars imputable to Germany for the period mid-1960 to mid-1969. Such future reimbursement, however, would terminate the hoodwinking of the American people that the annual "offset" agreements since their inception in 1960 have constituted.

Yet, tragically, the state department has persisted in its hoodwinking course even since publication of Dr. Aschheim's memorandum. Indeed, in the Nixon administration, the state department announced on July 9 a two-year offset agreement with Germany which, though more complicated in detail, is still not a reimbursement agreement. Thus, risen out of the ashes of war to become the richest of our NATO partners and to possess the hardest of the world's currencies, Germany is slated to continue its evasion of the fiscal burden that American taxpayers have carried by themselves.

Yet perhaps all is not lost, and the spectacle of our richest ally beseeching us to put our fiscal house in order, while this ally fails to do its own share in our fiscal house order, may still be stopped. For, as reported by the Tribune's Washington bureau on July 12, "Chancellor Kiesinger of West Germany will face a tough problem when he visits Washington next month. Congress wants the Germans to pay more for American troops in Germany." So Congress may still be emboldened to rectify the state department's blunder.

To visiting Chancellor Kiesinger we extend a welcome. Addressing him and the 100 German economists who, in their open letter, have urged the upvaluation of the mark, we say: "German friends, do your fair share. Your reimbursement to the United States of 2 billion dollars per year will prove your genuine partnership with America. You will thereby have solved both the United States and the German balance-of-payments problems at the same time. The dollar will then have been spared devaluation, the mark will have been spared upvaluation, and the stable exchange-rate system will have been restored to viability."

In sum, Congress should invite Chancellor Kiesinger and President Nixon to redraw the 1969 offset agreement. The institution of equity of treatment to American taxpayers and the restoration of freedom of payments to the dollar cannot be safely put off for another two years. Before the international monetary system is engulfed, there is still opportunity for the two allies to join in their common concern.

#### FEDERAL PROCEDURES DESIGNED TO PROTECT MEMBERS OF MINORITY GROUPS FROM DISCRIMINATION ON FEDERALLY ASSISTED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

(Mr. McCORMACK (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks I include a copy of a letter that I have sent to Hon. Arthur A. Fletcher, Assistant Secretary of Labor, in relation to the "careful study of the

operation of Federal procedures designed to protect members of minority groups from discrimination on federally assisted construction projects," and in particular having the "Philadelphia Plan" made applicable to other cities throughout the United States, and particularly that the second city to apply this plan through should be the city of Boston:

THE SPEAKER'S ROOMS,  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., July 29, 1969.

HON. ARTHUR A. FLETCHER,  
Assistant Secretary of Labor,  
Department of Labor,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have had called to my attention by the Massachusetts State Advisory Committee of the United States Commission on Civil Rights a recommendation that the Advisory Committee has made and called to the attention of the Labor Department, and under your jurisdiction, namely the question of the careful study of the operation of Federal procedures designed to protect members of minority groups from discrimination on Federally assisted construction projects, and particularly call attention to what is known as the "Philadelphia Plan," and that this Plan should be applicable to other cities throughout the United States, and particularly that the second city to apply this plan through should be the City of Boston.

It is my opinion, and concurred in by Congressmen Burke, O'Neill and Macdonald of Massachusetts, and also other Members from Massachusetts, that Boston should be designated as the next city in which the so-called "Philadelphia Plan" should be put into operation. While I have referred to the Philadelphia Plan, my examination of it fails to disclose the fact that there is a training program provided therein. It is my opinion that such a program should be included in its application to the City of Boston, if Boston is selected as the next city in which this field of human endeavor would be put into operation by the Labor Department.

I am also aware of the fact that the Federal Executive Board of Greater Boston has endorsed the recommendations submitted by Reverend (Fr.) Robert F. Drinan, S. J., Chairman of the Massachusetts State Advisory Committee, and those associated with him on this Advisory Committee, and those associated with him on this Advisory Committee. Coming from this source, such endorsement lends great support to the proposal submitted to the Massachusetts State Advisory Committee in relation to the City of Boston.

In any event, Mr. Secretary, it appears to me that every effort should be made along these lines to assist members of all groups who are economically depressed, and with particular emphasis in relation to those of the Black race and Puerto Ricans. I can assure you that I will do everything I possibly can to cooperate in conveying to the members of the construction industry, and to the unions relating thereto, the importance of their complete cooperation in a program of this kind. Such a program is completely consistent with the very theory upon which our government is predicated.

If you have any suggestions to make as to how on the congressional level I can cooperate with you on this program, please have no hesitancy in communicating them to me. In any event, I strongly urge immediate action in the carrying out of the Plan known as the "Philadelphia Plan" in its application to the City of Boston, with the additional suggestion I herein mentioned in my letter in relation to emphasizing every activity possible in the training of those who will benefit from this Plan.

I will appreciate it if you will keep me ad-

vised of the action taken by you and the Labor Department on this matter.

With kind regards, I am,  
Respectfully yours,

JOHN W. McCORMACK.

#### PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION'S HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAND LAW DEVELOPMENT

(Mr. ASPINALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the Public Land Law Review Commission, which I have the honor to chair, will submit its report and recommendations next year. In the meantime, the staff has been engaged in a comprehensive research program, based on which the Commission has been coming to grips with various facets of public land law and administration.

One of the works, prepared under direction of the staff, is basic to a full understanding by all those who are interested in public lands. It is a "History of Public Land Law Development," prepared for us by Prof. Paul Wallace Gates of Cornell University with a chapter by Prof. Robert W. Swenson of the University of Utah. The book was published by the Government Printing Office and is available from the Superintendent of Documents at \$8.25 a copy; I commend it to all as an invaluable reference work which is both interesting and informative.

A review of the "History of Public Land Law Development" appears in the current issue of "Forest History," which is published quarterly by the Forest History Society at Yale University. Because of its timeliness, under permission previously granted, I insert at this point of the RECORD the full text of the review which was prepared by Marion Clawson who is a former Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

The review follows:

REVIEW BY MARION CLAWSON OF "HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAND LAW DEVELOPMENT"

(NOTE.—Mr. Clawson is director of the land use and management program of Resources for the Future, Inc. He is the author of many publications on land policy; most recently, *The Leland System of the United States* (1968).)

To those of us interested in the public lands—and our number seems to be growing in recent years—the publication of either of these books would have been a happy event. To have the two of them published, and within the same three-month period, is a greater reward for our interest than anyone could have expected. Each is a real find, worth reading and buying. Different in many ways, they tend to complement one another nicely, although apparently each was prepared independently of the other.

Professor Gates prepared his study under contract to the Public Land Law Review Commission. If the other studies of the Commission are as outstanding, and if they are made publicly available, then the Commission will be a success almost irrespective of its own findings and recommendations. Gates, with only 18 months to produce this book, had graduate students help him, and enlisted Professor Swenson of the University of Utah to write one three-part chapter on mineral resources exploitation. Still, a book of this length, detail, and scholarship could

never have been done in the time allowed were it not for nearly 40 years of previous research in this field. To a very great extent, the Commission and all of us are benefiting from this long record of research, in what is now a comprehensive book.

The primary organization of the book is topical. There are chapters on private land claims, credit sales, cash sales (2), preemption, military land bounties, grants to states (2), railroad and other grants, homesteading, dry farming and stock raising, and others. Within each the treatment is primarily chronological. This method of subject organization enables one to follow an idea from inception to legislation, criticism, and later modification or repeal. These are substantial advantages, especially valuable in such a long and detailed treatment of a very complex and detailed subject. The chief disadvantage of this approach is that the interplay between different programs, and among different actors, is often not as clearly evident as a simpler historical treatment might afford.

Gates has written in the general tradition of Hibbard (*History of the Public Land Policies*), Robbins (*Our Landed Heritage*), Peffer (*The Closing of the Public Domain*), and others. His book is distinguished in that it is somewhat longer and more detailed, places less emphasis upon origin and history of legislation, tries (not always satisfactorily) to show how laws worked out in operation, and, of course, is more up-to-date.

Perhaps Gates's greatest contribution to public land history is the outstanding way in which he has shown that there has almost never been a single coherent and consistent set of federal land laws. As he clearly demonstrates, Congress is not a single body with a single mind, but a group of men representing diverse and usually conflicting interests. And often the easiest way to resolve a conflict is to include something for everyone, sometimes in the same act. The incongruity of the homestead law and the public land sales—which were continued for more than 25 years after homesteading was initiated—have been traced by Gates in earlier publications and are further illustrated here. But grants to railroads overlapped with grants to states; federal land reservations such as the forest reserves overlapped with both; sales could be made and homesteads taken—and both were—in the same areas, and so on. Neatness, orderliness, and ship-shapeness were precisely what the federal land laws never had.

Gates shows—as have earlier writers, but he does it in more detail—how Congress repeatedly sided with the land claimant, the "settler" as against the government agent and agency. This was most marked, perhaps, with private land claims where Congress repeatedly granted land claims rejected as fraudulent by generous commissions, while the land agent who caught a timber company in trespass was likely to be not only repudiated but also punished (by loss of job or otherwise).

The readers of FOREST HISTORY may find of particular interest the two chapters on federal forest land management and the one on federal grazing land management. Gates follows what might be called the "conservation line" in the interpretation of forest and grazing history of the past three decades or so; the federal agencies are the good guys, the ranchers and forest industry often the bad guys. Perhaps because of my own personal experiences, I found these less objective and somewhat less complete than earlier chapters; but they are nevertheless factual, and I think it clear that Professor Gates has done his best to report the record as he saw it.

Malcolm Rohrbough, associate professor of history at the University of Iowa, is a relative newcomer to the field of public land history, although his doctoral dissertation

did cover some of the subject matter included in his book. He deals with a much shorter time period than does Gates; early public land history, though complex enough in these early years of the nation, is obviously far simpler than history for that same period and the more than 100 years since, combined. Rohrbough digs much more deeply into the actual operations of the land laws and brings to our attention far more new material than has any writer thus far. To anyone reasonably familiar with American land history, the story Gates tells is mostly known, though he does bring in new detail and new perspectives; but I found far more that was new to me in Rohrbough. He has gone much less into the history and the politics of land legislation, and much more into the actual operations of these laws on the land, including the operations of the General Land Office as an organization.

Rohrbough's book is replete with incident and detail that cannot well be summarized here. I found it a fascinating story. For instance, I had not realized how much competition there was in the early days for government surveying contracts—not because they were profitable in themselves, but because they were a prime mechanism for ascertaining, at public expense, the character of the land in areas soon to be opened. Many of the largest land speculators had their surveying organizations and bid upon government contracts, taking their real profit in terms of the advance and detailed information on land quality yielded by the surveys. Other surveyors lacked such direct connections with land speculators, but made copies of their maps and notes which they sold or loaned for a fee to would-be land buyers.

One may summarize much of the detail in Rohrbough by saying there was a persistent and generally successful effort by people on the frontier—"settlers" and "frontiersmen" were words of praise, "speculator" was not—to make the federal land laws work as they wanted them to work, whether or not this was the way Congress intended them to work. The settlers association (perhaps more marked at a later date) that Bogue and others have studied, the efforts (usually but not always successful) to inhibit or prevent competitive bidding for land offered at public sale, and other actions were part of this. In Alabama around 1820, the competitive bidding really was competitive; a speculative fever swept the bidders, and prices reached heights not previously dreamed of—nor long sustained.

Each of these books suffers somewhat from being "trees" rather than "forest"; that is, one wholly unfamiliar with American land history—a foreigner, for instance—would probably find each too detailed and bewildering. If on the other hand one is even modestly knowledgeable about American land history, each is rewarding, rich with important detail, and well worth having in one's memory and library. One must assume that the authors achieved their objectives.

#### AND THE SLAUGHTER GOES ON— WHEN ARE WE GOING TO CURB IMPORTS AND SALES OF WEAPONS? WHEN ARE WE GOING TO REGISTER AND LICENSE EVERY WEAPON IN THIS COUNTRY?

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, the Nixon administration has formally announced its opposition to Federal gun registration and licensing of gun owners. This is a position diametrically opposed to the Johnson administration's advocacy of such controls.

The administration claims that effectiveness of last year's Gun Control and Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is as yet unmeasured. It also pleads invasion of States rights and prohibitively high costs of administering national gun registration. One city, Toledo, Ohio has adopted an ordinance requiring handgun owners to obtain permits. As a direct result, murders there have fallen by 85 percent, and other major crimes have shown similar significant dropoffs.

Last year's act, barring importation of cheap, concealable-type handguns, is being defeated by domestic manufacturers of these weapons, or by importation of foreign-made parts for assembly here. How then, can anyone seriously suggest leaving it to the individual States? Twenty-six of them have virtually no restrictions on sale or ownership of firearms. Few jurisdictions show signs of acting to prevent the ongoing slaughter.

Such weapons from abroad were flooding our domestic market; 1.15 million foreign handguns entered our country in 1968, about half from West Germany. All were easily available to criminals, juveniles, and the mentally unbalanced from discount stores or through local "grapevines." The law passed last year allows importation of foreign weapons parts so long as the frame of the pistol is fabricated here. Restrictions do not apply to domestically manufactured handguns. So we are back where we started, except that the gun lobby is attacking even the thin seive of defense this law presently provides.

We could and should forbid importation of parts for guns which are already banned from importation as a complete unit. But we will not, even though it is right.

We could and should control domestic manufacture of these murder weapons by applying the same standards of size, barrel length, quality, and safety specifications that now comprise import restrictions on pistols made here. But we will not, even though it is right.

We could and should ban them as unsafe products by applying similar standards under FTC legislation, which regulates quality of other domestic goods. But we will not, even though it is right.

We could and should register and require a permit for every weapon in the Nation, from the smallest caliber rifles and pistols to the heaviest weapons available and sold. But we will not, even though it is right.

As we meet here today, every drug addict, hardened criminal, juvenile delinquent, militant, lunatic, and assassin is free to acquire long weapons, ammunition, cheap domestic handguns and other armaments. Daily the slaughter continues of innocent small business people, pedestrians, bystanders, and other innocents.

All the while, the National Rifle Association piously proclaims that Americans have an inalienable right to blow one another's heads off in the name of constitutionality. A President, a U.S. Senator and a great civil rights leader lie in their graves along with tens of thousands of other innocent victims of our beknighted gun laws. Still the gun lobby raves on

about the right to self-defense in terms of freely purchased weapons. If moon men invade us, we should all be able to take pot shots at them from our hedges and dormer windows. Marvelous.

Such arguments are as bereft of sense as a herring is bare of fur. All have been struck down and proven false again and again. Yet like some mastodon or dinosaur of long ago, the gun crowd bleats louder and rumbles on—braying its specious arguments to all who would hear. Now they have been joined by the Nixon administration, which rattles on of States rights and difficulty and expense of administration. Other countries have been able to withstand the expense and administer the programs. We cannot?

Mr. Speaker, what will it take for us to act rationally and end this monstrous evil? No one is safe. No street will be secure until weapons are prevented from reaching those who prowl them. In the meantime, the slaughter goes on—and on—and on—and on. Who will be next?

#### SHORTCHANGING ELDERLY AMERICANS, OUR NATIONAL SHAME— PODELL CALLS FOR EXPANDING MEDICARE TO COVER ALL RELATED BENEFITS FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, American goes to the moon, wages futile war in Vietnam, and pours billions into military spending programs. Yet the everyday needs of almost 20 million older Americans are not being met. Government is turning away from its partially realized goal of assuring that these fellow citizens are accorded their fair share of America's substance and prosperity.

I am heartily disgusted with those who pay lip service to the needs of these people, while turning around the next moment and ignoring their pledges. We have created medicare and allowed it to be abused by some segments of the professions. We have promised our elderly an end to subsistence living, and have failed to keep that sworn word. We have assured them social security benefits would reflect financial realities of the marketplace. In this too we have fallen far short.

Other nations have caught up with and passed America in areas of necessary benefits provided to the elderly. These include everything from housing and social services to medical services, drugs, and dental care. In the name of one excuse or another, we are standing by as a nation while those citizens quietly go on doing without. So they live with a little extra pain than most, a little worse diet than most, and much less security than most. Such is the national disgrace of the United States. If we exist as a nation for 10,000 years, this blot upon our escutcheon will remain.

For several years, Congress has had placed before it a measure to provide free outpatient drugs to all the elderly under medicare. I have introduced this bill as a Member of this Congress, and

it languishes as medicare did for so many years before final enactment. Is there any excuse, except that major drug companies oppose it? It is a fact that although older people constitute 10 percent of our population, that pay approximately 25 percent of all national costs for prescription drugs. Not only, therefore, should we make this concept a legal reality, but should add to it several other natural adjuncts flowing from the original medicare concept. I am introducing a group of these measures today, each aimed at fleshing out the framework of medicare. By their passage, we would make available to our elderly a full range of medical benefits, treatments, and medically beneficial devices to vastly enhance the quality of their lives.

The first bill in this new packet of legislation would provide one routine annual physical checkup for persons insured under medicare's supplementary medical insurance benefits program.

Such a checkup would include physician's services, diagnostic X-ray, laboratory, and other diagnostic tests involved in complete physical checkups.

Next is a measure eliminating a requirement that an insured person must first have been admitted to a hospital to qualify for extended medical care services under medicare. It also expands posthospital extended care services under medicare to include therapeutic as well as nursing care.

A further measure amends that section of medicare dealing with home health services. Under it, transportation would be provided to a place where health services are given to those eligible for benefits under home health services. This is a case where health services cannot be provided at the particular home of a recipient.

Still another essential measure would affect the limit on posthospital extended care services, now limited to 100 days for any spell of illness under the medicare program. This bill removes the 100-day limit, so benefits would apply for any length of posthospital extended care.

My final measure would amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act—medicare; part B. It would include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among benefits provided by the medicare insurance program. Our Social Security Administration has already estimated that a program for this bill would cost \$500 million annually for dental care, \$150 million for eye care, and \$100 million for hearing care—a total of \$750 million.

Cost to those electing part B coverage would be an increase from \$4 monthly to \$6 monthly. There would be an equivalent increase in the Federal share for such benefits if the existing formula was utilized. Under this measure, the financial formula would be changed so that Government, not the beneficiary, would bear the load of any added costs. Present sharing of costs on a 50-50 basis would be changed to a one-third/two-thirds sharing by this bill.

Here, then, is a package of basic legislation which would combine to extend the umbrella of medicare out to its full-

est extent to cover our elderly. Such complete ranges of service are available in numbers of countries, including many in Europe. It is worth noting that Bismarck's Germany in 1870 offered most of these services to the elderly of that time.

None of these measures is questionable from a merit standpoint. None threaten exorbitant demands upon any segment of society. Each would provide a fair minimum, which our older citizens surely have a right to ask for. None inhibits the physician, hospital, or prescribing pharmacist in the least. None threatens already massive profits already being enjoyed on all levels of the medical and related professions. Each would lessen apprehension, suffering, and pain. Each would be a potent reaffirmation of the promise of American life. We can do no less.

Daily the plight of 20 million senior citizens worsens. Pain goes unrelieved, fears remain unallayed, minimal security is jeopardized, and quality of their lives constantly lowers. We can change all of this by living up to promises already made. These bills are vehicles for such change.

#### THE DANGERS OF STUDENTS FOR A DEMOCRATIC SOCIETY

(Mr. CEDERBERG asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, since I made my remarks some time ago on the radical Students for a Democratic Society I have received hundreds of letters requesting copies of the Record containing my comments and asking for further information on this subversive organization. Almost daily today we read of various industries which have become aware of this group's efforts to infiltrate their plants for the purpose of stirring up trouble. Trade publications have published the "Work-In Organizer's Manual" in full as an effort toward keeping their members informed of the dangers presented by the SDS and its aims.

One of the best, and most well-documented, histories of this group which I have come across in my reading on this subject is the booklet, "Students for a Democratic Society," published by the Church League of America. In a readable and comprehensive, yet relatively short volume this organization has presented a picture of the growth and development of the SDS from its patently socialistic origins. The Church League has published other documentary-type materials which relate to groups which threaten to destroy the institutions of our society. These include "The Black Panthers" and "By Our Enemies You Will Know Us"—an exposé of student revolutionary plans.

I am advised that the Church League, of 422 North Prospect Street, Wheaton, Ill. 60187, will make this material available to Members of Congress on request.

It will not be too long before students begin to return to their campuses and again face the possibility that the doors will be closed due to the irrational and

anarchistic behavior of a few. Some will be facing the challenge of the university for the first time. It is my hope that we will be able to bring about enough of an awareness of the dangers of groups such as those mentioned above that we will be assured that our young people will direct their energies into constructive rather than destructive channels.

As I have mentioned before, I do not challenge the right of individuals, in any institution, to work for the betterment of the society in which we live. This is the direction in which we all wish to move. I would, however, deny to anyone the right to destroy that which he dislikes, and that is my objection to organizations such as the SDS.

#### AID TO FEDERALLY IMPACTED AREAS

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, once again the Congress must debate the level of funding for education assistance to federally impacted areas. For 19 years, Public Law 874 has authorized funds for operation and maintenance of schools in school districts on which nearby Federal installations have placed a burden.

These payments have always gone to school districts with no strings attached and this aspect of the program has contributed mightily to its popularity over the years. Until fiscal year 1969, the authorization was never less than 98 percent funded in the appropriations process.

But popularity aside, the concept of Federal payments to school districts in impacted areas is sound on its merits. Military installations with substantial numbers of young families living on base are clearly a heavy burden on local schools. In some cases the rapid buildup of Federal activity has outpaced the capacity of local authorities to respond with adequate education facilities. Public Law 874, for 19 years, has been an appropriate response to this challenge.

#### COMMITMENT VERSUS PERFORMANCE

Mr. Speaker, today this body considers appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies. Over the years, the Congress has made commitments to all the people through the enactment of authorizations for various education programs. Today, we shall see to what extent we are able to live up to those commitments for fiscal year 1970. As I review this appropriations legislation, I apprehend that we shall fall somewhat short of our promises.

This legislation fully funds category A of Public Law 874. Thus, it provides the full cost of educating those children whose parents both live and work on Federal installations. Payments under this provision are part of permanent law.

But this bill provides nothing under category B. Thus, school districts with children whose parents either live or work on Federal installations will receive

no relief during fiscal year 1970. If the legislation as it now stands becomes law, school districts in my State of Kansas, for example, will lose nearly \$8 million of their 1970 entitlement under existing law.

School districts in California will lose over \$75 million, those in New York will lose over \$16 million, and those in Alabama will lose nearly \$10 million. Mr. Chairman, the effect of this legislation will be clear: local authorities will be forced to substantially increase property taxes in the face of congressional unwillingness to meet an historic commitment.

**IMPERFECT AUTHORIZATION LEADS TO DILUTION OF A MERITORIOUS PROGRAM**

Mr. Speaker, I do not suggest that Public Law 874 is without faults. Over the years, this legislation has been expanded to the point where school districts are entitled to payments that cannot be justified under the original concept of the act. Indeed, in some instances, the presence of a Federal installation actually increases the tax base for a community rather than the other way around. In further instances, Federal installations have attracted families with income and taxpaying ability substantially above the community average.

The legislation has been expanded to include payments to schools with children from public housing developments.

The net effect has been to extend the authorization to an entitlement for fiscal year 1970 in excess of \$650 million. The Bureau of the Budget and the Congress are unwilling to commit such large sums to this single education program in this year of record spending and inflation.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fiscal realities this year, I urge a compromise in the funding of Public Law 874. I support the amendment which would fund the program—both category A and category B—to the fiscal year 1969 level. This would mean that Kansas, for example, should receive about \$8.5 million, California should receive about \$78 million, and Alabama should receive about \$9.5 million.

Regardless of whether this compromise succeeds, the Congress should soon begin a thorough review of all authorizations under Public Law 874. Those students from families actually contributing to an increased tax base should not be eligible for assistance in future years. Those communities with Federal installations that contribute substantially to increased revenues at the local level should not receive additional windfalls from the Federal Government under legislation specifically designed to assist school districts adversely affected by the Federal presence.

Mr. Speaker, I support a compromise to fund Public Law 874 at the 1969 level. I urge the Congress to undertake rational reform of the basic legislation in the near future, to avoid destructive dilution of the program. Only through such reform can we protect those districts which, on the merits, deserve substantial Federal payments under Public Law 874.

**JOBS FOR WELFARE CLIENTS SEEN AS ALTERNATIVE TO GUARANTEED INCOME**

(Mr. TALCOTT asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the welfare system devised way back in the 1930's, and patched up ineffectively ever since, is a failure for everyone concerned—the recipient, the administrators, the taxpayers, and society.

Many suggestions for change have been proposed and considered—negative income tax, family maintenance, guaranteed annual wage, insured income, and a dozen others.

It seems to me that many of the advocates of change in our "welfare system" are promoting only new labels for old ineffective methods.

The National Chamber of Commerce has given this matter of welfare considerable study.

Mr. Karl T. Schlotterbeck, director, manpower programs for the National Chamber of Commerce, had written an article which should be read by every Member of Congress.

Guaranteed full employment or guaranteed job opportunity are concepts which deserve more consideration. Our efforts to reform and improve the welfare system require sharper distinctions. The able must be more clearly separated from the unable. There must be clearer penalties for remaining on welfare; there must be better incentives for getting off welfare. The taxpayers are entitled to as much consideration as the tax user.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the article of Mr. Schlotterbeck at this point in the Record. I urge that this concept be considered among the many others:

**JOBS FOR WELFARE CLIENTS SEEN AS ALTERNATIVE TO GUARANTEED INCOME**

(By Karl T. Schlotterbeck, director, manpower programs, National Chamber)

The idea that all Americans should be guaranteed a regular income, whether or not they are able or even willing to work, will soon be up for decisive action.

Advocates, gathering in strong legislative battle formation, include such high officials of the Nixon Administration as Robert H. Finch, secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, and Daniel P. Moynihan, assistant to the President for urban affairs.

Guaranteed income legislation is pending in Congress, and President Nixon is expected to submit his own plans on the subject soon. A President's Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, appointed by President Johnson to make a thorough study, is planning to issue its report this fall. Chairman Ben W. Heineman is committed in advance to the income guarantee.

The businessman or anyone else who doesn't bother to learn what is involved here, and make his opinion heard where it counts, may soon come to realize that one of the proudest traits of the American people has suddenly vanished while his back was turned; that self-reliance, which built this nation, has been reduced from an ideal to an option.

To encourage idleness, waste potential manpower, increase consumer demand of able-bodied adults who produce nothing, or risk more federal deficit spending under present inflationary conditions—all of which

a guaranteed income program would do—would be to "sweeten" welfare at the expense of those being hurt by inflation. Many persons, living on once-adequate fixed incomes, are now being dragged down toward poverty by the declining value of the dollar. Their rights need some attention.

To contend that inflation is only a temporary evil, and that a guaranteed income would be a permanent virtue, is to presume that our economy can grow sufficiently to afford these and all other costs of government without strain.

The guaranteed income would become a pressure to raise minimum wages. If an able-bodied adult and family is to have a higher income, guaranteed, the minimum wage might have to be raised to induce him to work. And experience shows that when wages rise at the bottom, workers at each succeeding level of skills up the line will insist on maintaining their pay differentials, thus intensifying the wage-price spiral.

Taking the inflation problem as it stands right now, we see:

- (1) Widespread shortages of skilled workers.
- (2) Pay rates rising faster than productivity, which inexorably brings on still higher production costs and higher prices.
- (3) A growth of welfare costs at all levels of government as the unskilled and other disadvantaged persons become more costly to maintain, and impatient for a larger share of the general affluence.
- (4) An incipient revolt of taxpayers against needed tax increases—and even present taxes.

As the Administration endeavors to hold the line on government spending to reduce inflationary pressures, some states and cities—burdened with a continuing growth in the welfare caseload and costs—look to the Federal Government for more help.

The natural tendency is to ask: Why not put to work many of those on welfare? This would make it easier to hold down government expenditures. It would give encouragement to oppressed taxpayers. It would help many employers desperately in need of more workers.

**MISINFORMATION ABOUT WELFARE**

Many heads of dependent families would welcome the opportunity to get off the welfare rolls. After all, personal dignity and self-respect cannot be purchased with a relief check. They can only be earned.

This solution, however, does not appeal to the "hand-out" artists who argue that there is very little work potential among welfare recipients.

About a year ago, one federal spokesman said that 95% of those on welfare, or eight million persons, were aged, disabled or children, and thus unable to work. The remainder, he said, were mostly mothers needed at home. He estimated that only about 50,000 of the 8.4 million on welfare were employable unemployed males.

That would be a most discouraging prospect if it were true. But it isn't.

Not only is our welfare system clouded by misinformation; not only is it perpetuating human apathy, hopelessness and idleness among able-bodied adults, but it is also badly in need of administrative reform. Procedures for getting monthly income to those in real need are cumbersome, costly and demeaning. There are numerous complaints about the indignities of the welfare "needs test."

Against these criticisms, the virtues of some form of a guaranteed income are proclaimed. Types most often mentioned are the so-called Negative Income Tax and the Family Security Plan.

Essentially, these propose that the U.S. Treasury pay money directly to those with incomes below certain income levels. A modified work incentive would be built in as an inducement to the able-bodied. The NIT idea

is being tested now on a small scale with money from the federal poverty program.

Right now, before there is a new national commitment to any plan for dealing with the related problems of manpower and welfare, and before we take further risks with our economic well-being, the businessman and other taxpayers should be demanding answers to basic questions.

- What is "welfare"?
- Why are they on welfare?
- Where is the welfare growth occurring?
- How do they qualify?
- How substantial is the manpower potential?

**WHAT IS WELFARE?**

This term usually refers to the five federal-state programs of public relief—Old-Age Assistance (OAA) for people 65 and older, Aid to the Blind (AB), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), Aid to Permanently and Totally Disabled (APTD), and Medicaid. The first three were in the 1935 Social Security Act. The fourth was added in 1950 and the last in 1965.

The purpose is to aid people who are destitute and in want. In the first four, need is met in part or in full by cash payments. In the fifth, medical care is paid for.

All 50 states have the first four of these programs. Medicaid pays for needed medical and hospital care for those on the other welfare programs. By law, every state must have a Medicaid program by 1970, and most do now.

**WHY ARE THEY ON WELFARE?**

The aged, the blind, and the disabled simply have insufficient income for a minimal living and, by and large, have no potential for earning through employment. Families receiving AFDC also have inadequate income and, hence, are in need. While many of the family heads are potential workers, immediate health problems or presence of young children (in families headed by women) may prevent their holding a job and earning a living.

The dependent child program accounts for virtually all the growth in the four cash welfare payment programs since 1960. According to HEW, the number of recipients (adults and children) has doubled from three to six millions.

The figures in millions of persons are:

	Numbers of recipients in December	
	1960	1968
OAA	2.3	2.0
AB	.1	.1
APTD	.4	.7
AFDC	3.1	6.1

**Costs of benefit payments**

	(In billions)	
	1960	1968
OAA	\$1.6	\$1.7
AB	.1	.1
APTD	.3	.7
AFDC	1.0	3.3

Note. These data do not include administrative costs, which in some jurisdictions will add another 30%.

**HOW TO QUALIFY FOR WELFARE**

A person (or family) in one or another of the four categories—aged, blind, disabled, or with dependent children—can qualify by proving to be in need. This is the "needs test." They must show that their available income and other resources are inadequate to provide a minimal or subsistence level of living, a level defined by state law and regulations and varying from state to state. The "needs test" involves considerable investigation—case by case—to verify an applicant's statements about income and other resources.

**WHAT IS THE MANPOWER POTENTIAL OF THOSE ON WELFARE**

The 2.8 million aged, blind and disabled who are on welfare have little or no work potential. In their case, it might be feasible

to replace the present "needs test" with a simplified income test, and thus eliminate some of the administrative costs.

This is being tried now on an experimental basis. To maintain state and community concern for these people, the programs for aged, blind and disabled should continue to be financed jointly by the federal, state and local governments.

To appraise the manpower potential among the six million receiving aid for dependent children, we need more facts.

**WHO GETS AFDC HELP?**

By updating the figures from an HEW sample survey made in 1967, we can reasonably estimate that:

There were approximately 1.5 million families with 4.6 children on AFDC in December, 1968.

More than one million of these families live in the 130 cities with populations of 100,000 or more.

Almost 800,000 families are white; more than 700,000 are nonwhite.

About 1.1 million families—73% of the total—are headed by the mother.

Typically, but perhaps surprisingly to some persons, the AFDC family is not large. Fifty per cent, or 750,000 of the families had no more than one or two children to support. Another 450,000 families had only three or four dependent children.

A substantial part of the caseload growth results from loss of job income by the head of the family. At the same time, many families drop off the AFDC rolls as the family heads get jobs.

About one million of these families were receiving near the end of 1967 less than \$200 monthly from AFDC—less than the monthly pay at the \$1.60 minimum wage.

In summary, the adults in the families receiving aid for dependent children represent a substantial manpower potential. They are highly concentrated in our larger cities. Their income needs are not extraordinarily large. A number of them have had job experience, including those mothers who are heads of families. A substantial number—even with no prior work record—have sufficient schooling to be trainable for job openings.

In the light of these and other facts, there should be a new direction for Aid to Families with Dependent Children. But these data are for the nation as a whole. A sample survey should be made in each of the 130 larger cities to determine the manpower potential of adults on AFDC. Then this potential could be developed.

**HOW CAN WE DEVELOP MANPOWER POTENTIAL?**

The primary objective should be occupational rehabilitation of the family heads. A financial incentive should be offered to encourage them to take training, and basic education, if needed. A family living allowance should, of course, be provided while in training. Quite possibly, many of those with prior work records will need some additional skill training to qualify for jobs that will pay enough to help them off welfare.

Child-care facilities may have to be arranged if mothers are to take training and hold full-time jobs. Illegitimacy and father-abandonment are substantial contributing causes of families being on relief. Family planning information and devices should be freely available to adults on AFDC.

**NATIONAL CHAMBER POLICY**

This is the kind of program that would do most to bring out the manpower potential of adults on AFDC. It is based on a policy adopted this year by the National Chamber after a six-month study by a special Committee on Welfare Programs and Income Maintenance. The essence of this policy:

1. Needy persons, such as the elderly and disabled, who cannot care for themselves, should be provided for by the public.

2. Able-bodied adults in need should be given opportunities and incentives to work.

3. Guaranteed income arrangements should be rejected. At best they tend to preserve the status quo rather than to improve conditions for the needy.

It will be up to business to take an active part in rehabilitation programs. An appropriate slogan of the National Chamber referring to the welfare mother caring for dependent children is, "If you won't hire her, don't complain about supporting her."

Business, of course, is not alone in this responsibility. Other segments of the community—education, churches, labor and government at all levels should share in the endeavor.

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz has said that "manpower [training] programs can increase the supply of useful labor and thereby increase the ability of the economy to match the output and demand." Clearly, occupational rehabilitation, in place of a guaranteed income, is the proper way to relieve both the welfare and inflation problems at the same time—and give these people a helping hand to rise up out of poverty.

**LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT**

(Mr. HOLIFIELD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the Appropriations Committee for reporting out a figure of \$40.709 million for funding of titles I, III, and IV of the Library Services and Construction Act. While this amount is still short of the program level for fiscal year 1969—\$49.894 million—it is gratifying that the committee has acted to appropriate nearly the same level as last year. I am hopeful that when this bill is considered in the other body, the full amount from the previous fiscal year can be reached.

The figure of \$40.709 million is the same as that recommended by the Johnson administration. More significant however is that the Appropriations Committee has reported out a figure which is \$17.5 million above the amount requested by the Nixon administration for this vital program. The lesson should be clear to all. In California particularly, the lesser amount as requested by the Nixon administration would have meant the end of many valuable State library services.

The need for education is one of the most fundamental needs of this century. Our recent achievements in space would not have been possible if our schools and teaching resources had fallen short of the excellence we must have to maintain our position of world leadership in many areas. The public library stands as one of our greatest educational resources.

It is inconceivable to me that the present administration would seek to curtail the many great services provided by the Library Services and Construction Act. Prior to the inception of the Library Service Act in 1956, only one-half the amount needed for minimum service was provided for public libraries. At that time, State library agencies recorded that only 25 percent of the population had adequate library service, with 89 percent of the inadequately served living in rural areas. The need for im-

proved facilities and services existed in all areas but passage of this act was most directly concerned with rural areas.

The need in urban areas received recognition with the Library Services and Construction Act, signed into law on February 11, 1964, by President Johnson. At that time, he stated in part:

The central fact of our times is this: books and ideas are the most effective weapons against intolerance and ignorance.

The 1966 amendments to this act added to its purpose the promotion of inter-library cooperation and provision of assistance for specialized State library services.

Over the past decade, these acts and their amendments have benefited over 85 million Americans in new and improved libraries. Over 27 million books and other materials were purchased under the program with Federal, State, and local funds during the first decade.

It is indicative of the success and popularity of this program in California, and in my congressional district, that I have received considerable mail and other communications urging full funding of the Library Services and Construction Act. A recent address by the California State Librarian, Mrs. Carma R. Leigh, delivered in Norwalk, Calif., on July 19, is worthy of inclusion at the close of my remarks. Following Mrs. Leigh's speech are some additional documents which demonstrate the need for continued funding of this program, as well as its considerable accomplishments in California to date. I insert these materials in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARIAN, CARMA LEIGH, AT DEDICATION OF LOS CERRITOS REGIONAL LIBRARY OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY, NORWALK, CALIF., JULY 19, 1969

Dr. Ringwald, Supervisor Bonelli, County Librarian William Geller, all other distinguished platform guests, and all of you as friends and owners of this new regional library facility, the most distinguished and important of all: I bring greetings from the California State Library, and, as State Librarian, greetings on behalf of the other libraries of California.

This building you dedicate today with so much pride, pleasure, and anticipation for the future, is one of 60 such public library buildings in California which the State Library has assisted financially with grants of approximately one-third of their cost. These grants have come from federal funds under the federal Library Services and Construction Act Title II that has been in effect since 1964.

This cooperative local-state-federal public library building program has brought to California \$10,772,507 of federal funds since 1964, to which \$22,964,888 of local funds has been added, to make a total of \$33,737,395 for California public library building purposes. This approximately thirty-three and three-quarter million dollars has provided 1,095,830 square feet of new public library space, in 60 buildings.

Los Angeles County Public Library has received 11 of those grants:

From Federal LSCA II funds.....	\$2,221,061
From Los Angeles County funds.....	4,858,929
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>7,079,990</b>

This Los Cerritos Regional Library building represents the largest of the federal grants to Los Angeles County Public Library:

\$459,711 of federal funds, to \$919,423 of Los Angeles County funds, for a total cost of \$1,379,134 for 39,000 square feet of space.

Besides the 11 grants to Los Angeles County Public Library, there have been 5 other federal LSCA II grants for public library construction to other independent public libraries in Los Angeles County. These have made public library buildings in: Altadena, Long Beach, Monrovia, Palos Verdes Peninsula, Pasadena.

Plus, of course, the grants to 44 other localities throughout California, from Siskiyou County on the Oregon border to San Diego County on the Mexican border.

This is a most gratifying record of local initiative, state and federal assistance, and overall accomplishments, for 60 California communities in California's cities and counties.

We wish we could go on helping toward similar accomplishments in other California communities. But it is coming to an end. There will be no more federally assisted public library building construction program—unless Congress acts to restore funds to the federal appropriations budgets under consideration this month of July, in the House of Representatives. Action on these appropriations is expected to be final on the House floor by July 30. If you are interested, and wish to have other communities benefit from federal assistance in constructing needed public library buildings, you may wish to tell your Congressmen, your representatives in the House of Representatives in Washington. Some 40% of California public library buildings are over 40 years old, out of date, and hopelessly overcrowded, despite all the new buildings recently constructed.

In addition, many newly settled areas where our fast-growing California population has moved have no library buildings at all to serve the new populations.

I greet and congratulate you today on bringing to completion this largest of Los Angeles County Public Library's regional library buildings. I know you will use and enjoy it many years into the future, and I hope many other Californians will be able to do the same.

APPLICATIONS RECEIVED IN FISCAL 1969 FOR FEDERAL LIBRARY SERVICES AND CONSTRUCTION ACT FUNDS WITH WHICH TO SUPPORT LOCAL LIBRARY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS, CALIFORNIA STATE LIBRARY, SACRAMENTO

Title I—Services

Number of applications received.....	22
Number of applications that could be funded.....	3

Number of applications that could not be funded.....	19
--	----

APPLICATIONS FUNDED

Black Gold Cooperative System, on behalf of 7 member libraries in 3 counties (see list of systems and members) for development of Reference and Information Center to serve all member libraries.

Eureka City Library, on behalf of north coast libraries, to plan for a system of coordinated library services, including all types of libraries. (Some Title III funds involved, for inter-type-of-library cooperation.)

Metropolitan Library System (See attached 4-page list of members of this 16-member cooperative system in Los Angeles County.) To develop library service to the economic community of all 16 cities.

APPLICATIONS THAT COULD NOT BE FUNDED

East Bay Cooperative System, on behalf of 4 member libraries in 2 counties (see list), for demonstration of bookmobile service to minority population areas, including films and records; also staff to coordinate system-wide services.

49-99 Cooperative Library System, on be-

half of 8 member libraries in 5 counties, to acquire and provide educational films for entire area.

49-99 Cooperative Library System (see list of members) for reference materials to serve entire area: 5 counties.

Long Beach Public Library, for intensified service to economically & socially disadvantaged areas of Long Beach.

Los Angeles County Public Library, for extended hours for 4 community libraries in "curfew" (disadvantaged) areas of unincorporated Los Angeles County.

Metropolitan Library System (see list of members) to establish strengthened library services for the families of children enrolled in or eligible for participation in the Headstart Program.

Metropolitan Library System, for educational but not curriculum-oriented films & videotape recordings for people of 16 cities.

Mountain-Valley Library System, on behalf of 7 libraries in 5 counties (see list), to establish a film circuit of 16 mm. & Super 8 cartridge films for use throughout the mountain and valley counties.

North Bay Cooperative Library System, for development of central physical processing of books and other materials for 16 libraries in 6 counties north of San Francisco Bay. (See list of members.)

North State Cooperative Library System, on behalf of 16 libraries in 9-county area of 27,995 square miles, for establishment of strong reference and information service for entire area. (See list of members.)

Richmond Public Library, for acquiring books, written materials, audio and visual materials, for strong, well-rounded cultural enrichment program in the area of Shields Park, with a black population, in cooperation with Contra Costa County Library.

Sacramento City-County Library, for Libros en Espanol (Books in Spanish for 75,000 Spanish-speaking population in the greater Sacramento area, in cooperation with the non-profit corporation, Sacramento Concilio.)

San Luis Obispo County Library, for establishment of bookmobile, small library bus, and extended mailing service to residents of remote areas of the county, Spanish-speaking, and elderly, who are unable to get to regular library outlets.

San Jose/Santa Clara/Sunnyvale Cooperative Library System, for special library services to reach shut-ins and senior adults throughout the 3 cities.

San Joaquin Valley Library System, for library service to physically handicapped and aging throughout 6 cities and counties.

Santa Clara Valley Library System in conjunction with the San Jose/Santa Clara/Sunnyvale Library System, for strengthened reference and information services for 5 libraries in Santa Clara County.

Santa Clara Valley Library System, to establish special business and industrial library services in Santa Clara County.

Santiago Library System, to acquire foreign language collections to serve needs of 4 member libraries in Orange County.

Solano County Library, for intensified library service to disadvantaged areas of Solano County.

\$3,116,365 would be required to fund all these programs in the first year, and \$2,138,656 in the second year of their operation, making a total of \$5,255,021.

California will receive only \$1,154,367 under Title I, if the 50% cutback in LSCA I appropriations prevails, in Fiscal Year 1969-70.

MULTILIBRARY SYSTEMS

Berkeley-Oakland Service System: Berkeley Public Library, Oakland Public Library.

Black Gold Cooperative Library System: Lompoc Public Library, San Luis Obispo County Library, San Luis Obispo Public Library, Santa Barbara Public Library, Santa

Maria Public Library, Santa Paula Public Library, Ventura County and City Library.

East Bay Cooperative Library System: Alameda City Public Library, Alameda County Library, Contra Costa County Library, Richmond Public Library.

49-99 Cooperative Library System: Amador County Library, Calaveras County Library, Lodi Public Library, Modesto Public Library, Stanislaus County Library, Stockton-San Joaquin County Library, Tuolumne County Library, Turlock Public Library.

Inland Library System: Colton Public Library, Corona Public Library, Ontario Public Library, Riverside Public Library, San Bernardino County Library, San Bernardino Public Library, Upland Public Library.

Metropolitan Cooperative Library System: Altadena Library District Library, Azusa Public Library, Covina Public Library, Glendora Public Library, Monrovia Public Library, Monterey Park Public Library, Palos Verdes Library District Library, Pasadena Public Library, Pomona Public Library, Redondo Beach Public Library, Santa Fe Springs Public Library, Santa Monica Public Library, Sierra Madre Public Library, South Pasadena Public Library, Torrance Public Library, Whittier Public Library.

Monterey Bay Area Cooperative Library System: Carmel (Harrison Memorial) Public Library, Monterey County Library, Monterey Public Library, Pacific Grove Public Library, Salinas Public Library.

Mountain Valley Library System: Auburn-Placer County Library, El Dorado County Library, Lincoln Public Library, Marysville Public Library, Roseville Public Library, Sacramento City-County Library, Sutter County Library.

North Bay Cooperative Library System: Callistoga Public Library, Healdsburg Public Library, Lakeport Public Library, Marin County Library, Mill Valley Public Library, Napa City-County Public Library, Petaluma Public Library, St. Helena Public Library, Santa Rosa-Sonoma County Library, Sausalito Public Library, Sebastopol Public Library, Solana County Library, Sonoma Public Library, Ukiah-Mendocino County Library, Vacaville Unified High School District Library, Vallejo Public Library.

North State Cooperative Library System: Butte County Library, Chico Public Library, Colusa County Library, Modoc County Library, Orland Public Library, Oroville Public Library, Plumas County Library, Shasta County Library, Siskiyou County Library, Tehama County Library, Trinity County Library, Willows Public Library.

San Joaquin Valley Library System: Coalinga Unified School District Library, Fresno County Library, Hanford Public Library, Kings County Library, Madera County Library, Tulare City Library.

San Jose-Santa Clara-Sunnyvale Cooperative Library System: San Jose Public Library, Santa Clara Public Library, Sunnyvale Public Library.

Santa Clara Valley Library System: Mountain View Public Library, Santa Clara County Library.

Santiago Library System: Huntington Beach Public Library, Orange County Public Library, Placentia Library District Library, Yorba Linda Library District Library.

Sierra Library System: Carlsbad Public Library, Chula Vista Public Library, Coronado Public Library, National City Public Library, Oceanside Public Library, San Diego Public Library.

#### SINGLE LIBRARY SYSTEM

Kern County Library.  
Long Beach Public Library.  
Los Angeles County Public Library.  
Los Angeles Public Library.  
San Francisco Public Library.  
San Mateo County Library.

#### NEW FINDINGS ON THE EFFECTS OF NUCLEAR FALLOUT: RELEVANCE TO "FIRST STRIKE" TALK

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague from Michigan, Congressman LUCIEN NEDZI, and myself, I wish to inform the House of a most interesting open seminar which we conducted last week to look into some disturbing new developments regarding the effects of nuclear fallout—particularly strontium-90—on infant mortality. Congressman NEDZI and I concur as the significance of the information and opinions revealed in this informal session.

Three months ago, on April 24, 1969, I inserted into the RECORD new research on the effects of radiation from fallout on infant mortality conducted by Dr. Ernest Sternglass, a well-known radiation physicist from the University of Pittsburgh. Dr. Sternglass' startling findings, while still tentative and quite controversial, suggest that the effects from nuclear fallout may be many times more severe and persistent than the Atomic Energy Commission or anyone else has ever indicated or supposed, particularly upon children born within a period of years after nuclear blasts. They suggest, also, that these severe effects would not be geographically limited, but would very likely extend across the entire hemisphere in which multiple nuclear blasts might occur. It was for the purpose of giving wider exposure to these possibly crucial findings that I called attention to this material earlier this year.

In an effort to learn more about the Sternglass findings, which are very new, and also to learn more about the view of scientists who are dubious about his work, Mr. NEDZI and I invited Dr. Sternglass and two other prominent radiation scientists to review their knowledge of this field in an open seminar last week. The two scientists appearing with Dr. Sternglass were Dr. Shields Warren, professor emeritus of pathology of the Harvard University Medical School, and Dr. George Hutchison, an epidemiologist from the Michael-Reese Hospital in Chicago. Dr. Warren was formerly head of the U.S. delegation, United Nations Scientists Committee on the Effects of Radiation, 1957-62, and Director of Biology and Medicine at the Atomic Energy Commission, 1947-52.

Various interested Members of the House were invited to attend this open seminar and participate in the discussion and questioning. We were honored to have with us the distinguished Chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Chairman HOLIFIELD, and Congressmen GEORGE BROWN, FRASER, and ROYBAL.

Several things become evident in the course of our discussion. First, the correlation Dr. Sternglass has discovered between the presence of radioactive strontium-90 from nuclear tests and infant mortality in the United States appears to be the only explanation currently available to explain the excess infant

mortality in this country noted in recent years by the Public Health Service. As a result of this excess infant mortality, the United States has dropped from second or third from the top of the list of developed nations with regard to low rates of infant mortality, to 18th on that list. Despite many efforts to find an explanation for this phenomenon, various possible causes have been eliminated as possibilities, and no theory currently has much evidence to support it, other than that now offered by Dr. Sternglass.

Second, Dr. Sternglass seems to be the first researcher to look into the relationship between strontium-90 radiation and infant mortality on a comparative basis in various States of the Union and various nations of the world which, over the past 25 years, have been subject to nuclear fallout.

While the Atomic Energy Commission and various scientists working both independently and under contract to the AEC have kept careful and continuing track of radiation in the atmosphere in search of possible health effects, and while the AEC has sharply attacked Dr. Sternglass' findings, it appears that the precise relationship, or apparent relationship, identified by Dr. Sternglass has not been specifically studied or investigated by any of these analysts.

Finally, while such replication and additional research will be needed adequately to verify Dr. Sternglass' findings, the implications of those findings are such that we may not be able to afford the time required fully to verify the findings before we change our national policies in various fields in response to them. It may be necessary to assume that Dr. Sternglass' findings are substantially correct and to act accordingly now, rather than risk the thousands of unnecessary infant deaths and deformities that might result if we ignore Dr. Sternglass' findings and they are eventually shown to be accurate.

In the view of Congressman NEDZI and myself, the most significant inference that must be drawn immediately from the Sternglass work is its implication for the "first strike" argument that is so widely used to justify proposed nuclear weapons systems like the ABM and MIRV. If the Sternglass findings are correct—that even low levels of strontium-90 may have devastating effects on subsequent generations of all nations in the same hemisphere where a nuclear first strike occurs—such a first strike becomes "unthinkable" for any nation, if it is not unthinkable already. Even if the Soviet Union, or the United States, were tempted to strike first on the basis of a belief that such a strike would render the other side incapable of retaliation, the striking nation would have to face the certainty that succeeding generations of its own people and succeeding generations of allied nations would suffer infant mortalities and deformities in very large proportions; those born fit might be forced to destroy the overwhelming number of unfit in order to have any hope themselves of surviving.

In short, the greater the certainty and magnitude of the devastation a nation

contemplating a first strike would face not from a retaliatory strike—which it might hope to preempt—but from the explosion of its own first-strike weapons, the less likely it would be to launch such a first strike. The Sternglass findings, which are well known to Soviet scientists, have plausibly, if not yet conclusively, posed a much more frightening picture of the total effects of any nuclear blast for all nations in the same hemisphere than has ever before been even tentatively documented. It is our view that given the strength of these findings, the lack of immediate evidence to refute them, and the enormity of their implications should they eventually turn out to be true, the only reasonable and responsible thing for world leaders to do is to assume that they are true unless and until they are refuted, and act accordingly in the meantime. These findings thus lessen substantially the prospect that either the United States or the Soviet Union will ever launch a first strike against the other, leaving both sides with correspondingly less justification than can now be mustered for the immense increases being contemplated in our nuclear capabilities.

It is particularly significant that Dr. Shields Warren, although skeptical of Dr. Sternglass' precise findings, agreed that extensive multimegaton attacks, whether in the form of a United States-Soviet exchange or of a first strike, would be "terribly harmful" throughout the Northern Hemisphere, that there would be a "tremendous increase in the number of abnormalities, in still births," and that "there would be a pretty horrible degree of problems for a great number of generations."

Key portions of the discussion, unedited by the participants, follow. The complete transcript of the seminar will be available as soon as participants have had an opportunity to review and edit their remarks.

Mr. BROWN. I gather that Dr. Sternglass would agree that the hypotheses he is making are not fully substantiated. They are intriguing and it leads to a speculation as to the effects of a nuclear exchange.

Let's postulate that we have a nuclear exchange of the type set forth in the Defense Department, which would result in 10 to 6 times the 20 kilotons perhaps you are talking about in the paper here. Of course, the physics of that exchange would be important as to whether it was a ground blast, air blast or water blast. But, assuming that something of that magnitude and recognizing again that we are talking in hypothetical terms, what would be your extrapolation as to the effects upon infant mortality?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Well, I can only go on the basis of quantitative results the computer produces for us, and the results are something like this:

For a ground burst of 20 kilotons in New Mexico, one out of 100 children born downwind as much as 1,000 miles away died presumably in terms of some effect, presumably due to immaturity or other factors that caused an infant to die more readily.

If, therefore, one were to have 100 20-kiloton bombs in a ground detonation, there would be essentially few children surviving born in the next generation for the next ten to twenty years, in that area.

Now, for air bursts of megaton weapons the situation is somewhat different. There,

our figures show that for 200 megatons released in the stratosphere in different parts of the world, one child out of 100 born in the United States may have died as a result of this release. Again, therefore going from 200 megatons to what is needed for an effective first strike, namely 20,000 megatons, one again has a factor of 100, or coming close to the situation where even if you and I are adult survivors, might survive, to see a large fraction, of not all children, subsequently born to die of the effects of this massive deposition of long-lived fallout.

Mr. NEDZI. I think one of the crucial questions, assuming the Soviet Union originated an attack, is the effect on the Soviet Union 3,000 miles or 6,000 miles away.

Dr. STERNGLASS. Let me explain this. If strontium 90, and I say if this continues to be confirmed, and if strontium 90 is the primary agent responsible, then we are dealing with a very long lasting effect. So that since strontium 90 has a half life of around 28 years, it would not disappear or decrease significantly in the time required for the fallout to drift back to Russia in the matter of some 5 to 10 days since the upper stratospheric winds move at a typical velocity of 60 to 100 miles an hour, the material circulates the entire world in about a period of two weeks, so that this is a short time compared to the time necessary for a strontium 90 to die away. As a result, this is in effect a suicidal type of attack.

Mr. BINGHAM. Do you have any information about Soviet views or findings in this?

Mr. STERNGLASS. I do indeed. At the very meeting at which I presented this at Hanford, Russian scientists presented similar data showing very surprisingly strong effects on animals at very low radiation doses.

In addition, the Russians have for many years been very concerned about the effects of the central nervous system. They have taken young Beagles and during pregnancy exposed them to only a few rads of external X-ray, and found significant differences in their ability to train these Beagles subsequently to make them respond in their Pavlovian experiment. So the Russians are extremely concerned.

In addition, Dr. Sakarov, whom we all know released his famous statement that was reproduced in New York Times, has expressed personal concern repeatedly about the genetic effects of carbon 14 produced by nuclear weapons even in the absence of any fission materials whatsoever, in the so-called clean weapons releasing only or producing only carbon 14. He has himself written an article pointing this out in Russian magazines and, more recently, he has pointed out that nuclear war would be suicidal for mankind.

Mr. NEDZI. Dr. Warren, can you comment on that?

Dr. WARREN. I have no doubt that nuclear war would be a very devastating thing. Suicidal is a very strong term to use. One of the things that impresses me about almost any species of animal, including man, is its ability to survive under a wide variety of adverse conditions.

We have been trying to get rid of rats probably ever since man tried to store food. The rat population today is larger than it ever has been.

I don't think that there is any absolute answer that that can be given here one way or another. If one accepts Dr. Sternglass' hypothesis that there is something peculiarly bad about the placement of the radiation from strontium 90, I think that very worrisome figures would result from a quantitative study of this.

I find myself that it is difficult to assume that one type of beta radiation varies greatly in its effect from another type and I would not take as pessimistic a view as Dr. Sternglass.

However, I think there is no question but what any nuclear exchange of any magnitude

would have very serious effects as far as the world as a whole is concerned.

Mr. FRASER. May I ask a couple of questions? One is if at a given level of radiation you get one additional death per thousand—I may not be asking the question right—if you double radiation would you get a linear rise?

Dr. STERNGLASS. As a matter of fact I wrote a paper on this which was published in Science in June, 1963, in which I showed that based on the evidence then available from X-rays given to pregnant women, there was a direct relationship you might say a straight line relationship—between the number of X-rays given the mother and the likelihood that the child would develop leukemia even down to one X-ray.

Now, at higher levels, such as encountered in Hiroshima, linearity was established from about 50 rads up to 1,000 rads long before the article. Of course, precise linearity is not necessarily the most important point. Even if there is some curvage in the line, what is really important is that by now, in contrast to what we knew 15 years ago, there is no reason to suppose that even very low level radiations do not produce some effect. That was the so-called "threshold issue."

Now we have much more data suggesting that there is no evidence, again this is threshold, for most genetic effects. There is some healing and there is some indication of some slight curvature, but I think basically most radiobiologists today, including the Federal Radiation Council in its recommendations to the Government, has assumed that the conservative approach requires us to assume that we do have, in fact, a direct linear relationship at levels of a few rads. Wouldn't you say that?

Dr. WARREN. I think that is quite a fair statement. I think probably the few rads that you speak of lie somewhere around 50 or 100 rads.

It is much better established at higher levels.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. This is a very important point I think, that has been made. It is true that this assumption has been made, but it is not an assumption susceptible to proof. It is made on the basis of having a cushion of protection far greater than we can at this time say. The Federal Radiation Council was set up statutorily by my Committee for the expressed purpose of giving it independence to set standards.

They are men that are completely objective. They are scientists who are contributing their professions, putting their professional judgment on the line when they do this.

There is one thing that I think Dr. Warren will testify to, that the Joint Committee has done from the very beginning, it has placed safety as their primary duty, that nothing should be done from an economic standpoint or any other standpoint, where in the best judgment they would say it is detrimental. In other words, if there were going to be any mistakes made, it would be mistakes on the side of safety.

We have spent literally hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development on all kinds of animals, mice; and the genetic work that the two brothers down in Oak Ridge—

Dr. STERNGLASS. The Russell brothers.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Russell, yes. And the famous geneticists out in Indiana, Dr. Mueller and others, that worked over the years. Always we have abjured them and we have adjured the Commission to take no chances, put a factor of safety as far as you can in everything that you do.

Dr. WARREN. This is absolutely true. I have been at times directly responsible for carrying out these instructions, and I have always

been very much impressed by the attitude that Mr. Hollifield and all of the other members of the Joint Committee have shown, as well as the AEC.

I think it is worth saying that this is a clear demonstration over the years that safety in a new and unknown field can be bought if you are willing to pay the price for it.

Mr. NEDZI. Dr. Hutchison, could we get a comment from you on the relationship between dosage and damage?

Dr. HUTCHISON. The comment that Dr. Warren had a moment ago, I think, it is important to put it in reference to the question of linearity. The doses in which we can speak of a demonstrated effect, starting someplace at 50 or 100 rads, I think we can talk about it at a somewhat lower dose.

Dr. STERNGLASS. Right.

Dr. HUTCHISON. We can speculate, and it is speculation to say that linearity is the most likely way the thing works at lower doses. But this must remain as speculation.

Of course, it has to be true for higher doses, because there are only limited doses that can be observed in the human population. However, for the ranges at which we have good observational data, a linear fit is pretty good.

Mr. FRASER. Let me pursue this question. I get the impression, among other ways of getting at this too general kind of investigation, one would be attempting to establish the specific causal relationship where you have controllable experiments. The other is kind of a macro-analysis, where you deal with general, long-term trends and try to establish causal relations.

I gather that is what Dr. Sternglass has been trying to do.

On that score, the Public Health Service obviously is very much interested. You made an observation that there has been a conference to find out—have the others pursued the same kind of inquiry you have been making? And, if they have, I am curious as to what kind of answers are being developed.

Dr. STERNGLASS. There has recently been a book published by Drs. Schlesinger, Nesbitt and Shapiro, published by Harvard University Press, devoted entirely to the problem of infant mortality changes in the United States. It includes a discussion of fetal, childhood, and maternal mortalities, because for every child that dies there are some mothers that also perish at the time.

So, in this book, a careful analysis was made, a review of all the things that the Public Health Service had uncovered in its attempt to find an explanation.

The general conclusion of the book is that there is, at the moment, no known medical, sociological, or other single factor that could account for the difference observed between the United States and other countries, despite the enormous efforts that have gone into this. Radiation was the only factor that I know of that was not considered.

Mr. FRASER. The book does not seek to explore that?

Dr. STERNGLASS. It does not mention the word "radiation."

Mr. FRASER. It apparently rules out other—

Dr. STERNGLASS. Other variables, such as the introduction of sulphur drugs, or the introduction of various other new drugs, the thalidomide series situation, the effect of the population movement in the United States, all these other factors have been examined and looked at in his book and found not to explain these abnormal patterns in the United States.

Mr. FRASER. Dr. Sternglass, are there not other investigators—

Dr. STERNGLASS. There are still people working on it.

Mr. FRASER. Of radiation?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Not in the relation of fetal mortality. No one has ever looked at it, not even myself. I, myself, have been obviously

concerned about possible low level fall-out effects since 1959, 1960 and 1963. Even though I was very concerned, it never occurred to me to tie the well-known poor performance in infant mortality to radiation until last October, when I ran into this data.

Mr. FRASER. Your work here is—

Dr. STERNGLASS. It is new, within the last four, five or six months. In fact, it is for this reason that it has been so difficult to have it fully studied and examined. And this is what one likes to do. These procedures generally take many years for something of this magnitude to be widely studied, and to be fully accepted.

But I am afraid that we may not have the time. That has been my concern. The reason why I brought this up at these meetings in the Health Physics Society and others and why I wrote a letter to the New York Times, is that I felt a very intense concern that this fact, although not yet, by any means, fully proven, should be examined as soon and as widely as possible because of this vast implication if it turns out to be true.

Mr. FRASER. Let me see if I have this. You are apparently the first one attempting to make a study of this correlation?

Dr. STERNGLASS. That is correct.

Mr. FRASER. Since that is the case, others may follow along, and develop either identical or different solutions not yet available?

Dr. STERNGLASS. That is right.

This is very early data and it has not yet had a chance to be widely discussed in the scientific literature.

Mr. FRASER. Let me put a question. Your conclusions, at the moment, are considered to be uncertain or controversial?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Surely, both.

Mr. FRASER. Prior to your work, starting in October, this is really not a fair question and only a lawyer would ask it—have you been publishing papers and taking positions with respect to the effects of radiation?

Dr. STERNGLASS. For years.

Mr. FRASER. Which evoked a similar controversy?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Certainly, because in 1963, at the time of the Test Ban Hearings, I published a paper in "Science," in which I took some of the data of Dr. MacMahon and Dr. Stewart and drew attention to the point that they suggested they did not exclude the possibility of linearity; and that, therefore, low level fallout from continued testing in the atmosphere was likely to produce serious defects, even though one could not prove this. Since this was clearly a hypothesis, it could not be proven beyond a shadow of doubt.

It was, by its very nature, controversial. But I did not hesitate to bring the evidence to the attention of the scientific community at the time, because of the potential importance of this matter.

For this reason, I believe that this is a similar situation now. Through forces of circumstance, I ran into a totally unexpected but potentially serious matter, which, if it were merely a scientific matter, could be left to internal discussions within the scientific community without affecting the health and safety of our society as a whole. But, being also a father of young children, and hopefully a grandfather, and being humanly concerned of crippled children—and I happen to be living next to a home of crippled children, through no circumstances that I could control—I had a natural concern for these matters. And I don't believe that, as a scientist, I need to separate my driving motives from my interest as a scientist to look at the facts and have others study them.

I certainly have a clear concern about bringing these matters to the attention of the people.

Mr. BROWN. Dr. Warren, has the AEC pursued this kind of analysis, do you know?

Dr. WARREN. In this specific form, as I am

aware, it has not. I believe that there is a staff study of Dr. Sternglass' work being made at the present time. I have not seen this, however.

Mr. BROWN. You don't know of any other independent—

Dr. WARREN. No.

Mr. BROWN. You are in agreement that there is very little inquiry other than Dr. Sternglass' pursuits?

Dr. WARREN. Yes. I think it would be, perhaps, fair to say that the method of determining this excess mortality, which Dr. Sternglass has used, is not a widely used procedure. I think it is probably worthwhile to make some very careful estimates along these lines.

Mr. BROWN. It is a case that the Public Health Service has developed a concept independently of his research?

Dr. STERNGLASS. Yes, without a cause.

Dr. WARREN. It is true this is one of the tools which is used. However, in almost no human mortality problem can one ever hope to get a zero point, carrying the straight line on to zero.

Dr. STERNGLASS. May I correct that impression?

These are logarithmic plots, and they do not go to zero. They have no bottom. In other words, they go to 100 cases per thousand. There is no zero; and the straight line does not mean that I anticipate someday there will be zero infant deaths. It is a logarithmic plot. Really a plot of exponentials, when plotted on a linear scale, gradually and slowly approaches zero as an infinity, but never actually reaches it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Dr. Warren, is it true that the Public Health community has found a mystery here with regard to this fluctuation or trends of infant mortality that has puzzled a lot of people, and it has not been explained?

Dr. WARREN. I think it is fair to say that there is not complete agreement. No, there is no consensus as to why the U.S. mortality rate for infants apparently has stayed so high. I am not a statistician, but perhaps Dr. Hutchison, who is much more of one, would care to comment here.

Dr. HUTCHISON. It has been a surprise. It has been studied very extensively. I don't know that it is thought of as more of a surprise than any other things that one sees in statistic trends that are gotten by similar investigation. But it is a well known phenomenon, the fact that the United States infant mortality rate has fallen from its high position to a relatively low position in the Western world.

Mr. FRASER. In relative terms.

Dr. STERNGLASS. Right. Might I just once answer this. In my Hanford paper, I quote, as pointed out in the summary of the Special International Conference on the parnatal and infant mortality problem in the United States, held May 13th, 14th, 1965, there seems to be "No simple, concise explanation for the leveling off or for the unfavorable position of the infant mortality rate in the United States. No single statistical demographic or medical factors appear to account for the international differences observed in the parnatal and infant mortality rate."

The quote is taken from Reference 39 of my paper; and it essentially refers to the following: a report of the International Conference of the parnatal and infant mortality problem of the United States, report series four, three June, 1966, National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Public Health Service; and also a reference of the same pointing out, the same anomaly in Public Health Report, Volume 75, page 391, 1960. There the early evidence on the leveling trend in the United States is first pointed out.

Mr. BINGHAM. I would like to ask a question particularly in light of what Dr. Warren has said. We have talked about the effects of a nuclear exchange, and everybody agrees

that such an exchange would be a pretty bad thing. But what I would like to ask, in light of the discussion, is this: There has been discussion of the possibility of a Soviet first-strike against this country.

Now, assuming that they might conclude that they would wipe out, in one blow, our capacity to retaliate by, let's say, an attack on all ICBM's, they could knock them out with one strike with their SS-9—or whatever it is—and produce explosions of five to ten megatons on the ground—how serious from their point of view would it be? How serious would they have to consider the problem of fallout to be, as it might affect (a) themselves from that attack, and (b) countries such as Cuba nearby that are their friends?

Mr. NEDZI. Or the other way around. What affect would it have on the United States if our leaders determine that we have a capability of a first strike against them?

Dr. WARREN. I have had, in the aggregate, about 400 R of radiation through some foolish experiments that I did when I was young and should have known better, and other things. This was spread out over a long period of time. I have attempted to do some rough calculations of what the fallout average might be from an exchange of this sort.

These are not, in any way, statisticated, they are essentially off the cuff. I think, using the U.N. Scientific Committee's information and the effects of atomic weapons, we could assume that a very good share of the U.S. and of the U.S.S.R., and for that matter most of the Northern Hemisphere, would probably in 30 years subsequent to such an event aggregate perhaps in the 300 to 400 R range of radiation.

Dr. STERNGLASS. I would concur with that calculation. I have carried it out myself.

Dr. WARREN. I am glad we have the same figures.

This spread out and protracted radiation would be harmful, terribly harmful spread out over a huge population. It probably would not be completely lethal, not completely suicidal. It might not have serious effects as far as the living population was concerned. And one would, hence, have to figure out how hard boiled, so to speak, the rulers are—to what extent they are concerned about the future of the Northern Hemisphere.

Mr. NEDZI. Could you discuss or describe the effect it might have on future generations?

Dr. WARREN. I cannot, with any degree of accuracy, except that I am sure there would be a tremendous increase in abnormalities, in still births, and that the surviving population might have to change its entire social atmosphere, and instead of caring for the unfit, kill the unfit so the few fit can survive.

However, the changes inherent in the genes pool, the germ plasma as a whole would be very seriously damaged. There would be recurrences of a pretty horrible degree of problems for a great number of generations.

I think it all comes back to what we have said earlier, that there is no question but what this would be the most serious catastrophe that mankind has ever faced. It could be quite comparable with some of the epidemics of the Black Death in the Middle Ages.

#### MORE DICTATORIAL AND ANTILEGAL ACTS

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the present leadership of the

United Mine Workers of America, fearful of losing out on its high salaries, special benefits and nepotism, apparently is accelerating its efforts to block the nomination of Joseph (Jock) Yablonski for UMWA president against incumbent W. A. Boyle.

Reports of attempted bribes, threats, and other illegal activities in the coal fields to keep Joe Yablonski's name off the UMWA ballot are becoming more commonplace.

There follows an article from the August 2, 1969, New Republic magazine and another letter to the Secretary of Labor giving some of the details of the roughshod tactics being used in this most important election:

#### THE MINERS PLAY ROUGH ELECTING A UNION PRESIDENT

For the first time since 1926, when John Brophy ran against John L. Lewis, the United Mine Workers of America will have a real contest for the union presidency. On May 29, Joseph Yablonski, a member of the International Executive Board, announced his candidacy against the incumbent Tony Boyle. If Yablonski loses, it won't be for a lack of a case against the incumbent. The union leadership, enjoying its high salaries, special benefits and nepotism, has lost contact with the rank and file.

When the wildcat strikers of the black-lung movement in West Virginia marched on Charleston last spring they booted the district UMWA headquarters, which had ordered them to go back to work. The spontaneous strikes and demonstrations produced a revision of the state's workmen's compensation laws. In Pennsylvania, where black-lung laws give more protection to the miners (Yablonski figured prominently in the lobbying effort), coal miners are troubled about other matters. The union and anthracite companies, most of which are in Pennsylvania, recently announced a contract that includes an outrageous "slave labor" clause giving companies the right to force miners to work seven days a week. When Boyle and his boys addressed miners at Gallitzin, Pa., they were drowned out by jeers and catcalls.

John L. Lewis was a tidal force. Tony Boyle is not. He is described by close associates as "moody and suspicious." But he is running hard now. When he spoke at Welch, W. Va., July 13, spot advertisements were carried hourly for several days on at least five radio stations in the area. Press releases including a biography and picture of Boyle were sent to the papers and TV stations. Buses, allegedly paid for out of union funds, carried Boyle supporters to the rallies. The UMW president arrived surrounded by union officers. Burly sergeants-at-arms were stationed at strategic spots in the hall. Behind the speakers' platform hung a larger-than-life picture of Boyle. He defended his six-year record, attacked the "do-gooders" who would "run this union," and called for union solidarity against "those who would split us." Emphasizing it was not a political speech, Boyle informed the miners of a new UMW department of occupational health, created on June 23 by a special session of the International Executive Board.

On the same day, Yablonski spoke to a small group of miners in the bleachers of an old and neglected athletic field in Matewan, W. Va. News of the meeting was passed around by word of mouth. Three union district representatives were present, writing down the names of those they recognized. Yablonski stood among the miners. He said he wanted to make the union both democratic and militant. He talked about changes in safety laws and in the union pension fund

which would make coal mining more humane.

The miners understood. Although they get a basic daily wage of \$32 while in the mines, they receive pitifully small sums when they are disabled. A miner's widow also has a hard time of it. An average of 300 miners are killed each year. Their widows get between \$30 and \$90 each month from the state and \$2,000 for funeral expenses from the UMW pension fund. After 12 months the union takes away their hospital cards which had entitled them to free hospital care when their husbands were alive.

The Mine Workers Journal fawningly covers every activity of the union officers. (Its editor depends upon Tony Boyle for his job.) A recent 24-page issue carried 28 flattering pictures of Boyle; the discontent of the miners voiced at the Gallitzin rally was blanked out. Yablonski's announcement of his candidacy—reported by *The New York Times*, the *Washington Post* and *Newsweek*—got no mention by the *Journal*. However, the *Journal* staff wrote an eight-page scandal sheet entitled "Election Bulletin," in which Yablonski was called "... the ex-convict, the thief, the deserter of his family, the shake-down artist and the informer on his brother union members." (In 1931, by his own admission, Yablonski spent eight months in jail for breaking into a slot machine, which had taken his money.)

Since declaring his candidacy Yablonski has been fired as director of the union's Labor Nonpartisan League, threatened with a loss of salary, and physically assaulted. On June 28, after talking to local union leaders in Springfield, Ill., he was knocked out from behind by a karate chop. According to the doctor who treated him, the blow would have been fatal if it had landed one-quarter of an inch closer to the spinal nerve. A day later, 50 "pickets," paid \$20 apiece and organized by a certain John Karlavage (he's paid \$15,400 a year by the UMW as an International Representative), broke up a pro-Yablonski meeting at a school in Shenandoah, Pa. Karlavage is also the president of the Shenandoah Borough Council; he had tried to convince the school board secretary to lock out the meeting. Although unsuccessful he managed to deter the town police from giving the meeting requested police protection.

Back in the days when unionists were fair game for Pinkerton goons, union solidarity was a necessity and elections a luxury. As a result, most of the 23 union districts have traditionally had presidents appointed by the International. Boyle recently eliminated two more districts which still had elected presidents: now there are only four districts with autonomous officers. District organizations supply ready-made, union-paid campaign committees for the incumbent. In District 30, for example, the Committee for the Re-Election of our International Officers operates out of the district headquarters in Pikeville, Kentucky. The chairman of the committee has a salary of \$11,130 as a district representative, the secretary of the committee is secretary to the district president. The district has a fund, supplied by the international, of \$55,000 for "expenses," partly used it's said to bankroll the campaign committee. The committee bought a newspaper advertisement in nearby District 29, which ominously warned Yablonski, who was addressing a rally there, to "stay out of District 30." It has mailed the "Election Bulletin" to all District 30 union members.

In brief, Boyle is financing his campaign with money from the rank-and-file miner. Two of every five dollars paid in monthly dues go to the international. The international has utilized money from the \$169-million pension fund by placing \$70 million of its assets in a no-interest checking account, at the National Bank of Washington. The UMW owns 75 percent of the bank.

Against such well-financed organization,

Yablonski can summon only a small staff of volunteer miners who work for him over vacations or in their spare time.

Union locals are now voting on nominations for international officers. Five years ago, nominations from only five locals were needed to win a place on the ballot. Steve "Cadillac" Kochis, a relatively unknown candidate, received the requisite number of local nominations for President and proceeded to win 20 percent of the miners' votes. That was too much. So in 1968, the number of locals necessary to put a man on the ballot was raised to 50 by an International Convention stacked with Boyle delegates. That convention was held in Denver, Colo. The cost of sending delegates was prohibitively high for many small locals. The international paid their expenses and in some cases even supplied "delegates"—but it did it selectively.

Approximately 500 of the UMWA's 1,100 locals are "bogus locals," which have less than the ten active miners required by the union constitution. These are dominated by pensioners. (70,000 of the union's 185,000 members are pensioners.) When John L. Lewis died this past June, Boyle took his place as a director of the UMWA pension fund. He promptly raised the pensions of bituminous miners from \$1,380 to \$1,800 per year. Pleasing pensioners is good union politics. The nomination made by a "bogus local" with four or five active miners and a majority of pensioners is equal to the nomination of officers made by a local with 600 members. The international disbanded all such "bogus locals" in District 5, where Yablonski was once elected district president. "Bogus locals" in all other districts were not touched.

On weekends during the nominating season (July 9 to August 9) when most locals hold their meetings, the district officers and international and district representatives are busy men. Nominating elections are arranged and then announced only to a few members who support Boyle. Where Yablonski men appear to be present in sufficient numbers to win the local, ballots are counted in a back room, and Boyle is announced the winner.

Supporters of Yablonski are alternately offered jobs on the union payroll and threatened with the loss of their company job. The coal companies feel very comfortable with Boyle and are willing to cooperate in blacklisting dissident miners. They are especially alarmed by some of Yablonski's ideas for encouraging better observance of safety. He has suggested, for example, that the companies be required to pay \$100,000 above regular state compensation to the widows of miners killed in accidents.

On July 9, Yablonski asked the Labor Department to investigate and monitor the nominating procedures, but to date there has been no response. Unofficially, (the UMWA will announce the official results after August 9), Yablonski has already won thirty of the fifty locals necessary for a nomination. With two more weekends to go there is a good chance he will be on the December 9 ballot for the general election in which miners vote as individuals.

If the tactics used during the nominating procedures are any indication of what Yablonski may expect in the general election, the chances are good that another election will be held after December 9. Under the Landrum-Griffin Act, the Secretary of Labor may supervise a new election where illegal tactics are in evidence.

JULY 25, 1969.

HON. GEORGE P. SHULTZ,  
Secretary of Labor,  
Department of Labor,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter is a request for reconsideration of your letter of July 23, 1969. During our meeting yesterday

afternoon on this same subject, I set forth a number of reasons why the investigation should go forward at this time, and I also set forth additional violations of law which have come to our attention since my letter of July 18, 1969. As agreed, I will not repeat in this letter all of the many reasons I gave for reconsideration, but simply set forth the new violations. Some of the worst violations (see e.g. paragraph 15 hereafter) came to our attention even since our meeting with you yesterday afternoon. They are listed below:

1. On the night of July 19, 1969, Mr. John Aiello, a paid employee of UMWA trustee District 17, who illegally blocked the nomination of Mr. Yablonski at Local 7113 (Paragraph 10, July 9 letter), telephoned Mr. Charles Shawkey, the pro-Yablonski president of UMWA Local Union 9616, Boomer, West Virginia, and threatened to kill him.

2. Officers of UMWA Local Union 6086 placed an advertisement, under the union seal, in the Williamson, Kentucky *Daily News* of Saturday, July 12, 1969, demanding that Mr. Yablonski "stay completely out of District 30".

3. On July 19, 1969, Boyle henchmen pulled a new trick at UMWA Local Union 1577, Girardville, Pennsylvania. This is the background. As has been the case elsewhere on numerous occasions, no notice was given that nominations would be conducted, as required by Section 401(e) of the LMRDA and the UMWA Constitution. Second, and again this practice is widespread, Mr. John Karlavage (Paragraph 8, July 18 letter) and Mr. William Rogers, both International Representatives of the UMWA and non-members of the local union, were present in the vicinity and at the meeting in order to intimidate local union voters and otherwise to manipulate a Boyle nomination by illegal means. That afternoon (July 19, 1969) Mr. Karlavage telephoned Mr. Al Albert, a Yablonski supporter, and warned him to stay away from the meeting that night. Nevertheless, about forty local union members supporting Mr. Yablonski appeared and waited outside of the meeting hall for the 6:00 p.m. meeting to begin. At this time, Mr. Rogers approached one Julius Savitsky, a Yablonski supporter, and offered him five dollars to leave or to vote for Mr. Boyle. When Mr. Savitsky refused, Mr. Karlavage offered him five more dollars, but this bribe also was rejected. Finally, when an outdoor clock and the watches of the Yablonski supporters reached the designated hour of 6:00 p.m., they entered the meeting hall, in which the clock had deliberately been set forward to read 6:10 p.m., and were informed that a Boyle nomination had already been conducted by those other members (approximately 20) who had entered earlier.

4. William J. Savitsky, a Yablonski campaign worker (and no relation to Julius Savitsky, *supra*), sought to observe nomination meetings at UMWA Local Unions 1443 and 7226 and was barred therefrom by paid UMWA officials supporting Mr. Boyle.

5. Even the old trick of spreading rumors about the death of the rival candidate has been tried. In the Nashville, Tennessee, coal area, efforts were made to plant this rumor. The Associated Press finally killed it.

6. UMWA Local Union 1376, Hazelton, Pennsylvania, held its nomination meeting on July 18, 1969. Present were non-member UMWA International Representatives "Jimmy" Thomas and Boley Overa (also a leading instigator of the illegal activities in Shenandoah, Pennsylvania, referred to in Paragraph 4 of the July 9 letter). In order to assure a Boyle nomination, one Steve Crowbar, a paid UMWA employee, brought to this meeting more than ten persons who were identified by Mr. Joseph Onduko and Mr. Rex Marshall, an active local union member for more than fifty years, as not being members of Local 1376.

7. It is a regular practice for UMWA Dis-

trict officials and employees to show up at nominating meetings to intimidate the voters. Especially intimidating is the effect upon small pensioner locals with only a few persons present, where up to a dozen paid district officers and representatives have appeared at the nominating meetings. Examples of this intimidation occurred at Local Unions 4917 and 5600.

8. On July 17 Local Union 1451, Girardville, Pennsylvania, held a regularly scheduled meeting. No notice had been given that nominations would take place, so only about 10 members out of at least 124 appeared. Mr. Boyle was nominated by a vote of 6 to 4. Many members have told Mr. Savitsky that they would have gone to the meeting and voted for Mr. Yablonski had they been notified of the nomination election.

9. With further reference to Paragraph 9 of the July 18th letter, Mr. Karlavage, after most of those at the meeting had left, declared the earlier nomination illegal, re-held the meeting with only 5 members present (less than a quorum under the UMWA Constitution), and declared Mr. Boyle nominated. Mr. William J. Savitsky and Mr. Joseph Monaghan witnessed portions of this illegal maneuver.

10. In paragraph 7 of the July 18th letter, it was pointed out that a secret ballot had been refused at the UMWA Local Union 1686 meeting. Again, a secret ballot was not taken in the 4-3 vote nomination of Mr. Boyle on July 19, 1969, at the Snap Creek Coal Company Local Union, Logan County, West Virginia. Notice of nominations was not given prior to this meeting either. And also on July 19, 1969, a nomination election was scheduled for UMWA Local Union 1443, Shenandoah, Pennsylvania—but again under the watchful eyes of UMWA International Representatives Karlavage and Rogers. The members attending this meeting demanded a secret ballot vote, and three times a vote by show of hands was passed by hefty margins in favor of a secret ballot election. Three times George Humetsky, the Boyle "floor manager", conferred with Mr. Karlavage and was told to "make them stand". Thereupon, amidst great confusion and while several members were walking about or leaving in disgust, Mr. Boyle was declared nominated in a standing vote. These are clear violations of LMRDA Sections 401(c) and 401(e). Certainly LMRDA did not intend to provide secret ballot only at the general election and not at the nomination stage when it is equally, if not more, important.

11. Local 7604, Kopperston, West Virginia, held a regularly scheduled meeting on July 19, 1969. No notice was given that there would be nominations. As a result only about 40 people showed up, whereas there are at least 700 members of that local. This is a union where the majority was clearly for Yablonski but he did not get the nomination because of the failure of notice.

12. Nor was notice provided for the nomination meeting of Local 6553, Brownsville, Pennsylvania, where only eight members attended and nominated Mr. Boyle. Subsequently, more than 25 members of that local have personally contacted Mr. Yablonski and complained that they had wanted to vote for him but had received no notice of the meeting. And finally, clearly inadequate notice was again omitted with respect to the nomination election of Locals 1868, Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania and 1443 referred to in paragraph 10 above.

13. With respect to paragraph 16 of our July 18th letter, Mr. James Manfredi offered Mr. Robotny five dollars to vote for Mr. Boyle. Mr. Robotny rejected the bribe.

14. With respect to paragraph 4 of our July 18th letter, the attempted discriminatory dechartering of pro-Yablonski Local 7488 has now been completed, even though this local has approximately 75 members, fifteen of whom are currently working mem-

bers, and the UMWA Constitution provides that locals may be chartered with only ten working members (hundreds of UMWA locals, still chartered, have less than 10 working members). Furthermore, although no final action has yet been taken, in May, 1969, shortly after Mr. Elmer Brown had announced his candidacy for International Vice-President, UMWA trustee District 17 President R. R. Humphries announced that Local Union 8752, which has 102 members and of which Mr. Brown is President, and the strongly pro-Brown "Lando" local, which has 27 members, would be merged into UMWA Local Union 6001, which has about 50 members. (All three of these locals are in Delbarton, West Virginia).

15. Nor is the Boyle camp satisfied merely with illegally blocking Yablonski-Brown nominations by vote of local union members. The UMWA Constitution provides that local recording secretaries shall forward the nomination blanks containing the names of those persons nominated to reach UMWA Secretary-Treasurer Owens' office not later than August 9, 1969. On Saturday, July 19, 1969, UMWA trustee District 28 Acting President Ray Thornsby ordered the local presidents and recording secretaries within that District, including one Ray Hutcheson, president of UMWA Local Union 1374, Oakwood, Virginia, to report to the principal offices of District 28 in Norton, Virginia. There, Mr. Earl Brown, the paid District 28 official alluded to in paragraph 4 of our July 18th letter, pursuant to the instructions of Mr. Thornsby, ordered each local official to refrain from mailing the nomination blank in time to reach Mr. Owens by August 9, 1969, in the event that such official's local nominated Mr. Yablonski and Mr. (Elmer) Brown. At the same time, Mr. Earl Brown presented to each such official numerous copies of a libelous sheet concerning Mr. Yablonski, which sheet was prepared under the direction of Mr. Thornsby, and a written directive, signed by Mr. Thornsby in his official capacity, ordering these local officials to post copies, in their official capacities, of the libelous sheet on the bulletin boards of their respective local unions.

When I left your office yesterday afternoon, I predicted that, unless you acted, there would be an acceleration in violations of the law you are charged with enforcing. As we spent last night rechecking the oral allegations I had made to you, we also validated that prediction. The gauntlet has now been laid down to us and to you by the Boyle crowd—even if we get the fifty nominations, they will find a way not to count them (see paragraph 15).

Tomorrow and Sunday the largest number of local unions will hold their nomination meetings. It is not too much to say that only your announcement of an investigation of illegal activities inside the UMWA election process can prevent fraud and intimidation and possible violence from one end of the mining country to the other.

We are seeking some measure of internal democracy in the upcoming UMWA election in line with the spirit and purpose of LMRDA. We know that is your spirit and your purpose, too, and we beseech your action now.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR.,  
Attorney for Joseph A. Yablonski and  
H. Elmer Brown.

#### EDWIN LAHEY DIES

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Mrs.

Pepper and I were shocked and saddened by the recent death of Ed Lahey, an old friend and wonderful man who enjoyed an illustrious career as a newspaperman. Ed was a journalist for better than 40 years and widely respected by his associates and those whose names he struck with the keys of his typewriter.

Ed Lahey combined the skill of a poet, the charm of a leprechaun, and the diligence of a hunting dog. He had great professional skill and dedication, as well as human warmth and understanding. He was a good and decent man whose public self was dedicated to informing others, while his private self always sought to understand and appreciate them. Mrs. Pepper and I will miss him. So will we all.

Mr. Speaker, I would at this point like to include in full the notice of Mr. Lahey's death as reported in the Washington Post of Friday, July 18:

#### NEWSMAN EDWIN LAHEY DIES

Edwin A. Lahey, who emerged from the Chicago railroad yards to become one of the most illustrious newspaper reporters of the modern American scene, died here yesterday at age 67.

In more than 40 years of journalism, Mr. Lahey had been a leading crime and labor reporter in Chicago and chief Washington correspondent for the Chicago Daily News and for the Knight Newspapers. He had been in declining health for several years due to emphysema.

Mr. Lahey described himself as a grammar-school dropout and he often maintained that he wrote "for the people who move their lips when they read." Nonetheless, he was the friend and confidant of Presidential candidates, Supreme Court justices, labor leaders and many other National figures.

President Nixon yesterday called his death "a real loss to American journalism" and hailed Mr. Lahey as "an excellent practitioner of the kind of hard-hitting, direct but always fair reporting that seeks to cover every area of political life."

The list of news beats that he scored in his years of Washington reporting was, Newsweek said in 1962, "practically endless."

His 1952 interview with a brooding Sen. Robert A. Taft, whom Mr. Lahey tracked to Quebec, was credited with leading to Taft's Morningside Heights reconciliation with Republican Presidential candidate Dwight D. Eisenhower.

In 1953, he scored a national beat in reporting the resignation of Labor Secretary Martin Durkin, the "plumber" in the Eisenhower Cabinet of millionaires.

In 1956, when communist Gilbert Green decided to surrender to Federal authorities after jumping bail, he made his decision known in a special delivery letter to Mr. Lahey.

A small man with twinkling eyes and winning Irish wit, Mr. Lahey possessed a gift for penetrating and sometimes devastating phrases. His lead sentences—the first lines of news stories—were legendary.

When "Machine Gun" Jack McGurn was killed during a Chicago shooting match in the 1930s, Mr. Lahey wrote a sympathetic obituary taking note of the mobster's love for golf. His story began:

"Jack was killed last night. He died in the low Eighties." (an address on the Chicago South Side).

When Richard Loeb of the Loeb-Leopold murder case was killed in prison after making a pass at a fellow inmate, Lahey wrote: "Dickie Loeb, despite his erudition, today ended his sentence with a proposition."

In 1956, Mr. Lahey was selected as a pool reporter to observe the first hydrogen bomb

tests in the Pacific. His story began: "Megatons, shmegatons. It was a hell of a blast." Later, during a wave of National debate about fallout shelters, Mr. Lahey wrote that "the only defense against nuclear blast is a state of grace."

His journalistic credo was "Fawn Not Upon the Great," a quotation from Thomas A. Kempis, and in his long career he rarely breached it in print or private.

He described Lyndon B. Johnson as "not the kind of guy you'd like to be stuck in a bus station all night with." Mr. Lahey summed up the 1960 Presidential election in simple terms: "Nixon had the wrong kind of kisser. Kennedy sends the women."

Lahey covered every Presidential campaign from 1944 through 1964, but he did not count himself as a pal of Presidents. "I have advised my associates," he once wrote, "to preserve one paragraph in my obituary to point out that in my long career as a Washington correspondent, five Presidents have ignored me at press conferences."

Mr. Lahey was a devout Roman Catholic and active in Alcoholics Anonymous. He was a member of the Gridiron Club and, because of his year at Harvard as one of the first group of Nieman Fellows, a member of the Harvard Club. He lived at 3863 Chevy Chase pkwy. nw.

He is survived by his wife, Grace; two daughters, Mrs. Allen Kobliska of Washington and Mrs. Bernard Nigro of Alexandria; two brothers, James and Joseph; a sister, Gertrude Meiers, and five grandchildren.

Funeral services will be held at 11 a.m. Saturday at the Blessed Sacrament Church, 6001 Western ave. nw. John Hightower, president of the Gridiron Club, asked that members attend.

#### MANDATORY RETIREMENT: PRO AND CON

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege recently to accept the kind invitation of the American Legion magazine to write a brief article for its "Washington Pro and Con" feature on the proposal that mandatory retirement ages be established for members of the legislative and judicial branches of our Federal Government. My distinguished colleague, Congressman GEORGE BUSH, of Texas, took the affirmative and I took the negative opposing arbitrary limits upon the service of the Members of Congress and our Federal judges. I believe these articles might be of interest to our colleagues, and I therefore include the texts, as follows, in the RECORD:

SHOULD WE HAVE A MANDATORY RETIREMENT AGE FOR MEMBERS OF THE LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES?

"YES"

(By Representative GEORGE BUSH, Republican, Seventh District, Texas)

In developing a premise for the argument favoring mandatory retirement age for members of the legislative and judicial branches, one is ultimately confronted by the maximum—if a minimum age, why not a maximum age?

In researching the many whys and why nots of this issue (which I did extensively before proposing legislation on the subject), I found myself continually referring back to the Constitution. Although the document does specify a minimum age limit for members of Congress, and does qualify the terms of judges by stating that they should

hold office "during good behavior," nowhere is there found any specific reference to the matter of a maximum age limitation for those in Congress and the federal judiciary.

Over the years, Congress has provided for a retirement age for civil servants, yet it has exempted itself and the courts. Even though the retirement benefits for members of Congress and judges are highly appealing, they have not exactly induced an unbridled rush for retirement row among those now qualified. Indeed, the allure of these benefits has had a relatively negligible effect upon those eligible for retirement.

Accordingly, I feel the time has come for us to consider a mandatory retirement age for judges and members of Congress. I have introduced a resolution proposing a Constitutional amendment that would do just this.

Specifically, my bill calls for a mandatory retirement age of 70 for members of Congress, the Supreme Court and other federal judges. In deference to those in office, it would not apply to any member of Congress serving at the time of enactment.

In proposing this legislation, I am not advocating that anyone be "retired just for the sake of retirement." I do think, however, that all of us reach a certain point in our later adult years when our talents for existing jobs are not as complete as they once were, though we still may maintain an inherent interest in the routine of the work. Case in point: the involved and demanding daily work load that a Congressman faces; one which often becomes extremely difficult and physically demanding for older members. I would hope that these older members could be called upon to give their services—on a voluntary basis—in some other capacity. I would also hope that I am offering them a new approach—an alternate avenue through which these older members might better apply their talents. I feel that the adoption of this amendment by Congress and the American people would result in a more efficient Congress and a more effective court system.

I have always believed that one of the primary rules of life is change. What I am arguing for here decidedly represents change—change that, I feel, will ultimately mean a constructive manner of progress.

"No"

(By Representative CLAUDE PEPPER,  
11th District, Florida)

My opposition to a mandatory retirement age for members of Congress and federal judges may appear to be self-serving. But I suggest that there are objective reasons for rejecting this well-meaning but ill-advised proposal.

The unfortunate consequences that might flow from its adoption are easily illustrated. A mandatory retirement age of 70 would have prevented many distinguished political leaders in Great Britain, France and the United States from serving, and serving well, their respective countries.

For example, Henry Palmerston could not have served as Prime Minister of England from 1855 to 1865, because he became 70 in 1854. Benjamin Disraeli could not have served as Prime Minister of England from 1874 to 1880, for he turned 70 in December of 1874. William Gladstone, who became 70 on December 29, 1879, would have thrice been prevented from serving as Great Britain's Prime Minister—1880-1885, 1886 and 1892-1894. And Winston Churchill, who became 70 in 1944, could not have been Prime Minister from 1951 to 1955.

In our own country, a mandatory retirement age of 70 would have prevented Henry Clay from serving a final term in the Senate. It would have denied the House of Representatives valuable years of service by Joseph Cannon, Sam Rayburn and John McCormack as Speakers. It would have eliminated eight years of service by John Marshall, nine years of service by Charles Evans Hughes

and eight years of service by Earl Warren as Chief Justices of the United States. These men rank among the most active and brilliant justices to serve on the high court.

The point is simple but cogent: mandatory retirement for members of Congress and federal judges would deprive the country of valuable leadership.

I support voting at age 18 because I believe young voters would counterbalance an electorate weighted with age and would have a beneficial effect on politics in our country. I do not discount young people because of their age, nor reject a member of Congress or a federal judge because he has passed the age of 70. So far as a member of Congress is concerned, the electorate can determine when he is too old to serve, and that determination is best left in their hands. Most federal judges, I am convinced, retire when they deem themselves too old to perform the duties of their office.

There is no proof that a man's usefulness is finished at age 70, and until I can be convinced otherwise I remain opposed to mandatory retirement age.

#### MEMORIAL DAY, 1969—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM A COBLENZ

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, every year the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia and their friends make it their business in the District to pay proper tribute on significant days. It has just been called to my attention my good friend and for years a good friend of the Congress, Mr. William A. Coblenz, was selected to deliver the address on Memorial Day. I would like to place his remarks on permanent RECORD.

I should point out, Mr. Speaker, he is a former public affairs specialist in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. He delivered the principal address at the Memorial Day exercises on the Battle Ground National Cemetery, Brightwood, May 30, 1969.

The occasion was given under the auspices of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, the GAR Memorial Day Corporation, the Lincoln Group of the District of Columbia, the Brightwood-Manor Park Citizens Association and the Wheaton-Silver Spring Civil Air Patrol, Cadet Squadron.

Mr. Coblenz is a volunteer veteran of both World War I and World War II, and was for more than 7 years before his Library of Congress service, the Acting Director and Assistant Director of the Division of Public Information in the Department of Justice. Before that he had been a Boston newspaper reporter, editorial and feature writer, and daily columnist.

Without either agreeing or disagreeing with the substance of this excellent memorial address I nevertheless regard it a thoughtful, vigorous, and searching commentary on the campus turmoil of our time and related subjects and feel it deserves wide and respectful circulation and consideration from us all:

MEMORIAL DAY 1969—BATTLE GROUND NATIONAL CEMETERY, BRIGHTWOOD, D.C.

These are solemn and—as I see them—tremendously important memorial services.

They are important because of the turmoil of the era in which we live.

They are important because they enable us to draw some kind of contrast between the age when these men gave their lives for their country and the age today in which not a few of our youth insult the flag and cast shame upon themselves and the tradition of this free and open society.

So I, as a citizen, feel grateful to the group of patriotic organizations who made this thoughtful and reverent function possible and I am immensely proud to be your speaker.

The age in which we have our being right now is at once the most decent, the most humane, certainly the most civilized since man first began to walk erect—and it is also the most barbaric, and the most ungrateful since man first began to communicate with man.

The contrasts on this planet in this hour are dramatic, dynamic and terrifying.

We have the means at hand, stored, labelled and ready, to totally destroy ourselves and all life on this planet.

And we even have those who have the will and the drive to do it. But we can also fly to the moon.

What confronts us like a monster spewing fire is the extremism of the left actually feeding, by reaction, the extremism of the right.

Between these two violent and massive mob-stupidities rests a central force, which I hope is mightier than the other two, and which I call the current maturity of western civilization.

I mean in fact this audience before me here on this battleground.

We here in these environs today stand in the midst of a solemn and simply magnificent historical fact:

This is the sacred graves of the dead upon whose lives and sacrifices our nation was built.

Our own generation—at least mine, the adult, the middle-aged, the elderly—stands accused of having failed our youth.

They say we gave them Vietnam.

They say we gave them outworn, unchanging, decaying, misused, inadequate and mismanaged institutions of higher learning.

They say we gave them the premonition of total doom on the very doorstep of their future which we threaten, by our mistakes, with annihilation.

They say—some of them—we gave them an exploitive and materialistic society, and a false sense of values.

They say we are callous to the needs of the poor and the disadvantaged.

They say we are sumpily servile to the rich and the powerful.

Our society, they say, is the flunkie and the handmaiden of the military-industrial complex.

The colleges and universities are the very entrance gates, they say, to the total dominance of our civilization by the entrenched minions of cupidity, greed and ruthlessness.

On the other hand they, the dissident students and their associates, would have us believe that they are the advance troops for the millenium and the harbinger for the coming of the Messiah. They may be against soap but they are wholeheartedly for flowers and for love.

Taking these complaints and these boasts, all in all, I know of no greater fraud since demagoguery first became an amazingly successful technique for organizing, promoting and advancing anarchy and nihilism. There has been nothing like it since the Communist manifesto.

This demagoguery is particularly ugly because it cloaks itself in the robes of civil rights, justice and equality.

They have already succeeded in befuddling the minds and paralyzing the will of some of our most distinguished university administrators.

A student who commits a criminal act is not a criminal—he is a dissident.

These young malefactors pretend to idealism. They enjoy the immense charisma of youth.

The inherent awfulness of this special kind of demagoguery is that it uses what may very well be a profound wrong or a whole catalogue of wrongs, and, under the guise of righting them, creates a far greater wrong.

First let me put down this basic proposition:

There has never been a moment in the history of mankind when man has achieved for himself the degree of decency, justice under law, and grandeur of character that invests this government today on this soil, under this flag.

The noble dead we honor on this Memorial Day bear testimony to this divine truth. For they helped create it, and not by burning their draft cards, or doing what would have been the equivalent in their time.

Now then, if against what I have just said, we want to catalogue the crimes against decency and against humanity that exist today, all of us, of course, can present a long and formidable indictment. And this indictment I am honest enough to say goes far deeper and is much longer than anything the socially and judicially backward Students for a Democratic Society have so rudely shoved forward so far.

My answer is that our society—our open society—has an answer to these evils and is correcting them even as they happen.

That's the great, the profound, the monumental difference!

The key phrase is: Open society.

What does that mean?

When the conspiracy came to light in the plumbing industry of this country only the other day fifteen of the country's largest manufacturers of plumbing fixtures were convicted of raising, fixing and stabilizing prices against the law. Twelve of the fifteen were fined a total of \$370,000 by Pittsburgh's Federal District Court. Millions of dollars are yet to be returned to those who have been cheated.

We've had Senator Gaylord Nelson, Senator Warren G. Magnuson, the late Senator Estes Kefauver expose irregularities in our massive automotive industry, in our giant and ruthlessly profiteering pharmaceutical industry. We've had some of the corporations in the extremely powerful and financially unlimited electric appliance industry brought before the bar of justice, heavily fined and some of its major executives jailed for rigging bids. They included some twenty-four corporations and they made huge and dishonest profits.

But what is the answer?

The answer is that under the system these radical students condemn, under this flag, under this basic law of the land—the Constitution of the United States, these immensely powerful corporations, were brought to book. Some went to jail. Millions of dollars were returned, under law suits, to those whose pockets, economically speaking, had been picked, and for as long as this nation's business history is written, this chapter of our economic chronicle will show these violators of our economic laws to have contributed a very sad chapter, indeed, to the economic history of the United States.

Thus to this degree at least our industrial system was washed clear and clean with the simple, severe, commanding detergent of law, of equal justice under law, the detergent of congressional investigation, the detergent of a free and widely sweeping press and communications network, the printed, the pictorial, the magazine, the graphic processes of publicity.

Consider what it means to a free and open society, so unquestionably free and open, that whether you agree with him or not, a relatively unknown, unmoneyed, unsubsidized, young lawyer, fresh out of the Harvard

Law School, and himself a student only yesterday, found it possible to bring the greatest industrial giant of all time—General Motors—and the whole automobile industry, to its knees. His contribution to automobile safety is one of the greatest contributions to the public interest in the last two decades, decades in which upwards of 53,000 of our people have been slaughtered on our highways annually. And the motor industry's effort to find a scapegoat by blaming it on drunken driving failed miserably to hold water. What we have today (Federal regulation) is not what I would ordinarily recommend, but it turns out to be the best solution under the circumstances.

The solution is that Washington is now, under the legislative cudgel which the industry brought upon itself, telling Detroit how to design an automobile. What has done is to shove more and more socialism down its own throat and the throat of the American economy and the American people.

But what is my point?

My point is that evil will always be with us, whoever governs and whoever is enriched, but that what all this history teaches us is that we have the will, the means, the courts, the press, the public opinion, to correct, to wipe out, to diminish or eliminate these evils as they occur.

Dissent against economic crime? Dissent against judicial impropriety? Dissent against legislative malfeasance? Dissent against executive abuse?

Of course there is dissent!

And under our system, under law, under due process, we manage to renew and to rededicate ourselves to the tradition and to the nobility, to the honor, to the sense of fairness and fair play, that has made us great—the greatest nation of all time. The sense of duty and patriotism we memorialize today. If the Pentagon perpetrates a lie and a deliberate misrepresentation of contractual and fiduciary facts, we find it exposed, emblazoned as if in Neon Lights, editorialized upon, discussed in our mass circulation magazines, and detailed on television, with the actual faces and voices of those involved.

Against this what is the ground for complaint? Who is complaining, and how do they complain?

This Federal Government, whose flag they trample upon and whose draft summonses they burn, now pays nearly a quarter of the total cost of American higher education. I repeat: a quarter of the total cost of American higher education!

Did you get that in your struggle for an education?

Did I?

The National Defense Student Loans promised by the Johnson administration reached a total of \$270 million. It is now not the inconsiderable sum of \$155 million, under the Nixon administration. Is this something to complain about? These are low-interest, long-term loans that benefit lower and middle-class families.

As I speak some half-million students out of a total of 6½ million students now derive their higher education from these loans.

Nor is that all:

There are college work-study programs. The idea here is to provide decent paying jobs for needy students working their way through college. The sums involved were \$211 million and now come to \$146 million.

Is this neglect of our youth?

There are all manner of scholarships available now that were undreamed of two generations ago. Our country on every level of industrial talent; skilled, unskilled, superskilled is crying out for men and women, the disadvantaged, the discriminated against, the disadvantaged, the super-disadvantaged, to please come and fill these jobs and situations at prices and fringe benefits that would have meant paradise to my generation. They are offered everywhere and the pages of the

newspapers are full of classified appeals for employe-help—engineers, professional, non-professional—if only those applying are qualified. If they excel the salary rates are nothing short of phenomenal compared to what the generation of our time got that did not riot, that worked hard, that toiled its way to higher education on its own, and that made the success they enjoy solely on their own merit and effort.

How did the generation—our generation, yours—complained against so violently today let our youth down?

I ask how?

This is the generation of Americans who fought their way through two savage and astronomically costly world wars—and won both! The whole of mankind, including—and especially including Germany and Japan—had their liberties preserved for them because of these gargantuan sacrifices that are, as of now, the greatest wars in the whole chronicle of human conflict. This is the mass of Americans who valiantly and courageously legislated their way through the greatest depression known in the whole long tragedy of modern economics, the tragedy of economic cycles, panics, depressions, recessions, prosperity and bankruptcy. The legislation on our books today, effected by the generation complained of, is a magnificent and brilliant deterrent to these economic catastrophes. The very liberty, the very prosperity, the very security created for those who constitute our radicals, in and out of the universities, is precisely what made possible the very freedoms they enjoy and abuse.

The generation complained of is the generation that after the world's most savage and barbaric war created the Marshall Plan. That plan alone from 1949 to 1952 poured twenty-two billion dollars into foreign aid, military and economic. Altogether our foreign aid program up to June 30th, 1968, shovelled a total of one hundred and thirty-six billion—I repeat 136 billion dollars of our taxpayers' money, the money and treasure of our time, into the very Christian business of helping the impoverished and the war-ridden.

We, the United States and mostly the generation complained of, were the very foundation force in the rehabilitation of Germany and Japan, our enemies of yesterday, who are now—because of this enlightened statesmanship—our allies of today.

Was this creating danger and havoc and hopelessness for our youth?

When in the history of man was there such an implementation of the teachings of Holy Writ?

And on such a scale?

And with such an immense national effort, personal sacrifice, total altruism?

Who are these mostly young people who tear down, and burn, and insult, and take possession?

I ask:

What is their approach to curing the ills that afflict us?

Their immediate approach is the gross degradation of the human spirit.

It is a violent rejection of elementary good manners.

It is a contempt for the respect owing to teachers and parents and elders. It is insult to scholars and men of the mind.

It is the most supine and abject imitation and emulation of Hitler's bully-boys when Nazism was in flower and in the ascendancy in Germany.

Before the Nazis insulted the whole of mankind they insulted their own German nationals, their universities, their great physicists, their Nobel prize winners and the best and dearest among their folk.

They ran amuck as these student agitators are running amuck today.

A student militant with a meat cleaver in his hand was photographed leaving a con-

ference between the warring students and the administration at Harvard.

The Secretary of Defense, invited to speak at Harvard, found himself the target of every imaginable verbal and physical outrage and contumely so that he couldn't speak and had to be spirited away from those who—for all we know might have killed him—by sneaking him through a series of interconnecting cellars.

That was Secretary McNamara.

In another incident this type of student shoved a banana into the mouth of an instructor who differed with him.

With certain differences in style but not in technique this very thing happened all across the country. Under these tensions the President of Swarthmore dropped dead. A Harvard dean had a stroke. You saw the authentic photographs of armed students, with rifles and knives and shotguns, coming out of a university building they had seized at Cornell in Ithaca. You all know what happened at CCONY and the University of California at Berkeley; at Howard University here in Washington. President Ray L. Heffner resigned as President of Brown University and President Buell G. Gallagher from City College in New York. President Grayson Kirk resigned from Columbia University under vicious and unjustified attack. College and University boards all over the country have to beg for qualified administrators to take over this thankless job of running these institutions of higher learning.

This irreverence, this contempt for order, this scurrility, this obscenity, this hoot and jibe, this business of girl-students insulting President Mary Bunting of Radcliffe with language that would make a guttersnipe wince, is said in some quarters to be the freedom of expression of youthful idealists.

Is it unreasonable to ask:

What are these progressive young idealists, these young geniuses of the world of tomorrow, these brilliant, top-drawer students, doing in such inferior institutions of alleged higher learning as: Harvard, Brown, CCONY, Dartmouth, Berkeley, San Francisco State and a dozen others? If they cannot find universities to equal their intellectual prowess, their idealism and their talents, what stops them from creating a university of their own?

At least one?

All it takes, if they are sincere, is a shelf of books and a boarding house. They can get their faculty easily from among the radical professors who support them.

Or could they?

If they were genuinely sincere and they did that—created a university of their own—even people like myself, might contribute however modestly from our modest means to help them.

Don't tear down the other people's schools, like Harvard, in existence for 331 years; build up one of your own.

If you hate the school you are in, why don't you leave it?

I saw the recent presidential inaugural marred by some young misguided hoodlums a few blocks from the White House.

Of course they have a right to protest.

But not on the scene and on the day when the United States is swearing its duly elected President into office. I believe that the local authorities were dead wrong in granting any kind of permission to protestors on the day of the inauguration. The dissidents have a right to hire their own hall, make their own speeches, yell their immature and thoughtless heads off, to their own audiences within their own environs, or any permitted environs, so long, to repeat an obvious cliché, as they do not interfere with the rights of the rest of us.

On this solemn Memorial Day, amid these graves of our honored dead, whose sacrifices

for us—for all of us—put to shame the disrupters and revolutionaries of our time, what does all I've said add up to?

Basically the noise and the theatrical pretentiousness of this peculiarly privileged criminal class hopelessly exceeds its substance, its validity and its durability. They have seized on some more or less obvious wrongs to create a great deal of black smoke. The fundamental truth according to the best available statistics is that the student criminals and near-criminals, the dissidents and the doctrinaires, constitute no more than, or less than *one-half of one per cent* of the nation's students. Their case—that part of it that does make sense—if wisely and fairly presented, would, perhaps slowly, have a good chance to prevail at the court of collegiate and public opinion. Changes and corrections in college administration and curricula would have been affected in any case.

Harvard is not today what it was 331 years ago; nor is Columbia today what Columbia was when Alexander Hamilton was a student there. This Nation—an open society—constantly undergoing change, often deepthful change, is itself capable of improving its social conditions without resorting to violence.

We did marvelously well through the decades.

The fortunate weakness of this campus hue and cry rests in the fraud of its pretensions and the dishonesty of its claims. It is not just a lunatic fringe; it is an example of hard-core psychotic unbalance. That makes it its own enemy. And, as such, it will disappear in the pages of the history to which it has added an unpleasant and an ugly footnote. What will endure so long as freedom is the goal of man is the respect and the memory, the infinite values which have been left to us by these men whose graves we honor today and who gave us and freedom striving mankind, their last full measure of devotion.

Ladies and gentlemen: We salute them and I salute you for honoring them.

#### EDUCATION IN THE UNITED STATES

(Mr. LOWENSTEIN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this week the House of Representatives is considering legislation that will deeply affect the future of education in the United States. This is, therefore, a most appropriate time to remind the House that we ought to give early consideration to the question of the minimum age at which Americans can vote in national elections.

Hardly a politician opens his mouth these days without inveighing against those young people who have given up on "the system," without urging young people to participate in "the system" as the best way to redress their grievances and to affect their country's policies. Now the bedrock of participation in a democracy is surely the right to vote, but for reasons so obscure that hardly anyone can conjure them up from memory we continue along with the minimum voting age set at 21. Does anyone doubt that 18-year-olds today are better educated, better informed, and more involved in public matters than 21-year-olds were when 21-year-olds were given the vote? Does anyone suggest that there

is wisdom or fairness in a situation that finds half the men who are killed in Vietnam were too young to have taken part in the election of those who made the policies that sent them to their deaths?

The franchise in America has been extended gradually—to the nonproperly, to blacks, to women, to those who don't speak English. Each extension has strengthened democracy and strengthened the Nation. The vigor and political sophistication of our 18 to 21-year-olds—to say nothing of their broadening frustration with things as they are and with the way decisions are made that affect their lives—all argue that now it is time once again to extend the vote to another disenfranchised group of Americans.

Both Democratic and Republican 1968 party platforms supported the idea of an 18-year-old minimum voting age. So did President Eisenhower, President Kennedy and President Johnson, and President Nixon in his campaign last year. One of the most general and most bitter complaints of young Americans is the disparity between statements and actions of the political leadership of the country. That disparity suggests a cynicism, a hypocrisy, on the part of the leadership that creates further spirals of cynicism and despair among young people. Is it really helpful or honest to urge young Americans to seek social change through democratic channels when they continue to show more readiness to participate in the democratic process than we have shown to admit them?

If we think for a moment how good it would be for the electoral process in America, as well as for the health of the public dialogue on the great issues that now divide us, I believe we would move to lower the voting age with as great dispatch as the cumbersome machinery of constitutional amending permits.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FISH, for Wednesday, July 30, for personal reasons.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HOLIFIELD, for 20 minutes, today and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH), and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RHODES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TALCOTT, for 30 minutes, on Thursday, July 31.

Mr. SCHWENGL, for 15 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter to:)

Mr. GONZALEZ, today, for 10 minutes.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, today, for 20 minutes.

Mr. REUSS, today, for 20 minutes.

#### EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. SIKES in five instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BELCHER, and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HANNA, immediately following the remarks of Mr. PERKINS in the Committee of the Whole today.

Mr. McCARTHY to revise and extend his remarks following remarks of Mr. JOELSON.

Mr. DOWNING to extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of Mrs. MINK.

Mr. ROSENTHAL to extend his remarks immediately following those of Mr. REID of New York on the amendment on page 21, line 8, of H.R. 13111.

Mr. COHELAN to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables during general debate on H.R. 13111, today, in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. ADDABBO to extend his remarks following those of Mr. JOELSON, on his amendment, today.

Mr. PETTIS to extend his remarks following those of Mr. DOWNING, today.

Mr. MICHEL to include extraneous matter and tables with his remarks made today on H.R. 13111 in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PUCINSKI (at the request of Mr. MIKVA), to extend his remarks in connection with Mr. MIKVA's special order today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FISH) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SANDMAN in two instances.

Mr. McCLURE in two instances.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. McDADE in two instances.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. HALPERN in two instances.

Mr. CARTER.

Mr. WYMAN.

Mr. HOGAN in two instances.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. WINN.

Mr. POLLOCK.

Mr. SCHWENGEL in two instances.

Mr. CONTE in two instances.

Mr. HORTON.

Mr. BUSH.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. RUPPE.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. HOSMER in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALEXANDER), and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. EDWARDS of California in two instances.

Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in eight instances.

Mr. GIBBONS in two instances.

Mrs. CHISHOLM.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON.

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. DIGGS in three instances.

Mr. RARICK in three instances.

Mr. ROONEY of New York.

Mr. HAWKINS.

Mr. GONZALEZ in two instances.

Mr. BIAGGI in two instances.

Mr. HUNGATE in two instances.

Mr. MOORHEAD in six instances.

Mr. OLSEN in two instances.

Mr. MINISH.

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. KASTENMEIER in two instances.

Mr. ANDERSON of California.

Mr. BOLAND.

Mr. FRASER.

Mr. BURTON of California.

Mr. WOLFF.

Mr. HELSTOSKI in two instances.

Mr. MAHON.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. FRIEDEL, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2785. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the State of Tennessee certain lands within Great Smoky Mountains National Park and certain lands comprising the Gatlinburg Spur of the Foot-hills Parkway, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3379. An act for the relief of Sgt. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army (ret.).

H.R. 5833. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1972, the existing suspension of duty on certain copying shoe lathes.

H.R. 6585. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. A. F. Elgin.

H.R. 10946. An act to promote health and safety in the building trades and construction industry in all Federal and federally financed or federally assisted construction projects.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 30, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1001. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on a survey of progress in implementing the planning-programming-budgeting system in executive agencies; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1002. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on financing of costs incurred to preserve the Columbia River Basin as a source of salmon and steelhead trout, Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Government Operations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 499. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 12829, a bill to provide an extension of the interest equalization tax, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-398). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 500. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13018, a bill to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-399). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 501. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 13080, a bill to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withheld at source (Rept. No. 91-400). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLANCY:

H.R. 13150. A bill to provide for orderly trade in footwear; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 13151. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase, in certain cases where an individual entitled to a widow's or widower's insurance benefit remarries, the portion of such benefit which such individual may continue to receive after the remarriage; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 13152. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 and the Railroad Retirement Tax Act to provide for the continued payment of supplemental annuities in accordance with present law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 13153. A bill to designate certain lands within the Island Bay Wildlife Refuge in Florida as "wilderness"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUNT (for himself, Mr. ASHBROOK, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. DEVINE, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PELLY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. TEAGUE of Texas, Mr. SCHERLE, and Mrs. DWYER):

H.R. 13154. A bill to prohibit any State from levying income taxes on nonresidents of the State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 13155. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include dental care, eye care, dentures, eyeglasses, and hearing aids among the benefits provided by the insurance program established by part B of such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13156. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the coverage, under the supplementary medical insurance benefits program established by part B of such title, of one routine physical checkup each year for individuals insured under such program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13157. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment thereunder, in the case of an individual otherwise eligible for home health services of the type which may be provided away from his home, for the costs of transportation to and from the place where such services are provided; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13158. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to remove the present limit on the number of days for which bene-

fits may be paid thereunder to an individual on account of posthospital extended-care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 13159. A bill to amend XVIII of the Social Security Act so as to eliminate, in certain cases, the requirement that an insured individual have first been admitted to a hospital in order to qualify under such title for the extended-care services provided thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE of Illinois:

H.R. 13160. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROUDEBUSH (for himself and Mr. BRAY):

H.R. 13161. A bill to adjust agricultural production to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 13162. A bill to implement the Federal employee pay comparability system, to establish a Federal Employee Salary Commission and a Board of Arbitration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 13163. A bill to amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to extend the programs of assistance under that act for community mental health centers and facilities for the treatment of alcoholics and narcotic addicts, to establish programs for mental health for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 13164. A bill to provide for an annual audit by the Comptroller General of the accounts of the AMVETS (American Veterans of World War II); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 13165. A bill to amend section 3101 of title 38, United States Code, to prevent consideration of proceeds of, or transfer of proceeds of, U.S. Government life insurance, and national service life insurance for Federal estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13166. A bill to amend chapter 1, title 38, United States Code, to provide a statutory presumption of service-connected death of any veteran who has been rated totally disabled by reason of service-connected disability for 20 or more years; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 13167. A bill to amend subchapter IV of chapter 81 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Administrator to contract with hospitals (or medical schools or other medical installations having hospital facilities) for the use of hospital beds when not needed for the care and treatment of veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama, Mr. BARRING, Mr. BLACKBURN, Mr. CARTER, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. HANSEN of Washington, Mr. HORTON, Mr. KYROS, Mr. MCKNEALLY, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. RARICK, Mr. REES, Mr. VANIK, Mr. WRIGHT, and Mr. ZION):

H.R. 13168. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the return to the sender of pandering advertisements mailed to and refused by an addressee, at a charge to the sender of all mail handling and administrative costs to the United States; to

the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 13169. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a basic \$5,000 exemption from income tax for amounts received as annuities, pensions, or other retirement benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 13170. A bill to provide for the orderly expansion of trade in manufactured products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 13171. A bill to provide for Federal Government recognition of, and participation in, international expositions proposed to be held in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 13172. A bill to amend the Humane Slaughter Act of 1958; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIKVA:

H.R. 13173. A bill to amend the Consumer Credit Protection Act to provide minimum protection to citizens of the United States from garnishment for debts due for State or Federal taxes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 13174. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide minimum protection to citizens of the United States from garnishment for debts due for Federal taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 13175. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the inpatient hospital deductible which is presently imposed under the hospital insurance program upon an individual's admission to a hospital; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13176. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a widow or surviving divorced mother who has been entitled to mother's insurance benefits may generally continue to receive such benefits, without regard to her age, even though none of the children of her deceased husband are any longer entitled to child's insurance benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES (for himself, Mr. STEIGER of Arizona, Mr. McCLURE, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. FOREMAN, Mr. STEED, Mr. CAMP, Mr. BURTON of Utah, Mr. LLOYD, and Mr. MELCHER):

H.R. 13177. A bill defining and limiting the application of certain acts of Congress to Indians and Indian tribes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPRINGER (for himself and Mr. GERALD R. FORD):

H.R. 13178. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys and other articles intended for use by children which are hazardous due to the presence of electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.J. Res. 844. Joint resolution providing for distribution of the moon samples brought back by Apollo 11 to the Governors of each of the 50 States; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. BROTZMAN (for himself, Mr. SCHADEBERG, Mr. PELLY, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. HANSEN of Idaho, Mr. OLSEN, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. RHODES, Mr. MAYNE, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. HOSMER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia, Mr. STEPHENS, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. UTT, Mr.

ADDABBO, Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and Mr. PEPPER):

H.J. Res. 845. Joint resolution providing for the display in the Capitol Building of a portion of the moon; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana (for himself, Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. HEBERT, Mr. CAFFERY, Mr. RARICK, Mr. PASSMAN, and Mr. WAGGONER):

H.J. Res. 846. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the freedom of choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT (for himself and Mr. CORBETT):

H.J. Res. 847. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BLANTON, Mr. BRASCO, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN, Mr. DENT, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. FLOOD, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. GALIFIANAKIS, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. HANNA, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. PRICE of Illinois, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. VIGORITO):

H.J. Res. 848. Joint resolution authorizing the Civil Air Patrol to erect a memorial in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DICKINSON (for himself, Mr. HAYS, Mr. DENT, and Mr. DEVINE):

H. Res. 502. Resolution relating to the per annum gross rates of pay of certain positions under the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 503. Resolution providing additional postage for Members and officers of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 13179. A bill for the relief of Teodosia Bocoboc Bueno; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 13180. A bill for the relief of Giovanni and Marie Cordara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 13181. A bill for the relief of Mr. Giuseppe Cavallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 13182. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Dart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 13183. A bill for the relief of Jimmie Kazu Uyemura and others; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13184. A bill for the relief of Niko Lencek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 13185. A bill for the relief of Iris Kathleen Preddie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWENGEL:

H.R. 13186. A bill to provide private relief for Lt. Comdr. LeRoy E. Coon, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy (ret.), continued on active duty in a retired status after June 30, 1967; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 13187. A bill for the relief of Eva Lengyel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.