

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, after the time has run out on this amendment by the Senator from Louisiana, a substitute will be offered which embraces the language of the bill as it passed the House and which would extend the surtax at the rate of 10 percent for the remaining 6 months of this year, and at a 5-percent rate for the first 6 months of calendar year 1970, which would be the language of the House bill.

Mr. President, that proposal will be offered as a substitute for the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana. Later, the Senate will have a chance to vote on an amendment for the repeal of the investment credit, which again will be the same language as now included in H.R. 12290.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tem-

pore. What is the pleasure of the Senate?

RECESS UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 15 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 1969, at 11 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 30, 1969:

AMBASSADOR

Kenneth Franzheim II, of Texas, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary

of the United States of America to New Zealand.

U.S. ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

The following-named persons to be members of the General Advisory Committee of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

I. W. Abel, of Pennsylvania.
Harold Brown, of California.
William J. Casey, of New York.
Douglas Dillon, of New Jersey.
William C. Foster, of the District of Columbia.
Kermit Gordon, of the District of Columbia.

James R. Killian, Jr., of Massachusetts.
John J. McCloy, of New York.
Lauris Norstad, of Ohio.
Peter G. Peterson, of Illinois.
J. P. Rutna, of Massachusetts.
Dean Rusk, of the District of Columbia.
William W. Scranton, of Pennsylvania.
Cyrus Roberts Vance, of New York.
John Archibald Wheeler, of New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, July 30, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

As we have opportunity let us do good unto all men.—Galatians 6: 10

Almighty God, on this first day of the rest of our lives, we pause in Thy presence uniting our hearts in prayer unto Thee. Fill us with the power of Thy spirit that we may do our duties and carry our responsibilities with patient confidence and persistent courage.

As we seek cooperation among the nations of the world in an effort to bring peace on earth and good will to man may Thy truth be in our minds and Thy love in our hearts. Bless our President in his journey as he works toward this end.

Let us never be weary in well doing, let us always do good to all men, and let us forever seek the best even in the worst times.

In the name of Him who lived the good life we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 59. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Army National Guard Facility, Ethan Allen, and the U.S. Army Materiel Command Firing Range, Underhill, Vt.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1373) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and for other purposes, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two

Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. CANNON, Mr. HART, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. PROUTY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

OKLAHOMA IS PROUD OF BILL LUNN

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to visit with two outstanding young Oklahomans, William D. Lunn, of Muskogee, and Rick J. Joseph, of Sapulpa, who were in Washington as Oklahoma's delegates to Boys' Nation.

Later in the week, I was understandably proud of Bill Lunn, of my hometown, when he won nomination on the Nationalist ticket and was elected vice president of Boys' Nation.

I know all Oklahomans share this pride in Bill; in his fine parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dick Lunn, of Muskogee; and in the American Legion of Oklahoma, which annually selects truly outstanding young men as its representatives at Boys' Nation.

Mr. Speaker, to my mind one of the finest programs in the country is the American Legion's Boys' State and Boys' Nation program, and, of course, the comparable Girls' State and Girls' Nation program. This belief is reaffirmed every time I have an opportunity to visit with the students who are selected to participate in these programs.

Bill Lunn is typical of these young men. He is intelligent, forthright, articulate, and able. And, in view of his successful race at Boys' Nation, he is obviously a first-rate campaigner.

Oklahoma is justifiably proud of Bill Lunn.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. 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. 128]

Adams	Dawson	Leggett
Anderson,	Evins, Tenn.	Lipscomb
Tenn.	Fish	Lujan
Ashley	Gallagher	Miller, Calif.
Brooks	Goldwater	Pepper
Broomfield	Gray	Pollock
Cahill	Halpern	Powell
Carey	Hathaway	Reid, N.Y.
Celler	Jarman	Scheuer
Clark	Jones, Tenn.	Young
Clay	Karth	
Davis, Ga.	Kirwan	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 399 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

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

SOVIET-AMERICAN RELATIONS

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on July 10, Foreign Minister Gromyko, in a wide-ranging report on international affairs to the Supreme Soviet, stated:

The Soviet side is ready to study the possibilities of development of Soviet-American relations. For example, why not discuss the question of exchanging authoritative delegations between the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet and the U.S. Congress?

My question, Mr. Speaker, is twofold: First, does not the suggestion deserve the courtesy of a response? Second, should not the response be affirmative? The ambivalence of Soviet attitudes in the past weeks has reached almost Pavlovian proportions. On the one hand there has been renewed jamming of U.S. broadcasts, naval maneuvering in the Caribbean, and remorseless suppression of do-

mestic dissent. On the other, we find ample publicity and praise for the lunar landing, a warm reception for Mr. Humphrey, trade feelers, hints of desired cooperation in space, and the Gromyko speech itself. The speech was made after President Nixon's announced intention to visit Rumania, a gateway, some surmise, to the Far East. Having lifted restrictions on travel to Red China, for Congressmen specifically, it would seem appropriate for our Government to give equal time to Mr. Gromyko's interesting proposal.

If we are ever to understand the riddle wrapped up in the enigma, we will have to take a closer look at the package. By the same token Premier Kosygin's Glassboro visit was his first to the United States, not a very good average for the leadership of a great world power that suspects our intentions and doubts our capabilities.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on June 27 and July 7, I was detained on official business and unable to be present on the floor. I should like for the Record to note that had I been present June 27 and July 7 I would have voted in favor of repealing the freeze on AFDC appropriations and in favor of authorizing the additional funds for construction of the John F. Kennedy Center.

RIGHT TRACK ON ANTIGUN BILLS

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

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to note that the Nixon administration has gone on record in opposition to gun registration and the licensing of gunowners. This is something which will be hailed by law-abiding owners of weapons everywhere. The attitude of the Administration was stated at hearings sponsored by Senator Donn in the Senate Judiciary Committee by spokesmen who stated that there has not been sufficient time to judge the effectiveness of the crime fighting laws enacted last year, and that nationwide registration of weapons would vastly increase costs of administration and the requirement for enforcement manpower.

Most Americans are tired of the subject of gun controls. They realize that the anti-mail-order bill passed last year is already working a hardship on local dealers, particularly in ammunition sales, and that it has had no appreciable effect on the volume of crime. All gun control bills are heralded by their sponsors as measures to curb crime, yet crime continues to increase. The antigun law makes it harder for law-abiding citizens to acquire and own weapons, but it has little effect on the criminal.

In direct contrast to this action, the holdover Commission on Violence appointed by President Johnson more than a year ago has recommended a Federal system of handgun licensing which is designed to bring about the confiscation

of more than 90 percent of the handguns in the Nation. The recommendations of the Commission are certain to be ignored. Their activities have been a waste of money and their contributions to crime control have been nil.

THE NIXON SURTAX

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

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the bad penny returns.

On our calendar again today is the so-called emergency extension of the surtax withholding collection, due to expire at midnight tomorrow.

Again we will hear of the dire consequences if we should fail to continue to collect—from a small group of our wage earners—a tax which has expired.

Make no mistake. The Johnson surtax is dead. It was very soundly repudiated by the people at the polls last November. It died by its own terms on June 30—a month ago today.

The tax collection was kept alive, even though the tax was dead, when this House passed the Nixon surtax on June 30—by a narrow margin of 210 to 205. It is now hung up, subject to political manipulations, and nearly dead in the other body. If it can be passed there, it can be passed today or tomorrow.

So again, we are asked to extend the collection of a dead tax—one which our constituents have overwhelmingly repudiated. One in which money is taken from the workingman so that he cannot spend it, to curb inflation by removing money from circulation, while the Government wildly dumps the same dollars in the name of progress into an overheated economy.

Mr. Speaker, we have a unique opportunity today to truly represent our constituents by refusing to breathe new life into the dead Nixon surtax—and allowing it to rest in peace. I intend to cast the vote of my district against this measure. I urge our colleagues to join in giving it a sound rejection.

EXTENSION OF SURCHARGE WITHHOLDING TAX RATES FOR 15 DAYS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 501 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 501

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to 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. 13080) to continue for an additional fifteen days the existing rates of income tax withheld at source and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment.

No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, and said amendments shall be in order, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the minority, to the very able and distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH). Pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that some 2 or 3 weeks ago we passed a resolution which would authorize withholding of the surtax until July 31 pending the enactment or defeat of the surtax bill.

The House passed the surtax bill and it went over to the other body where some extended debate has been going on and some parliamentary maneuvering.

It is now obvious that there is serious doubt that the July 31 date will be adequate. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has seen fit to ask for an addition of 15 days, or to extend that extension until August 15, next. This was done, of course, with the hope that they will get their collective minds, or enough of them over in the other body, together to take some action upon this bill.

Mr. Speaker, as I said on the previous occasion, this is merely a housekeeping matter. Assuming that the tax bill will pass, it would certainly obviate a lot of confusion that would result if the extension were not granted and if the taxes were not withheld. It would be quite a burden upon the administration and upon the taxpayers if it were not extended.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS).

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Mississippi for yielding. Do I understand that this applies to the 10-percent surtax and only to the 10-percent surtax?

Mr. COLMER. That is my understanding, I will say to the gentleman from Iowa, and I know that the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas will confirm that that is a fact.

Mr. GROSS. And, in the absence of any legislation on the subject with respect to the 10-percent surtax, or tax reform, or a combination, this would carry over until August 15?

Mr. COLMER. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. The withholding is what I have reference to, which would mean for the month of August for all practical purposes, is that the withholding would apply to the entire month of August; is that correct?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Under the bill which the rule makes in order the withholding would not be applicable except for the period of time from July 31 through August 15, inclusive. It would not apply to the remainder of the month of August.

Mr. GROSS. Well, what then in the absence of legislation on the part of both Houses of the Congress? What situation are we in from August 15 since the plan for a recess of the Congress becomes effective on August 13 and extends into September?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi yield further to me in order to respond to the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. COLMER. I yield further to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. It is difficult to be factual in response to the question. If nothing more is done, if the bill which we passed in June is not passed by the Senate before we leave and if this 15-day extension should not be subsequently extended, then the withholding itself would drop back to the normal rates, and the 10-percent surcharge, presumably, would be dead.

Mr. GROSS. Would it mean that the withholding would be applicable and would be effective for the first 15 days of August and not for the remainder of the month of August?

Mr. MILLS. That is right; just 15 days. If the gentleman from Mississippi yield further, let me take my friend, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GROSS), into my confidence. I am not in a position to know what the other body may do. This bill takes us through the remainder of this period of time between now and the announced recess of the House on August 13. The Senate has been saying that they did not want to pass a surcharge bill until the reform bill had moved.

We anticipate—and I am not presuming to take over the position of the majority leader (Mr. ALBERT) in announcing programs—but I have conferred with him informally and we presume that we will have before the Committee on Rules, with the indulgence of the committee, on next Tuesday the request for a rule on the tax reform bill; that we will debate that bill on Wednesday and Thursday of next week, and vote on it some time Thursday afternoon.

Now, that will be the 7th of August. It will, therefore, be transmitted to the Senate a week, or 6 days, at least, before the stated date of the recess on August 13, giving the Senate a chance to consider it and to take what action it wants to take with respect to the surcharge.

Now, if the Senate advises that it cannot act and in its wisdom feels that the surcharge withholding should be continued, they could amend this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, the majority leader of the other body has said that the other body will be in no hurry to take further action. Now, my question is: if we pass this measure for the 15 days, would the other body take the 15-day request and extend it, say, for 15 days, or for 30 days? Is there any such understanding as that?

Mr. MILLS. If the gentleman from Mississippi will yield further, I have no understanding with anybody in the Senate about what the Senate may do on this, or any other matter, none at all. But I do believe that we have our own individual responsibility in the House to give the Senate time through this measure to further consider what it wants to do.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we are today in a comparable position to a football team which is 3 points behind, and are going down the field with third down and 2 yards to go. They only have a few minutes left in the game. They should try to make that extra 2 yard, not punt and lose the ball and probably the game. They should try to win.

I think that is what we are trying to do here: to give us a chance to work out the surtax; to give us a chance to bring a tax reform bill before the House next week, and to see if these important matters can be resolved.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Mississippi, the very distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, has explained the resolution very adequately, and I concur in his remarks. Between the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi and the colloquy with the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS), I believe that the bill, H.R. 13080, has been adequately explained, and I for one feel that we can now vote for the resolution without any further debate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I urge the adoption of the rule.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot conceive that the Internal Revenue is going to collect taxes for one-half of 1 month. They may do so, but that is hard to believe.

We are here called upon to pass a bill providing for 15 days, which would take us to the middle of August. Again, I cannot help but wonder, if we got into a bind, as to what would happen—perhaps this is inconsequential—but what would happen to the planned recess which has been announced as beginning on August 13?

Mr. SMITH of California. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa simply this: that there are many things that many of us cannot conceive of. We do not have a crystal ball that would show us what may occur on a future day. But this is based on the right thing, and the most responsible thing that the House can do today: to pass H.R. 13080 and send it to the other body, and then take up the tax reform bill and handle these bills before the vacation, and before the 15th of August expiration of the surtax.

That is the way I feel about it personally.

I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas if he desires me to do so.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Let me respond to the question of the gentleman from Iowa about this, that is, the question whether it has an effect or not with respect to pay periods for withholding purposes.

Remember that Thursday is the 31st of July, and if a pay period should occur on August 1, then presumably there would be some question in the minds of those who are withholding as to what to withhold. If a pay period should occur a week later, on the 8th of August, there would be no question about that week's pay period being withheld at lower rates or the existing rates. So there could be one on the 1st of August. There could be one on the 8th of August. Then there could be one on the 15th of August that could be affected by this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Would the gentleman not go on and project—if the Congress recesses on August 13—would the gentleman go on and project, in the absence of any other legislation extending the date, what would be the situation at the end of the month, with Congress still in recess until September 3?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. As I endeavored to point out earlier, you revert back, at the end of the period, August 15, if there is nothing further done, to the rates that were in existence prior to the surtax.

So any moneys earned by then would not be affected for withholding purposes, insofar as surcharge rates are concerned.

Now then if you would look at the other side of the question, if the surtax itself is not extended beyond its termination date of June 30, then those who have been withheld upon for the month of July and the first half of August, would get a refund of the amount of the surtax that had been withheld against them because the law then will have actually expired on June 30 unless it is extended.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK. All I really know about this tax program is what I read in the papers.

I would like to know from the gentleman from California whether he has any authority to speak for the President, when the President has insisted that we have a 1-year surtax extension instead of a 5-month extension, because this is very important to know when this bill is considered on the floor of the House.

Mr. SMITH of California. I do not know what the gentleman has in mind when he asks me whether I am speaking for the President. I do not want to say anything misleading but, of course, I am not here to speak for the President of the United States, but can speak only for myself, the gentleman from California, and I am speaking in support of the resolution. That is, I think, the only thing I

can do, to try to resolve these important questions and try to resolve these problems that the House, the other body, and the Committee on Ways and Means are facing.

Mr. CLARK. If it is extended for another 15 or 30 days, as the gentleman from Iowa stated, it will go on until September 2 because of our recess or vacation or whatever we call it here in the House. Then, after that, what comes up? Are we going to extend it again and again until we get a 1-year extension or are we finally going to come down to the point where the House is going to approve or disapprove a 5-month extension, as the House really wanted to do in the beginning—and so has the other body.

Mr. SMITH of California. I cannot answer that. I can stand here and prognosticate with the gentleman for the next half hour. But the other body could get this bill and change the cutoff date to November 30, 1969, and send it back and we would have to decide whether we are going to take it or leave it or what we are going to do.

I do not have a crystal ball. All I can say is that as of July 31 this is the best thing and the only thing I think we can do and should do. But I cannot guess and look into the future with you.

Mr. CLARK. Since this is very important—and I think this is a very important issue—to know whether or not to vote "yea" or "nay" on this particular bill today, on this resolution, I think that is why I asked the question.

That is the reason—I think it is very important for the Members to know whether you are coming back later on for a 5-month extension or a 1-year extension.

This, to me, is most important to know whether or not to vote "yea" or "nay" on this.

Mr. SMITH of California. I say to the gentleman, it is important but I am unable to answer that further than what I have already said.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK).

CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

(Mr. SISK asked and was given permission to speak out of order.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I hope not to use the time allotted to me because I recognize that we need to proceed. I take this time to announce to the House that as of today we secured 1 hour of special order for this coming Monday, August 4, at which time the subcommittee of the Committee on Rules handling the legislative reorganization bill will attempt to lay out for the benefit of the Members the progress that we have made and the status of our work. I recognize that there is concern among many of the Members of the House who are interested in legislative reorganization, in knowing exactly what the committee has been doing, because we have been doing our work in executive session.

So on Monday next we will make a presentation. I hope to be rather brief

and then yield for questions or statements from any Member of the House who may desire to participate, and to explain as fully as possible some of the problems with which we are grappling and some of the progress that we have made in trying to get to you as soon as possible, a bill on legislative reorganization.

We invite all Members who are interested to be here and to join in this discussion.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like personally to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. SISK) on the tremendous effort he has been making, the time he has spent, and the orderly procedure that he has been applying to the study of the reorganization bills. All other Members of the subcommittee should also be commended for their active participation. I would hope that all those Members who have been asking questions about this subject over the past several months will be present Monday afternoon and let us have a chance to attempt to answer the questions they may have in their minds.

Mr. SISK. I thank my colleague from California. Let me say that he, too, has contributed a great deal because this is a rather trying and agonizing task.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I would certainly like to join in commending not only the gentleman in the well but my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. SMITH), for the many hours I know they have spent to date in pursuing this very important subject. I would join them in the hope that there would be a good response to their plea for attendance at their special order on Monday so that we can pursue this vitally needed reform in the House and, hopefully, emerge with the greatest consensus, if you want to use that word, that will give us a bill before this session of Congress adjourns.

Mr. SISK. I thank my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, the members of the subcommittee who have been working on this subject, in addition to my distinguished colleague from California (Mr. SMITH), are the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BOLLING), the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. YOUNG), and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA). We will appreciate it if you will be here Monday and if you do have questions, we will attempt to lay out the progress that has been made.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentlemen from California and the gentleman from Illinois about the work that has been done, and is being done on

this reorganization bill in the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like, in addition to commending the two gentlemen from California, to commend also the other members of the subcommittee Messrs. BOLLING, YOUNG, and LATTA, and at the same time ask for a little patience and consideration of the problems that are involved in this monumental task of reorganization. It is not a question of some Member placing a bill in the hopper down there and saying, "This is what we want." There are 434 other Members who may not agree with that proposal.

I remind those who seem to be impatient about this matter that the other body spent practically 2 years trying to write a bill; and when they had done so, it did not meet with the approval of this body. Therefore, we just ask for a little patience. We are trying to bring about a constructive, but at the same time, an effective and practical bill.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I join in the commendations to the gentleman from California and other members of the subcommittee and also in expressing the appreciation of all Members of the House for the expeditious manner in which the chairman of the committee and his members have arranged for this matter to be considered thoroughly by this fine subcommittee.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader. I also thank the chairman of the Committee on Rules for yielding this time so we might speak on this matter.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. 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. 13080) to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withheld at source.

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

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. 13080, with Mr. MONAGAN 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 rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS) will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BYRNES) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. MILLS).

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 13080, as has been previously pointed out, would temporarily extend the present effective surcharge withholding rates for an additional 15 days, from July 31 through August 15.

Mr. Chairman, it will be recalled that earlier, because it was impossible for the Congress to conclude action H.R. 12290 prior to July 1, the Senate passed and the House agreed to an amendment to H.R. 4229 which extended the surcharge withholding rates from June 30 to July 31, 1969.

I think it is very important that we point out that this action did not represent a change in any taxpayer's liability for 1969, but instead merely continued withholding at a rate which included application of the surcharge, and the same is true of the present 15-day extension before the House.

Mr. Chairman, the Senate has not completed its action yet on H.R. 12290, and it appears, from what information I can get, that it will not be able to do so before Thursday night, July 31. If it does not do that, and if we do not take action to continue for this period of time the withholding of the tax so as to include the surcharge, there will be a great deal of confusion, uncertainty, and expense, first to employers, who in the absence of this enactment might be faced with the difficult problem of changing over from one set of withholding rates as of August 1, and then, should Congress subsequently complete action on H.R. 12290, be faced with the necessity of shifting back to the higher rates including the surcharge tax.

The problem is also presented to employees if the withholding tax is not continued, in that their take-home pay checks would be increased, and then, if the Congress completes action on H.R. 12290, the withholding would again increase, and their take-home pay would be decreased.

In this event many employees would be likely to be underwithheld upon; that is, they would be likely to owe additional taxes when they filed the tax returns on April 15, 1970, for the taxable year 1969.

I believe it is far more convenient for them for the withholding to be uniform than to have this gap in the withholding. Certainly it is far more convenient and brings about less confusion for the employer. Also, the administration of the program by the Internal Revenue Service is involved, and would be adversely affected by this lapse.

A question has been raised as to what may ultimately happen. I have no idea what may happen in the other body. I have not been told of any more information that you have received yourselves about what they may finally do.

I do believe, however, there is a responsibility on the part of the House, as well as the other body, to see to it that if finally the surcharge is to be extended for 5 months, for 12 months, or for whatever period of time, we do it in such a manner as to create as little inconvenience and confusion as possible to the employee, to the employer, and to the Internal Revenue Service.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chair-

man, about the proposition. It speaks for itself.

Let it be borne in mind, and let me repeat what I said earlier: This 15-day extension does not involve any change in any taxpayer's ultimate liability. That is something with respect to the continuation of the surcharge itself.

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

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

Mr. GROSS. So far as I am concerned, in my feeble part as a Member of the House of Representatives, I made no issue over the last extension because I lived in hope that in the interim period there would be some evidence on the part of the House that it intended to cut expenditures; that the bills would carry amounts at least equal to or reduced below the expenditures of last year.

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

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I find myself in the situation here today whereby to vote for a continuation of the withholding is by indirection a vote for the surtax.

There is a bill pending before the House now—consideration of this bill has interrupted consideration of it—which, when one takes into consideration the forward funding, is \$1.3 billion more than the expenditure for last year, and that does not include a single dollar for the pay increases that went into effect on July 1.

I would not be in a tenable situation here today if I voted for a continuation of the withholding of the surtax, with no evidence whatever that the House is genuinely and sincerely interested in halting inflation by the most effective measure; that is, the reduction of expenditures on the part of the Government. I deeply regret that there is all too little interest in that which is of greatest priority—deep cuts in spending rather than continuing higher taxes to produce greater revenues to be brought to Washington and spent.

I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding to me for this brief statement.

Mr. MILLS. Let me make it clear to my friend and to anyone else who may be of the impression he has indicated he is, I do not by any stretch of the imagination interpret a vote for this 15-day withholding as being an endorsement of the surcharge or as having any relationship whatsoever to the vote on the continuation of the surcharge itself. This is done to avoid the confusion which would occur if the surcharge itself should be extended into the future. That is the whole point of it.

I would think all of us would want to go through this period creating as little confusion as possible.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require, and I am going to be very brief.

It has been said and correctly so that this is really a housekeeping matter. The only purpose of extending the period for the current withholding rate is to avoid the possibility of great confusion both

with respect to the employers of this country and the employees of this country and, in addition, to avoid problems that could be created as far as the Internal Revenue Service and its administration of the tax law are concerned. All we are doing here if we extend this is to say that we are going to take this action as a precaution against creating undue burdens on all of the employers of this country, big and little, and on all of our taxpayers and those who are charged with the collection of our taxes. As the chairman of the committee has said, it cannot control one way or the other what ultimately happens as far as a continuation of the surtax is concerned. You can beat this extension, you can turn this bill down, and you can revert to the old level of withholding. That does not foreclose the possibility of the extension of the surtax. That does not foreclose its passage eventually by the Senate, on agreement by the House, and being signed by the President. It cannot have any effect except to create confusion in that kind of a situation.

Therefore, I would think, Mr. Chairman, that it is pointless for us under any circumstances to put this kind of a burden thus created on our people, which would accomplish nothing.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, no amendments are in order except amendments offered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any amendments?

Mr. MILLS. There are no amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MONAGAN, 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. 13080) to continue for an additional 15 days the existing rates of income tax withheld at source, pursuant to House Resolution 501, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 307, nays 105, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 129]

YEAS—307

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Albert
Alexander
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews,
N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Beall, Md.
Belcher
Bell, Calif.
Berry
Betts
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burlison, Tex.
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Caffery
Cahill
Camp
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clausen,
Don H.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Collins
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Coughlin
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniel, Va.
Daniels, N.J.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Dellenback
Denneny
Dennis
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Donohue
Dorn
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford,
William D.
Fountain
Fraser

Frelinghuysen
Frey
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gettys
Gialmo
Gilbert
Goldwater
Gonzalez
Goodling
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Hall
Hamilton
Hammer-
schmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey
Hastings
Hathaway
Hebert
Heckler, Mass.
Hicks
Hollifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hutchinson
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Kath
Keith
King
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Koch
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Landgrebe
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Lloyd
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClary
McCloskey
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald,
Mich.
McEwen
McFall
McKneally
McMillan
Macdonald,
Mass.
MacGregor
Mahon
Mailliard
Mann
Marsh
Martin
Mathias
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Melcher
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minshall
Mize
Mizell
Monagan
Montgomery
Moorehead
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Hara
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.

Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Preyer, N.C.
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor, Ark.
Purcell
Quile
Quillen
Rallsback
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reuss
Rhodes
Rivers
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Roman
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Ruppe
Ruth
St. Onge
Sandman
Satterfield
Schneebell
Schwengel
Scott
Sebelius
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Sullivan
Symington
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitehurst
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Winn
Wold
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion
Zwach

NAYS—105

Adair
Addabbo
Anderson,
Calif.
Andrews, Ala.
Barrett
Bennett
Bevill
Blaggi
Blanton
Blatnik
Brasco
Brinkley
Brown, Calif.
Burlison, Mo.
Byrne, Pa.
Chappell
Chisholm
Clark
Clawson, Del.
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Delaney
Dent
Diggs
Dowdy
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Elberg
Farbstein
Flood
Flowers
Foreman
Gallfianakis
Garmatz

Gaydos
Gibbons
Griffin
Gross
Hagan
Haley
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Leggett
Lennon
Long, La.
Lowenstein
Madden
Meskill
Mikva
Minish
Mink
Mollohan
Morgan
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher

Nichols
Nix
Obey
Ottinger
Pike
Podell
Pucinski
Randall
Rarick
Riegle
Roberts
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Shipley
Slack
Staggers
Stokes
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Tiernan
Vigorito
Walde
Welcker
Whitten
Wilson,
Charles H.
Wolff
Wyder
Yatron

NOT VOTING—20

Anderson,
Tenn.
Broomfield
Carey
Clay
Davis, Ga.
Dawson

Edwards, La.
Evins, Tenn.
Fish
Gallagher
Gray
Halpern
Hogan

Jones, Tenn.
Kirwan
Lipscomb
Lujan
Miller, Calif.
Powell
Smith, N.Y.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Edwards of Louisiana with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Carey with Mr. Hogan.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Lipscomb.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Lujan.
Mr. Jones of Tennessee with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Davis of Georgia with Mr. Anderson of Tennessee.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Clay.
Mr. Dawson with Mr. Powell.

Mr. McCARTHY changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 10595, GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 10595) to amend the act of August 7, 1956 (70 Stat. 1115), as amended, providing for a Great Plains conservation program, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, appoints the following conferees: MESSRS. POAGE, STUBBLEFIELD, PURCELL, BELCHER, and TEAGUE of California.

There was no objection.

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 further 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.

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 further consideration of the bill H.R. 13111, with Mr. HOLIFIELD in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday afternoon, the Clerk had read down to and including line 24 on page 25 of the bill. There was pending the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), the amendment thereto by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH), a substitute for the Joelson amendment by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and an amendment to the substitute by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment.

If I understand the amendment correctly, and I think I do, the amendment adds \$629,048,000 above the appropriation of last year for programs affected by the package amendment. The appropriation last year was \$2,414,000,000 for these programs. In the Joelson amendment an increase of \$629 million is provided, bringing the total to \$3,043,307,000 for the program involved.

We should not go along with the Michel amendment. His substitute does nothing more than to bring the level of expenditures—the level of impacted areas legislation expenditures—up to the 1969 figure. That is all the Michel amendment proposes to do.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Members of this House should be so glibly that it will take one-tenth of a loaf for the Joelson half loaf.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have personally been interested in the amendment which carries the increases which has been offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON), but I do not think that we should abrogate our responsibility.

The Robison amendment brings the expenditures up to the same level as the expenditures in the Joelson amendment—the same figures—except the Robison amendment leaves it up to the U.S. Commissioner to do your legislating for you. The Robison amendment would afford no assurance of a contribution of a school library, and NDEA equipment, or a guidance and counseling program. They would leave it up to the U.S. Commissioner of the Office of Education to say how much money shall go into the library program.

The same thing is true with reference to the supplemental educational centers. The Robison amendment leaves that up to the Office of Education to do this legislating. The same thing is true with reference to guidance and counseling. I hope this body rejects the Robison amendment and the Michel substitute.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I had first been constrained to vote for the Robison amendment because it restores the entire amount of money that I wanted to restore but, having spoken with the Chairman (Mr. PERKINS) and having listened to him today, I see a very real danger, and that is that giving this discretion to the U.S. Commissioner of Education will deprive the library program of adequate funding. I therefore oppose the Robison amendment.

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

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PERKINS was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, the Robison amendment of course endeavors to sweeten up the Michel package. Not many of us want to be against increasing the funds for better educational programs. The increase in funds is of course desirable. The purpose is just a gimmick to try to get votes, but I do not believe we want the Robison amendment unless we want the Office of Education to do all our legislating.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it is not true that the Robison amendment contains no additional funds for vocational education or for higher education?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct. The Robison amendment only deals with the library title, title II of ESEA, title III of ESEA, and title III of NDEA, the equipment title, and the guidance and counseling title of NDEA, title V.

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

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky has been making a very fine speech in attempting to point out some of the differences in the Robison amendment which, while it does represent an improvement over the Michel amendment, falls completely short of what some of us believe is necessary.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Kentucky if it contains anything in the way of aid to students, for student loans, or student assistance, or anything of that kind?

Mr. PERKINS. It does not. It does not touch any subject matter except the four titles that I mentioned, grouped together,

restoring the expenditure to the last year's spending level during the past fiscal year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), to my way of thinking, has been carefully worked out. We make a reasonable gesture to do something for the ghetto schoolchildren, and in the poorer rural areas of this country we make available an extra \$180 million. When you compare the Michel substitute, how can we go along with it—and I say this as a friend to the impacted program—how can we vote for the middle-class schoolchildren in the area of military installations, where we have considerable wealth, and not support the poor urban child, or those in the rural areas of this country. If we are going to do something about the welfare load, and if we are going to do something about hard-core unemployment, and if we are going to do something about school dropouts, I say to you in all frankness we ought to be here increasing the funds for elementary and secondary education at least a half a billion dollars, so that the States with larger numbers of low-income people and the poorer communities would benefit at least commensurate with what we do for the impacted aid program.

It will be disgraceful on the part of this Congress if we do something for the middle-class child and fail in our responsibility to do something for the child in the greatest need.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Joelson package amendment should be adopted by this Committee.

We do something for vocational education.

I want to run over these figures briefly. We bring the guidance and counseling figure up to last year's level.

The NDEA title—equipment—up to last year's level of \$78 million.

Title II—school libraries—up to last year's level of \$50 million.

Vocational education, the increase over fiscal year 1969 is \$240 million.

That is in the Joelson package.

In the NDEA student loan program, over the fiscal year 1969, there is an increase of \$35,600,000 in the package.

So we certainly are doing something in the areas of greatest need. We have tried to work out priorities, for the areas of greatest need, even overlooking impact, but we are certainly taking into consideration the need for more money for the poor children of this country.

If we are going to have a balanced educational program in this country in the future, I do not think we should go in a one-sided direction because somewhere along the line the house may fall in on some of us. We want a solid, sound and sane educational program and not just what is for you and nothing for me.

Mr. Chairman, 9 million children who are participating in title I programs throughout the Nation have a great stake in what we do here today. This is approximately the level of participation in title I programs in fiscal years 1967, 1968, 1969 and the expectation for 1970. In those schools where children were falling behind in scholastic progress the

initiation of title I programs has shown these youngsters to steadily improve, sometimes gaining a full month's learning for every month spent in the classroom.

The evidence before our committee shows that reading tests data from a sampling of States indicate that title I participants are attaining higher levels of achievement based on national testing scores than would have been expected in the absence of title I activities. Moreover, this evidence discloses that the serious dropout rate in title I schools has decreased and more disadvantaged children continued their education beyond high school in 1967 than they did in 1966.

In spite of the progress that we are obviously making in the increased scholastic achievement of disadvantaged children, the evidence clearly discloses the need for the expenditure of more funds per pupil in these programs than present levels of appropriations permit. Where programs have been narrowly confined to smaller numbers of participant students so as to obtain the maximum dollar impact on their scholastic progress greater success has been enjoyed. However, if we are to effectively provide educational opportunities in title I schools, the solution does not lie in eliminating numbers of children from the program in order to increase the progress of a few—I submit that the solution lies in providing more funds to local educational agencies to strengthen the program for the benefit of all the children in the school system who need the special types of programs that title I provides. Presently we are funding title I with less than 40 percent of the authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that for the fiscal year 1970 we should be appropriating the full authorization in excess of \$3 billion for title I programs. In surveys conducted by the committee of school superintendents throughout the Nation, the response we received from thousands of school administrators emphasized the hardships imposed by the low funding levels in ESEA, particularly for title I.

The first question in the survey, the most pertinent to our discussion of Federal financial assistance, asked if the Federal Government was doing its share in providing funds for elementary and secondary education. Sixty-five percent of those responding indicated that the Federal Government was not doing its share. In very large school districts, over 80 percent felt the Federal Government was not doing its share. A great majority of those responded that the Federal Government is doing its share, conditioned their response to a full funding situation. Many of the superintendents offered suggestions, over 40 percent of which recommended that support be increased. In districts with enrollments of over 100,000 two-thirds of the responses asked for increased support.

Another question, which specifically dealt with the financial aspects of Federal education programs, asked to what extent the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was underfunded. Nearly 70 percent of the superintendents indi-

cated that this legislation was underfunded and frequently commented that the programs financed by the ESEA are ones on which they rely heavily. In large school districts over 90 percent of the superintendents indicated that the program was underfunded.

Let me share with you just a few of the responses from local school superintendents which I believe illustrate clearly the adverse effects of curtailments and reduced levels of funding.

From Argyle, Iowa:

ESEA is extremely underfunded. Our area has been cut from \$45,000 three years ago to \$19,000 next year. We have approximately 40% of our students identified as educationally deprived (see enclosed list), yet we have had to eliminate teacher aides, TVR equipment and instruction, summer school, and other items from our educational program, and cut our nurse to 1/2 time due to title I budget cuts. I believe that someone in Washington should take a look at the small rural areas of our nation and see the problems we have here.

From Cherryvale, Kans.:

In our particular school districts, we will be underfunded in the ESEA by approximately \$4,000. Due to the reductions in our entitlement we will have to cut off part of our summer program. In our summer program we work with our remedial students.

From West Grove, Pa.:

Our school is located in a rural area with many low income families—therefore we have many children who are educationally deprived some of whom we are unable to reach because of lack of funds. Each year of the ESEA program, the Title I funds have been reduced, thereby making it necessary to curtail our program.

From Norfolk, Va.:

Although it is difficult to know just what the Federal Government's "share" is in assisting to improve the quality of elementary and secondary schools, the Federal Government has failed to support fully its own appraisal and estimate of its obligation. The Congress has passed a volume of highly significant legislation authorizing financial support for schools in recent years, but the actual appropriation of funds seldom matches the authorization. Our first recommendation to strengthen the Federal Government's role in improving elementary and secondary education is to fully fund the authorizing legislation already in existence.

The total allocation to the Norfolk School System for ESEA Titles I, II, III, and Central City Project, after reductions for the current year, amounts to approximately \$2.6 million. We estimate that there are in excess of 20,000 children enrolled in this school system in need of the educational services for which ESEA was created. It is clearly evident that the funds available are insufficient to achieve any substantial impact for more than a relatively small number of children. The full funding of ESEA would approximately double the funds available, and approximately double the potential impact of the Act."

From Double Springs, Ala.:

Recent enactments of Congress furnishing support for elementary and secondary education has been great!! It has made a tremendous impact on our educational system. ESEA is at least 50% underfunded.

Our need is great—even desperate.

For these reason, Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the package to add \$180,800,000 for fiscal year 1970 for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Educa-

tion Act is urgently needed to improve the effectiveness of these programs.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute and in support of the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey whose proposal would provide what I believe is a reasonable level of funding for essential education programs.

In 1968 the Congress appropriated \$4.1 billion for education.

In 1969 we appropriated \$400 million less

The January budget proposals would have lopped off another \$100 million from the 1969 figure.

The April budget would have cut still another \$400 million.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the Appropriations Committee has seen fit at least to halt the decline and I heartily commend that decision.

But if we are no longer to look backward to 1968 as the year when this Congress made its most substantial contribution to education, we must recognize the necessity of supporting the well-thought-out package of amendments proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Each year, Mr. Chairman, this body has increased the authorizations for

these education programs—we have expanded the Congress' promise to the young people of this Nation.

And yet the gap between the promises and the realized appropriations continues to widen.

I suggest that we must narrow that gap now, narrow the gap between authorizations and appropriations, between promise and delivery.

Mr. Chairman, the educational crisis now facing my own city of Los Angeles is only one example of a nationwide phenomenon.

Cities with declining tax bases are being further jeopardized by voters' rejection of critically needed bond issues, and the resulting burden falls most heavily on inner-city youngsters who need the most help.

At this point in the RECORD I would like to include an excerpt from testimony by Los Angeles City School Superintendent Jack Crowther relating to programs for disadvantaged children:

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT— TITLE I: COMPENSATORY EDUCATION

The number of children residing within the Los Angeles City School District who are eligible for Compensatory Education programs is shown in Table I. This number has increased by one third, from 94,000 to 121,347 since the beginning of the programs in FY 66.

TABLE I.—CHILDREN ELIGIBLE FOR ESEA, TITLE I PROGRAMS

Fiscal year	Family income less than \$2,000 (1960 census)	AFDC excess of \$2,000 (annual survey)	Total	Increase	Percent
1966.....	39,493	54,615	94,108		
1967.....	39,493	63,070	102,563	8,455	9
1968.....	39,493	68,000	107,493	4,930	5
1969.....	39,493	72,091	111,584	4,090	4
1970.....	39,493	81,954	121,447	9,863	9

The above figures are based on the 1960 Census data for families earning less than \$2,000 per year and the updated data for families receiving in excess of \$2,000 per year AFDC aid.

The allocation to the District of Title I funds and the date of notification are summarized in Table II. Although increasing in FY 68, the allocations showed a marked decrease for FY 69 and again in FY 70, projected on the basis of the Administration Budget. The difference between the \$38,225,805 to which the District would be entitled for FY 70 and the \$13,500,000 anticipated is deeply discouraging. The problems of mounting effective programs when the notification of funds to be actually received comes so late in the fiscal year is a story you know well.

TABLE II.—ALLOCATION OF ESEA, TITLE I, FUNDS TO LOS ANGELES SCHOOL DISTRICT

Fiscal year	Entitlement	Appropriated	Date notified
1966.....	\$23,715,216	\$15,130,585	April 1966.
1967.....	27,384,321	14,838,952	Mar. 30, 1967.
1968.....	29,560,575	16,201,638	Feb. 16, 1968.
1969.....	32,024,608	15,028,872	Jan. 7, 1969.
1970.....	38,255,805	13,500,000	

¹ Estimated entitlement based on forward funding at a 10-percent reduction from current year.

For the past four years, we have been able to assure the effectiveness of the compensatory education programs as budgeting resources have declined by reducing the number of pupils being served, as shown in Table III. This is the only way we have been able to maintain a given level of expenditure for

each child. The data shown in Table IV indicate we have even improved on this by increasing the amount spent per child, but only at the expense of serving fewer pupils.

TABLE III.—Number of pupils served in ESEA, title I, program

1965-66 (approximate).....	65,000
1968-69 (approximate).....	50,000
1969-70 (approximate).....	45,000

TABLE IV.—Expenditures per pupil participating in ESEA, title I, programs

1965-66	\$233
1968-69	300
1969-70 (required by State guidelines)	300

We have been forced to take programs out of some schools entirely, although the need in those schools has increased. Consequently, the number of schools with compensatory education programs has been decreased as summarized in Table V.

TABLE V.—NUMBER OF SCHOOLS WITH ESEA, TITLE I, PROGRAMS

	Elementary	Junior high	Senior high
1965-66.....	117	12	12
1968-69.....	61	12	12
1969-70.....	33	6	13

¹ Estimated.

The failure of Congress to appropriate funds sufficient to support the compensatory education programs is reflected in Table VI. Here, the amount of money allocated per

pupil is computed in terms of the total number of pupils eligible.

TABLE VI.—ESEA title I, allocation per eligible child

1965-66	\$160.78
1966-67	144.68
1967-68	150.72
1968-69	134.69
1969-70 (estimate)	111.16

Mr. Chairman, the need for the compensatory education programs made possible through Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act exists. Evidence of the need is shown in every State achievement test administered. Based on the criteria contained in the law, there are over 121,400 young people eligible for these compensatory programs. Of these, we are able to serve only 50,000, but even fewer next year. The Report of the California State Department of Education on Evaluation of ESEA Title Projects of California for 1967-68 is evidence that we are successfully helping young people. Senior high school students averaged more than one year of growth on the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. The average growth of students in reading improvement classes was 1.3 years, while basic reading students averaged one year's growth. Greater gains were demonstrated on subsections of the reading test. For example, in one group, students improved by 2.9 years in reading vocabulary, while others showed a growth of 2.5 years in one year's time, where normally only .7 years' growth has been the pattern. In response to questionnaires, 74 percent of the parents noticed improvement in children's study habits, 80 percent said their children's attitude toward school had improved, and 78 percent thought their children learned more than they had during previous years. I urge you to provide the funds authorized to do the job that must and can be done.

Mr. BELL of California. Today, Mr. Chairman, we are all concerned with law and order.

And yet it is the very youngsters we are talking about—the children of the ghetto—who are most likely to become involved with crime, with riots.

Through these programs we have the chance to reach them.

We have the chance to invest the taxpayers' money in a high-return program which not only can reduce crime and welfare costs, but which can increase future tax revenues from those who would otherwise be tomorrow's hard-core unemployed.

These, Mr. Chairman, are investments in America's future, investments which, in my view, we cannot afford not to make.

And yet, under title I compensatory education programs alone, Los Angeles is now serving one-third fewer children than it did 4 years ago.

The per-pupil allocation has dropped while inflation and costs have increased.

Mr. Chairman, reaching the children of poverty before they have dropped out, before they contribute to ever-increasing crime rates and ever-growing welfare rolls is a concept few thoughtful Americans would reject.

Our authorizations for this program and for the others contained in the measure before us reflect this view, but our decisions to put our money where our promises are, always seem to fall far short of the need.

It is with the strongest possible urgency, therefore, that I support the Joel-

son amendment, and urge that my colleagues do the same.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FARBSTEN. I want to go on record as favoring the Joelson amendment. I might say in passing that in view of the fact that we find a surplus of \$3 billion, certainly we should not hesitate to spend about \$900 million of that for education. I can think of no better place to put \$1 billion of that surplus.

Mr. BELL of California. I certainly concur with the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support in the strongest possible terms the package amendment which will be offered to increase by \$894 million the funding for education and library programs.

There is something inherently wrong with a society whose government can allocate over \$80 billion to defense, give little thought to a \$2 billion cost overrun connected with a single airplane, spend \$4 billion on a space program in 1 year and then find it virtually impossible to get even \$3.4 billion for the education of all its 60 million schoolchildren and the many million more who derive personal enrichment from library programs.

There is something basically inconsistent about an administration which preaches self-help and then grabs away the books and educational programs from those motivated to learn and improve.

To turn about society, to overcome the administration, I led a group of 71 Members of Congress in appealing to Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, chairman of the HEW-Labor Appropriations Subcommittee, to restore the huge cuts in Federal aid to education and libraries recommended by the Nixon administration. In some small way I believe our letter was helpful in stirring the committee to restore some of the Nixon cuts to a tune of \$1.3 billion.

But like society and like the administration, the committee's education and library budget recommendation seems totally out of touch with the needs of our cities. Rather than increasing or even maintaining the per capita amount available to disadvantaged children to upgrade their education under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the committee chose to reduce the per capita. Rather than increase the volume of books available to schoolchildren who would not otherwise have the opportunity to read books, the committee chose to provide no special funding for title II.

Rather than stimulate programs to make education both more relevant and individualized through vigorous support of the supplemental centers program of title III of ESEA, the committee chose to lump funding for this program with that for three other programs and to provide not even an adequate level of funding for title III for all four programs. And rather than spur the construction of public libraries so that the young and old alike could have the opportunity to enjoy contact with books, the committee chose to provide not one

red cent for library construction under title II of the Library Services and Construction Act.

If the funds are not restored, the effect of these cuts on the education and library programs of this country will be devastating. The impact on New York offers a good example. It would mean that programs like the more effective schools program, which provides the culturally deprived youngster with a chance to get ahead through providing additional services, teachers aides, and educationally deprived lower class size will suffer; it would mean that the educationally deprived kid who needed books and library services would be left without them; it would mean that innovative programs of preschool training involving the pupil and parent alike would have to be abandoned; and it would mean that the quality of teacher instruction in critical subject matters would be hurt and the availability of educational equipment would decrease.

It is hard to believe we live in a Western society where belief in progress is paramount. For in terms of educating our young, we are slipping backward. I cannot bring myself to believe that no matter what the results of this vote today the Federal Government will spend less on education this year than last, just as it spent less in fiscal 1969 than it did in fiscal 1968. For heavens sakes, what is wrong with this country? Our epitaph may very well be: Billions for guns—pennies for books.

It is up to the House of Representatives to undue these distorted priorities. I do not as strongly support some of the programs contained in the \$894 million package amendment as I do others, but I shall support the package as a whole as the only way of mustering the support necessary to do something to turn this society around.

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

Mr. BELL of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Chairman, I support, wholeheartedly, the effort by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, CHARLES S. JOELSON, to amend H.R. 13111, the Labor-HEW appropriations bill for fiscal year 1970, to provide needed funds for essential education programs.

Specifically, the Joelson amendment, supported by the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, would provide funds to reestablish previous program levels for school libraries, NDEA equipment, and guidance and counseling, and college facilities, as well as necessary funds for Impacted Area Aid Public Law 874, vocational education, title I, II, and III of ESEA, and NDEA student loans.

By virtue of previous congressional action, each of these programs, now established and operative, with students, schools, and systems deeply involved and dependent thereon, is essential to our previously declared efforts to provide the best possible education to the most students in our evermore sophisticated and complex world society. Even as a student, having received the benefits of an edu-

cational loan, finds needs for the continuation of the loan program, so too, does a school or a school system find continuing need for the various programs which, once established, became integral parts of their academic and institutional modus operandi. Educational administrators and teachers throughout the congressional district I represent have advised me of the need for continuing these programs and their significant help in the proper education and counseling of their students.

If, in general, the Federal Government has the responsibility of continuing that which it has set in motion for the common good, it certainly must have particular responsibility in those geographical areas upon which, by other action, the Federal establishment has imposed impacted conditions. Here again we find ourselves involved with a fight to restore funds for Public Law 874 as we have in the past.

Impacted aid is that Federal assistance least tainted by Federal control. Our local school administrations have been able to use this money, without direction from the Federal Government to supplement their already too meager budgets. If this money were not added to the appropriation many school districts would find that they must either close or drastically curtail their programs. I do not choose to be a party to either alternative.

Surely when we can find the funds and genius to walk on the moon we can find the way to adequately fund our educational programs.

This country's most precious resource is its youth. To fail to adequately educate that youth and prepare them for life in this world of ours is tantamount to wasting that precious resource. This we cannot afford to do. In these days of spiraling operation costs, increasing resistance to local property taxation, and community insistence on quality education, to fail to fully fund these programs will, in effect, be sentencing our children to the punishment of inferior or mediocre education—this we cannot afford to do. The welfare of this Nation depends, in final analysis, on the ability of our youth. That ability will, in a large measure, be determined by their education. Let us not falter in the task of providing them the education they need. Let us fulfill our previously declared commitment of providing the best possible education for the most possible students. This Nation's welfare depends upon it.

I urge the adoption of the Joelson amendment.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, first I wish to take this opportunity, as chairman of the subcommittee that has jurisdiction over the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Impact Act, to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), and his subcommittee, for recognizing the need for additional funds for vocational education. They have given us \$80 million more and we are most grateful. I am sure

the vocational educators all over this country owe the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood), and his committee a debt of gratitude.

It is quite apparent from the discussion so far that we will provide additional funds for title B students under the impact aid bill whether we enact the Michel amendment or whether we enact the Joelson amendment, for both now carry these provisions. But I believe every Member should keep in mind that if he votes for the Michel amendment, he will be reducing his own State and district allocation by 78 percent of what it was in 1969. I invite each Member to examine the table I placed in the RECORD on May 26, page 13816, to see how much his district would lose in 1970 under the Michel amendment. Just deduct 22 percent from the 1969 allocation in your district and you will see what your vote for the Michel amendment will cost your school people in impact money.

I would like to tell you something about this category B. I think you ought to know it, and I think it ought to influence your judgment.

There are 55 million children attending elementary and secondary public schools in this country. The bill before us now provides, roughly, \$1.5 billion of Federal aid for various programs for those 55 million youngsters, which comes out, roughly, to \$30 a youngster. But this same bill provides more than \$462 million for only 2.5 million children who benefit from the impact program. This comes out to \$150 per student.

Last year we spent \$115.5 million on 348,000 A students. These are the students who live on a military installation and attend a public school in the community. The Federal Government, quite properly, pays the full cost of educating those children to the local community, because the parents of these youngsters, living on a military installation, pay no local taxes for education.

But last year we also spent another \$347.5 million on 2.2 million B students. These are youngsters who live off the military installation, whose parents pay real estate taxes to the local community and spend their money in the local community, and still, under the B category program, the Federal Government pays one-half the cost of educating these youngsters, simply because they are there by virtue of some Federal activity. That comes out to \$150 per student.

Under this program, 28 States get a total of less money for all of their category A students than the single State of Virginia across the river gets for its B students. Virginia got \$27 million for B students and \$3 additional million for A students in 1969, for a total of \$30 million of Federal aid for impacted areas.

The Michel amendment perpetuates this inequity without providing additional help to those districts that do not have impact children.

How can Members go back home and justify this kind of program without taking care of the rest of the educational needs of their communities? I would like Members to look at this list. My colleague from Illinois talked about the fact that 385 Members of Congress represent districts that get aid under the

impact program, but 72 of these get less than \$100,000 for their respective districts. Some will get only \$40,000; some will get \$50,000; and some will get \$60,000. These Members are being asked to vote a \$400 million appropriation for B students in order to bring into their own districts \$40,000 or slightly more for a handful of students in their districts.

I invite Members to look at the rest of this list. In the Joelson amendment at least we have some equity in taking care of the B students as well as all other needs of our district. I know you all want to support the impact program. I never have seen anybody want to shoot Santa Claus. But at least in the Joelson amendment we have some opportunity to bring about some equity in this program, because we not only take care of the B student at 90 percent funding, but we also take care of vocational education and student loans, the impact areas, titles II, III, IV, and V, library services and all these other things.

If my colleagues were to vote for the Michel amendment alone, we would be voting to give \$200 million of impact money to 10 States in this Union and \$147 million to the remaining 40 States. Under the Joelson amendment we will be taking care of more needs; and bringing more equity to the different programs, so we will be voting to take care of the B students and also all students in our congressional districts and in our States.

I would ask Members to ponder the difference between these two propositions. We must look at the equity of it.

We have studied this in my subcommittee. We have held extensive hearings. There is no question that the Joelson amendment addresses itself to the modest beginning of meeting the funding needs of the programs in the authorizing legislation. I ask Members to consider this. If we vote for the Joelson amendment, we are taking care of B students, but also taking care of all other students in this program.

If we vote for the Michel amendment, we will vote for the B students and that is just about all. If Members think they can justify this disproportionate expenditure of \$200 million for 10 States and \$147 million for the remaining 40 States, that is for their own judgment. But I do not believe such inequity can be justified unless we substantially increase Federal funds for all the other programs included in the Joelson package.

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

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

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to make it clear that under my amendment, it is 90 percent for category A and B and under the Michel amendment, it is 100 percent for category A and 59 percent for category B.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as we debate and discuss the merits of the proposed Joelson amendment to H.R. 13111, I wish to emphasize particular items of this legislation which are of special concern to me and in my judgment make the amendment deserving of support.

Earlier this year, during hearings on H.R. 514, to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, our committee learned that more than 44 million of America's public and private school children have benefited directly from title II programs since 1966.

As we know, title II provides allocations to the States for the purchase of school library resources, textbooks, periodicals, films, video tapes, and other printed and published instructional materials.

In a letter which I received in my office today, Rev. Robert Clark, superintendent of schools for the Archdiocese of Chicago School Board, said that:

Since the enactment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, approximately 350,000 pupils enrolled in Roman Catholic schools in Cook and Lake counties, Illinois, have been the beneficiaries of library resources and supplementary textbooks loaned to them by local public school boards which have received Federal funds for that purpose.

Further, Father Clark says:

The Title II program also has served to assure parents of all parochial school pupils that federal aid to education, for which they are so heavily taxed, results in some kind of tangible benefit, however meager, for their children.

In his testimony before the House Education and Labor Committee last March, Secretary Finch said:

Top priority for Title II projects has gone to strengthening education for disadvantaged children in core cities, equalizing minority group education, improving educational opportunities in isolated rural areas, and setting up model programs for early childhood education.

There is no question that this title has improved both the quality and content of educational materials in schools throughout the United States.

This program has proved an effective incentive to States and to private and public elementary schools to enhance and expand their instructional resources.

More than 70,500 public school libraries were expanded in 1967 alone as a direct result of title II.

A singularly effective component of this legislation has been the coordination of efforts between private and public school educators. In cooperative programs, many of which have been instituted for the first time, many States have conducted inservice training programs to help librarians, teachers, and administrators to better organize school libraries and instructional materials centers, as well as to improve methods of selecting materials.

The benefits accruing to our national system of education have been marked.

Demonstration programs involving mobile equipment and various instructional resources have been established in more than 30 States. Similar programs are planned or are being developed in other States as well.

Title I funds are allocated on the basis of a formula which includes the total number of children enrolled in public and private elementary and secondary schools in each State. No matching

funds are required. Program funds totaled \$300 million from 1966 through 1968.

With the proven success of this title, an appropriation of \$50 million for fiscal 1970 seems little enough to pledge for continued operation of these much-needed programs.

Much the same praise can be shown on title II of the NDEA as well as title III of ESEA. Both these titles are deserving of the additional funds that would be provided in the Joelson amendment.

TITLE V OF NDEA

During debate and passage of H.R. 514 in April of this year, an amendment was adopted which consolidated these titles; namely, title II and title III of ESEA and title III and title V of NDEA. The amendment gives the Commissioner of Education discretionary authority to provide funds to the States for each of these worthwhile and interrelated programs.

Under the Joelson amendment proposed today, \$110,453 million over the recommended appropriation of \$200 million is suggested for: First, supplementary educational services; second, library resources; third, guidance and counseling and testing; and fourth, equipment and minor remodeling.

As a six-term veteran of the House Committee on Education and Labor and as chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, I strongly endorse these additional appropriations for both title II, title III of NDEA, title V-A of NDEA, and title III ESEA.

Title V provides a modest, almost pennurious, appropriation—\$17 million—for guidance and counseling.

Our school population increases annually in increments of hundreds of thousands of students. Each of these boys and girls has a special need for assistance in developing a career interest that will guarantee him or her an opportunity to do something meaningful in the adult world of work.

In most school guidance programs throughout the Nation at the present time, one of the major blocks to providing adequate guidance is the lack of education and occupational information geared to the specific needs of the States themselves. This has obvious, and often tragic results. We have all read the statistics that show the outmigration of young people from the rural areas of the Nation to the large cities and population centers.

In far too many instances, these unskilled, untrained, unaware young people are driven to jobs that end nowhere, with little or no opportunity for advancement.

With an effective guidance and counseling network operating within each of the 50 States, young people would receive some realistic preparation for the jobs and skills that are in demand in the labor market.

In a statement presented on behalf of the American Personnel and Guidance Association before the Appropriations Committee, Mr. John C. Odgers urged continued and expanded support for title

V-A, listing the following reasons for his endorsement:

First. Title V-A would assist youth at all grade levels in career development through self understanding, increased knowledge of educational and vocational opportunities and demands, and improved decisionmaking skills.

Second. Title V-A would provide concerted action on the dropout problem which deprives an estimated 25 percent of our youth of a high school education and the background for initial employment or further training.

Third. Title V-A would encourage the development of placement services to insure every school's ability to assist all of its students to complete an appropriate education program and move into the next step beyond high school—either further education or employment.

Fourth. Title V-A would enhance school-community relationships to secure services—health, welfare, employment, specialty training, information, and so forth—beyond those normally available within the school program.

Fifth. Title V-A would interpret local and area labor market information concerning student needs to administrators and the curriculum developers to assure a curriculum that will meet the needs of the students and the community at large.

Sixth. Title V-A would expand organized course selection programs to help all students make appropriate selection from the increasing number of vocational, special, and academic programs becoming available in the typical secondary education curriculum.

Seventh. Title V-A would provide individual and group experiences which will motivate all students toward the development of sound attitudes toward self, toward education, toward employment, and toward society.

In my own State of Illinois, title V-A funding amounted to \$894,406 during fiscal 1969. The estimate for fiscal 1970 is only \$622,243 for this title, a substantial and serious cut in service to young people.

To gauge the success of this program, I will cite a brief review of appropriate figures.

At the end of the first year of operation of title V-A programs in 1958-59, there were about 13,000 full-time equivalent counselors serving public secondary students.

By the end of school year 1966-67, 43,463 full-time counselors were serving public school children and in elementary and secondary schools, junior colleges, and technical institutes.

It has been estimated that the ideal ratio of guidance counselors to students is 1 to 300. In 1958, this ratio was 1 to 960. By 1967, however, this ratio had been reduced to 1 to 450, still in excess of the recommended ratio, but considerably improved over the enormous burden of 1958.

A large measure of the success of title V-A programs can be attributed to the number of students who are remaining in school longer and who are graduating from high school.

In 1958, before title V-A went into effect, 582 of each 1,000 students were

graduating from high school and 308 of these were entering college.

By 1967, 720 of each 1,000 were graduating from high school and 400 of them were entering college the same year. This amounts to an increase of 23.9 percent in the high school retention rate during the 9 years.

Guidance, counseling, and testing services help parents to recognize potential talent in their children. They help teachers encourage the development of those special talents. And perhaps most important, they give individual students a very real sense of their individuality and special abilities.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

It was with high expectations and well-founded optimism that my subcommittee, after 26 days of hearings on the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968, recommended this thoroughly revamped legislation to the House. Our colleagues agreed with our own perception of the critical need for greatly expanded vocational education programs, for this legislation was passed without a single dissenting vote by the House and the Senate.

Today we are requesting funding for this legislation, funding that will provide realistic and immediate help to students who are totally ignorant of the world of work and who are doomed to join welfare and unemployment rolls by the tens of thousands if they are not exposed to practical training experiences during their high school years.

The Joelson amendment would also provide \$488,716,000 for vocational education. This is an increase of \$131,500,000 over amounts approved by the Appropriations Committee.

The additional amount provided in this amendment will implement those portions of the 1968 amendments which call for occupational training programs for the disadvantaged, as well as funds for research that is an absolute necessity if we are to develop new teaching methods and materials and restructure existing vocational education curriculums. It would also provide some funds to start planning in residential skill centers if a further amendment is adopted.

Figures attesting to the need for vocational education speak for themselves. Permit me to cite a few of them:

First. Only one high school student in four is enrolled in a vocational educator program, although five out of six never achieve a full college education. Therefore, almost 60 percent of high school students enter the job market unprepared to hold a productive job.

Second. More than half of vocational students are still being trained in agriculture and home economics, where jobs are either dwindling, nonremunerative, or nonexistent.

Third. Youth unemployment between the ages of 16 and 19 is the highest in the Nation. Approximately 23 percent of white males, 33 percent of nonwhite males, and 49 percent of nonwhite females in this group of young people are unemployed.

According to the Advisory Council on Vocational Education, an organization

that was of great assistance to my subcommittee in rewriting this legislation, present vocational programs fall short of fulfilling their two major purposes which are to prepare students for the world of work and to give particular attention to those with special needs.

The recommended appropriation under the Joelson amendment will give assistance to the States through increased basic grants. The act passed last year required certain percentages of basic grant funds to be set aside to aid the disadvantaged and the handicapped as well as to postsecondary schools. These set-asides went into effect on July 1. Unless we provide funds sufficient to help the States meet their set-aside obligations, the cuts will have to be made in ongoing programs.

Far too many youngsters have been jostled around by the Government. It is time we gave them some assurances that their interests toward career preparation are our interests as well. This is not the time to discourage innovation and experimentation on the part of vocational educators and businessmen and members of the academic community.

Vocational education, particularly through its strenuous advocacy of co-operative work-study programs, can make the difference between a society that merely dumps its underachievers into the maze of welfare and public assistance programs or which gives each student the sincere opportunity to earn a meaningful living in a productive career.

I also support the other provisions of the Joelson amendment, which in my mind would establish a greater degree of equity in distribution of tax dollars for education. The higher education construction amendment as well as increases in funds for the NDEA student loan program and title I of ESEA bring more equity to the entire Federal-aid program.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last three words.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly for a correction?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New Jersey is altogether incorrect, because in my amendment we struck the provision which would have carved up the funds provided, and as a result category A and category B are treated precisely the same. The gentleman just does not know what is in the amendment.

I also wish to correct the statement about the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, because under the Joelson amendment 90 percent entitlement is provided, and under my amendment 78 percent is provided for A and B.

But the gentleman is incorrect when he says we are only taking care of category A.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from North Carolina will yield briefly, I have been informed the gentleman from Illinois did indeed put in a correction to his amendment, and the gentleman is correct in his statement.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I listened carefully to the debate yesterday and today. If there is one thing that has become crystal clear from the debate, it is that the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky is wrong when he says we ought to decide on this floor what categories of education require the most attention. That decision can best be made by the people who are running the school systems of the country, and not by 435 Members of the House of Representatives.

I commend the Members to the comments made in the well yesterday by the very distinguished chairman of this subcommittee (Mr. FLOOD), when he pointed out that the subcommittee which brings this bill before us today was merely following the direction of the Committee on Education and Labor and the amendment sponsored by the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN), when this House consolidated several of these programs. I believe that is a desirable result to be accomplished, and the House ought to go along with the subcommittee recommendation.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. JONAS. I yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon (Mrs. GREEN) left the discretion with the States and not with the Office of Education. That is where the gentleman in the well is wrong.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is not even willing to leave it to the States. I believe it ought to be left to the State departments of education, and the gentleman believes it ought to be decided here on the floor of the House.

We have seen in 2 days that we cannot get any unanimity of opinion as to how much money should be in this program and how much money should be in that program. That is because we are not experts on the subject of education and that was recognized by the House in approving the Green amendment and the Committee on Appropriations was simply following suit.

I should like to urge the Members of the Committee of the Whole today—I do it because I do not serve on the subcommittee which conducted the hearings and is handling the bill today—and to recommend that the Members follow the leadership of this subcommittee, the Members of which are all recognized friends of education, are among the most able and sincere Members of this body, and have devoted 4 months of their time to this subject, who have studied it thoroughly, and who have in my opinion brought before the Committee of the Whole today a bill which should be enacted without amendment.

I think the committee bill is a good one and supported it in the committee although it is \$155 million above the revised budget. So far as I am concerned I think the committee bill as it came out of the subcommittee—following long and careful study and consideration—approved by the full committee, and now

before the Committee of the Whole, should be approved.

We have heard a lot of talk here today and yesterday about our neglect of the schoolchildren and about how we are not spending enough money on education. I hate to be accused of being opposed to education, as I am being accused in telegrams and letters by people who obviously do not know the facts. Let me remind the Committee of a point which has not been mentioned so far in the debate.

We who bring appropriation bills to the floor have told the Members repeatedly that there is a great deal of difference between appropriations and spending. Let me just state what is in this bill for spending in 1970; not appropriations, but spending. That is what counts, because the Department of Education has on hand unexpended balances right now of previously appropriated moneys amounting to more than a billion dollars. A good part of that was provided last year in advance funding, but if we eliminate that there is on hand in that office for future expenditures \$211 million which is not even in this bill and was appropriated in prior years.

Let me tell one other thing about spending. This refers to the outlays by the Office of Education, the actual expenditures last year, which amounted to \$3,424,000,000. Get that figure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

(On request of Mr. HALEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. JONAS was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. JONAS. The Office of Education in fiscal year 1969 spent \$3,424,000,000.

The outlays projected in the 1970 budget by the Office of Education amount to \$3,701,000,000. This committee added \$86 million of additional expenditures to the \$3.7 billion, making total expenditures authorized by this bill, as it came to you from the committee, of \$3,787,000,000 as compared to \$3,424,000,000 last year. That means if the bill before you now is enacted, the Office of Education will be provided \$363 million more to spend than it actually spent in 1969.

In view of that fact, I ask you in all honesty and in all reason, in view of the fiscal situation that our country is confronted with, why should you not pay more attention to expenditure than appropriation levels. You can approve the committee bill before you today and feel assured that the Office of Education will have \$363 million more to spend on education next year than it spent last year. But this is only part of the story. Federal funds for education in the 1970 budget total nearly \$10,000,000,000. This is a fivefold increase since 1960—yet the argument has repeatedly been made on the floor today and yesterday that Congress is neglecting education. No wonder the people back home are misled when they read such charges. They deserve to be answered and a complete answer will be found in the speeches made yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee (Mr. Flood) and by the equally distinguished ranking minority member (Mr. MICHEL).

Remember these figures: \$10 billion for education—throughout Government—and \$3,787,000,000 spending authority provided in this one bill alone for the Office of Education. This is \$363,000,000 more than that Office spent last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK).

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair might state, under the procedures of the House, he is trying to recognize first members of the subcommittee on appropriations handling the bill and second general members of the Committee on Appropriations. It is his intention to go back and forth to each side of the aisle to recognize Members who have been standing and seeking recognition the longest. The gentlewoman from Hawaii sought recognition all yesterday afternoon, and the Chair was unable to recognize her because of the procedures of the House, having to recognize Members on both sides of the aisle who are members of the committee. I wish the Members to know that the Chair will recognize them under the normal procedures.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, this House heard various individuals rise and denounce the impact aid program as a "bonanza." As one of the "hosses" who receives about 10 percent of my State education budget from this source, may I say in all sincerity that every dime of these funds is used for the education of children and this I do not regard as a bonanza.

I repeat what I said earlier, 45 million children in America come from these 4,263 school districts that receive impact aid funds. The substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is far from generous.

If you vote for his amendment, you will, in effect, be voting to reduce your school districts impact funds by 13 percent. The Michel amendment will give your school districts only 77 percent of their entitlement. In fiscal 1969 your school districts received 90 percent entitlement. This is a 13-percent cut.

The fiscal 1970 Public Law 874 requirements are \$650 million, of which \$154,700,000 are for category "A" children and \$456,394,000 are for category "B" children; \$32,300,000 are for so-called section 6 "on base" children educated directly by the Federal Government because local school districts have refused impact funds as totally inadequate for a proper educational program.

If Public Law 874 is such a "bonanza" my question is how come 52,400 children attend these federally operated schools?

This Federal section 6 school system is 100-percent federally supported. One hundred percent of cost. If these same children were in a local school district the Federal share would be only 50 percent of average per pupil costs as determined from the budget of 2 years previous. Who is getting the bonanza?

Getting only 50 percent of average costs as existed 2 whole school years previously is absolutely no bargain at all. Hawaii's average per pupil school costs this coming school year are \$770. Two

school years ago they were \$632. Yet under Public Law 874 we receive only 1/2 of \$632 instead of 1/2 of \$770 for this coming school year. This means that we are actually allocated only 41 percent of our current costs per "A" child, even with full funding.

The Michel amendment would cut this payment to only 31 percent of our current costs. I am not at all impressed by this kind of generosity.

It must be voted down or the quality of education of 45 million children in 4,000 school districts will be poorer by \$150 million. Impact budgets which were set at 90 percent of entitlement in fiscal 1969 will be reduced under the Michel amendment to 77 percent of entitlement for fiscal 1970.

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.

Since the very beginning of this program in 1951, Public Law 874 has received full congressional support for 100-percent funding, except for the last fiscal year where the funding was 90 percent of entitlement.

Now this Michel amendment would cut this to 77 percent of entitlement.

In my own State of Hawaii during our school year 1968-69 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 as I have just explained.

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.

With 100-percent funding for 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 alone.

With funding cut to \$7.8 million the State will have to come up with the \$5.2 million deficit just for our 17,000 on-base schoolchildren.

This is my case for funding of the Public Law 874 program as provided in the Joelson amendment. 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. We are not discussing only the impact children.

I urge you to vote down the Michel substitute and vote "aye" for the Joelson amendment.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment which will go a long way toward overcoming the dangerous neglect of extremely vital educational programs which are threatened by the committee bill.

These programs include the impact aid program, vocational education, the school library program, instructional equipment, construction of badly needed facilities under the Higher Education Act, college student loans, and several others.

It is not merely that I regard education in all its important ramifications as one of the very best public investments we can make. It is also that the committee bill sounds retreat from many of the great educational goals this Nation has so wisely established in the last few years.

The committee bill, to our sadness and our shame, cuts far below our expenditures of last year for program after vital program in the educational field. It completely eliminates some of them.

Surely this is not the time for a drastic reduction in our educational budget. A nation which can land men on the moon and return them to earth, and all of this the product of education, would be penny wise and pound foolish at this vital juncture in history to cut back on its educational goals and reduce its educational effort. Yet that is precisely what the committee bill proposes, and that is what the Joelson amendment would correct.

LOCAL EFFECT

Let me give you one illustration of what the committee bill, if it is not amended upward, could do to the local educational budget in only one locality of the country.

According to my best calculations, the school systems in Tarrant County, Tex., will receive approximately \$5 million less for the coming school year if the Joelson amendment is not adopted. Total category B funds under the impact aid program, which the committee bill would eliminate in their entirety, came to some \$3,149,803 for these Tarrant County schools in fiscal 1968.

If these funds are reduced as the committee bill proposes, many communities throughout the Nation will suffer this same fate. They will be confronted with one of two alternatives. Either their local educational programs will suffer severely or the already burdensome local taxes on homes and private property will have to be raised very appreciably.

It is my personal observation that the Tarrant County schools are very wisely expending the moneys they receive. These moneys are not wasted. They are well invested in the future of our country. They are necessary if we are truly serious about excellence in education. I am sure that the same situation applies throughout the Nation.

EDUCATION AND OUR SENSE OF VALUES

Against this background, let us briefly appraise our national attitudes and ask ourselves just how well we are measur-

ing up as a nation to this crucial central challenge of our age.

Just where have we placed education in our national standard of values? Just how important have we as a people considered it to be?

Is it as important to the average American as his automobile? Last year, all Americans together spent almost twice as much on the purchase and operation of our automobiles as we did on our public elementary and secondary schools.

Is it as important as recreation? All told, we spent \$5 billion more on recreation than we did on education. Does it mean as much to us as cigarettes and highballs? Last year, the American people spent more money on tobacco and alcoholic beverages than we did on the education of our children.

Have we allowed our sense of values to get slightly out of focus when a big league ballplayer can make \$100,000 in a season and a teacher in our public schools will make perhaps \$8,000?

Is not there something strangely amiss when a television comedian gets more for a single 30-minute performance than our best high school teacher with a doctor's degree can make all year? Should the reward be that much greater for making people laugh than it is for making people think?

EDUCATION AND DEMOCRACY

Education and democracy are inseparably interconnected. They advance hand in hand. When either suffers, the other suffers.

In the absence of public understanding of vital issues, and a public ability to cope with them, democracy could not endure. If this has always been true, it is doubly true today and will be trebly true tomorrow.

Walter Lippmann, in his book, "The Public Philosophy," raises the question as to whether our system, depending as it does upon public support for the shaping of major national policy, will prove adequate to the stresses and strains of rapid change in the space age. As legislators we surely can understand Lippmann's misgivings. While I do not share his gloomy forebodings, I recognize his legitimate concern.

Neither a sensationalist nor a muckraker, that writer views the successful political figures of our time as basically "insecure and intimidated men" whose decisive consideration is "not whether the proposition is good but whether it is popular—not whether it will work well and prove itself, but whether the active-talking constituents like it immediately."

Although I regard this characterization as much too severe, there is in it an element of truth. In a democracy, public policy ultimately must win the approval of public opinion. Events, Lippmann says, move much faster than the public's ability to keep astride.

Thus, in the final analysis, the big public decisions of the future cannot be much better, much wiser, or much more profound than the public at large is prepared to understand and embrace. And here is where education—in its broadest sense—becomes so vital.

Democracy in our time faces an entirely new set of challenges. They are so

new and so different from any to which our Nation historically has been accustomed that our entire past experience is of only limited value. Democracy's survival depends upon the public capacity to stay abreast of these challenges. And this depends upon education.

WE NEED BOTH QUALITY AND QUANTITY

The crisis in which we have so suddenly found ourselves has spawned a lot of truth and a lot of utter nonsense as well. Much has been said and written about the need to provide a challenge and an opportunity for the gifted child. Nothing could be more vitally important. The world has need of the gifted. To help gratify the inquisitive hunger of his mind at a pace with which he can cope, and to help him find through intellectual accomplishment the acceptance and prestige of his contemporaries by glorifying excellence, are goals toward which we must rapidly move.

But some in their zeal to help the gifted have carried their thought one dangerous step further. Some months ago a teacher wrote an article for a national magazine under some such title as "Must Everyone Go To College?" His basic thought was that society cannot afford the expense of making higher education available for those with less than average mental endowment.

Were we to accept that philosophy, it would be only an additional step to asking "Must everyone receive a public education?", and from this only one more step backward toward barbarism until we might ask "Must every child be given an opportunity to go to school?"

It is alarming to me to observe that in California, a State long recognized for enlightenment and leadership in the education field, cutbacks now proposed in the financing of higher education could result in the State university system's denying admittance even to some students who graduate in the top 25 percent of their high school graduating classes.

In a democracy education must never be reserved for the limited elite. We may be impatient at times with the slower youngster or with the immature as we strive for excellence in the system, but we can never totally surrender quantity for quality. By such a yardstick, Einstein, Edison, and Albert Schweitzer might have been consigned in their adolescence to the ashheap of human lost causes, for the record reveals that each of these was considered slow as a youth.

In a democracy everyone theoretically can vote—can participate on a fully equal basis with the better endowed intellectually in the formulation of national policy. While we strive to educate the few gifted youngsters to the fullest extent of their capabilities, it would be the greatest folly for a democracy to sacrifice even slightly the attention due the average or even the below average boys and girls.

WE HAVE MADE PROGRESS, BUT NOT ENOUGH

Only the most prejudiced observer would deny there has been much progress in recent years. Taken as a whole, the educational qualifications of teachers have risen steadily; the curriculum is broader; educational materials have improved; physical facilities and equip-

ment are decidedly better; and most students are learning more.

The unparalleled investment in education in the past 50 to 60 years has proved highly profitable for the United States, whether it is reckoned in benefits to individuals or in benefits to national economic growth, cultural enrichment, and military security. Yet these marks of past progress are distinctly modest—yes, even far short—of what must now be accomplished in a much shorter time.

I am speaking here of the impact of the tremendous numbers of new youngsters, born since 1950, and now descending upon our high schools and colleges. A convenient yardstick is available in the fact that fully twice as many American children were born in 1956 as in 1936. High school enrollments expected in September 1969, may reach 15 million compared to 3.8 million in 1959.

THE COST

This, then, is the challenge. We dare not ignore it, and we cannot put it off. It is no exaggeration to say that our survival as a nation and as a way of life can depend upon how adequately we measure up to it.

While it is not by any means solely a problem of money, it cannot be solved without the application of a very great deal of money measured by our previous standards, in a limited time. I am emphatically convinced that money for education is not an expense in the classic sense. It is an investment, a very good investment in the future and one which cannot fail to pay rich dividends. But let us face it frankly: it will cost money.

Look at it as a percentage of the gross national product, and the figures assume slightly less frightening proportions. In 1958, total educational expenditures were roughly 4.5 percent of the gross national product. In spite of the massive infusions of help in the past 8 years, they fell to 3.78 percent last year.

If these figures tell us anything at all, they surely should demonstrate that dollars spent on education do indeed return measurable dividends to the economy. One almost could conclude from the record that the more we spend intelligently on education, the more there is for the Nation to spend on other things.

It is like "casting our bread upon the water." It returns to us multiplied in value. The greater the pace at which our educational expenditures have risen, still greater the pace at which our gross national product rises. The connection is not theoretical, but clear and direct. The one proceeds as a direct result of the other.

It has been demonstrated that the educational benefits of the so-called GI bill of rights have actually paid for themselves and returned a profit—not only to the whole economy, but to the Government itself. The increased earning power generated and set in motion by that program has yielded sufficiently higher incomes that the additional taxes paid to the Government on those higher incomes have more than three times retired the total cost of the effort.

From the record of all employed Americans, the fact emerges that a bachelor's degree from college—on an average—

will yield \$100,000 more in earnings than its holder could have expected to receive over a lifetime if he had merely graduated from high school. A doctor's degree will add approximately \$300,000 to the individual earning expectancy. All of which merely goes to say that the educational dollar is just about the best investment any level of our society can make. It more than pays for itself—to the individual, to the economy, to the Government, and to the Nation.

Moreover, it is absolutely vital to the future of the race.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the amendment which I believe will result in the full funding of our educational effort which is so important today.

A few days ago, we watched with an estimated 600 million others throughout the world as man took his first step on the moon. This demonstrated what man can do given the knowledge and the tools with which to work. We have accomplished tremendous things and are making tremendous advances in all lines of endeavor—scientifically, sociologically, technologically, economically and politically—yet there is so much to be done.

We face today, many domestic problems and in the final analysis, the real solution to them is a solid education for all our people—an education which will provide every citizen an equal opportunity to contribute with the full measure of his capacity, to the solution of these problems and the continued growth of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, as many of you know, I started my career in public service about 30 years ago as a member of the local school board in my hometown of Roseville, Calif. Subsequently, I served in the California State Legislature for approximately 10 years before coming to Congress as a Representative of the Second Congressional District of California. Accordingly, I have had what I believe is a rare opportunity to witness the problems of education at three levels of government—local, State, and Federal.

I am well aware of the contributions which the local taxpayers and local school boards are making in a tremendous effort to educate our young people. The tax burden, however, on the local property owner has reached the saturation point. In my own State of California, the people are contributing substantially toward the education of our young people, but the job is tremendous.

In the school year 1966-67, the average daily attendance exceeded 4,700,000 students and I am quite confident that today it is well in excess of 5 million, in the public elementary and secondary schools alone. The cost of giving these young people basic education in the State of California was \$3.8 billion in the 1966-67 school year and I am again quite confident that since that figure was 7.7 percent greater than the cost of school operations in the preceding year, that today's cost is well over \$4 billion a year.

Education, or the lack of it, knows no school district, county or State bound-

aries. It is of national importance. The contributions of an individual with a superior education can affect every citizen of this Nation. If on the other side this individual had been unable to make this contribution due to an inadequate education, every citizen would suffer.

In order to accomplish this goal, we must do our utmost at all levels. This includes, of course, elementary and secondary schools and the colleges and universities. Congress recognized this in creating a variety of programs over the years including the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with its eight titles, all of which are extremely important. Namely, aid to the disadvantaged; school library resources; supplementary centers and services; assistance to State departments of education; educating the handicapped; bilingual education; and dropout prevention. Other equally important programs implemented are the National Defense Education Act, Higher Education Act, federally impacted areas, Education Professions Development Act, Adult Education Act, Vocational Education, Manpower Development and Training Activities, the Office of Economic Opportunity program for Job Corps, Headstart and Follow Through, and the Cooperative Research Act.

An authorized program, as we all know, is of little value without the funds to meet the challenge which we recognized must be met in voting the basic legislation. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I stand solidly in support of the amendment to provide school funding of these programs. The need for education has never been greater.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. All of the education programs in this amendment are vital to the growth and future of our educational system.

The crux of our problem, of course, is money—additional funds, larger appropriations, all the words that we are afraid to say aloud these days because of the "pressing need to cut our Federal budget."

Mr. Chairman, I am just as concerned about prudent Federal spending as anyone in this body, but there are two things to consider: The first is the re-statement of the fact that the effective education of our youth is of the utmost importance to our Nation and is not the proper place to begin to cut corners. The second point is one which has a tragicomic tone, the fact that our estimated budget of fiscal year 1969 was incorrect to the tune of \$2.174 billion. The surplus the Government estimated would be \$900 million turned out to be \$3.074 billion, the largest since 1957. What did we do, Mr. Chairman? How many corners did we so unnecessarily cut, how many valuable programs did we arbitrarily kill when we did not have to? For the coming year let us learn from past experience.

The administration's recommendation to cut back the aid to federally impacted areas to \$187 million is both unwarranted and most unjust to the local commu-

nities which will be affected. How are they supposed to raise the \$400 million which will be needed to run their schools? And why should local communities have to tax their citizens to provide for children who are not their responsibility? People are already overtaxed. In most communities further local taxation to make up for these reductions is simply impossible. Do we need to have some of our schools close down to prove the shortsightedness of these reductions? With regard to construction funds for impacted school districts, far more money must be appropriated than the pitiful \$15 million suggested. With over a \$6 billion surplus predicted for fiscal year 1970, what justification is there for this harsh underfunding?

Adequate appropriations for our library programs are another important concern of mine and the people of my State. I cannot understand the thinking behind these sharp reductions. In an era of an information explosion, library services are increasingly necessary. Anything we do to encourage increased knowledge among our citizens will be returned to our country a thousand times. Recently I saw a statement which noted that the Government is currently spending 25 cents a person on library programs and over \$21,000 a person on ammunition to supply the war in Vietnam. If that is so, what has happened to our sense of priorities?

The amendment's restoration of \$33 million for the construction of academic facilities under the Higher Education Act is most important to accommodate the additional young people in our colleges due to population growth and need for more education. If we are going to expect sensible behavior from the college generation, then let us set an example here by a sensible order of priorities in spending tax dollars.

I cannot speak too strongly of the importance of increasing funds for direct student loans under the National Defense Education Act. The amendment, which adds about \$41 million to the committee's recommendation, is still below the need and below the 1970 authorization, but moves in the right direction. Many students have written to me explaining the problems facing them if they do not get a Federal loan. With the present rise in interest rates, the availability of guaranteed loans has been seriously limited. It is an absolute necessity that we appropriate increased funds or many students will not be able to continue their higher education.

One last point. The \$181 million which the amendment adds to H.R. 13111 for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is most important if the programs under title I are to be really effective for the 9 million children involved.

In conclusion, the need for passing the Joelson package amendment, thereby adding \$894.5 million to the appropriations bill, should be obvious. If we are going to be cautious about dipping into the predicted budget surplus, let it be when we consider military expenditures, but we simply cannot afford to hedge on

our commitment to education—not if we intend to exercise some responsibility for our country's future.

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

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. KAZEN. Mr. Chairman, I join my colleagues who have preceded me on the floor to evidence my concern over the lack of Public Law 874 funding for category B students. I represent several school districts whose educational programs would be seriously curtailed if this bill does not provide for at least last year's level of funding. In fact, it would be most difficult for some of my schools to open their doors in September if they are not assured of receiving these funds. These schools are located in areas which have a very poor tax base and cannot raise another dime from their already overburdened taxpayers.

In one district all impact students are category 3-B students and it would stand to lose approximately \$280,000. To offset this loss, taxes would need to be raised 80 percent. Already, the taxpayers in that district are paying more than comparable districts in the State of Texas and the additional revenue needed would be impossible to raise. Of that district's 3,300 students, 75 percent are Federally connected and the area is considered a bedroom community because the only industry in the area is an Air Force base. The district's student population has doubled in the past 5 years and the growth can only be attributed to the proximity of the base to the school district.

Another one of my districts last year enrolled 2,600 children. In the coming year they will enroll over 3,200 children, an increase of over 30 percent. At least 400 of these new students are impact students, their parents having moved in because of the district's location relative to the large permanent military installations. These 400 new impact students will require that the district expend an average of \$1,666 dollars each for classroom space, a total of about \$666,448. These new students will require hiring 15 new teachers at a cost of about \$97,500 and the expenditure of some \$9,000 for other operational costs for a total requirement of \$772,948, to house and educate just the additional impact students moving into the district in the 1969-70 school year. Under this year's current funding guidelines these 400 new impact students will entitle that district to an additional \$55,644 for a total Public Law 874 entitlement for the 1969-70 school year of \$209,916.

Because of the growth and increasing costs, the local school tax rate was increased 25 percent last year and is being increased another 20 percent this year. If Public Law 874 funds are not forthcoming, this district could not function next year. An additional increase of 60 percent to compensate for Public Law 874 entitlements would be impossible.

Mr. Chairman, the local people and the State government are assuming as much of this financial burden as they can. It

is imperative that Public Law 874 funds be provided.

In another one of my districts which is adjacent to two other military installations, 600 new students to the district will be enrolled. This is due almost exclusively to the district's proximity to those bases. That district finds itself with a budget at the present time based on past years experience with Public Law 874 funds and they find after their budget is made, their money is obligated, their teachers employed, their desks bought, and the children ready to come into the schools, that the Congress is going to deprive them of Federal money for these federally connected children. If it were a wealthy district, this would be no problem. However, this district is not even average in wealth. It is below average. They have recently voted \$2 million of bonds and raised their taxes 30 percent to build buildings for the children in this district. They have raised their maintenance tax for operation.

This district would be entitled to approximately \$420,000 if the program is funded at last year's level. If these funds are taken away from the district, the children, which are composed of many underprivileged, will suffer educationally in a great way.

I could go down the list and talk about many more of the school districts in my congressional district and bring to your attention their dire need for these funds. Suffice it to say that the reasons for having provided Public Law 874 funds in the very beginning are as valid today in those districts as they were at that time and we in the Congress would be doing the schoolchildren a great injustice if we do not provide these funds at this time.

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

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the pending amendment to more adequately provide funds for schools which face extraordinary hardships because of the impact from unusual Federal activities.

In my judgment, of all the millions—even billions—appropriated as Federal aid to education, none is more justified than that which is provided for these impacted districts. I am speaking of the real, bona fide situations, where the Federal impact is overwhelming. The dollars spent to compensate for this unusual problem go very directly to the benefit of students.

Let me cite an example or two, to illustrate what I mean by the schools that are faced with unavoidable hardship without this source of help.

One school in San Antonio has an enrollment of 2,500, of which over 50 percent are "impact" students. The school tax rate was increased by 25 percent last year, and by 20 percent this year.

In that area, adjacent to large military bases, a tremendous residential building program is now in progress, mostly for single families. Due to current tax structures, a residence is occupied and the local school must house and educate

children for as long as 2 years before actual tax income is realized from the new projects, of which there will, in the next 12 months, be 1,000.

Moreover, the vast majority of mobile homes in the area are owned by service personnel and are tax exempt under the Serviceman's Relief Act.

A local school bond issue, recently approved, amounts to \$7 million. One-half of all local taxes collected must go toward this debt retirement.

This district qualifies for some \$200,000 in funds under Public Law 874. If impact funds are not provided, the local tax rate would be forced upward by 50 cents, or possibly \$1, per \$100 valuation.

The rate is already exceedingly high, and a further increase would be next to unbearable.

I could cite other examples. One comes to my mind—the Scherz-Cibolo-Universal City Independent School District, located in the suburbs of San Antonio, adjacent to Randolph Air Force Base, where 75 percent of the district's students are federally connected.

The district tax rate is \$1.05, of which 55 cents is designated for maintenance and operation and 50 cents is designated for debt-retirement purposes. In 1964 the district had all of the real property revalued and placed the property on tax rolls at 90 percent of actual market value. A home valued at \$11,000 pays \$105 in school taxes.

Without impact funds, in order for the district to maintain the same services, same salaries, the tax rate would have to be increased 80 percent on the district's \$35 million valuation. This would be far more than the district's taxpayers could bear.

I have cited two schools which are victims of a financial dilemma directly due to Federal activities. Others could be cited in the same locality. These schools are desperate. They have no control over who or how many people move into the area. They must provide education for every child that knocks on the school door. Their unusual burdens are of Federal origin, and it is the moral duty of the Federal Government to compensate for this federally imposed hardship.

I urge my colleagues to support the pending amendment.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MINK. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PATTEN. 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. This 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 1969 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 future of American youth.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, during the last fiscal year, 163 of the 174 eligible districts in Colorado organized and conducted title I programs. Of the 163 programs, 28 involved a combination of two or more districts who pooled their resources and operated the programs cooperatively.

Of the \$8.5 million expended during the year, nearly 75 percent was expended for instruction, and the remaining 25 percent for medical, dental, and food services, for maintenance, administration, equipment, and minor construction. About 95 percent was expended during the regular term and 5 percent for summer programs.

More than 46,000 pupils were enrolled in title I programs.

Programs were operated that involved children of all age groups from preschool through high school. There were 29,000 elementary schoolchildren—kindergarten to sixth grade—enrolled and more than 17,000 high school pupils were offered programs.

The categories of expenditures were: Compensatory education, 85 percent; handicapped children, migrant children, Indian children, 15 percent.

Approximately three-fifths of the salary cost—totaling approximately \$5 million—was for teachers' salaries. Other salaries paid were for teacher aides, librarians, counselors, psychologists, social workers, nurses, doctors, dentists, clerical workers, and administrators.

A total of 1,633 persons were employed to operate the program.

Programs embraced activities in art, business education, cultural enrichment, English reading, English as a second language, English speech, foreign languages, health, physical education, home economics, industrial arts, mathematics, music, natural science, social science, vocational education, and many others.

Inasmuch as all of these programs were provided in addition to the normal offering that would have been provided for these children had title I funds not been used, some comparisons are possible, using control groups, or by comparing with the total group in a school or school system.

DROPOUT RATE

The dropout rate in title I high schools has been reduced 1 percent over 3 years, while the dropout rate in non-title-I high schools has increased 2.2 percent, while the dropout rate in all high schools in Colorado has increased 0.6 percent.

HOLDING POWER

Twelfth grade title I high schools increased one-tenth of 1 percent.

Twelfth grade non-title-I high schools decreased one-half of 1 percent.

Eleventh grade title I high schools increased 1.1 percent.

Eleventh grade non-title-I high schools decreased one-half of 1 percent.

Tenth grade title I high schools increased 1.5 percent. Tenth grade non-title-I high schools increased three-tenths of 1 percent.

Test scores show improvement in reading with more than 10 percent of the title I pupils who were in the lowest quartile at pretest moving out of that quartile as posttest.

Test scores in arithmetic show improvement slightly better even than in reading, while test scores in language arts are slightly below the results in reading.

Greater gains were realized when specialists taught small groups for extended periods in special classrooms.

Disadvantaged children did not get that way only yesterday and a short duration program will not change them for tomorrow.

For these reasons I urge this House to accept the Johnson amendment for in so doing we will be adding \$180,800,000 to this important bill.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. While I realize that it is unrealistic at present to expect Congress to close the \$5 billion gap between authorization and appropriations in view of the economy wave sweeping the country, I am firmly convinced the American people do not want vast cuts in education programs. The people want inflation curbed and taxes reduced, but not at the expense of their children. The Joelson amendment will increase H.R. 13111 by \$894.5 million, and all of the increases provided in these programs are absolutely essential. I feel that this Congress has a responsibility to take a substantial part in the solution

of the present financial crises in education.

Although education is a local responsibility, the problems facing the local school systems and the results of a failure to solve these problems are national in scope. Our modern economy is a national and not a local economy. It thrives on the mobility of our population. The citizen New York educates today may well contribute to the resources of Chicago tomorrow. Conversely, the citizen my community fails to educate today may well be a drain on the resources of your community tomorrow. Our national economy must be preserved through a national effort to assure adequate educational opportunities everywhere in the country. Otherwise cities will weary of the effort of overcoming the educational handicaps of its youth, knowing that the resulting well-trained citizens may be drained off to other areas—only to be replaced by persons poorly educated elsewhere.

Education has always been regarded as a necessary ingredient of national stability. To the extent America fails to educate its youth, we will fail to equip people with the tools that are necessary for economic, social and personal satisfaction in the world of today's modern technology. The uneducated child of today becomes the frustrated hostile adult of tomorrow.

So I urge you to consider not just the children of your constituents—but the children of all American families—and enthusiastically support this amendment.

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

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

It seems somewhat incongruous to me that while all mankind is acclaiming this Nation's achievement in space, the administration is seeking drastically to curtail our educational effort. During the Eisenhower administration, the launching of sputnik in 1958 resulted in the enactment of the National Defense Education Act. This was as a direct concern that our educational system was inadequately equipped especially in science and technology, for the challenge of the space age.

Now that we have landed on the moon, are we to abandon our commitment to our schools and colleges? I say no, for the challenge of the future is now far greater than it was in 1958.

The Appropriations Committee has provided an extremely modest increase in education funds beyond that requested by the Nixon administration. It is far too meager an amount to be effective. While we keep our eyes on the moon, let us not fail to reach for the stars.

In 1965 we promised the economically disadvantaged children of this Nation, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, that the Congress of the United States would assist the State and local school boards to provide them better educational oppor-

tunity. In my State, a large percentage of these children are American Indians. They are economically and culturally deprived because of the decades of neglect of their educational opportunity under the control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The vast majority of Indian children in Montana now are in public schools, administered by local boards of education upon which our adult Indian citizens serve with distinction. Unless we provide the public schools with the additional financial resources the Joelson amendment provides, we will again be breaking faith with our Indian citizens. We let them serve on school boards—but deny them the money they need to do the job for their children. Let us not do it to them again.

Increased funding is an investment in the future of America which will repay human and economic dividends of ever-increasing magnitude. Education is a necessity, not merely a nicety. The strength of our Nation, whether measured by the gross national product or by the general enlightenment of the people, rests upon adherence to this proposition.

I urge you to support the Joelson amendment.

INDIAN PROGRAM

The 1968 title I program served 47,562 Indian children in programs conducted by local school districts to meet the most pressing needs of educationally deprived children. Summer programs served 5,922 Indian children.

Indian children participated in a wide range of programs including art, cultural enrichment, reading, English as a second language, health, physical education and recreation, mathematics, music, and vocational programs. Supplementary services, such as clothing, food, guidance and counseling, health, psychological, speech therapy were also provided.

The program participants ranged from prekindergarten through grade 12, the greater proportion being sixth grade and below.

Approximately \$6.5 million was spent on behalf of Indian children in public school programs. Many programs were developed especially to meet the individual needs of these children, primarily the teaching of English as a second language, improving attitude toward school through parent participation, and home visitations and specialized programs to improve reading competency.

An average of \$133 per child was spent to provide these specialized services.

In addition, over 50,000 Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools in 16 States participated in the program, of which 1,650 were physically or mentally handicapped. An amount of \$9 million was spent for specialized services over and above the regular school program in 1968.

Indian children are among the most educationally deprived of all school-age children. In a population where the dropout rate is 30 percent greater than the national average, the need for special services on behalf of Indian children is of high priority.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Michel amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we will choose today between the appropriation of scant funds for impact aid and a major package of across-the-board restorations to at least keep Federal aid to education on a par with last year.

Item for item, the Joelson package is superior to the Michel substitute.

In the crucial matter of impact aid, the Joelson amendment provides local schools with 90 percent of the authorized entitlement. The Michel substitute provides only 69 percent of entitlement for 874(b) funding. In short, under the Michel substitute local schools will receive 21 percent less impact aid than they will under the Joelson package.

In addition, the Joelson package provides funding at last year's levels for school libraries, for the purchase of equipment, for the operation of supplementary education centers, for guidance and counseling.

The Joelson package provides desperately needed funds for student loans and higher education construction.

The Joelson package provides well over \$100 million for vocational education.

The Joelson package, too, provides \$180 million for programs to assist schools in poverty areas.

How can we possibly turn our backs on the need to educate our children?

Today the Soviet Union outspends the United States on public education. When all the funds for education spent in the United States at the local, State, and National levels are added together they still do not total the sums the Soviet Union spends on education.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In connection with the statement just made by the gentleman from California, I would like to point out that a recent check of the figures indicates that in spite of the seemingly large sums of money that people have been talking about spending at the Federal level; even if the Joelson amendment were adopted the contribution of the Federal Government to education in this country when measured against contributions in State and local taxes paid by the citizens of this country, will represent less than 8 percent of the cost of education in this country. This represents the smallest national commitment to education of any major nation in the world, Communist or non-Communist.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I emphasize the point.

Mr. Chairman, we are mightily concerned about losing the arms race but we are apparently contented to lose the education race.

We won the moon race, but will we win the education race?

We will not prevail as an independent, free and just society if we are ignorant and uneducated. Education costs money. It is our obligation to provide the necessary funds for education.

I most vigorously urge the adoption of the Joelson package amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Robison amendment because, when we make our decision between the Michel substitute to the Joelson amendment we will be making our decision between impact aid at last year's figure, or impact aid at \$80 million over last year's figure.

The only way we can be certain that those four programs—library resources, equipment of NDEA, supplemental centers of ESEA, and the guidance and counseling program of NDEA—are funded at last year's level would be to support the Robison amendment.

Without the Robison amendment, if the Michel amendment is adopted, we would not be able to increase those figures. I believe it is necessary for us to raise them and the Robison amendment brings the total up to last year's figure.

Let us see what happened last year.

Last year the appropriation for title II of ESEA was just about one-half of the year before.

In 1968, the appropriation for title II ESEA, library resources, was \$99,234,000.

ESEA, title III, for 1968 it was \$187,000,000. Last year it was cut to \$164,000,000.

The NDEA appropriation, title V(a) for 1968 was \$24,500,000. In 1969, last year, it was cut to \$17,000,000.

The appropriation for NDEA, title III, in 1968 was \$78.7 million—last year they left that at the same figure.

So you see last year appropriations were substantially cut by about \$80,000,000 for those four titles. If there was any fat in them in 1968, that was cut out in 1969.

I believe that if we are going to keep faith with the educational agencies in this country, we ought to have maintained the appropriation at that level. We can give some flexibility to them with the Robison amendment in order that, even if in 1970 there were some adjustments to be made between these four titles that could be made and that is a wise move.

Any of you who are interested in an increase for vocational education, as I am—and any of you who are interested in increasing the student loan program, the national defense education act student loan program, as I am, will have an opportunity to do it later when those paragraphs come up.

If the Michel substitute with the Robison amendment is adopted and, therefore, preventing the Joelson amendment from being adopted, you can take up those other items at a later time.

If you have any desire to put money where the needs are the greatest, surely that \$80,000,000 increase for impact aid is not the place to make it.

There are much greater needs. Priority is surely higher for vocational education, education for the handicapped, which is not a part of the Joelson amendment—and needs in higher education. In fact, even the increased needs for title I of ESEA are much greater than impact aid because at least it is distributed to some of the neediest education agencies of the country or practically all of them.

But I ask you not to put yourself in the position so that you will have to vote for the Joelson amendment because the \$80 million increase there is completely unwise.

What is the difference last year in impact aid from 1968? Was there a cut in impact aid in 1969 compared to the year before as there was for ESEA II, ESEA III, and NDEA V-A? No. In 1969 there was a \$106 million increase in impact aid. Now you are asked to increase it another \$80 million. It is completely unreasonable.

There are other areas of education that have a much higher priority than does impact aid. Surely ESEA II has a priority up at the top. We can fund that in the Robison amendment. After that we can make a decision about what level we want to appropriate for each program.

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

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I compliment my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, for working for increased appropriations. But if I understand the gentleman's philosophy, on the so-called Green amendment that was passed on the floor, the gentleman in the well is advocating that the States have the flexibility so how can you reconcile the committee bill and the Michel substitute where you place that authority and flexibility in the hands of the Office of Education?

Mr. QUIE. I know what the question of the gentleman is. I would say that if we could consolidate in 1970, I would be all for it. But we need to give some opportunity for the States to get geared up for that, but we could give flexibility to the Commissioner now. I do not think that is unreasonable. I think it is wise, and the Commissioner can, with his own authority, give some discretion to the States to make their decision as to how they want the money to be spent for each program by sending in a package plan.

(Mr. RUPPE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the amendment to increase funding for Public Law 874. The present bill before the House seeks some \$187 million for aid to federally impacted areas. This amount would eliminate payments for children whose parents work on Federal property, but who do not live on Federal property. In many areas of the Nation, my district included, the cut-off of these funds will wreak havoc among school districts already strapped for funds. The reason is simple. Concentrations of Federal land ownership seriously deplete the tax base on which local governments and school districts must sustain themselves. Public Law 874 has proven to be an effective, if artificial remedy for the school financing problem.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to restore Public Law 874 funds in H.R. 13111 at least to the fiscal year 1969 level. I feel that no curtailment of the aid to federally impacted areas program should be made until the whole question of taxation and public lands is settled. As you

are no doubt aware, the Public Land Law Review Commission has been established to resolve the problem of public land ownership and local tax needs. The Commission is expected to present its findings to Congress in 1971. Until such time as we can effectively act upon the Commission's recommendations and provide an adequate means to help finance local school districts affected by Federal land ownership we simply cannot afford to curtail Public Law 874.

(Mr. McKNEALLY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. McKNEALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment to H.R. 13111, presented by the distinguished gentleman from the State of New Jersey. I, like many other of my colleagues on this side of the aisle, was elected to this venerable House on a platform which called for economy in Government spending. However, I cannot stand by when "economy in Government spending" could very well deliver a devastating blow to the cause of maintaining quality education in our beloved country. If there must be cuts in the budget, why must the thrifty pen strike at funds for vocational training, funds for the construction of college and university facilities, funds for student loans, funds for school libraries, and funds for impacted areas? It seems to me that these actions in the name of economy betray a rather bewildering sense of priorities—especially when one considers that educational costs were not left on the launch pad as inflation blasted off.

Of particular interest to me is the aid to impacted areas. My 27th district was entitled to \$1,123,215 during fiscal year 1969, of which \$681,930 was designated for "B" category students whose parents work, but do not live, on Federal installations. Because of the large portion of funds for this second category, if nothing at all is appropriated for "B" category students for fiscal year 1970, the schools in my district will suffer a setback from which they could not recover. They cannot ask for higher taxes. It goes without saying, the citizens of this Nation are not terribly fond of the idea of raising their taxes—even when they are necessary to defray the expenses of educational needs. They cannot go to the State of New York, for the gentlemen in Albany have also decided to practice economy in areas where the education of children is concerned.

I refer you to title 20, section 236 of the United States Code, which proclaims the purpose of Public Law 874. It reads:

In recognition of the responsibility of the United States for the impact which certain Federal activities have on the local educational agencies in the areas in which such activities are carried on, the Congress declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this chapter) for those local educational agencies upon which the United States has placed financial burdens by reason of the fact that—

- (1) the revenues available to such agencies from local sources have been reduced as the result of the acquisition of real property by the United States; or
- (2) such agencies provide education for children residing on Federal property; or

(3) such agencies provide education for children whose parents are employed on Federal property; or

(4) there has been a sudden and substantial increase in school attendance as the result of Federal activities.

In this declaration of policy, could there possibly be a more explicit delineation of the Federal Government's obligation to these impacted areas? Can one deny that the importance of Federal Government meeting this obligation is substantially greater than it was in 1950 when Public Law 874 was enacted?

The example of Highland Falls, N.Y., it seems to me, is paradigmatic in displaying the necessity of the Federal Government acting in accordance with its responsibility to impacted areas. More than 80 percent of the land area of the town belongs to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. Consequently, Highland Falls presently receives funds for both "A" and "B" category students. If the funds are not appropriated for both categories for fiscal year 1970, then it is estimated that the true tax rate would have to be raised \$9.66 per \$1,000 in order to overcome the deficit in the school district's budget. Such a raise is manifestly unacceptable to the taxpayers of Highland Falls, for they recently voted down an increase of \$3.35 per \$1,000, called for by the school budget.

I am sure that someone would be bound to ask the question—"Why should a citizen in another city pay Highland Falls' school taxes?" The point is, Highland Falls has lost approximately 13 percent of the remaining land to the Palisades Interstate Park Commission, which leaves 7 percent available to the town and school district. Therefore, there is no possibility for the town to attract industry to help with the tax burden.

Mr. Chairman, this is but one example of the many school districts throughout our country that are at the mercy of this distinguished body's determination to fulfill its responsibility to federally affected areas. In the same way that I am opposed to cutting funds for Public Law 874, I am opposed to "economy in Government spending" which would severely impair the ability of our educators to do their duty for our children. It is with relish that I stand in support of the amendment presented by the able gentleman from New Jersey. I could not serve in this venerable House with proper pride if the majority of my colleagues did not rally with us.

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the points made by my distinguished colleague from Hawaii (Mrs. MINN) regarding impacted aid. My only regret is that she seems content to settle for 90 percent of entitlement. I would prefer to hold out for 100 percent because the money is desperately needed. If these funds are eliminated, my district will suffer an educational privation the effects of which will be disastrous.

For fiscal 1969 we received 88 percent of our entitlement but prior to that time, since the program's inception in 1951, we have always received the full entitlement. This assistance is especially needed now as the average cost of education per pupil continues to rise. Even if the full entitlement were given, only 50 percent of the cost is paid for those in the "A" category and 25 percent for those in the "B" category.

I would like to make a special plea in defense of category "B"—the aid given for children of Federal employees who do not live on Government bases. The argument that no impacted aid money should be given for those students whose parents pay real estate taxes to the local jurisdiction begs the question. The Federal facility which employs those parents pays no real estate taxes. On the contrary, these Federal installations occupy land which would usually be occupied by commercial or industrial taxpayers. So that argument is specious. The Joelson amendment calls for 90-percent funding for impacted aid, and although I would prefer to hold out for 100 percent, I recognize the practical aspects of achieving what is acceptable to this body. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Joelson amendment which will demonstrate to the country that we place a high priority on education.

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Joelson amendments to H.R. 13111, the HEW appropriations for fiscal year 1970. In order that programs and facilities may be maintained and expanded, adequate funding must be provided if our educational institutions are to survive under the economic pressure they continually face. Development and expansion of education programs and facilities are essential to the future of our Nation, and must be a top priority if we are to continue to offer quality education to our youth. We must remember that our young people constitute the most precious resource of our Nation.

The impact aid program, with its no strings attached base, is to me the best Federal education program. In my own congressional district, the application of the Joelson amendments would provide an additional \$6 million to Montgomery County schools, thus helping all children. The aid to Howard and Anne Arundel Counties, both of which contain part of my district, is approximately \$1 million.

The title I provision is often overlooked but is extremely important in order to continue our efforts in early education for underprivileged children. In Montgomery County, it aids 12 public schools and three private institutions. Adoption of this amendment, would not only benefit participating institutions but would allow for the expansion of the program to more of our needy children who are not presently participating.

Under the title III section, the Joelson amendments would provide the additional funds which are necessary if facilities are to continue to operate pro-

viding for the development of special skills. For example, in Montgomery County, there are presently four institutions which focus on children with underdeveloped skills, while, at the other end of the spectrum, there are three Montgomery County schools which offer computer-assisted instruction for highly talented children. If each schoolchild is to be offered the opportunity to develop to his full level of potential, these facilities must have proper funding if they are to continue to operate.

In considering the 1970 HEW appropriations, we must bear in mind the overriding importance which education plays in the future of our Nation and its citizens.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of 100-percent funding of Public Law 874.

Today we are again faced with an appropriation bill which fails to recognize the Federal Government's responsibility to make payment in lieu of taxes to the schools attended by children of military and civilian government personnel.

When Public Law 874 was enacted, the Congress acknowledged that such payment is the Federal Government's responsibility. Yet this appropriation bill is, in effect, rewriting the tax law for over 4,000 school districts in this country by eliminating the payment of an obligation the Congress has acknowledged for 20 years.

The theory of payment for category "B" children, those who live in the school districts and whose parents work on Federal property, is that since real property taxes form the base of educational support in this country, and the Federal Government does business in the districts, its working real estate should bear some of the cost of local government, particularly when the Federal activity creates an undue burden on local resources. Children are one of these burdens; they need education. So the Federal Government became, in a sense, a taxpayer in the school districts to help educate the federally connected children.

It is extremely shortsighted to reduce education aid now provided our school districts under Public Law 874 under the assumption that these school districts will be able to make up for the loss of funds through greater local taxation. In nine cases out of 10 the loss will be made up in September by a reduction in the quality of education. It is the children who will suffer the most. Fewer teachers will be hired; the purchase of books will have to be delayed; classes will have to be combined; sabbatical leave for teachers will have to be canceled; and overall belt-tightening will have to take place.

Here we are on the 30th of July, and all school districts have entered into their contracts with teachers and their programs are set for the fall. Imagine the chaos which will be created if they are suddenly denied these funds. In Fairfax County, the loss will be almost \$12 million; in Arlington County it will be \$2,300,000; in Alexandria \$1.5 million, and in Falls Church \$500,000. It will be

virtually impossible for them to make up this loss until next year when the loss will be reflected in an increase in taxes, in an area where property taxes are already among the highest in the Nation. Meanwhile, as I said before, the children will suffer.

The two counties and two cities which I represent spend up to 70 percent of their total budgets on education. The impacted areas program does not come close to defraying the actual additional costs they must shoulder to provide top-quality education to the children of Federal personnel who live and work there.

All of us know that the cost of operating schools has gone up. Local taxes have gone up. Yet this bill virtually eliminates the Federal contribution to these costs in areas like northern Virginia where almost no living accommodations are to be found on Government property, yet thousands of acres are occupied by the Government tax free which would otherwise be assessed real property taxes. This amounts to a declaration by the Congress that the Federal Government will not pay its tax for its land in use in a school district.

Wherever we have a bedroom-type community, such as we have in the Washington suburbs, we do not have the broad tax base to support the demands for capital for construction and other school programs. In order to produce the tax revenues to adequately provide for education, you must have an industrial tax base; a business tax base. Private industry pays that tax but Federal installations do not. Private industry also does not set up PX's as a means for their employees to escape contribution to local sales tax. So, while presence of Federal installations may stimulate the economy in part, it does not do so in the same measure as does private industry.

Finally, there is a matter of good faith involved in the continued funding of this program. The affected school districts rely on the money the program provides to partially defray the burdens placed on them because of large numbers of federally connected children. It is, in fact, a form of aid to military and civilian government personnel and their families. It was designed not to supplant but to augment the educational expenditures of the school districts with large concentrations of Federal employees. The quality of education in these areas must not be allowed to erode by false economy such as is proposed in the elimination of all category "B" children from the program.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the appropriation of all the funds authorized for this program.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to state, at the outset of my own remarks on this bill, that I think we have had a splendid debate on one of the Nation's major areas of disagreement today, and I want to compliment

particularly and commend particularly the very able chairman of the subcommittee, who I think has demonstrated once again that he is one of the great chairmen of this House. I think his statesmanlike recognition of the desire for more debate yesterday was abundant testimony to his ability and his statecraft, and I am certain all Members join in appreciation of that position which was taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) yesterday.

It seems to me, in summing up the situation that prevails at this moment, with all respect to a very able subcommittee and a good basic bill, that was brought to the floor, that there has developed a general agreement in the Committee of the Whole, at least, that there are a number of areas in which we need to increase the amounts allocated to education. At this stage of the game I think we almost have agreement on both sides by most of the participants in the debate that we need to increase the funds for impacted aid, and we need to increase the funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

As a matter of fact, we have amendments offered on both sides that do these things, although more generously in the Joelson amendment.

The Michel amendment takes one small step for closing the breach that is present in this bill and in the priority needs of education today. The Robison amendment to the Michel substitute takes several additional steps. But if you want to take the nine full steps that cover the full picture and that meet not only the needs in the impacted districts and not only the needs in the poorer districts that are reached by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, but also meet the needs in the field of higher education and also meet the needs of your students who have been brought into the educational picture today and encourage many of them to go into college in reliance upon authorized programs for loans and assistance, then you must go the full route with the Joelson amendment. I think it has been documented very well here on the floor today and yesterday during the debate that there is only one measure pending before this body that covers all of the nine steps and covers them with some full recognition of the priority needs of education, and that is the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and I hope it will prevail.

Yesterday I put into the RECORD the remarks of some of the education leaders of the State of Oklahoma about the importance of recognizing some of these aspects of the educational needs that are not covered in the Michel-Robison combination.

For example, I put in the RECORD the statement which was made by the director of financial aid at Panhandle State College down in Oklahoma, and he said this:

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 col-

lege we get a notification from HEW cutting our NDEA allocation 31% from what it was last year. What do we tell the student?

I put into the same RECORD remarks from men in charge of these student loan programs at the University of Oklahoma, at Oklahoma State Tech, and at Oklahoma State University.

They are all facing the same tragic situation. We have encouraged the students, many of them from lower income families, to come to school to try to further their education. We cannot fail to carry out the commitments we put in the authorization to provide the assistance that enables them to follow through with their plans that we ourselves have encouraged.

I say to Members, let us meet the needs in higher education, let us meet the needs in impacted districts, let us meet the needs in the ghetto schools with the full package amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

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

Mr. EDMONDSON. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman has made an excellent statement. As he knows, I have always supported aid to education. However, there is a matter that troubles me, and that is adequate funding of this. How does the gentleman propose to accomplish this? Is he willing to bite the bullet and vote for a tax that will fund it?

Mr. EDMONDSON. If the gentleman from Kentucky is offering a tax that will be dedicated specifically to education, I will vote for it in a minute. He will get my vote for it tomorrow.

Mr. CARTER. I certainly hope so, but I notice the gentleman voted "no" on another tax a short while ago.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, like many in this committee, I am sure, I found it necessary this morning to go back and review the bidding, and I spent about 2 hours reading the very interesting record we compiled on yesterday, to find out precisely where we were in this stage of the proceedings. Believe me, I found the record almost equally as stirring as I did the presentation from the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) yesterday.

But today, unlike many of the men who are taking the well to praise the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) for their very splendid work which they did in this committee, I am not going to proceed then to recommend to this House that we completely dump the work product of that subcommittee. I found it took almost a small wheelbarrow to carry home the other evening the more than 8,000 pages of testimony that had been compiled by their subcommittee. I happen to know they did their work and they did it well.

I see my friend, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. YATES) who will recall when

we debated this very appropriation bill last year he offered an amendment, which I supported at that time, to add \$135 million to title I, to increase the amount that had been recommended in 1968 by the Appropriations Committee, and we did not prevail.

But I want to suggest that a somewhat different situation obtains in the country today. I feel, as my friend from Kentucky Dr. CARTER, suggested a moment ago, that at the very hour when the surtax hangs in the balance on the other side of this Capitol—and we do not know, we literally do not know at this moment whether the \$10 billion involved in that measure is going to be available to meet these demands or not—I think we ought to be very careful before we tell the subcommittee of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOON) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) that we are going to disregard what they have recommended in nine different areas. For the so-called Joelson amendment would add approximately \$900 million in a wide range of educational areas.

I am pragmatic, as they are, and recognize that with respect to these impacted aid people, we are going to have to do something about them. Even as one who has some category 3B students in his district, I agree it is not the best way to disperse Federal aid.

I would agree with the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON). I think he has made a valuable suggestion in offering an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL). But beyond that I simply cannot go, devoted as I am to the cause of education in this country, because of some of the factors that I think as a responsible Member of this body I must entertain regarding the fiscal condition of our country.

If I understood the gentleman from Illinois yesterday, the \$180 million, for example, that is requested by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), in his amendment, that he would tack onto title I, is not needed. The bill reported by the committee does make available full funding, that is, the same funding we had in 1969, and the committee has added another 5.5 percent—am I not correct?—for the increased cost of education, and the funding provided for will take care of that 250,000 students who would be added to title I rolls because of updating of the AFDC formula. We do not have to be afraid that we are shortchanging the disadvantaged children of this country under title I.

I would suggest that in all prudence, in sound judgment, we ought to adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) as I hope it will be amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I wish to add my support to

the package amendment to H.R. 13111, sponsored by Representative JOELSON.

The amendment provides for adequate funding of our children's educational needs. The bill, as it now reads, does not. It assumes that, although the price of everything else in the country has gone up, education costs have remained the same.

Educational requirements and costs have not remained the same. When the price of labor and steel and brick goes up so does the cost of construction and equipment for schools and libraries.

Because of insufficient tax bases, local school districts across the country, urban and rural, are unable to finance the programs necessary to provide a truly adequate modern education. As a result President Nixon's task force on education has reported a dramatic increase in the Federal Government's responsibility in education. It also reported that the American people expect and demand that "vastly enhanced Federal role." Thus, the task force found that education "has become clearly established as a top concern of the National Government."

I would remind you that a child entering grade school today will live and work a substantial portion of his adult life in the 21st century. It will not be possible for an adult to succeed in the future if we fail to provide the necessary educational resources. We will need engineers to develop our expanding space and industrial development as well as provide the vast array of goods demanded and required by consumers. We will need, and, in fact, need today, more doctors to care for the health needs of an expanding population. We could not have put an American on the moon had we scrimped on education in the past. Nor can we assure ourselves of any success in the future, whatever the enterprise, whether in space or on earth, if we fail to adequately provide educational facilities for today's students. Whatever the occupation, in order to function in tomorrow's world, students cannot get by on reduced educational priorities.

There are people who tell us it is not economically feasible to provide more funds for educational needs. They are wrong. We have won a race to put a man on the moon. And we have come up from behind to do it. This, too, we were told, was an impossible task, one which was supposedly not economically feasible. Yet we found the will and the resources to carry it off. If we are capable of stepping on the moon and circling mars, then we are also surely capable of providing for our less spectacular but no less crucial educational priorities.

The Joelson amendment will provide sufficient funds, consistent with economic priorities, to continue the crucial business of education. Failure to provide these funds will mean that our children will learn a little less than they need to; libraries will not be built and students will read a little less than they need to; there will be fewer loans to college students and fewer scientists, fewer doctors and fewer teachers. Failure to provide the funds will mean the country will be a little less equipped than we need to be. I find that unacceptable and urge that

my colleagues support the Joelson amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I, too, rise in support of the Joelson amendment.

I am somewhat surprised by some of the rhetoric—actually I am not surprised, except in the sense I would think that the memories of some people would be better.

Do those who fear enlarging, as the Joelson amendment would, and quite properly so, the expenditures for education, make any reference to a \$3 billion surplus? Is the surtax to be the end of all reason here?

Yesterday the distinguished minority leader, who is a great friend of mine, and I hope he will remain one, characterized those of us who support the Joelson amendment as being irrational, inconsistent, and irresponsible, and he connected it with the vote on the surtax.

I did not hear him talking about the inconsistency of those who voted against the surtax last year and for it this year.

I did not hear him talk about the irresponsibility of those who have consistently voted against Federal aid to education at every level, and are now its pious advocates, albeit parsimonious ones.

No; I believe that consistency demands support of the Joelson amendment. It is the responsible thing to do. It is not irresponsible in the slightest.

It is all well, as the gentleman from Minnesota said, "Why, let us just take this one thing at a time; take the Michel amendment and pass it, and then we can act on each of the others."

Let me warn you that there is an awful lot more in this legislation than impacted areas. If, indeed, anything were to go it should be this carrot. The other things are more important, even though I consider Public Laws 815 and 874 important.

The fact of the matter is that the opponents of the Joelson amendment would weaken the position of those of us who are consistent advocates of Federal aid to education at every level, because with impact aid out of the way they can chop away at will at the other sections.

I do not say that the gentleman from Minnesota would not support additional money for vocational education. I am sure he would. But I am not sure what he would do in other areas.

Here we have one reasonable, rational package. I might say in passing, I consider it to be a bit too modest, but like the minority leader I am a pragmatist. I am a pragmatist, however, in seeing my interests across the board.

I do not question the motives of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) or of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON). I believe they are very sound in their thinking, from their point of view. I just happen not to agree with their point of view, and I believe it is absolutely imperative that the amendments be defeated and that the Joelson amendment be adopted in the interest of rationality, of consistency and of responsibility.

I call your attention to the \$33 million appropriations increase requested for

construction of higher education facilities. The amount requested, \$33 million, would bring this year's appropriation up to last year's figure. Although the anti-inflation measures undertaken by this administration are appreciated by each of us, we cannot afford to be shortsighted: a farmer may feel hard put to buy grain to feed his geese—but when they lay golden eggs, as indeed education does, he cannot afford not to feed them. I suggest we cannot afford not to appropriate these funds for college construction. Budget cuts in this particular area would be at the cost of cramped quarters in the college classroom, antiquated buildings and equipment, and, in fact, turning away many eager students who would otherwise be contributing to society—the very same society that is now bemoaning the lack of participation by our youth for the betterment of all.

It is not necessary to list the many institutions of higher education which need budget allocations for their facilities. You are just as aware as I that colleges are in dire straits because of inadequate housing, classrooms, and labs. There is no justification whatever for a cut in this budget area. We are not seeking the impossible, we are seeking only the very same amount of money that you and I passed last year. Consider the number of new students applying to our colleges, consider the amount of students now enrolled in our colleges, and then consider the amount of \$33 million and how far that money will go toward alleviating the pressures of enrollment. What would happen, my colleagues, if less than last year's appropriation was passed, indeed, if not \$1 of last year's appropriation was passed. It is imperative that at least an amount equal to last year's is appropriated. Each of you know it should be half again as much as \$33 million, but most certainly, it should be equal.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment to restore funds desperately needed in the educational field. As I said in testimony before the Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare in May:

I come here because I am deeply concerned about the future of education in this country. We all know of the financial crisis of our urban area schools. We know of the increasing demand for higher education—and the strained resources of our colleges. At the very time when our educational needs are greater than ever before the budget you have before you recommends a decrease of \$500,000,000 in Office of Education appropriations for next year. At a time when primary and secondary enrollments are increasing 2 percent per year and when college enrollments are increasing 8 percent each year the present budget contemplates decreasing Office of Education expenditures by 14 percent next year. This increased enrollment tells only part of the increased need for finances in education since cost of instruction per student also grows markedly each year. At a time when the weak and inflexible tax base of state and local governments are burdened to the breaking point, the budget sent to Congress shifts an increasing burden to state and local governments. All of this is occurring in the context of unprecedented prosperity. Our Gross National Product is higher than it has ever been. I have no doubt that this nation can afford increasing expenditures in education. I think we owe our children the best

possible education. This budget does not provide for that kind of education.

I fear that if these cuts are permitted to stand the quality of education provided our students will decrease, the ability of schools and colleges to keep up with changing technological needs will diminish, the creation of new capacity to educate burgeoning enrollments will suffer, and the quality of educational opportunity will be impaired. I also fear that if we short-change our educational needs at this point in history, we will pay for it many times over in the future. I believe deeply that these are not expenses that we can defer. A year of lost opportunity in education can never be regained. A year of substandard instruction can never be corrected. Our neglect now will haunt us in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I note with pleasure that the committee has restored some of the cuts which I mentioned in my testimony such as the \$35 million in grants for public libraries under title I of the Library Service and Construction Act; also the restoration of \$1 million for acquisition and cataloging by the Library of Congress to a total of \$5.5 million even though this is below the present operational level and \$1.8 million below the amount requested by President Johnson. I am also pleased that the committee has raised funds for student loans under title II of the National Defense Education Act from the totally inadequate \$155 million requested by President Nixon to \$181.3 million.

But other cuts that remain in the bill are of disastrous proportions, in my judgment. The dismantling of the Federal impacted aid program to eliminate funds under section 3(b) for children whose parents work, but do not live, on Federal property. This would be an enormous cut of \$318,694,000 from \$521 million appropriated last year to \$202 million in the current bill.

This established Federal program has, through the years, provided much-needed Federal assistance to many local school districts throughout the country. It has been especially useful in providing small- and middle-sized communities with the assistance necessary to provide an educational program for children whose parents worked on Federal property. Where these children comprised a large percentage of the school-age population, and where enrollments were subject to rapid fluctuation, this aid was, and is, indispensable to providing an educational program. In 1970, under present formulas, the State of New Jersey qualifies for \$15,350,000 of this aid. Under the budget proposals the school districts in the State will receive \$4,200,000. In practical terms this means that many districts in the State are likely to fail completely. And others will have to operate severely curtailed programs in order to stay in operation. Nationally, the budget proposes to reduce this year's appropriation from \$505,900,000 to \$187,000,000. If these cuts are accepted, and the remaining money is distributed in accordance with administration plans, it will mean that this assistance will be paid on 400,000 students next year. This compares with 2,400,000 this year. If the aid is distributed under the same formula next year as it was this year, it will mean that schools will receive about 25 cents next year for every \$1 they receive this year.

I believe that this aid must continue. School districts have come to depend upon it. It means the difference in local schools and no local school in hundreds of school districts. In others it means the difference in providing good and poor instruction. It must be continued.

Funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs for textbooks, resources, and other education instructional materials, supplementary educational services, guidance, counseling, and testing have been cut from \$310 million appropriated for fiscal 1969 to only \$200 million in the present bill. Such a destructive reduction in these programs that have proved to be so important in carrying out the purposes of the ESEA Act must not be allowed to stand.

Mr. Chairman, equally destructive are the proposed cuts in the higher education programs. The committee report states that the \$785.8 million recommended is an increase of \$5 million over the budget request. What it does not spell out is that it is \$5 million higher than the woefully inadequate Nixon budget request but actually is \$112 million less than the amount requested by President Johnson in January.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the time to cut back on our national educational commitment to our children and young people. These funds must be restored or they will result in irreparable damage in the educational processes. Public funds spent on educational programs are necessary investments in the future of our Nation. We must keep faith with this generation that will play such a vital role in America's future. Let us vote for the amendment to increase the funds so desperately needed for education.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that in the discussion which has taken place over the last several hours on this floor yesterday and now in the several hours which have transpired already this afternoon we have bandied words and amendments around so thoroughly that some of us really do not understand exactly where we are. May I review that very briefly and then make comment on the specifics.

We have an amendment introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) which deals with some nine different sections of appropriations. Then there was an amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) which would be in effect a replacement for the Joelson amendment, and it dealt only with the question of impact aid.

At that stage, if the Michel amendment had succeeded, everything else in the Joelson amendment would have come out and it would have covered just impact aid. Then the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) made an addition to the Michel amendment which added to impact aid four particular sections of ESEA and NDEA. If the Robison amendment passes, there will be an amendment to Michel, and Michel will then come before us in contradiction or in opposition to the Joelson amendment. At that point we will have a chance to

choose. Do we take this four-piece package plus impact aid and substitute it for what Mr. JOELSON recommended in covering his nine particular points? If that Robison-Michel package is then substituted for Joelson and that substitute passes, we have not foreclosed dealing with the problems of higher education; we have not foreclosed dealing with the matter of vocational education; we will not be precluded from facing those questions one at a time as they come along.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with that picture before you, may I say just a word about the specifics.

So far as impact aid is concerned, no one who votes for the Robison-Michel package need worry about cutting impact aid. The bill which is before you, the basic appropriation bill, deals only with some \$202 million for this program. The Michel amendment would add to that an additional \$303 million. So it is a major move in the direction of increasing aid to impacted areas. It puts this aid back at the level that it was last year, which, as I repeat, is some 300-plus million dollars over what is in the appropriation bill at the present time. So you do not have to worry about whether you are undercutting impact aid.

Now, so far as the amendment of the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) is concerned, he is here talking about taking a step in the direction that we took when we in this House passed H.R. 514 some time ago. I have listened to my esteemed chairman make the distinction between State plans and whether we will give up our rights here on the floor and go to the Office of Education and let them make allocations as between these subjects. Ladies and gentlemen, when we passed H.R. 514, and when my colleague from Oregon made the amendment to put together four different sections of ESEA and NDEA, we were taking a significant step away from narrow categorical aid.

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Not at this time.

We were dealing here with the situation of putting four categories of educational aid together, which would permit flexibility in moving funds back and forth between four different areas which are essentially similar. The question is at the present time whether we want to leave this type aid in four narrow categories. Do we want somebody to have the choice to move funds back and forth between categories as a preliminary to what is going to happen in 1971 when the choice will be in the States?

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

Mr. DELLENBACK. Not at this time.

Under the Robison amendment, in that intervening year of 1970 there will be flexibility. The flexibility will admittedly be in the hands of the Office of Education instead of in the States, but it is a step in the proper direction and there is nothing to preclude the Office of Education from recognizing that, if H.R. 514 becomes law, then next year the choice will be out of its hands completely and the choice in moving

funds between these four areas will be in the hands of the States. There is nothing to stop the Office of Education in that intervening year from moving in the direction of listening to the States and moving in this particular direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(Mr. DELLENBACK asked and was given permission to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. DELLENBACK. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Oregon does not want to leave a false impression on the membership of this body, I am sure.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Certainly not.

Mr. PERKINS. It is true that the amendment to H.R. 514 offered by your colleague to put discretion in the hands of the States does not take effect until 1971.

But now there is no assurance that that amendment will become law. H.R. 514 has not ever been reported by the Senate committee. No one knows what the other body will do and then there will be the conference. But here we do something diametrically opposed. The committee bill, H.R. 13111, and the Michel amendment, both place discretion in the hands of the Office of Education to allocate funds between the library, the equipment, the counseling, and the title III programs. What assurance do we have that any of these programs will survive?

Mr. DELLENBACK. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what I have previously said on this particular point and to point out additional problems with which we are involved. These four titles, which have been enacted as separate categorical groupings, are similar.

These areas of aid should not be kept in narrow boxes. They should be placed together and the funds be made available to the four areas together.

Mr. Chairman, we should go along with the Robison amendment by putting these areas together and leave the discretion as to how the funds should be used in the Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this body to adopt the Robison amendment as a first step. Second, then adopt the Michel amendment. Third, since the adoption of the Michel amendment will have replaced the proposals offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), then I would suggest the adoption of the amended Joelson proposal.

From then on go from page 26 of this bill and increase funds for vocational education and make such other increases as we think are important.

Mr. Chairman, let us not get lost in the forest. By following this procedure we will be able to do for education what we should be doing for education.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. The chairman of the authorizing committee, the gentleman

from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS), indicated that the Office of Education is against the library program and the equipment program as well as the supplemental centers and guidance counseling. They cannot be against all four in my opinion.

Mr. DELLENBACK. The vote and the procedure which I have outlined will have all of these programs continued and will aid the impact areas and thereby we will be acting in a responsible manner.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday the distinguished chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations told us, to quote him, that the impacted areas program was "indefensible," although he planned nonetheless to support the appropriation. And, yesterday also the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) said that the impacted areas program represented a "bonanza," which he said he nonetheless planned to support.

I rise now in support of the Joelson amendment. I do so both because I believe it is defensible and that it does not represent a bonanza. Rather, the Joelson amendment contains a much needed increase in funds for a wide spectrum of educational programs in this country, increases that are not provided in the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) or in the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON).

You know, Mr. Chairman, I was just looking at some interesting figures, interesting in view of the fact that we have heard a great deal here this week about fiscal responsibility. I notice that the U.S. Treasury pays a net of \$1.2 billion in direct subsidies to cotton and wheat farmers in this country. We are only asking in the Joelson amendment for an increase for the education of the people of our country of a little less than \$895 million. That figure represents an increase of less than the subsidies which we pay to producers of cotton and wheat. Surely, the education of the young people of our country ought to be worth at least an added investment of similar magnitude.

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year I said on the floor of the House that President Nixon was due congratulations on his having appointed Mr. Finch as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and on his having appointed Mr. Allen as the Commissioner of Education, because both those men are widely known and respected for their commitment to education.

At the same time, I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete text of then President-Elect Nixon's education task force. I would hope very much that as we reflect upon what we do here today, we pay some attention to the recommendations of Mr. Nixon's education task force, for they move in precisely the direction of the Joelson amendment, and certainly not in the direction of other amendments that have been offered.

Let me recall to your minds a pledge made by Mr. Nixon in the campaign last year. He said—and I am quoting the President:

When we talk about cutting the expense of Government—either federal, state, or local—the one area we cannot shortchange is education at all levels, seeing to it that young Americans are the best educated in the world; that education is available to all our people, that those who do not have an equal chance at the starting line will achieve equal opportunity. This must be our fundamental objective and our path to the realization of the American dream . . .

Now, I just want to help the President carry out his campaign pledge.

Mr. Nixon made another campaign pledge last year, I would like to say to the distinguished minority leader, if he were here, to oppose extension of the surtax, but perhaps we can forgive the President for that particular change of position. However, especially since he has been so interested in seeing and hailing, as all of us have been, the results of the efforts of the last several years to place a man on the moon, I would think the President would want all the help he can get in helping put more of our young people in the schools, colleges and universities where they gain the knowledge essential to this and other achievements in our society.

Mr. Chairman, President Nixon has warned us not to shortchange the young people of our country by cutting back on funds for education, but he then recommended a budget that would do just that.

According to estimates, President Nixon's budget request for education programs administered by the Office of Education for fiscal year 1970 are approximately \$370 million below President Johnson's recommendation for the same fiscal year.

Moreover, the Nixon budget is some \$5 billion below levels authorized by Congress.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill which we are today considering adds some \$123 million to President Nixon's request, but it is still a woefully inadequate bill, as I am confident the action of the House of Representatives will make dramatically clear.

In other words, the bill before us today still "shortchanges" American education, something Mr. Nixon said he wanted to avoid.

Mr. Chairman, my own home State of Indiana offers some graphic examples of the way in which President Nixon's education proposals shortchange American young people. The Johnson administration recommended that Indiana receive \$1,080,789 for library resources under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; this year Indiana is to receive nothing at all if the present administration's request is upheld.

The Johnson administration request was \$4,181,310 for Indiana under title III of Elementary and Secondary Education Act for supplementary educational centers and services; the Nixon request has cut that budget almost \$1.5 million to \$2,766,361.

Indiana's impacted area estimate was \$2,491,000 under the previous adminis-

tration; the Nixon request cuts that by over 60 percent to \$982,000.

Our college work-study, educational opportunity grant, and NDEA college student loans have been similarly cut; this is particularly interesting in view of the recommendations made by the President's task force. The report said:

We are agreed that the present Federal program of basic Educational Opportunity Grants . . . is a good program and should continue with increased funding.

Mr. Chairman, let me also cite here that the Nixon education task force said of national defense student loans and college work-study:

Funds available for National Defense Student Loans and Work-Study are slightly larger than for 1969-70 than they were for 1968-69, but it seems certain that they will fall far short of the need. We know that overall college enrollment will increase; that there will be a more than usual increase from very low income groups. In addition, college costs have risen and there is an increase in the allowance for legislative costs.

Mr. Chairman, the costs in these last programs are particularly tragic since they strike directly at the colleges' ability to provide help for students who need financial aid in order to reach college at all. The colleges in my own district, for example, will be forced to inform large numbers of students that their financial aid will have to be discontinued. The University of Notre Dame was to receive approximately \$594,000 for NDEA loans; the estimated allocation is less than half that—\$267,000.

Goshen College, in Goshen, will have its allocation for the same program cut from \$131,000 to \$58,000.

St. Mary's College will have a cut-back in its EOG allocation from \$40,000 to \$30,000.

Similar cuts will have to be made at Purdue, Bethel College, and Grace Theological Seminary.

Mr. Chairman, these cuts curtail in the most cruel way the programs which are now enabling needy youth to attend college. They fly in the face of all of the recommendations of the President's task force, leading educators, and commentators on the educational scene.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, I strongly support the amendment of Mr. Joelson which would increase the appropriation under H.R. 13111 by \$894.5 million. His amendment would offer increases in the most essential education programs, including impacted aid, vocational education, ESEA titles I, II, and III, NDEA titles II, III, and IV, and title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act.

Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this amendment. I am confident, the spirit of most if not all of the members of President Nixon's Education Task Force. To do anything else would shortchange our most vital educational programs and thereby shortchange our Nation's most valuable resource—educated men and women.

Let me just observe, Mr. Chairman, in response to some of the points that have been made about the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON)—and I appreciate that he wants to increase funds for several programs—but my friend from Oregon (Mr.

DELLENBACK) is dead wrong when he tries to tell us that there is not much difference among the several programs that are included in the Robison amendment. For example, there is clearly a great difference in the program for guidance and counseling from the program for school libraries. If you do not believe it, ask any school librarian. Indeed, I want to say that those who support the Michel amendment, which provides no money for libraries, and those who support the Robison amendment, which lumps libraries in with three other programs, and earmarks not 1 cent for them, are driving a knife in the back of every school library in this country. Members should know that when they vote on these amendments.

Mr. Chairman, I think that we ought to seize the opportunity contained in the Joelson amendment as a golden one, and one which will not come again for a long, long time. Let us not "short-change," to quote Mr. Nixon from his campaign of last year, the education of the young people of our country.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the Robison amendment is defeated, I hope the Michel amendment is defeated, and I hope that we have very strong bipartisan support for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMANS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the Appropriations Committee's proposal offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). I oppose the amendments being offered to destroy Mr. JOELSON's effort to keep the past promises made by Congress to the American people.

Mr. Chairman, the events of recent weeks, the adventure of Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins have proved that the old adage, "the sky is the limit" is a false cliché. We can, as a nation, do almost anything we want to—if we want to badly enough. We have opened vistas for the next generation that challenge the imagination—and also challenge us as the custodians of the public purse to properly husband our resources so that the promise of the future can be achieved.

The most essential factor in the formula for the future is the mental capacity of our children and youth. This is an idea which Congress has supported by enacting far-reaching programs for education at all levels. But Congress by enactment of authorizations without accompanying appropriations has been a shameful hoax on the taxpayers of this country, and indeed, the next generation. We cannot, in good conscience, make promises on the one hand and on the other hand shortchange and cut back education by these programs.

Compared to the astronomical costs of the defense program—and I do not mean those costs directly supporting our fighting men which I support—the increase

proposed in the Joelson amendment is modest, indeed.

There is no more important work for the Congress than our duty to insure that future generations have the intellectual capacity to cope with the challenging world of tomorrow that we have erected for them. They cannot meet this challenge without an opportunity to develop their minds, their skills and their spirits to the fullest extent.

The amendment by Mr. JOELSON provides additional funds beyond those proposed by the Appropriations Committee for such programs as vocational education, aid for low-income children, library and textbook materials, guidance and counseling, educational equipment, increased student loan funds, and a substantial increase in impact aid.

The people of my district—educators, school board members, college officials, and most of all, parents—support increased funds for education. These are responsible, intelligent people who are aware of the dangers of inflation which concerns us all. They believe, as I do, that the children and youth of this country cannot be sacrificed on the altar of false economy. Let us use a small portion of the amount we spend in the defense and other hardware budgets to provide for an investment in the most essential factor in the formula for a bright future for our Nation—the minds of our children and youth.

Mr. Chairman, the children and youth of this Nation, as well as their taxpaying parents, were promised meaningful help from the Congress of the United States when we passed the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965 and its amendments of 1966, 1967, 1968, and again in 1969—just a few weeks ago—each time by an overwhelming vote.

We cannot now renege on those promises by failing to provide adequate funds to implement this and such other laws as the National Defense Education Act, the Higher Education Act, the Vocational Education Act, and the Library Services Act.

The Joelson amendment to H.R. 13111 will come closer to meeting these commitments to the education of our young people than will the bill before us presented by the Appropriations Committee. It is the very least we can honorably do. I urge my colleagues to support the increased funding as proposed in the Joelson amendment, and urge you vote "no" on the Michel amendment which is really intended to defeat the purposes of the carefully constructed and responsible compromise in the allocation of limited educational funds contained in the Joelson amendment.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the issue today before this House I think is relatively simple. I know the hour is late, and I will try to be brief.

Basically, the past administration shockingly cut the funds for education contrary to the leadership of the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) and other members of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The present administration, with the one exception of title I, has not done much better.

I might say that I would like to compliment the Committee on Appropriations for trying to add some additional funds.

But having said that, Mr. Chairman, the fact is—and I want to mention just a few numbers, very simply—that the present bill has zero funds—zero funds—for direct loans for construction of undergraduate academic facilities. It has only 62 percent of the authorization for NDEA student loans, 38 percent of the authorization for ESEA title I, and 21 percent of the combined authorizations of ESEA titles II and III, and NDEA title III-A, and NDEA title V-A.

I strongly support the entire package proposed in the Joelson amendment, but I would single out a few elements that I think are particularly important.

First, the budget did not request any funds for title II of ESEA, school library programs. I commend the committee for including this as one of four programs which were to share an appropriation of \$200,163,000. But to divide \$200 million among four deserving programs is bound to result in a scramble for their distribution—especially if the Office of Education does not yet have the administrative machinery for joint administration and allocation of funds. Thus, I strongly urge that the \$50 million proposed in the Joelson amendment for school library programs be approved. Title II has meant a great deal to many schools which have been able to augment—and in some cases just start—their libraries to the benefit of all children. For parochial schools, especially, title II has been a source of funding that frees scarce cash for other educational expenses.

Second, the increase in funds for the NDEA student loan program is necessary per se but is even more urgently needed because of the inadequacy of the guaranteed loan program. Banks are reluctant to make loans at the 7-percent rate when a better return is available on other types of investment, and the tight money market makes any loan difficult to get. Thus, many students, especially those in their first year of college, will find that guaranteed loans just are not available and they will have to look for other sources of funding. I am hopeful that the additional NDEA loan funds made available in this amendment will help to meet this need.

Third, the package amendment provides \$33 million for construction of undergraduate academic facilities under the Higher Education Facilities Act. As I mentioned, the administration had not requested any funds for this program, relying instead on the interest subsidy program that was established last year in the higher education amendments. Direct loans funds were provided for junior colleges only. The need to continue the building program in 4-year colleges is, to say the least, extremely pressing, especially if increased enrollments are to be accommodated. In addition, the construction credit market is tight, and there is little reason to believe that the

interest subsidy program will make it easier to obtain commercial financing for such projects.

Put very simply, our Nation is clearly defaulting in a major and irresponsible way on adequate support for elementary and higher education. We are doing it at a time when there is a shortage of 2 million teachers in the United States; at a time when there are at least 400,000 classrooms which should be built; at a time when a majority of our 2-year colleges lack adequate books and when a number of our 4-year colleges lack the necessary library resources.

Accordingly, I do not believe this Congress will be living up to its responsibilities or come anywhere near living up to its responsibilities unless it unequivocally supports the Joelson amendment without modification.

I think it is essential that it be supported. I think this is a national requirement and a national imperative.

In short, this package amendment seeks to remedy a basic gap in the logic behind the requests for education programs. On the one hand, the call is heard for increased enrollments, for more and better teachers; on the other, we reduce the funds available to provide equipment and services to the new pupils and to train the teachers. Clearly, this is counterproductive; the only way to set the matter straight now is to support the Joelson amendment.

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

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First of all, I want to express my gratitude—and the gratitude of a very large number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to the invaluable Representative from New York (Mr. REID), for his heroic efforts to make at least the opportunity for a decent education available to all Americans. There is no way to measure his contribution to the overall effort to make America a place where there is in fact liberty and justice for all, because it is a contribution that is made more often away from the spotlight than in it, and because his own courage and energy inspire countless others to behave much better than they would otherwise have considered possible. Much that I want to say today will sound like an echo of what he has been saying, but it is no cause for sadness or reappraisal to find oneself echoing the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. Chairman, I hope we are at last about to begin the endlessly discussed process of what has come to be called reordering the national priorities. I hope we are about to witness a great rising of the majority of the members of both parties against the dangerous notion that this country cannot afford even minimum sums of money to assist education to attain even the standards regarded as minimal in years past. What this country cannot, in fact, afford is to go on neglecting its young people—its future, Mr. Chairman. If we care about that future, Mr. Chairman, we will vote today the additional funds necessary to repair at least to minimum standards.

Educational needs are nondeferrable. You cannot recapture a year of lost schooling, a year without access to library services. Students who cannot get loans and so cannot continue their education will presumably be less productive citizens, less creative, more dubious about the equality of opportunity that is their proclaimed right as Americans, and thus perhaps more dubious about America itself.

Some proclaim "economy" and say that means we cannot do more than the unamended bill proposes. "Economy," "economy"—what crimes are committed in thy hallowed name, O economy.

Now do we really believe that education makes life more worthwhile? Does a good education really help develop the potential of those who enjoy it? If so, what kind of "economy" is it to make life less worthwhile for thousands of people, to decrease the potential for earning—if you want to talk in dollars and cents—of countless thousands of young people, by countless billions of dollars? What is it we are saving when we waste some of the best talent in America by shutting it off from the opportunity to develop at its most critical moment?

Is it in the interest of economy—or of the economy—to spend our great national wealth in such a way that goodness knows how many people will end up in institutions or on welfare instead of doing productive work, living creative lives—and paying substantial taxes? Fie on Benjamin Franklin and his stitch in time. Better by far to take no stitch at all until the fabric of our national well-being unravels.

In fact, we should tell Benjamin Franklin that we cannot afford a stitch, at least not a stitch for our own kids. Billions for weapon overruns—lectures about economy for libraries. Billions to impose unpopular governments in far-off places—penury for our young and disadvantaged, so we can make our own Government as unpopular among millions of its own people.

Are we really going to approve legislation that will allow funds to implement title I of ESEA to be lost in the shuffle, so that the very areas most in need of assistance—the children already disadvantaged, God knows, through no fault of their own—are penalized yet again?

We can do much better than this—much better than we have been doing lately—and we can begin doing it right now. The remarkable diligence and skill with which the gentleman from New Jersey has put together what we celebrate today as the "Joelson package" has given us the opportunity to make what would be the most responsible statement to come from this House in many years.

We are promised that next week we will have an opportunity to make more equitable the way we collect the money we spend, an opportunity to distribute the burden of financing the national needs so all pay their fair share. Today we can begin to make an equally basic change—a change in how we spend what money we do collect. Success today will strengthen our hand for the battle next week, and success then will strengthen our hand for the battles still ahead.

The colossus that is America cannot be turned around by one vote, or in one day, or by one program. But if we are to reverse the lockstep that has already brought us to such wide grief as a nation we must begin somewhere, sometime. There is no place better to begin than here, and no time better than now.

Much more is at stake in the voting on these amendments than the specific sums of money involved. There are, of course, the lives of so many young people. But beyond even these lives, there is the question of what we can and cannot "afford" to do as a nation—the question of national priorities—the question of how we are to expend our resources. And the answer to that question will, of course, affect the well-being of every single American, and for that matter the well-being of much of the world.

I hope the House will want its voice to be heard on this question. I hope it will say "No" to continuing the stampede of waste—of resources, of time, above all of lives—that has driven so great a wedge between the promises of America and her performance. I will be grateful and proud to have the opportunity to be a small part of that voice when it learns its own strength and speaks its own mind. I hope it starts to do that today. The hour is already very late.

Mr. REID of New York. I thank the gentleman for his very real contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I would point out also that the Joelson amendment does include additional funds for title I of ESEA, which is one of the most important titles. But even at that, it would be funded at only 44 percent of the authorization. I hope more Members will be willing to stand up for 100 percent funding, consistent with the judgment of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is time that the Members of the House supported the Committee on Education and Labor in this area.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New York, and concur in his remarks.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) is a simple amendment—all it does is scuttle the Joelson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey.

This "package" proposal is the very least by which we should increase this appropriations measure. I know many of us would like to see aid to education doubled or tripled at the least, but I am hopeful that this proposal will meet with my colleagues' approval.

The distinguished gentleman has eloquently and clearly explained the need for this increase. There is little more that can be said, but I want to take a few minutes to emphasize the importance of increasing aid to education.

Almost every week I read another article documenting the importance of education, particularly elementary educa-

tion. Each year we spend billions and billions of dollars on the military. Yet, what greater strength can a nation have than an educated, productive, aware citizenry. The educated person is the greatest asset this Nation has.

Can we afford to ignore the educational needs of this Nation? Can we, as a nation, afford to allow children to grow to adulthood without teaching them skills, without helping them develop to the height of their potential? Can we afford to produce young adults who cannot read, dropouts who do not have enough basic education to even learn a trade? We cannot.

The Nation's strength is in its people—in all its people; by denying the best possible education to our children, we deny the contributions of the next generation.

Where could this money be spent better? I can think of only a few things that compare in importance—those things which a man needs to survive—food and shelter, and those programs, too, Mr. Chairman are not being adequately funded.

Where is this money being spent? In the tragic, destructive morass of Vietnam? On bigger weapons systems that will destroy our enemies and ourselves 10 times over?

The Defense Department estimates that, in 1968, 181,000 North Vietnamese and Vietcong were killed in the war. We spent about \$28 billion on the war in Vietnam that year. In a sense, we spent \$154,000 on each dead Vietnamese enemy.

In that same year we spent \$3.2 billion on elementary and secondary education. There were 45 million pupils enrolled in public elementary and secondary schools. That is \$71 a pupil to bring about a more productive life.

Compare that to \$154,000 to take a life. This is senseless, this is tragic.

I have heard much about economy, about priorities. I still do not know the priorities of this administration, for in July of 1969 we have still seen only a handful of programs offered, but I have seen the economy, and it is false economy.

Can we cut back on the education of our children and call it an economic measure? Our population is growing. There are more and more children in school. Programs, worthwhile, successful, productive programs have been begun. Do we now cut funds, end programs?

There are those who say we can fund in the future, when the country is in better economic shape. Will these children benefit later? No.

Other children may learn, but those who are bypassed now are bypassed for life. Unless, of course, we are willing to spend billions more on remedial education, retraining, adult education.

Is it not better to prevent these problems than to have to cure them in the future?

I see economy in the gentleman's amendment. It is a modest amendment that will for the most part bring appropriation levels to that of last year. Five of the nine items will solely do that. Another will provide funds for 90 percent of the authorization which we passed. A

sixth will provide additional funds to meet urgent needs in vocational education. Urgent because the jobs are there, looking for trained people, and there because we have not in the past provided sufficient funds for vocational education.

Another increase will help meet the increased demand for student loans—loans, not grants—because there are more and more students willing to go into debt in order to acquire an education.

The last item will meet the increased program costs and provide funds needed because of prior action by the Congress.

This is a modest measure. I would like to see much more go to education.

As I have said, where better could we spend this money? This is an investment, an investment in the Nation's future. We will need an educated and trained population to take care of the Nation's future needs, to provide the Nation's growth.

I cannot understand reductions in this field. This cannot wait. The students will be returning to school in a little more than a month. Do we ask them to wait for another year? Do we tell them that books will come next year? Do we tell them we cannot counsel them?

The answer to these questions must be "No." Even with this amendment these programs will be badly underfunded. But to do less than this would be criminal, it would be foolish. No purpose is served by limiting education. The funds we fail to provide this year, we will have to provide in the future. Only then it will be tenfold, and it may be too late.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REID of New York. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID) on his excellent statement and I concur in all that he has said.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we have all heard that the youth of this Nation is telling us something. What they really are saying to us—in all their protest and moral exuberance—is quite simple. This system is not worth saving unless it can work; unless it can end injustice, and poverty, and racism, and war; unless it can reform itself to meet the just demands and expectations of the people.

This is what our forefathers believed when they fought a revolution with England. This is what they were fighting for—the English political system was neither responsive nor willing to be responsive to the demands of the colonists. And this is what is happening in this country today. It is the old compact theory of government all over again; the same compact theory we learned when we were in school, enunciated by John Locke's "Second Treatise of Government" and incorporated by Thomas Jefferson in the Declaration of Independence. As Howard Zinn, professor of political science at Boston University, put

it in his brilliant book, "Disobedience and Democracy":

Governments are instituted among men for certain ends; . . . among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; . . . whenever a government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it. The government is not synonymous with the people of the nation; it is an artificial device, set up by the citizens for certain purposes. It is endowed with no sacred aura; rather, it needs to be watched, scrutinized, criticized, opposed, changed, and even overthrown and replaced when necessary.

We, Mr. Chairman, are being "watched, scrutinized, criticized and opposed" by the youth of this Nation, and, more important, we had better change, we had better show them that this system can work, or we are likely to be "overthrown and replaced."

All of this may sound to some as just the old standard liberal rhetoric. High flown, philosophical, absolutely unrelated to "real life." But the college students, by their militance, have clearly demonstrated to us that they are deadly serious. They really believe in the political theories that we mouth so freely, and they mean to force us to live by our espoused values.

Today, we in the House are discussing an education and labor bill closely watched by the college students. We know the urgent educational needs of America, or at least we have been told innumerable times about them. But this bill seems to fulfill the Biblical quotation:

They have eyes to see, but they see not; ears to hear, but they hear not.

In spite of rising enrollments and rising costs, the bill before us is essentially the same that the House passed last year.

Are we really so ignorant that we do not realize what a bill of this sort means? The low appropriation of money and the ominous Whitten amendment together discriminate against the poor student directly, and, especially when this is coupled with the so-called student unrest amendment, the bill oppresses all students. Let us not deceive ourselves, ladies and gentlemen—the students are not going to acquiesce in this regressive legislation. They have watched and scrutinized; they are not criticizing and opposing. Are we going to force them to overthrow and replace?

The Joelson amendment would partially correct this sad state of affairs. While it is insufficient, at least it is a step in the right direction. It would appropriate more funds to critical problems. It would also indicate to students that in spite of tight budgetary pressures, the Congress of the United States gives high priority to the education of young people.

Our own House Internal Security Committee and our brothers in the Senate have been conducting lengthy hearings on the Students for a Democratic Society and other radical collegiate groups.

It is fashionable to speak these days about reordering our national priorities. Wonderful. The question is, are we willing to put our money where our mouth

is—literally? This bill implies that we are not.

I appeal to you to join me in voting for the Joelson amendment as an inadequate but hopeful education measure. Let the students know that Congress will respond to the needs of the people. I quote to you again:

Governments are instituted among men for certain ends; . . . among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; . . . whenever a government becomes destructive of those ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Robison amendment.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding so I can attempt, at least, to get that knife of mine partially out of the back of every school librarian, where my friend JOHN BRADEMANS put it.

As we all know, the Robison amendment that is pending as an amendment to the Michel substitute addresses itself to these four programs: supplementary educational services, ESEA title III; library services, ESEA title II; guiding, counseling, and testing, which is NDEA title V-A; equipment and minor remodeling, which is NDEA title III-A. What it seeks to do, on a consolidated basis, is to increase the moneys to be appropriated for these four purposes \$110 million above the committee figure for such four purposes, in order to get back to the 1969 fiscal year level for such purposes.

Let me point out that in the bill the committee's figure was also provided on a consolidated basis, but that figure, again, was \$110 million below the 1969 fiscal year levels.

Now, let me see if, in the remaining time I can get from the gentleman, I can marshal some arguments in favor of consolidation.

The major arguments, as I see them, are: first, all four of these programs involve State administration, under State plans approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, for the benefit of local schools, with the funds distributed among the States on the basis of formulas reflecting population. Hence, they are very similar.

Second, despite the similarity of these programs, they now require four separate State plans, four separate distribution schemes, four separate applications at both State and local levels; four separate sets of accounting reports, and so forth—all of this adding unnecessarily to administrative cost and to administrative redtape.

Third, when the four similar programs are administered separately, as they now are, and as the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) and as the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS) would require them to continue to be, this would mean that each State can spend only the allotted funds in the proportions, established nationally or fed-

erally, which might not correspond, and probably would not correspond to what the true State needs might be in these particular areas, but when the programs are consolidated the States can determine their own priorities.

Finally, program consolidation of these important, closely related State grant programs moves in the direction of broader Federal support of education, with fewer strings attached, so there will be more and more State and local authority over the use of funds, which is the direction I think we ought to go.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. Chairman, until I have had a chance to take some time, I will not yield further. I must say I am somewhat disappointed at the opposition of my colleagues on the other side, to the Robison amendment.

Let us make it clear in the RECORD today, so that this will not get lost tomorrow. If we do not adopt the Robison amendment, we will, I suspect, adopt the Michel amendment, and then we will have to go on from page 26. So if the Robison amendment is not adopted, amending the Michel amendment, we have no chance to come back and increase the funding for the four grant programs in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the National Defense Education Act.

So I intend to vote for the Robison amendment, because if we do not, tomorrow the librarians and the supplementary education people and the guidance people will have many of the Members of this House to blame. I do not intend to be one of them. I intend to maintain my support of NDEA and the ESEA.

Let us adopt the Robison amendment. Let us not be fooled by the argument that this will give some superpower to the Office of Education. Consolidation means a great deal, but let us not forget if we fail to adopt the Robison amendment, we will not be back over this point in the ball game. We will have to go on from there.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, any nation that can put a man on the moon can certainly afford the price of a quality education for every American and any person who does not realize that it was the American educational system that made it possible for one of our astronauts to walk on the moon, has missed a very significant point.

One of the realities of educational planning and budgeting at the school district level, is that once the Congress begins funding a project or program at a determined level, our local school boards depend and rely on that funding once they have their programs underway. This is only logical and practical. As a result, they budget on that basis, and when, as has happened so often, these funds are cut or eliminated, they find it difficult, if not impossible, to compensate for these funds from State or local sources to continue programs already underway.

My point is, that while the Committee on Appropriations has reported out a bill which, in effect and on the surface at least, increases the overall appropriation for education by \$123 million over the budget request, there is a lot more involved here than just the matter of quantity alone.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I want to associate myself with the remarks made yesterday by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUINN), in stressing the vital need to upgrade and enhance the national defense student loan program, and in the area of vocational education. As I see it, it is in these two areas that we, in the Congress, can contribute most to the poor, the underprivileged, and the unskilled in this country.

A third area of major concern to many of us in the Congress concerns the committee's recommendation regarding Public Law 874 funds for federally impacted areas. I represent a district in California that has felt the true impact of the military buildup on the west coast associated with the Vietnam conflict. The steady influx of military families and Federal employees in this area has placed a tremendous burden on the local school boards, particularly in Marin and Napa Counties, and to a lesser extent, in Sonoma County.

Quite frankly, I view the recommendation to cut funds entirely for section 3-B of Public Law 874 as grossly unfair and discriminatory in nature—not only to the school districts that are relying so heavily on these funds, but to those who will have to pay the bill, should this section go unfunded. In this case, the difference would have to be made up by the already overburdened property taxpayers, and by the very people this legislation was intended to help—the service families.

Anyone familiar with the military's on-base housing priority system knows that it is the lowest ranking men, the privates, seamen and airmen, who by and large are at the bottom of the list and must reside offpost until they either rise in rank or until housing becomes available to them. As such, Mr. Chairman, these men are the lowest paid people in the service, and it is they who will certainly suffer the most should section 3B go unfunded.

In all candor, I know it is not the intent of the Congress to make an already difficult situation more difficult for these young married servicemen who have responded to their Nation's call. Nor is it the intent of the Congress to inadvertently place a greater burden at this time on our taxpayers and local school districts that have had absolutely no choice in deciding where military bases are located, or where the influx was going to be placed with regard to the war in Vietnam. This, however, could be the net effect should this unwise, unfair, and shortsighted provision carry.

It is my fervent hope that every Member will weigh this provision of the bill carefully and in light of what we are trying to provide here in the way of a quality education for all Americans.

Therefore, I call on my fellow House

Members to uphold the intent of the Congress as expressed nearly 20 years ago, by voting to support full restoration of the desperately needed funds for federally impacted areas.

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

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman in the well for his statement.

Mr. Chairman, there is no greater obligation on the part of this Congress than to support programs of education for the young people of our Nation.

As in the past, I feel that full funding of the impacted school programs is essential. In the 12th Congressional District of Illinois, impacted school funds assist those school children whose parents reside on the military bases at Fort Sheridan, Great Lakes Naval Training Center, and the Downey Veterans' Hospital, as well as the children of parents who are employed at such Federal installations.

My colleague, the gentlewoman from the State of Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) offered the amendment to increase impacted school aid in the last Congress. It was my expectation that she would offer a similar amendment to the present bill. Unfortunately, the popularity of the full funding of the impacted school program is being used in the Joelson amendment as a vehicle to continue four other categorical grant programs.

Mr. Chairman, my experience with local school administrators convinces me that the multiplicity of categories impedes local school principals in their efforts to develop improved educational opportunities.

Accordingly, the subcommittee's recommendation to lump together four categories has merit. If the overall total of funds—as proposed in the so-called Robison amendment—were to be adopted, this objective could be attained.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, if there could be full funding of impacted school aid, then the Congress would be fulfilling substantially our national responsibility to elementary and secondary education.

One advantage to impacted school aid is that the funds may be expended to meet the greatest and most pressing needs of the local school districts.

There is a similar advantage in the Robison amendment.

However, it is doubtful that a clear-cut expression consistent with my position will be possible with the amendments and substitute amendments which are being considered in today's debate.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment and in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. I would like to focus my attention on the provisions pertaining to vocational education. Under the provisions of the amendment, we will add \$131,500,000 to the committee bill.

The largest part of the increase is for increasing basic grants to States. I point out that through the set-aside provi-

sions and the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968, unless we make these additional amounts available to the State grants, some of the ongoing vocational programs in our States are going to have to be cut back, because there are earmarked funds in this new act of 40 percent.

So it is necessary to increase the amount by \$57 million, as the Joelson amendment does, in order to assure that the ongoing programs will be continued.

The 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act, I would like to point out to the Members of this House, were passed unanimously by this House and by the other body, and we set up funding under that legislation which amounts to about \$766 million for this fiscal year. Here we are, trying to get \$488,716,000 by the Joelson amendment—about 63 percent of the funding.

Unless these amendments are adequately funded, the action of this House and the other body last year will be empty acclaim.

Of the 26 million youngsters who will enter the labor force next year, three out of 10 will be high school dropouts. Even those who have graduated from high school will have a difficult time obtaining employment, because they lack salable skills. Today only 14 percent of our high school children are receiving occupational education. This means that over 50 percent of our students who leave school or graduate from high school each year and who do not go to college have had little or no preparation for the world of work.

There is little doubt in our minds, and there was little doubt last year when we so enthusiastically passed the Vocational Education Act Amendments, that without sufficient vocational education, we would face, perhaps, the greatest challenge and crisis in American education we have ever faced. We recognize the need. We have tried and we are tired of asking repeated funding for remedial programs for the unemployed, the disadvantaged, and the undereducated.

For once we could do something conclusive by making funds available for educational programs that will eliminate the need for these steps that are taken after the fact.

We authorized \$766,650,000 for fiscal year 1970. Now we are talking about appropriating only \$279,216,000. I find this embarrassing. I find this an aspiration gap.

The Congress of the United States has authorized good education legislation. Year after year we have failed to adequately fund them. We have held out the aspiration to the children of America, to the teachers, to the educators, and to our school systems, and then we have dropped them brutally with our failure to appropriate money.

I submit for the poor, for the parents, for the educators, and for the concerned citizens this yo-yo attitude can only generate a crisis of confidence. History suggests that dashed hopes are the seed of turmoil.

The promise of a new day cannot be met with lofty rhetoric and a pallid per-

formance. The domestic budget contributes as much to our national security as does our military budget. A progressive country solving its own problems may do more for peace than a phalanx of antiballistic missiles. Full funding of education and the fulfilling of man's hopes must command a high priority.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I should like to inquire how many more speakers we have.

How many are standing? How many do I see?

One, two, three, four, five, six, seven—the gentleman from Illinois would be eight and I would be nine. And the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON) is still here. That is 10.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

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

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with care to this extensive debate, waiting with open mind to analyze whatever substantive criticisms might be raised against the educational programs sought to be strengthened by the Joelson amendment. I have yet to hear any. The entire argumentation offered to the Joelson amendment has been budgetary in character.

In the other body, a debate has been in progress for some weeks regarding the advisability of deploying a new weapons system at a cost of upward of \$10 billion. Opponents of that deployment have adduced arguments touching on the efficacy of the system as well as its cost. Yet, in spite of the agreed overwhelming budgetary consequences of the system and grave doubts and differences as to its efficacy, it may be adopted. Before us, on the other hand, additional educational assistance is questioned on cost alone.

It would be surprising to find ourselves investing a sum in the next generation of weapons which might not work and not one-tenth of that sum in the next generation of Americans who will certainly have to.

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

Mr. MELCHER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. There is no arena in which the fate of our country hangs more in the balance than in education. We either will give our children the tools with which to solve the present problems that confound us or civilization as we know it can perish. If there ever has been a price tag on survival, it must be the downpayment on our educational commitment represented by this amendment. I am pleased to vote for the amendment. I wish the consensus of the House would support an even greater appropriation for our future.

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). That amendment increases the appropriations originally proposed by the Appropriations Committee by the additional amount of \$894,547,000. It is incredible that the Appropriations Committee at this time in our history would bring in a bill that is almost a billion dollars less than the education appropriations for the past fiscal year, 1969.

In my own State of New York, we are going through an education crisis as I am sure every State in the Union is. We find that the reading scores of our children are poor, that dropouts are on the increase, and that the moneys needed to turn this situation around are simply not available from local resources. In the city of New York, the board of education has stated that it will be compelled to close the schools sometime in mid-term if additional funds are not provided to fund the school year at an even modest level. Our board of education has said that it would rather quit than cut back the existing school programs which are inadequate, and they should not be compelled to do so. The State legislature in my State did not provide the necessary funds and many of us have requested the Governor to call a special session of the legislature in order to deal with this problem. But we are compounding that financial bind if we further reduce the moneys already promised to the States under the authorization bill originally passed by us this year.

If the Joelson amendment is passed, I estimate that the State of New York will receive over and above what the appropriation bill now provides an additional sum of \$76,757,000. As large as that sum is it is still meager in relation to the need. But it will be helpful in dealing with a dire need.

It is disheartening for me as a freshman Member of Congress to see how easy it is for the military establishment to maintain and add to its budget and conversely how difficult it is for those who wish to strengthen the minds and bodies of our young people to obtain the necessary funds. To those who, whenever domestic programs are before this Congress, cry out in defense of their savage cuts, "fiscal responsibility," I say it is the height of fiscal and moral irresponsibility to shortchange the education of our youth. I urge the passage of the Joelson amendment and commend my colleague from New Jersey for having undertaken to marshal the forces on both sides of the aisle to override those ruthless cuts which the Appropriations Committee is attempting to impose on Federal aid to education.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge with gratitude the efforts of the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs whose members have made herculean efforts to bring home to every Member in this Hall the need for additional funding. If the Joelson amendment is passed as I hope it will be, in large measure it will be as a result of the efforts of these concerned citizens.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman. I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. This amendment would supplement many educational programs which are not adequately funded in H.R. 13111.

The Joelson amendment would provide additional funding for school libraries, student loans, vocational education, equipment and materials, college construction funds, and impact area aid. Each one of these programs is vital to some facet of the educational process. We can teach our children to read, but we cannot show them the magic of books unless our libraries are well stocked and up to date. Books are the key to all human knowledge and achievement. We jeopardize all we have done if we deny our youth the opportunity of a book. A good school library system is central to effective education. As it has been said in the past, "libraries are the banks of our educational system. And they yield rich dividends in knowledge and wisdom. They are the summing up of past achievement and a stimulant to future progress."

Our vocational institutions are insurane in another way. They insure that the needs of a highly technological society will be filled now and in the future. They must be able to meet the changing manpower needs and be able to prepare many of our citizens for a rewarding place in our industry. Furthermore, vocational education today is a vast savings for tomorrow. If we train today, we will not be faced with the need for crash remedial programs in the areas of retraining, unemployment, poverty and other social and correctional services.

Our present society demands a greater and greater number of college-trained people. And yet the cost of higher education is rising greatly. We cannot expect our students to go to college, if we do not provide adequate financial aid. The Joelson amendment increases the funds for student defense loans by 40 million dollars. This money is necessary if college is to be a reality for many of our students. Even this amount would not totally meet the increased demand.

Each of us has heard the expression "penny wise and pound foolish". If we skimp on the education of our children, this is exactly what we would be. The future is on our doorstep asking for help. How can we deny it?

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

Mr. MELCHER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the gentleman in the well all debate on the amendment and all amendments thereto, including the substitute amendment, be terminated in 35 minutes, reserving 5 minutes for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD).

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, when the chairman of the subcommittee took a count only a minute ago he counted 10 Members on their feet. I believe at the present time, with 35 minutes, each Member wishing to speak might get less than 1 minute.

I wonder if the gentleman would revise the time limit upward just a bit.

Mr. FLOOD. I will make it 40 minutes. Will the gentleman settle for 40 minutes?

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate will be limited to 40 minutes, and the names of Members standing will be taken down.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time taken in connection with the last action not be taken from the time of the gentleman in the well.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a point of inquiry. Is it clear that in my motion I reserved 5 minutes for the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and 5 minutes for the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FLOOD); that is, 5 minutes each?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the Chair's understanding. And it is also the understanding of the Chair that under a unanimous-consent request the time of the gentleman from Montana is not to be taken out.

The gentleman from Montana is now recognized.

Mr. MELCHER. Mr. Chairman, the record of debate concerning this bill establishes that the administration budget proposals and the committee action are trying to save Federal funds. However, both shortchange the funding of schools and education programs and libraries. The local taxpayers and the States will have to make up the shortage. Uncle Sam dips heavily into the pocketbooks of all taxpayers, and should pay for his share of education. Part of the \$3.1 billion Federal surplus should be invested in these programs to meet the growing costs of education. I support the Joelson amendment with vigor because either we improve the bill by passing this amendment, or our Montana people will be called on to add \$5 million to local and State taxes.

Unless the Congress acts to provide full funding for the education bills it has enacted, we will be playing a cruel hoax on the children and youth of this Nation. It is a fallacy to believe that the States and local districts can properly serve these children if the Congress fails them. As a member of the State Legislature of Montana for many years before I was elected to Congress, I am aware that State revenues and local taxes cannot be

increased to the degree necessary to make up the difference that inadequate Federal appropriations would require. I am also aware that local property taxes are already above reasonable limits, especially in school districts with the largest percentage of low income families. Clearly inadequate Federal appropriations will result in curtailment of programs for children and young people who most need the special assistance which Federal funds can make possible. While I am concerned that all education programs be fully funded, I am particularly distressed at the disastrous cuts in this bill of the funds for operational expenses of school districts impacted by Federal installations. My district in Montana contains Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, numerous Minutemen intercontinental ballistic missile sites, and it also contains Fort Peck Dam, an Army Engineers facility in northeastern Montana. The school districts in which these installations are located simply cannot cope with the proposed reduction of approximately 60 percent of their Federal funds. If these impact funds are not restored, the entire State-aid program for all districts in Montana will be distorted, since State funds will be drained into these and other federally impacted districts to the detriment of all school districts in the State. We have in my Eastern District of Montana, five Indian reservations and those schools off the reservations that educate Indian youth receive Federal impact aid.

The need for impact aid is no less now than it was when it was first enacted in the early 1950's. The land occupied by the Federal installations is still off the tax rolls. The federally employed military and civilian personnel and their dependent children are still moving in and out of the communities, creating the same impact that existed in the fifties. The need is as great as ever.

If there are flaws in the impact laws, then these should be corrected by the Congress. But to take such inconsiderate and cruel action as denying all impacted districts up to two-thirds of their entitlement is not the way to achieve reform. It can only achieve chaos.

I also support increased funds for vocational education. This is vitally necessary in a State such as Montana which is large in area with a large future for a growing economy. We have the waterpower, we have the natural resources—and we have the space—to achieve industrial development, which is greatly needed, but we must have skilled manpower to help bring this about. Recent Federal programs for expanding vocational education hold great promise—but provide only broken dreams to our youth if the funds are not forthcoming.

It is extremely hard for me to understand how the Secretary of Agriculture can come before our Agriculture Committee and recommend retraining rural people for "new opportunities"—as he did the other day—and we can be asked at the same time by the administration to reduce vocational education appropriations.

College student loans, work study, and college construction are worthwhile investments and this amendment increases all three.

The distinct possibility exists that unless the House acts today to increase the funds for the combination of titles II and III of ESEA and titles III and VA of NDEA that guidance and counseling services provided by title VA of NDEA will be reduced drastically from the \$17,000,000 provided last year. The funding for guidance and counseling is completely in doubt under the committee bill. This is a deplorable situation that must be corrected. Guidance and counseling services must be increased, not decreased as the committee bill and the Nixon budget provide.

There is an old saying in Montana—"Put your money where your mouth is." I believe this Congress must follow this advice by making appropriations for education equal to the authorizations which the laws provide.

We need increasing funds for counseling, for libraries, facilities, for impacted areas—for all the categories of educational assistance which has been provided in the past.

Some things can be postponed a year or 5 years, without any loss except time. But the education of our children cannot be postponed a year, or 5 years, without irreparable loss.

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

Mr. MELCHER. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to commend our fine new colleague on the high quality of his statement. I also desire to associate myself with his remarks. He has made a great speech on a most important amendment.

Mr. MELCHER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOWARD).

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the entire education community of this Nation is united, along with labor and other civic groups, in urging increased support for the education legislation we have passed in recent years. I congratulate them and support their effort—for it is not for themselves but for the children and young people of this Nation.

I support the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON), which will give modest increases above the committee's bill for such programs as impact aid, vocational education, student loans, and aid to disadvantaged children. The amendment merely restores—merely to the level of 1969 appropriations—funds for library and textbooks, equipment, guidance, and counseling, and innovative programs under title III of ESEA. Even these amounts are far below the authorizations we as a Congress have enacted into law.

I recognize the serious fiscal situation facing the country, and the problem of inflation which haunts us all. I do not believe, however, that inflation will run rampant through the land because we keep faith with the children of our coun-

try. We promise them substantial funds for education. We must deliver those funds if we expect them to maintain their faith in representative government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD).

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I will make my remarks brief and I hope telling. I would hope that this Chamber today takes action that will reaffirm the somewhat flagging commitment of the Congress to educational excellence.

Mr. Chairman, how can we vote to lower the fund levels which we established last year?

How can we create for the American people illusory education programs, for which in 1 year we authorize and appropriate necessary funds and the next year literally disclaim them by refusing to appropriate adequate funds. We have created tremendous gaps by talking big and delivering small.

We have before us a bill that is almost a billion dollars lower than the education appropriation for fiscal 1969.

We can change that. We can see that the American school systems get the funds needed to maintain the necessary educational excellence that our society demands of students.

We have before us the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey to beef up the education appropriation. Let us support this amendment.

Applying the meat ax to education is not fiscally responsible.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TUNNEY).

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I was not planning to speak in this debate originally, but I have, as any other Member of Congress, a system of national priorities, a system of values and I feel it is important that I speak out on these priorities and values at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I just cannot imagine that in this country of ours at this particular time in our history that we are willing to spend \$30 billion to keep the Thieu-Ky government in power in Vietnam and only spend approximately \$31.9 billion at all levels of government to educate 50 million young Americans.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion that is the most extraordinary malapportionment of priorities about which I have heard. I cannot see this Congress being unwilling to fund an additional \$2.5 billion with which to educate these 50 million young Americans.

The Labor-Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill includes \$202,167,000 for impacted area school aid. This is identical to the President's budget request for fiscal year 1970, \$318,694,000 below the amount appropriated for 1969. It represents 90 percent of the authorization.

This reduction in funds will result in the elimination of Federal assistance under Public Law 874 for category B students—those whose parents work but do not live on Federal property. If we allow this to occur many school districts throughout the Nation and particularly in heavily impacted areas such as Cali-

fornia, would be placed in a precarious financial situation.

Public Law 874 has had a long and successful existence and should be continued and even expanded. The program is designed to provide financial assistance for the maintenance and operation of public schools which experience financial burdens due to new or increased Federal activity. The full entitlement required for fiscal year 1970 is \$650,500,000 nationally and \$100,900,000 for California. The President's budget and the appropriations bill reduce this to \$187 million and \$25,200,000, respectively.

Public Law 815 provides assistance for construction of urgently needed facilities in school districts which have had substantial new or increased Federal activities. The full entitlement required for fiscal year 1970 is \$80 million nationwide and \$12 million for California. The President's budget and the appropriations bill reduces this to \$12 million nationally and \$450,000 for California.

The Federal Government is the Nation's largest landowner and employer. However, the Federal Government's land holdings and activities are not subject to taxation by the local or State governments. The presence of Federal property in a school district reduces the amount of real estate taxes otherwise available for educational purposes. Public Laws 874 and 815 are designed to lighten this burden of education which is imposed upon local school districts.

In California for example the nine counties of Imperial, Riverside, Kern, Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernardino, San Diego, Santa Barbara, and Ventura represent the highest concentration of federally impacted activity in the United States. There are 3,263,021 students enrolled in the school districts of these nine counties. There are 229,755 federally connected pupils in the districts within this area. The 204 school districts in these nine counties have an entitlement of \$45,840,253.

Dr. Gordon Harrison, superintendent of the Moreno Valley School District in California has estimated that out of the 204 school districts in the nine counties mentioned earlier, only 20 would remain financially solvent if category B student aid is eliminated. The entitlement of \$45,840,253 would be reduced to \$12,787,636 if category B funding is eliminated as this appropriations bill and the President's budget propose to do. Other impacted area school districts in California face equally serious consequences if the Congress does not appropriate at least an entitlement equal to that of last year, \$505 million. The alternative would be substantial increases in the local property taxes.

There are about 446 California school districts which use Public Law 874 funds, located in 47 of the State's 58 counties with 403,166 students. To replace the loss of Public Law 874 funds would require raising the local tax rate from a minimum of 0.20 in some areas to a maximum of 2.40 in others. Any increase at all is too much.

The taxpayers of California are terribly overburdened. It is clear that the

property tax can no longer be the sole vehicle for financing education. Other sources and methods of financing must be found. The impacted area program has served as an effective supplement for educational financing. Instead of curtailing this concept of school aid, we should be examining ways to expand it. Just last week the House passed legislation which allowed the States to tax national banks. This action represents a recognition by the Congress of the difficulties many States and localities are having in raising sufficient funds.

Clearly the proposed appropriations for impacted area school aid is not in keeping with the needs of education today. Clearly the proposed appropriations would be disastrous to States like California.

Mr. Chairman, education is one of the basic elements in the preparation of our youth and is essential to a continuation of our commitment to build a better future for our country and its people—to foster a better world and a better life for mankind.

Education has long been cited as the key to the solution of our economic and social problems. We must continue to strive for excellence. Not until we can say that each American child has had a good education should we begin to feel that our educational system is living up to the expectations we have for it.

We in Congress must increase the appropriations for education today if we feel that this goal can and should be fulfilled. Our Nation with its increasing complexity cannot bear a decrease in Federal education funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WHITE).

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendments to bring the financing of our educational programs more nearly up to the levels which this Congress has previously authorized. These are the Joelson and Smith amendments. To fail to do so is to retreat from the program we have so well conceived and executed in the past few years. This has been a nonpartisan program which has wisely made education the point at which our efforts to build a stronger nation have their focus.

We have legislated Project Headstart so underprivileged children might have opportunities to learn. Shall we, then, through cutting back such vital programs as impacted area funds and school library funds deprive these students of the very advantages we have been trying to give them? We have used such programs as the Neighborhood Youth Corps to keep our young people in school. Shall we, then, through cutting back on counseling services and vocational education, halt the very progress we have tried so hard to promote? In Project Upward Bound we have successfully taken young men and women from low income and underprivileged families and motivated them to attend college. Shall we then cancel out these advantages through cutting back our NDEA student loan programs, and our undergraduate construction programs?

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district where the need for these educational

programs is especially great. In my home county, El Paso County, military installations occupy 68,032 acres, more than 106 square miles of nontaxable land—land which is a part of the various school districts, and yet which cannot be taxed by them. More than 23,000 students in the two major school districts of El Paso County are from families employed at nontaxable Federal installations. The proposed budget cuts would deprive these districts of approximately \$3 million in impacted area funds for fiscal 1970. In smaller districts, the amounts are less, but the impact is equally critical.

These impacted school districts are taxing their residents at or near the legal limit, and future bond requirements will absorb the small remaining leeway. Their only recourse, if deprived of impacted area funds, will be to cut vital programs.

My district contains many young, ambitious Latin American students from low-income families. Our colleges are putting forth every possible effort to provide the higher education facilities these young people need. We must not reduce the effectiveness of their efforts through cutting back on construction and student loan programs. For many of these students, the critical need is vocational education. Our efforts in this direction must be steadily increased and not reduced.

Two days ago, a report from the Budget Bureau gave dramatic proof that many of our economy efforts are bringing gratifying results. We can reduce Government spending. We can find unessential Federal efforts that can be reduced or eliminated—but to make the proposed cuts in educational expenditures is to turn our backs on the genuine progress we have been making. It is inconsistent, wasteful, and uneconomic. I urge support of the amendment that will head us again in the right direction.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. HANNA).

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I would like also to comment on this business of consistency that was so eloquently argued by the leader of the opposition yesterday. Mr. FORB asked us to be consistent by voting against educational increases if we did not support the surtax on the administration's terms. As I look back on the record of their consistency of voting for the funds to supply the administration just past, I thought their definition of consistency a year ago was taken out of the philosophy that defines consistency as the backwater of the stunted mind.

He has asked us also to follow his logic in reducing educational funding. I would say that a definition of that kind of logic is it is a system of thinking which allows you to go wrong with confidence.

Mr. Chairman, we have to address ourselves to the strengthening of our Nation. We have voted \$80 billion for strengthening the military. We will in this bill provide \$10 billion for education. Is it inappropriate for us to commit one-eighth of the amount we so readily provided for military strength to provide for educational strength? The strength of the United States, if you look at it over the

years, is in our educational system, and in the educational support that we give our schoolchildren. Let us here today play to the surer and enduring strength of our Nation, and support the Joelson amendment. Lend your vote and your support to strengthening our educational funding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. RYAN).

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Some 5 years ago, when the breakthrough on Federal aid to education finally came, this Congress made a commitment which was reaffirmed in later authorization bills, and yet that commitment has been broken time and again in the appropriation process, as the programs repeatedly have been funded at less than fifty percent of the authorizations. The bill before us, which the Joelson amendment would increase, provides only some 38 percent of the authorization for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; it provides an average of some 18 percent of the authorization for ESEA title II, libraries, and title III programs.

Mr. Chairman, it is essential that we reorder our priorities in this Congress, and the place for us to start is today on education.

The Joelson amendment, which has the strong support of the numerous educational groups which make up the Emergency Committee for Full Funding of Education Programs, would provide additional funds to reestablish fiscal year 1969 appropriations levels for school libraries, NDEA equipment, guidance, and counseling, and college facilities. In addition it would provide increased funds which are necessary for the impacted area aid program—Public Law 874—vocational education, title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the NDEA student loan program.

The total increase in appropriations for these vital programs would total approximately \$900 million.

Mr. Chairman, the Joelson amendment is necessary because the Committee on Appropriations has simply failed to provide amounts adequate to the educational needs served by the programs I have mentioned. In the school library program alone, evidence presented to both the Appropriations Committee and the Committee on Education and Labor indicated that about \$200 million was needed to meet the need which exists for this program. While the increase of \$50 million contained in the Joelson amendment falls pitifully short of that figure, the provision of an additional \$50 million will at least enable the program to operate on the same level as it did in fiscal year 1969, and will enable many school districts to purchase textbooks and other educational material essential to the educational process.

This year, as in past years, the Committee on Appropriations has recommended appropriations for education which fall far below the authorized levels; for instance, the committee has

recommended only 38.7 percent of the authorization for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The Joelson amendment will only fund it at 44.5 percent of the authorization. Yet the budget of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, which last week achieved its goal of placing men on the moon, has received appropriations only slightly below the amount requested by that agency.

It is especially ironic that the National Defense Education Act should have had its funds slashed in three major areas—student loans, guidance and counseling, and equipment. For it was the Russian launching of the sputnik satellite a little over 10 years ago which fostered both the NDEA program—which was designed to increase the supply of college-educated scientific personnel—and our own space program which has culminated in the lunar landing of Apollo 11.

If funds for vital educational programs continue to fall dismally below authorized levels, how does Congress expect programs like NASA to continue to achieve the progress which they have? More important, how will our educational needs throughout the country be met?

The increased funding provided by the Joelson amendment is the minimum which Congress can accept if Federal educational programs are not to be completely crippled. I urge the adoption of this amendment to appropriate an additional \$895 million for the vital programs specified.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI).

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I would like merely to point out to those Members who have found a great deal of comfort in title II, the title that provides books and other services to our private schools—and that is the only title under which they can get help for our parochial schools. That title will be washed in with three other titles if the Robison amendment and the Michel substitute are adopted.

Those of you who have found comfort in bringing some modicum of help to private schools in your district would actually be voting away that help because if the Robison amendment is adopted they would be programed and washed in with several other programs. Under our rules, no further amendments would be offered later in debate in this regard if the Robison amendment is adopted at this time, and no further amendments will be possible later on to restore these \$50 million as a separate item under title II, which has brought meaningful help for the first time to millions of youngsters in our private schools.

So, Mr. Chairman, I hope those Members who will be tempted to vote for the Robison amendment and the Michel substitute will keep that in mind.

Also, I hope each of you by now has studied how much your respective districts and States will lose in the impact program if you vote for the Michel amendment. You can help all of the students in your districts, the impact

students, the private school students, and all other youngsters in your district by supporting the Joelson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS).

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, two questions have been asked that I have not heard answered. The first one is, "Where we will get the money if the Joelson amendment is adopted"; and the second is, "Are we going to bite the bullet?"

Mr. Chairman, the Joelson amendment, if it is adopted, will cost just a little more than one-third of the amount that one military contractor is attempting on one contract to overcharge the American public.

I do not think we have to bite the bullet. All we have to do is bite off the excess cost of the bullet, and there will be plenty of money to educate the children of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. TALCOTT).

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Chairman, education is one of our most important unmet national needs. We need to emphasize education. It needs help. I want to help. Unfortunately, the present programs for Federal aid to education are unsatisfactory—almost wholly unsatisfactory. Almost everyone involved in education finds fault with some section or some phase of the Federal aid to education. The taxpayer is particularly unhappy. Bond issues for school purposes are failing more and more often. Local taxpayers are refusing to spend or bond themselves for the present education system. Federal income tax revenues must be shared with the States for education purposes. Until this occurs, I will not be satisfied with the Federal aid to education program.

Our Federal Government must reduce its expenditures. Every program may be required to be tightened. Education may be an exception, and we should fund education equally with last year. No cut can be tolerated.

Public Law 874, the Federal aid to federally impacted school districts program has been highly criticized and in some areas abused the intent of the Congress. In my congressional district, impacted funds are appropriately used as the Congress intended. The school districts have been lulled into a sense of security. They quite properly have relied on these funds. All students—not just impacted students—are adversely affected by any diminution of funds. If funds are to be reduced, it would be grossly unfair to cut off these funds suddenly.

The parliamentary situation is confused—as it usually is when we try to amend highly complicated bills on the floor. Four hundred and thirty-five men and women simply cannot make the correct decisions in a few hurried hours of debate.

The addition of almost a billion dollars to this bill is a heavy burden upon the national taxpayer, a major contribution to accelerating inflation, with considerable dissatisfaction among the various pressure groups who are promoting their own special interests in this bill.

It now appears that there will be even more additional amendments. This is not the way to legislate.

The Robison amendment, coupled with the Michel amendment, appears to have the best chance of passing and providing for the educational needs of our youth under the fiscal restraints which we must recognize.

It is easy to take the floor and boldly and grandly urge the expenditure of more and more and more money.

But we also must pay the fiddler now, immediately. Some of us must remember the taxpayer. It seems passing strange to me that some of us who are most interested in education also must be the ones to stand up for the already overburdened taxpayer. I am most surprised that so many of those who are urging the House to exceed by \$1 billion the Committee on Appropriations and yet recently voted against the extension of the surtax to help meet the education costs or to extend the spending limitation of \$191 billion. Every dollar we add to this bill must be deducted from the allowable spending in some other Federal program.

Too many Members today fail to distinguish between authorization, appropriation, and spending. All three are quite different and should be considered separately.

We simply cannot appropriate every dollar that is authorized. There are programs in excess of \$280 billion which are authorized. To appropriate funds in this amount would bankrupt our country in a few months.

Even if we appropriate all the funds requested by every amendment proposed to this bill, the spending could be quite different. The Department of Education has at least \$100 million for these very purposes already appropriated to it and not spent. No program will suffer by lack of appropriated funds.

If we are to add a billion dollars to this phase of Federal aid to education, which probably could be spent advantageously, we should do it fairly to all sections of the country and to all children. The Joelson amendment was devised to bring a few large special interests into a compact to try to assure passage. It was concocted in a hurry, without adequate thought or consideration of all phases of education. It may have sounded good to the special interest groups at first blush.

I shall vote to increase the committee recommendation by one-half billion. I hope that this will be considered sufficient.

I hope that the Committee on Education and Labor will soon propose a bill for Federal aid to education that will prevent the kind of debate we have seen today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. RANDALL).

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment to H.R. 13111.

Under the limitation of time I will only be able to point out that the real issue before us is not that of economy

because the appropriation for education contained in this bill is not just another expenditure but is instead an investment. When all is said and done, money spent on education is the very best investment that can be made in the future of America. Nor is the issue here whether any of these funds amounts to a bonanza to local school districts as some have alleged. In every instance they have been authorized by prior legislation.

The true facts are that when we pass an authorization bill and then fail to follow it with an appropriation bill we have created a false image. When we authorize funds for education or anything else unless we intend to appropriate for these programs we have created a false impression and an unreality that is deceitful. Once we pass an authorization bill for a worthwhile program we in effect make a promise. We may choose to thereafter refer to these authorizations as entitlements but the true facts are we have made a sort of commitment. We should never let ourselves emasculate or belittle that commitment by appropriating less than the authorization. To authorize and fail to appropriate is to talk big and act small.

If we fail to appropriate sufficiently for the several entitlements under the education bill authorized and passed in the 90th Congress then no matter how we may try to explain it away or otherwise try to comfort or console the expectant recipients we are reneging on the promise we made and have shattered the image we created.

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

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. ICHORD).

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment increasing the appropriations for educational purposes approximately \$894 million over the amounts provided in H.R. 13111. Of this \$894 million increase, \$398 million is required to provide 90-percent financing of Public Law 874, popularly known as the impacted area program. I do believe that changes should be made in Public Law 874 in order that the need of the impacted areas is taken into consideration in the distribution of such funds. Some of the wealthiest school districts in the Nation are receiving aid under this program while many of the poorest districts receive nothing. However, I cannot permit the program to fall merely because we have failed to eliminate such wealthy districts who are not deserving of Federal aid from the program.

Throughout all my legislative career, on the State level as well as the Federal level, I have consistently supported increased appropriations for educational purposes. I feel very strongly that there is no area where Government can better spend its fund than in the field of education. I firmly agree with Humboldt who once said:

What you would have in the State, you must first put into the schools.

No society such as ours, where the governed are also the governing, can afford

to cheat on education which primarily deals with our most important resource, our youth.

The problem which we face today is essentially one of selecting priorities. We not only have educational problems which the Joelson amendment seeks to attack by the allocation of additional moneys, but we also have budgetary problems—serious budgetary problems. If we pass the Joelson amendment today we should resolve to recoup the moneys by cutting other programs in order to realize a balanced budget. There are innumerable items in the budget, the most obvious being nearly all the items in the foreign aid program, that should be assigned a priority below the additional moneys requested in this amendment. I support the Joelson amendment but hasten to add the caveat that we must not forget our responsibility to reduce other programs a comparable amount.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRAY).

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in the entire field of human endeavor more important than education, and this fact was underscored by H. G. Wells, who wrote in his "Outline of History":

Human history becomes more and more a race between education and catastrophe.

Education's importance is too great, its expense is too large, its scope is too vast and its potential, for good or for ill, too critical to the survival of a nation and a culture to allow it to be turned over to social planners. Yet, today, more and more, the citizens of the American Republic view with alarm and concern the steady, voracious appetite of a Federal educational bureaucracy that seems to be more interested in sociological experimentation than in education, with our entire educational structure for a blackboard, and pupils and teachers as dots on a graph or figures in an equation.

No endeavor has greater potential community support and enthusiasm behind it, and no endeavor binds a locality together so tightly, as the school. This tradition is one of the best in our history, and as old as the Republic itself. The founders and settlers of our country knew the truth and validity of this and in their wisdom established the principle of local control and responsibility, which principle has contributed significantly to the enduring strength and greatness of our country.

The American people are aware of this and, by and large, so is the U.S. Congress. Unwarranted Federal meddling in education is not unknown to the people nor the Congress, and we are faced with it, again, on a large and rather intemperate scale.

The bill before us, H.R. 13111, providing appropriations for fiscal year 1970 for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies, carries a provision to deal with that very situation. This time it is the issue of agencies of the Federal Government using Federal money as a club to blackmail local school systems. The provision in question absolutely forbids the Federal Government from forcing busing of students, abolishing any school, or re-

quiring any student to attend any school against his parents' choice. A similar provision was passed by the House last year but watered down by the Senate to the point of being totally ineffective. In addition, such restrictions have been written into law before, but have been totally ignored by the Washington educational bureaucracy.

The entire issue revolves around a very unfortunate sequence of events, practically all of which are attributable to some extremely radical proposals originating among the Health, Education, and Welfare bureaucrats back in 1966. Now, Congress had been aware for a couple of years of what might eventually be cooked up in fertile but feverish minds. Equally aware of the potential for great damage to the Nation's educational structure, congressional intent forbidding any such meddling had been made quite clear and plain.

THEORIZING RUN WILD

But there is always someone who does not get the word, and if they do, they choose to ignore it, setting themselves up as being better qualified to dictate to the American public what their educational structure should be. In this instance, "someone" was Harold Howe II, former Federal Education Commissioner, who took office in 1966 and almost at once made it quite clear that he was going to set the rules. A Wall Street Journal story of August 12, 1966, about Howe was headlined as follows: "Integrating Classes—Federal Officials Now Favor End to Tradition of Neighborhood School—New Education Commissioner Calls for Busing, 'Plazas'; Suburbanites Are Alarmed—His Only Weapon: U.S. Cash."

The story begins with these paragraphs:

"We can't do anything; we can only suggest and stimulate local school districts." (Emphasis in original text.)

The mildness of the words belies the intensity of the speaker, a firm foe of school segregation. He is Harold Howe II, the new Federal Education Commissioner, who insists that segregated schooling—by design or by living pattern, by race or by economic or social status—is bad for all concerned: Whites, Negroes, other minorities, poor kids, middle-class kids, rich kids. He will do all he can to help communities break down these barriers.

Mr. Howe can be tough. To educators, he talks a hard antisegregation line: "Gradualism, no matter what we call it, has failed." To Congress, he advocates a tough law. Specifically he espouses the aim of a proposal by Senator TED KENNEDY of Massachusetts to introduce into legislation the concept that not only outright segregation but mere racial imbalance in schooling is bad.

Down with neighborhood schools: About the only weapon now at Mr. Howe's command is money—the use of Federal aid to encourage local school experiments designed to assault segregation and, in the process, to weaken or even destroy the cherished "neighborhood school" tradition. This push is arousing cries of alarm from many schoolboard officials and parents, especially suburbanites.

A few paragraphs further, the Wall Street Journal story goes into more detail, as described by one of Howe's top aides, Mr. Nolan Estes:

More experiments are needed, says Mr. Estes, so that the new ideas can be subjected to critical, independent analysis—ex-

periments not only with educational plazas but with the supplementary-center ideas and the busing of children beyond neighborhood boundaries that is basic to all the new approaches.

To the Howe strategists, the neighborhood school concept, as most people think of it, is old stuff. They hope parents and local school officials will think in terms of the city as a whole, or of the city and suburb, instead of just a neighborhood. "We're not ruling out the neighborhood school," says Mr. Estes. "We're simply enlarging the neighborhood."

CONGRESS STEPS IN

When the civil rights bill of 1966 was up in the House for debate, an amendment was adopted aimed primarily at Howe's ideas. The Washington, D.C., *Star* in its lead editorial of August 12, 1966, said:

The thrust of the amendment is in this sentence: "Nothing in this title shall be construed to authorize action by any department or agency to require the assignment of students to public schools to overcome racial imbalance." The purpose of this was made clear enough during the debate. The House believes that Howe, supported by Gardner, has grossly distorted the plain intent of the 1964 Civil Rights Act in order to impose on the country his own notion of what constitutes a desirable racial mix in the public schools. And he proposes to do this by withholding federal funds from any school district which does not conform to integration standards imposed by his agency.

What he (Howe) intends to do, in brief, is to bus school children back and forth to achieve a racial mix satisfactory to himself, and if necessary to abolish the neighborhood schools in the process. This has never been required by the Supreme Court nor intended by Congress.

But Howe and company went right ahead. Then, early in September 1966, it was revealed that a "study group" at HEW had prepared something with the title "Equal Educational Opportunity Act of 1967." Then Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Gardner said it was only an "unofficial discussion paper" but did admit that the proposals contained in it were under consideration.

A section of the proposed bill discussed techniques that might be used to achieve compulsory integration in local schools across the country. These would include: "comprehensive, districtwide rezoning of school attendance areas to obtain maximum heterogeneity"; "pairing, grouping or clustering of adjacent Negro and white schools"; "reorganization of the use of schools; changing feeding patterns"; "careful site selection to locate new schools so as to maximize integration of residentially integrated student populations"; "increased busing from overcrowded to underutilized schools."

This was going a little too far. The U.S. Office of Education had prepared for distribution 52,000 pamphlets containing the toughest speeches made by any official on school desegregation, including, among them, busing. They had all been delivered during May and June of 1966 by Howe, and, as a Washington newspaper admitted—

Taken together, the four speeches in the Howe pamphlet indicate support for rezoning and school busing to achieve integration, including exchanges between slums and suburbs.

Distribution of the pamphlets was held up by the Office of Education. The Office's action came within 3 weeks after disclosure of the proposed bill. Reason given was that a Howe quote on the inside cover of the pamphlet was given the wrong title—and an incorrect tagline on the quote said it came from a speech at Bennington College, where it had actually come from a speech given at Columbia.

And then one newspaper revealed that Howe, so strong about busing other people's children, was sending his own son to school—not in Washington, D.C., where the Howe family lived—but to a private school in New England. At the time, enrollment in Washington, D.C., schools was 53 percent white; 47 percent Negro. Enrollment at the private school was eight or nine Negro students among 385 white boys.

The last word on Mr. Howe's plans was said in an interview with the new Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Robert Finch, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report, March 10, 1969:

Mr. Cohen (former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare) let Howe make a lot of statements in areas where Howe didn't have real authority—which gave a particular cast to the problem. They took the apparatus that had been assembled from earlier Secretaries of HEW and continued to push, push, push on this.

NIXON ADMINISTRATION STATES OPPOSITION TO BUSING

Secretary Finch had stated quite unequivocally earlier in the interview:

It's totally artificial to insist on busing school children if it may be detrimental to the level of education.

The greatest problem we've got in the elementary and secondary schools in the country is not to get so hung up on these other struggles as to let the quality of education in the public-school system erode and erode and erode.

President Nixon had recognized the problem and had said on two separate occasions, during the 1968 campaign:

I think that busing the child—a child that is two or three grades behind another child and into a strange community . . . I think that you destroy that child. The purpose of a school is to educate. That is what we have to do.

And, at another time, he said:

The purpose is education. I oppose busing because I'm for education. When you pick up children and cart them across town, you don't help their education. You hurt them.

So who is for the busing concept? Parents? Certainly not. My mail and, I dare say, the mail of every Member of the Congress, is overwhelmingly against it. School superintendents? *Nation* School magazine, May 1968, reported a poll showing 74 percent of the Nation's school superintendents were opposed to busing as a desegregation measure. School boards? The same survey had 88 percent opposed. Teachers? Today's Education, March 1969, carried a National Education Association research division survey showing 78 percent of the teachers were opposed to busing students from one district to another.

THE CHARGES AGAINST INDIANAPOLIS

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has recommended "racial balance" action in Indianapolis schools; the city forms a large part of the Sixth Congressional District, which I represent. The Department of Justice has filed suit against the school system, alleging discrimination in the assignment of pupils and teachers.

Now, the Indianapolis School Board has followed a general policy of allowing the neighborhood in which each school is located to determine which students go where. The objective has been to locate schools in areas where all children will not have to walk more than seven-tenths of a mile to school. There is no "racial mix" involved in this; courts have previously held that "racial mix" should not be involved. The Department of Justice a year ago held this policy is discriminatory and causes segregation. If this was true, then it would be in violation of Indiana State law, since desegregation of schools was done by law in Indiana in the 1950's. But no suit was filed under Indiana State law; it is the Federal Government nosing in to decide educational policies.

WHITE AND NEGRO CITIZENS AND PUPILS OPPOSE TRANSFERS

The Indianapolis School Board did take tentative steps to transfer teachers; this was part of Justice's charge. Thirty-eight teachers were to be transferred from Crispus Attucks High School, overwhelmingly Negro. The reaction of the Attucks student body was quick; they walked out in protest. At a school board meeting, Ronald Crenshaw, representing a delegation of Crispus Attucks High School students, raised strong objection to mandatory transfer of these 38 teachers. He said:

We are not against integration of Attucks, however, we are against the idea of drafting 38 of our black teachers in order to give Attucks a better racial balance. . . . Last year, Attucks was literally robbed of 25 black teachers. Now, a year later, Attucks is on the threshold of being robbed again. . . . When one is robbed of something, he usually considers that something valuable. We consider our teachers valuable.

They didn't become dedicated because someone said they ought to. They became dedicated because they understand and realize that a black student has to be better if he's going to succeed. . . . It is this dedication, loyalty and understanding that makes Crispus Attucks or any school a great and thriving institution.

At the same board meeting, an almost identical point was made by Citizens of Indianapolis for Quality Schools. This consists primarily of Northwest High School area parents and teachers. Their statement to the board said they were convinced—

Such mandatory transfer of teachers . . . is injurious to the education of all students . . . and lessens the quality of education.

Criticism of the Attucks transfers was joined by the Indianapolis section of the National Council of Negro Women and the Attucks Teachers and Students Association and the class of 1938, which objected to Attucks being used as a "resource pool" for black teachers.

In face of this, the school board then reduced the number of teachers transferred from 38 to 10, which was well below the minimum demanded by the Justice Department. At the meeting referred to above, not even members of the school board defended the teacher-transfer policy. As a column in the Indianapolis News put it:

It appears that the school board, under duress from the Justice Department, has accepted policies which lack support in the community.

PLAYING WITH FIRE

An Indianapolis Star lead editorial of April 26, 1969, entitled "Nose Under the Tent," cited the Star's longstanding warnings that Federal aid meant Federal control. It concluded with a paragraph grimly ominous:

But the camel of Federal control has its nose under the tent of our school system. Unless resistance to further interference in Indianapolis and Indiana public education is successful now, our schools will be, as Chicago is gradually becoming, the satrapy of the Federal empire in Washington.

"As Chicago is gradually becoming," The Baltimore Sun for Tuesday, July 29, 1969, in a story entitled "Chicago Schools—III: Suit by United States Would Renew Strife," refers to plans to sue the Chicago school system over desegregation, and says this "seems a certain prelude to renewed strife in a tinderbox of racial tension."

Speaking further of community sentiment, the story says:

Among the populace, the same well-organized white neighborhood groups that have resisted any form of integration in the past predictably assailed the federal action . . .

Just as predictable, Negro militants opposed any attempt to bring more white teachers into Negro neighborhoods.

Between these extremes, the response was unenthusiastic. In the Negro neighborhoods, the emphasis in recent years has been on community programs to improve schools and change them into institutions the people feel can help their children.

To achieve this, a lawsuit threatened in Washington against a remote city agency downtown seems simply beside the point.

For myself, I find it highly significant—and I do not see how the point can escape anyone—that the Federal Government's interference in its current fashion seems to be almost universally resented by both races. Why not? Is not this interference, by implication, casting a tacit interference of supposed inferiority on those very persons it is supposed to "help"? Who would not resent it? And why should not the Congress oppose it by every means possible? The Congress, I am certain, does not wish to be a partner, silent or otherwise, to engendering "renewed strife in a tinderbox of racial tension."

THE FEDERAL SCHOOLMASTER

In view of this public sentiment, in view of the great danger inherent in this questionable tampering and meddling, I find it hard to see just where HEW and Justice take their rationale for their actions. I cannot help but wonder if both agencies are afflicted with some sort of curse of absolutism—striving for the absolute goal, postulated on false premises,

and in so doing losing sight of the first and most important task concerned with raising a child to maturity: education.

Now, the charge is made against the amendment that it is a red herring, to draw attention away from the overall question of school desegregation itself. The charge is false; the charge itself, indeed, is a red herring, to draw attention away from forces and individuals who are only too ready and willing to go behind the back of the American parent, student, and Congress to use our entire educational structure as one massive sociological experiment blackboard.

Let us not forget that education is not only a big business in terms of number of pupils and physical plant, but also in terms of money.

Public and private schools, total expenditures, ran over \$50 billion in 1967-68. The Federal share is a relatively small percentage—6.1 percent, 1966-67—but in nothing else does such a small share have such tremendous influence.

The balance, let no one forget, comes from communities and States, through taxes, in the same fashion all money for public expenditure is raised. The additional 94 percent is raised on a local scale, and what is contributed by the States and localities, as a percentage of direct expenses for all functions, is quite high. Average for the United States, overall, is 40.8 percent; the high for the country is 53.8 percent—Indiana is second, with 53.2 percent—and the low is 26.9 percent. These are the most recent figures, compiled for the 1966-67 period.

And, as everyone is also aware, or should be, it is the taxpaying parents of schoolchildren themselves who are shouldering the major portion of a back-breaking cost. In spite of this, the never-ending flood of schemes emanating from the Federal educational bureaucracy continues to make the load heavier and heavier to bear.

The potential for opportunity—what our educational structure can give our children—is matched only by the potential for temptation to play God on the part of those in authority.

"But," says the bureaucracy, "we are only interested in making schools more democratic."

To this I can only say that autocratic behavior in Washington will do absolutely nothing toward fostering a sense of, or appreciation for, democracy in the schools. Did the students at Crispus Attucks High School, in Indianapolis, see anything "democratic" in sudden, arbitrary transfer of some of their teachers? I doubt it.

EDUCATE, OR ERODE BY SOCIAL EXPERIMENTATION?

Now, we can educate, or, if we allow ourselves to go running off after dubious and questionable concepts that can scarcely be defined, let alone shown to have any validity, we will, as Secretary Finch has said, "erode, and erode, and erode." I believe the parents of American schoolchildren have been quick to sense this process of erosion. In many cases, I have no doubt, the pupils themselves have become aware of it. It has to stop; erosion can progress beyond a cer-

tain point where return is quite difficult, if not impossible, and the ultimate consequences are indeed frightful to contemplate.

The late T. S. Eliot, accurately termed "one of our century's most profound cultural critics," saw this growing brutality and mechanistic attitude as the power of the State became greater and greater and steadily ate away at local control or guidance of education. He saw nothing less than breakdown and disintegration of true culture itself. He said:

There . . . is a danger that education—which (has come under) the influence of politics—will take upon itself the reformation and direction of culture, instead of keeping its place as one of the activities through which culture realizes itself. Culture cannot altogether be brought to consciousness; and the culture of which we are wholly conscious is never the whole of culture; the effective culture is that which is directing the activities of those who are manipulating that which they call culture. (Italics in original.)

There is no doubt that in our headlong rush to educate everybody, we are lowering the standards, and more and more abandoning the study of those subjects by which the essentials of our culture—of that part of it which is transmissible by education—are transmitted; destroying our ancient edifices to make ready the ground upon which the barbarian nomads of the future will encamp in their mechanized caravans.

So, educate, or erode? We still have a choice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SIKES).

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I support the Michel amendment. I would hope the House is giving careful thought to what it is asked to do. If we are going to march up the hill and back down again, we can make ourselves look pretty silly, and that may be what is in process. I know that each of us has constituents in town and that we want to impress them. I know that a vote for a greatly expanded program of Federal aid to education can be justified in many ways, but I know also that placing so much additional money in this bill is an empty gesture. Even if it survives Senate and conference committee action the additional money would not be expended because the Congress cannot require the Executive to spend money that he does not want to spend or feels he should not spend. The specter of inflation and runaway prices which the action now proposed would abet is even more serious than the needs of education. The downward sliding stock market affects your constituents also, even including those who do not own stocks. An exercise in futility in Congress provides no assurance in the marketplaces or to the public. It is difficult to cast an unpopular vote but this is a time when the House had better steel itself and cast an unpopular vote. This Congress already is overdue in demonstrating soundness in Government procedures more than anything else.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I cannot approve of the compromise of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) for only 77 percent for this pro-

gram. I noticed the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINN) is willing to compromise our interest in 100 percent for impacted programs in order to get through some other portions of the program, a few of which I think are much, much less desirable than the impacted programs. Supporting an increase in title I is one that is highly questionable. New York and many major metropolitan centers in the Nation are the principal beneficiaries of title I and it is a real windfall to them. In order to get support for the impacted programs it may be necessary for some of us to support the questionable increase in title I, however.

I am delighted to see that the committee's judgment on trying to differentiate the treatment of "A" and "B" students has not been sustained and we have finally gotten an agreement that there is very little difference in the entitlement for support between "A" and "B" students.

Unfortunately, I find myself in the position where I may have to oppose the committee substitute and support the position that is taken by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON). While I should prefer 100-percent funding of the entitlement for impacted districts and prefer to make decisions on each other item by line, apparently the closest we can get to full funding for impact areas, because of the parliamentary situation which has developed, is to support the Joelson amendment.

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, my remarks on this bill to fund educational programs will be brief, but I hope not empty, for this measure is one of the very most important which we shall consider in this 91st Congress.

I shall give my strongest support to funding the educational programs contained in the bill at the highest possible level. To do otherwise would be to break a commitment I have repeatedly made to the people of my State of Vermont, to say nothing of the commitment which we in the Congress have repeatedly made to the young people of America.

I commend the House Appropriations Committee for restoring as many of the proposed cuts in the area of educational assistance as it felt it could. But this is not enough, and additional funds for student loans, vocational education, library services, and regular school assistance under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act must be forthcoming.

I am fully aware of the need to balance our Federal budget and I do not take lightly the responsibility of voting for funds which go beyond budgeted amounts.

But I also know what program I believe should have No. 1 priority—and that program is the education of all Americans.

I can assure you that I shall support cuts in spending for nonessential military hardware, for unnecessary foreign aid and for unwanted and unwarranted public works projects which will more than make up for the additions which I

hope will be allocated for education today.

The responsibility of meeting educational costs is severely straining the resources of our local school districts and our State governments. We must assist them with as large a share of the Federal tax dollar as we can.

If our educational institutions are not maintained at the highest quality level, and if their programs are not made available to the highest quantity level of American young people as possible, then all of the great technological advances we witnessed in that great moon walk 10 short days ago will soon be in vain.

I implore each of you to join in giving your full support to the fullest funding of these educational programs here today.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD).

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

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to both sides of the aisle and both sides of the issue for the tone of this debate, which has been at a very high level.

I think the debate has been very interesting, but I will say I find that those who agree with my position are much more persuasive.

Very simply, Mr. Chairman, this afternoon we are going to be able to say to the kids of America, "We have faith in your ability and we believe in you and in your potential."

Today also, we have the opportunity to help them achieve that potential. I cannot think that anyone would turn that down.

I urge you, I implore you to support this amendment, not for me—I do not have to run again—but for the fine kids of this great Nation of ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

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

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the package of amendments that would add nearly \$900 million to vitally needed programs in education. This is definitely one area that cannot withstand compromise because we are dealing with the lives of young people who will guide the destiny of our Nation in the years ahead.

I know that my own State and my own district will derive significant benefits from these amendments. I consider it a privilege, therefore, to contribute my support to a program that will provide much needed assistance in the field of education.

Enactment of these amendments would prevent several school programs from being eliminated at the discretion of the Commissioner of Education. Other programs would be maintained at a level sufficient to be effective and to achieve their goals.

In addition, the amendments contain provisions to increase the appropriations for the federally impacted areas program to \$585 million. This program has been of immeasurable assistance to school districts in every State in our Nation and to 375 congressional districts. It has helped to compensate for the burdens imposed upon school districts by Federal activities.

The amendments would also salvage the school library books program, the guidance and counseling program, and the science equipment program. And vocational education training would remain intact and not be reduced.

The higher education undergraduate building program, and the national defense student loan program would be funded at a level which would allow them to continue adequately.

Finally, the amendments would make additional funds available for title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for the disadvantaged—and also assure funding for title II. Possibly no other aid to education program probes deeper into our country than title I. It will mean that so many more Americans will be able to acquire the basic skills which are prerequisites to living in our modern world.

Each of the programs I have mentioned are an integral part of our educational system. We certainly cannot afford to compromise the education of our young people—our leaders of tomorrow. We all understand the urgencies of the economic pressures in our country today, but we have established priorities and responsibilities that must be met—and this is surely one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT).

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we are today considering a package of amendments to restore the basic and fundamental funds to our education programs. H.R. 13111, as reported by the committee, is sorely deficient in support to ESEA, NDEA, vocational education, and impact aid.

I am well aware that our fiscal situation is strained to the limit at the present time. The Joelson amendment before us to put some of the cuts back in the HEW appropriation bill are necessary to even the basic operation of our school systems.

This is not an inflationary package. All that we are asking for in ESEA and NDEA is an appropriation equal to the 1969 appropriation. In a year when we have seen increasing expenditures in all areas of the economy—and I point to the C-5A and F-111 as an example of Federal escalation—the supporters of education must come as supplicants to the full Congress in order to merely stay even with the past year. We are asking for a zero-percent rise in expenditures—merely the same per capita money that was available last year.

The opponents claim that it is up to the Government to take the lead in combating inflation. I could not agree more. I believe substantial cuts can be made without harming essential domestic pro-

grams. Military appropriations will again approach \$80 billion in fiscal 1970. Why should defense appropriations be funded at 100 percent of authorization while libraries are funded at 3 percent, higher education construction is funded at 4 percent, and ESEA title I is funded at 44 percent. Competent analysts in the Pentagon are convinced that \$10 billion could be cut in defense without the least bit of harm to our defensive posture. Yet, the percentage of cuts in the military program is ludicrous when compared to other essential services. I say, if we are going to cut the budget, let us take out the big wasteful foreign military items and not desecrate the needed domestic aid packages.

Another point I want to stress is that this package is not a regional aid proposal. For some reason the feeling is that impact provisions in this bill are intended to support certain regions of the country at the expense of others. This is just not accurate.

My calculations indicate that impact aid funds are distributed equitably throughout the country. The Central States get 5.2 percent. The mid-Atlantic States receive 17.5 percent. The Midwest received 7.9 percent. The Northeast receives 9 percent, the Southeast will get 14 percent, the Southwest 16 percent, the Western States 29 percent, and the various territories a total of 1.4 percent.

These figures accurately reflect the distribution of school districts entitled to impact aid funds.

Impact aid consists of a large share of this amendment package. However, it is aid that is absolutely necessary to the basic function of the affected school districts. In my congressional district many of the school systems could not operate without this aid.

In 1950, Congress recognized the obligation of the Federal Government to provide financial assistance for the operation and maintenance of local school districts which are financially burdened when: First, the sources of local revenue are reduced as the result of acquisition of real property by the Federal Government; or second, local school districts must provide education for children who reside on Federal property or whose parents are employed on Federal property, or third, there is sudden or substantial increase in school attendance as a result of these Federal activities. In other words, this legislation was enacted to provide relief for local school districts adversely affected by the Federal Establishment and staffing of large civilian or military installations that resulted in both the withdrawal of said property from the local tax base and a substantial increase in the school aid population.

From its beginning this program has had strong bipartisan support, but every year we must fight for a sufficient authorization to enable the affected school districts to even barely meet their commitments both as to teachers' salaries and essential support services. This impact aid is not for frills, it is not for experimental programs, but is for the basic essential services that the school districts must provide. Under the amendments we are considering today, impact

aid will be funded only at 90 percent of the 1969 level. Under the Joelson amendment, the estimated need for impact aid is \$655 million. We are asking for \$586 million. The Michels amendment, however, only provides for an appropriation of \$506 million—far below even the minimum requirement for impact aid.

This is a percentage reduction from last year during a time when most other expenditures have escalated.

Finally, a number of opponents of this amendment package argue that we should defeat categorical aid so as to have available funds for general aid to education.

This is an apples-and-oranges argument that has not proved viable in the past. There is no indication that a cut in categorical aid will release funds for general aid.

We cut \$700 million from the MOL program. We cut \$400 million from the F-111B program. The Senate cut \$348 million from the A-7 program. All of this money is available, but has not been reprogrammed.

In other words, a cut in program A does not indicate an increase in program B. I am sure my colleagues will agree that it is unwise to give up categorical aid in the vain hope that general education funds will result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to any amendment which would increase spending over and above the committee's report and the revised budget, and I am one of the often spoken of Representatives who shares impacted aid, some in a rural area for a base closed over 12 years. I think it is time that someone said something about priorities for the taxpayer and for the future of the citizens of America, as well as the future citizens thereof. The question for most serious consideration is ways and means, and a balanced budget if we are not to be a bankrupt nation. What does this avail us, and why have not sources of income been suggested?

The question here is not whether we love our children or not. The question is not whether we believe in education or not. It is the sign of the times that so little thought is given to basic and fundamental laws of finance and equity. I think it is utterly ridiculous to vote for any amendment that would spend \$894 million merely because one person's State or district was losing \$5 million over their "take" from the taxpayers' pocket, in a post year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI).

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the membership on the tone of the debate in the last 2 days. It is one of the finer debates I have listened to in my 11 years here in the House.

However, there has been an obvious inconsistency, which is not surprising but should be noted. One fact that strikes me as demonstrating the inconsistency is to compare the vote we finally will have

on these amendments with the vote a few weeks ago to extend the surtax. We will find a number of members who voted against extension of the surtax but are perfectly willing to vote hundreds of millions of dollars above the budget on appropriations. Maybe what we need in this bill is a little more adult education, especially in economics and in logic among the Members.

Mr. Chairman, I recognize and appreciate the fact that the bill before us is substantially higher than the budget and that all of the pending amendments and the substitute will further increase funds for education. It is obvious that the final result will not be a setback to the funding expected from this departmental budget. However, I must re-emphasize the fact that many Members clearly disregard the overall budgetary situation and in effect become all things to all people. That is why I mention the rather obvious pattern of those who vote to increase appropriations and who vote against the taxes needed to pay for the programs they have supported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. COHELAN).

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, there is not an individual in this House who doubts that we can afford to spend one-tenth of 1 percent of our gross national product for education, who doubts that we can afford less than 1 percent of our Federal budget for education. The question is not whether we can afford to spend it—because this is just a bare-bones beginning of the job we have to do in education—but how we are going to allocate this modest addition to our Nation's education budget of less than \$900 million. Dare we say to the American people today—"We are going to spend several hundred millions more on the education of middle-class kids in middle-class communities, but we are going to continue to let our disadvantaged urban youth fester in undereducation, underjob training, and underemployment."

We must do the education job that the Joelson package contemplates, to preserve peace and sanity in our cities.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 13111 calls for expenditures of \$2.3 billion during fiscal 1970. In view of the size of our gross national product—now approaching \$900 billion—the penurious funding of our educational programs is both inexcusable and inexplicable. The Joelson amendment, which would add less than \$900 million to our educational programs, would merely bring our commitment for 1970 to the levels we set in 1969.

There are several areas in which we simply cannot afford the Appropriations Committee's frugality.

Title I of ESEA which serves 9 million of our neediest children must be amply funded to reflect the cost of added programs and the pressures of an inflationary economy.

In 1968, we amended the Vocational Education Act to provide expanded opportunities for occupational training, particularly for the disadvantaged. We

need additional funds to fulfill the promises of our new vocational laws.

We need to keep our library programs funded.

We must provide expanded higher education opportunities through the availability of student loans.

In all, we have made considerable strides in the recent past in all aspects of education. It would be tragic and untimely to arrest this progress through inadequate funding.

One last point, Mr. Chairman, I was grateful yesterday to my colleague from Mississippi, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee for his thoughtfulness in reciting for our benefit Aesop's fable of the overly greedy dog on the bridge who viewed the reflection of his bone in the stream, and lost the bone in hand—or perhaps—in tooth. To the debate on the Joelson package, more relevant, Mr. Chairman, is Aesop's story of the old farmer who felt he was near death. He was sad to leave his farm and his family. He had often told his three sons how important it was that they should work together to achieve their goals. As he lay on his bed, he asked the oldest to bring him a bundle of sticks.

He had the young man tie the bundle together. "Now," he said. "Break that bundle."

The oldest tried, but he could not do it. The second son tried, and he, too, failed. The third son did no better. The bundle could not be broken.

"Untie it," said the father. "Now see if you can break one of the separate sticks."

The oldest son broke the stick without any effort. The second son took another stick and broke it easily. So did the third son.

"You see now," said the father, with a smile on his face, "why it is important to stop quarreling and stick together. As long as you separate yourselves from each other you will be weak. United, if you view your goals, your aspirations, your hopes, as a common package, you will be so strong that together you will prevail."

Mr. Chairman, we must stick together and support the Joelson package to do the education job that must be done for all of our children.

For, as the greatest story teller of all time—Ben Franklin—told his colleagues in 1776:

We must all hang together or assuredly we shall all hang separately.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to hang together and support the Joelson package.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I am not against providing more money for education. But when we do so, we should allocate it so that it meets the Nation's greatest needs. The Joelson amendment simply fails to do that. Nobody can argue that the amendment meets that criteria. In the bill, there is a greater percentage for the disadvantaged than there is in the Joelson amendment and incorporating a higher relative level into the bill for the lower

priority items will make it more difficult to direct the Federal support where most needed from here on.

When the pork-barrel boys got around to distributing the pork in the Joelson amendment, those with the least need got hams and the bacon and left the disadvantaged with the salt.

That is what happened in relation to the Joelson amendment. Those programs in greatest need got the crumbs while the other boys walked off with the loaf of bread.

When we allocate another billion dollars for education, which I am for, I say let us allocate the money so as to meet the greatest needs for education instead of on some pork-barrel basis.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the Joelson amendment will prevail, providing \$629,048,000 over last year's appropriation for the program involved. If we fail to approve the Joelson amendment, we will not be doing anything for disadvantaged youngsters, the schoolchildren at the bottom of the barrel in this country, the schoolchildren who deserve top priority.

I must admit I am dissatisfied with this \$180 million figure for the disadvantaged schoolchildren, but I know this is the best we can do. I am realistic. If we fail to approve the Joelson amendment, the disadvantaged children will get nothing from this Congress, in my judgment.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, education should be our highest goal, our No. 1 priority. The host of problems that overwhelms our society will yield only before education. The challenges of a land that will, within our lifetime, have a population of 300 million can be met only by educating our young. Yet the committee asks us, at this critical moment, to cut the educational appropriation in the Federal budget.

In a recent questionnaire in which my constituents were asked to enumerate national priorities as they saw them, the overwhelming number of respondents ranked aid to education No. 1. The significance of that response cannot be overlooked: The American people know the importance of education, to themselves as individuals and to our national community. We cannot reject the mandate of the American people to look ahead and not be deterred by momentary economic expediency.

I support the Joelson package amendment to provide adequate funds to reestablish the program levels for education that were cut back in committee. I commend the gentleman from New Jersey for his wise and courageous judgment in offering this amendment. It will add nearly \$900 million for libraries, vocational training, student loans, equipment, guidance counseling, higher education construction, impacted areas aid, and other important programs.

In the immediate future, the programs contained in this amendment are designed to reduce hard-core unemployment, mitigate the drop-out problem, increase opportunities for poor and mid-

dle-class youths and insure the preparation of skills we need to keep our country going.

But this is also a bill with the future in mind, the future of our society as we know it now—prosperous, civilized, humane, prudent. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, Mr. Chairman, as a measure of support for our children and the generations that will follow them.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, at stake here today is an issue deeper than just that of the actual funding levels for Federal education aid; instead, we are facing the prospect of turning back on concepts which Congress gave overwhelming approval in 1965.

We must remember that only 10 years ago there was no such thing as general Federal aid to education. Even though major efforts to initiate such aid dated back to the late 1930's, prevailing attitudes in Congress held that such Federal education aid impinged upon activities which were better and properly left to State control alone, and, as one national political leader commented:

Unless we are careful even the great and necessary educational processes in our country will become yet another vehicle by which the believers in paternalism, if not outright socialism, will gain still additional power for the central government.

As the issue raged throughout the fifties, slowly the trend began shifting more and more toward an enlarged Federal involvement. And, it was an accumulation of factors which led to these subtle changes, factors such as sputnik and the demands for educational reform and renewal, the baby boom with its surge in school-age children and the resulting unprecedented "classroom shortages" and—both as a factor and as a result—the rapid climb of educational costs and the squeeze put upon available resource bases.

Twice, in both 1961 and 1962, the Kennedy administration almost succeeded in passing Federal aid legislation, but each year, proposed measures lost by the narrowest of margins.

But, the goal was in sight, and in 1963, the door opened with passage of the Higher Education Facilities Act; 2 years later, Congress enacted assistance for elementary and secondary education.

I do not want to belabor this body today with a long, detailed history and analysis of Federal aid to education. Yet, as the distinguished Member from Pennsylvania said yesterday:

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.

And, indeed, the change has been that great.

I believe it necessary that all of us realize the critical importance of allocating the highest possible amount of funds for fiscal 1970 education programs. I like to paraphrase President Kennedy when he noted that the continued growth and development of this country depends more on education than on any other single element.

Behind the Nixon administration's attempt to substantially lower these appropriations lies an oblique motive, one that the noted economist Kenneth Boulding pointed out last month at the Congressional Conference on Planning for New Priorities in America when he said that there has been—and continues to be—a direct trade-off between the military and educational sectors.

So, it thus becomes a question of priorities, and I am hard pressed to find any program area with as huge—or as broad—benefits as those that come from the funds budgeted for educational assistance.

I am astonished to hear critics of the Joelson amendment calling it unwarranted overspending. The meat ax has fallen again to chop up vital programs in health, education, and urban affairs, but I have yet to see similar-sized spending reductions proposed for the Military Establishment, for public works, for agricultural subsidies, or for such pet projects as the supersonic transport.

The bipartisan backers of the Joelson amendment continue to emphasize that their objective is primarily to reestablish previous program levels. And, even with adoption of the amendment we would still be putting far too little in many key education programs. In just its balance alone, I point out—as did the distinguished Member from Iowa (Mr. SMITH)—that the Joelson amendment tends to proportionately underfund valuable programs for college facilities, student loans, and interest subsidies.

Failure to pass the Joelson amendment would mean dangerous setbacks for all citizens. Can we really "afford" to cut back on aid to impacted areas, on our school libraries, on educational equipment? Can we "afford" less guidance and counseling, lower construction grants, reduced vocational education?

The price all of us would pay if the Joelson amendment is defeated is far too exorbitant in terms of the future course of this Nation. The entire thrust of Federal aid to education stands today at a crossroads, and the right direction to take is that of the Joelson amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I support the Joelson amendment to this education bill for the simple reason that it will provide more money and give more American schoolchildren an opportunity to receive a better education than it provides in the original bill. In the impacted areas alone it would restore most of the funds authorized back to 90 percent so we could have an additional \$398 million for our American school system. It would also aid vocational education and bring that figure up to \$331,500,000. It would also aid title I of the bill so the figure would be up to \$180 million. The Joelson amendment also contains a number of other important provisions that would help bring up the standard of American education which is today operating far below the status a rich nation should tolerate for its millions of citizens in the school-age bracket.

I well remember the fight we made in the 83d Congress almost 15 years ago to

pass a major education bill but it was defeated by the Republican-southern Democrat coalition by the small margin of only four votes out of about 350 cast. Had it not been for the four-vote margin of defeat millions of American schoolchildren would have taken advantage of an improved and advanced system of education during the intervening time since 1954. Thousands of school dropouts would have been saved and possibly occupying important positions in our Nation and economy, some of whom today may be partaking in riots and disorders and joining the army of discontents and unemployed American youth.

Let us not make the same mistake on this education bill as 15 years ago, much to the regret of millions of younger citizens and to the discredit and deteriorations of our school system. The greatest investment we can make today is to spend money for education and preserve our Nation and free government for future generations.

I understand the Ways and Means Committee tax reform bill will be on the floor of the House next week, and if Members are alert and study the provisions of the new tax reform legislation maybe we can close some of the fabulous and fraudulent loopholes enjoyed by big oil companies, foundations, real estate corporations and so forth, and so forth, and bring many billions of dollars into the Federal Treasury in next year's tax receipts from mammoth corporations who are well able to pay some of their profits into the Federal Government for the progress of our Nation and the education of our present and future generations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, a society will be judged, in the long run, by how sensitively it deals with its poor and underprivileged and how well it educates its young.

This Nation spends billions of dollars a year on armament systems—some of which have not even been proven workable. What kind of value structure do we have when we are willing to appropriate so much money for armaments of questionable value, but are not willing to deal nearly so imaginatively—or generously—with the development of our children's intellects.

We can spend all the money in the world for armaments and for space capsules, but how secure will this Nation be 10 or 20 years from now if we fail to provide an education which develops each child to the fullness of his ability and potential.

And, what are we really talking about today. Even if the amendment now before the House is passed, this would only appropriate funds for higher education at 4.6 percent of the original level authorized. Available funds for student loans would only be at slightly over 80 percent of that originally authorized, and title I money, which is such a necessary part of the budgets for so many school districts, would only be funded at 44 percent of its original authorization.

The Joelson amendment is trying, at least in a small way, to close the gap between congressional promises and congressional action—a gap which has left

local educators frustrated and confused and which has left local property taxpayers holding the bag for a very large portion of the cost of our educational system.

How can those who support tax incentives for capital investment for industry rationalize a vote against this amendment, which is really an investment in human beings, in the growth of young peoples' minds, and in the brain power of the future leaders of this country.

Abraham Lincoln said:

Education is the most important subject which we as a people can be engaged in. That every man may receive at least, a moderate education, and thereby be enabled to read the histories of his own and other countries, by which he may duly appreciate the value of our free institutions, appears to be an object of vital importance.

Mr. Chairman, I believe education is a subject of crucial concern and I do not believe the amendment before this House today sets too high a price for a matter of such importance to this Nation's future.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, we all know that when the Federal Government has workers in a community and they are working or living on Federal property or both, it is certain that the school district is deprived of local school revenue for its children, and that the children suffer in proportion.

Public Law 874 which provides for the Federal Government to pay its school taxes, just like other property owners pay their taxes, has helped millions of children receive a better education. The formulas in this law provide for the Federal Government to pay its taxes according to the burden imposed on the community.

There has been much talk today about the "B" pupil. A "B" pupil, as we have come to learn, is a child whose parents live off but work on Federal property. The parents of a "B" pupil pay taxes on their home but the plant where the parents work pay no local school taxes. It is easy to see that a severe burden is placed on a school district when it has children whose parents work on property which pays no local school taxes.

Mr. Chairman, it is strange to me that the Federal Government can impose such a burden on a local school board, and then expect that same school board to run a good school on half of the local revenue proportionately of that of other schools who are not affected by Federal impact.

Our children are our most priceless possession and their educational welfare comes first with the parents of this country. Surely the Members of this body cannot still believe that our school officials can run fine schools with one-half of the local school revenue cut off.

Cutting off the money for the so-called B pupil in an impacted school district would do vastly more harm than is generally realized. There are at least 2¼ million students whose parents live on or work on Federal property. If the Federal Government refuses to pay its school taxes on the plant where the parents of these children work these 2¼ million children are not going to be the only ones

to suffer. All of the approximately 20 million children who are in school systems affected by Federal impact will suffer if the Federal Government refuses to pay its school taxes because these school systems can do nothing but lower the level of education.

It is most difficult to believe that anyone could say, "Let us lower the education of 20 million schoolchildren." I hope that is not what we, in effect, do today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, the failure of the Appropriation Committee to adequately fund the programs under H.R. 13111 is a serious and costly mistake.

I therefore have joined with many of my colleagues, including a majority of the members of our Committee on Education and Labor, in drafting and supporting the package of amendments presented by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

While I am opposed to all the cuts advocated by the committee, I am particularly disturbed by the callous attitude toward library services and vocational education.

These areas are even more necessary than some of the more touted features of our educational system.

I am sure that in final action by the Congress there will be a wiser decision made and both of these sections will be funded more adequately.

Since there appears to be a misunderstanding on just what the Joelson amendment covers, I present an analysis and explanation of the proposal now before us:

PERTINENT FACTS ON THE JOELSON AMENDMENT
TO H.R. 13111

Item No.	Fiscal year 1969 appropriation	Fiscal year 1970 package amendment	Package increase over H.R. 13111
1. Impact aid.....	\$505,900	\$585,000	\$ 398,000
2. ESEA title II— School Library.....	50,000	\$ 50,000	(¹)
3. NDEA Title III— Equipment.....	78,740	\$ 78,740	\$ 110,453
4. NDEA Title V— Guidance and Counsel.....	17,000	\$ 17,000	(²)
5. ESEA Title III— Supplementary Centers.....	164,876	\$ 164,876	(³)
6. Vocational education.....	248,216	488,716	\$ 131,500
7. Higher Education— Construction, 4-year under- graduate.....	33,000	33,000	\$ 33,000
8. NDEA student loan.....	193,400	229,000	\$ 40,794
9. Title I, ESEA.....	1,123,127	1,396,975	\$ 180,800
Total.....			894,547

¹ To provide sufficient funds for 90 percent of the authorization.

² In the amendment, these programs are individually funded. They are not consolidated.

³ To provide funds equal to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1969.

⁴ To provide additional funds to meet urgent needs in vocational education.

⁵ To provide funds equal to the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1969.

⁶ To provide necessary funds for increased demand for student loans.

⁷ To provide for increases in program costs; and to restore funds for grants to local educational agencies, which grants have been diminished by amendments increasing the total number of participating agencies.

BRIEF EXPLANATION OF INCREASED FUNDING
PROPOSALS TO H.R. 13111

Following are brief explanations of the nine specific increases over H.R. 13111 that are included in the proposals for increased funding.

Impact Aid (PL 874): The proposal will provide \$585 million, which is \$398 million more than provided in H.R. 13111. It represents a funding level for Impact Aid Program of about 90% of the authorizations.

While less than 3 million children are counted in the Impact Aid formula, the impact of Federal funds from this program enriches the educational programs in schools in which there is an enrollment of approximately 45 million. In fiscal year 1969, \$505,900,000 was appropriated, approximately 90% of the entitlement of that year.

Vocational Education: The proposal will provide \$488,716,000 for the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended last year. This represents a \$131,500,000 increase over the amounts provided in H.R. 13111. The largest amount of the increase is for the purpose of adding to the amounts available for basic grants to states.

Basic grants to states will be insufficient to carry forward ongoing programs in many states, if additional amounts are not provided for basic grants because of the set-asides written in the law as a result of the 1968 amendments.

The 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act were almost unanimously hailed by the Congress last year as being absolutely essential in furnishing occupational training opportunities in the State vocational education systems throughout the Nation. Unless the amendments of 1968 are adequately funded, this was empty acclaim.

The additional amount provided in the proposal will implement those portions of the 1968 amendment which call for occupational training programs for the disadvantaged, as well as providing funds for vocational educational research, so essential in developing new teaching methods and materials and in fashioning training in new occupational fields being developed as a result of our technological advancement.

ESEA Title II, School Library Programs: This proposal provides \$50 million for Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. An identical amount was provided for this program in fiscal year 1969. This program makes grants to State educational agencies for the purpose of acquiring textbooks, library resources, and other instructional materials for loan to both public and private students and teachers in the elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation.

Evidence presented to the appropriations committee of the House, as well as to the authorizing committee, indicates that the need in this area is in the magnitude four times that provided in the package. Nevertheless, the provision of \$50 million will assure some progress in developing elementary and secondary school libraries and in enabling many school districts to acquire textbooks and new instructional materials essential to the educational process.

NDEA Title III, Equipment: \$78,740,000 was appropriated in fiscal year 1969 for this program. This proposal will add to the bill this same amount for fiscal year 1970.

The evidence clearly establishes a continuing need to fund this program. Many schools lack necessary instructional equipment in the fields of science, mathematics, modern foreign languages, and other basic academic courses. Past funds have not been adequate to fulfill all of the need. It would be an injustice to the many school districts who have not participated in this program to now be denied the opportunity to be provided with equipment. Evidence clearly demonstrates that this equipment strengthens learning opportunities in school districts that have been fortunate enough to obtain benefits from the program since its inception in 1958.

NDEA Title V, Guidance and Counseling: This proposal provides \$17 million for this program, which is the same amount that was

provided in fiscal year 1969. To eliminate or reduce the size of this program is inconsistent with the growing need for the career and academic guidance of elementary and secondary school children throughout the nation.

I am convinced that it is essential to expand on this program immediately. With greater emphasis being placed on occupational and vocational training in the school systems and in view of the emerging new career opportunities, the financial resources of state and local systems are not adequate to meet the increasing demand and need. Hence, a cutback in Federal support at this time would be critically damaging in many school systems throughout the nation.

ESEA Title III, Supplemental Educational Centers: This proposal contains \$164,876,000 for fiscal year 1970, the same amount as provided in fiscal year 1969. As a result of the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title III is now a state-operated program.

On the basis of the Congressional action in 1967, the resources of state educational agencies have been expanded to administer this program and to develop systematic allocation of funds in the state for programs and projects.

Any reduction in funds at this time will cut back on ongoing programs and the value of the experimentation and demonstration aspects will be lost. To preserve the investment already made in these programs, it is essential to fund them at least at the level established in fiscal year 1969.

Higher Education Act, Construction of Facilities: This proposal contains \$33 million for the construction of four-year undergraduate facilities. This is the same amount as appropriated in fiscal year 1969.

There is absolutely no justification for any cutback in grants to institutions of higher education for the construction of undergraduate academic facilities. Funds must be appropriated in view of the continued pressure on such institutions for accommodating increased numbers of students.

NDEA Student Loans: This proposal provides \$229 million for the direct student loan program authorized by Title II of the National Defense Education Act. This is \$36,600,000 more than appropriated in fiscal year 1969 and \$40,794,000 over the amount provided in H.R. 13111.

The rapid rise in interest rates has seriously cut back the availability of guaranteed loans. Unless more funds for direct government loans are made available, there will be no way for students to obtain financing for their higher education expenses. Additional funds in the direct NDEA student loan program are absolutely essential to enable many students to continue their college education and to take care of the expected demands on student assistance for entering freshmen.

Title I, Elementary and Secondary Education Act: This proposal provides for an increase of \$180,800,000 over the amount provided in H.R. 13111. Since the enactment of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a number of new programs have been added to cover the needs of children in state-operated programs. These new programs, by virtue of the 1967 amendments, must be fully funded before local education agencies are provided any funds from the appropriation.

In an under-funding situation, this means that all local educational agencies have not gained the full benefit from increased appropriations. In fact, these program add-ons result in reduced allocations to local educational agencies in fiscal 1969 under fiscal 1968. It is estimated that the program add-ons amounted to approximately \$81 million.

In addition, the costs for the operation of Title I programs have risen since its inception, and the slight increases provided for the program have not enabled the program

to be either strengthened or enlarged to meet the total need.

Approximately nine million children now are served by Title I programs. An increase, as proposed in the package, will enable the per pupil expenditure to be increased from approximately \$135 to \$155, with resulting greater impact on the progress in the children involved in these programs.

Evidence presented to the appropriations committee and the authorizing committee discloses that where programs have concentrated funds on smaller numbers of students, much greater results have been produced. I feel very strongly that, rather than reducing the number of children served by these programs, additional funds should be provided. These additional funds will not only strengthen the quality of instruction for those participating, but enable some expansion of the program to include more needy children who are not now participating. Even with the funds provided by this proposal, the program will be under-funded by as much as 60%.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment to restore funds for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, impact aid, NDEA, libraries, and higher education.

The schoolchildren of America need our help this afternoon. Unless we act now to vastly increase our support of education, our children will continue to be deprived of the opportunity for an adequate education.

This is the challenge that faces us today. It is essentially a test of national priorities. Are we to provide adequate support for the basic program of Federal aid for elementary and secondary education? Or are we to allow our promises of 1965, and 1966, and 1967, and 1968 to wither and die?

Our children, and the Nation, are looking to us for a firm commitment. If our answer is "no" to education, then we must accept responsibility for the further deprivation of opportunity for millions of young people, and a declining ability of many of our people to exist in and contribute to an increasingly complex civilization.

The real answer is that we need more education, not less, and we can ill afford the false economy to be derived by shaving a few million dollars from these vital education programs. On a long-range basis, such a cutback or retrenchment can have only adverse effects. Even the increased funding sought this afternoon will not bring the support of education fully to the authorized level, much less what it should be under any realistic appraisal of our national needs.

Let us look at some figures on ESEA funding. The amendment seeks only an additional \$180,800,000 over the amount for title I approved by the Appropriations Committee. Title I gives aid for educationally deprived children. Here is where we help the children from low-income families who will fuel the flames in the ghettos tomorrow unless we educate them today—the handicapped, Indian children on the reservation, migrant children, neglected, and delinquent children.

Under title I we seek answers to poverty, delinquency, unemployment, illiteracy, and school dropouts—all part of a vicious circle of despair and neglect that is eating at our society. Education is

the vital key to solving these problems. Yet of \$2.3 billion authorized for the current fiscal year the administration has seen fit to recommend only \$1.2 billion in appropriations. Even if we increase the committee request we will still be \$1 billion short of the authorization. How much greater is the actual need?

We also seek an additional \$110,453,000 under ESEA and NDEA programs that were "merged" by the administration. These programs are title II of ESEA, providing for books and certain visual aid material; NDEA title III programs for equipment; NDEA V for counseling and guidance; and ESEA title III for supplementary educational services. The authorized amount for all four is \$1.1 billion, but astonishingly the administration requested no funds at all for three of the programs and only \$116 million for ESEA title III. The authorized amount for that program alone is \$566 million. To spare some of the effects of this meat-ax cut the amendment would add \$110,453,000 to the committee-approved amount of \$200 million.

In view of the administration's attitude toward the three programs from which it proposed to withhold all funds, it seems apparent that little if any support will be given to library resources and other vital educational needs to these areas unless Congress acts to preserve their separate funding. The House bill would provide no categorical grants to the States for these purposes, and States would be free to abandon the programs altogether.

I support the additional funds I have listed as well as the other provisions of the package amendment to which I have earlier addressed my remarks. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which has become the cornerstone of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education in this Nation, should be fully funded. Short of that at least this modest amendment providing additional funds must be passed.

Education is our biggest national need, and no other goal should receive higher priority. I urge my colleagues to vote today for education by supporting the package amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the Joelson amendment also provides \$40,794,000 in increased funds for the NDEA student loan program during fiscal year 1970.

The program has not been funded anywhere near the needed level in recent years, and the amount approved by the Appropriations Committee is a retrenchment from even the current support. The amendment would add some \$40.8 million to the committee request.

The committee allowed \$188.2 million for the NDEA loan program, \$26.3 million more than the amount requested by the administration but \$5.2 million less than was appropriated for the 1969 fiscal year. The committee cut \$16 million from the requested budget for educational opportunity grants and \$5.3 million from the NDEA fellowship budget, directing that the reductions be applied entirely to funds for first-year students.

This reduction left \$159.6 million for educational opportunity grants, \$35.1 million more than was provided in fiscal

1996, and \$56.1 million for NDEA fellowships, \$13.8 million less than in 1969.

As much as I would like economy in Government, I feel that our vital educational programs are not the place to apply the budget ax. Before depriving millions of American students of the opportunity to receive the education they need in our complex society, we should reduce or eliminate waste and extravagance in our defense spending and in the procurement practices throughout Government.

The committee's slash of \$16 million from educational opportunity grants will, I suppose, pay for the \$15 million repair bill of the submarine allowed to sink in a naval yard. The \$5.2 million reduction in the NDEA loan program might, perhaps, pay for another bombing mission in Vietnam. Yet I question whether such military spending should be allowed greater precedence over programs which are basic to our national stability and growth, to wit, the children of America.

Our Education and Labor Committee hearings documented the need for student loan funds. Thousands of young people in every State are ready, willing, and able to achieve college degrees—but they lack the financial ability. A small investment in them will pay infinite rewards to our Nation in the future as they apply the professional talents gained through higher education.

Clearly there is no better investment in democracy and in our Nation's future. Without increasing education and knowledge we cannot survive. We need the best brains of this country and should benefit from them regardless of the accident of the parents' ability to finance an expensive education.

The student loan program accomplishes the objective of increasing our national educational resource from among all segments of the population. Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to give their full support to this very modest but much-needed additional funding, and to vote "yea" for the entire amendment to be offered by Congressman JOELSON.

Mr. FREY. Mr. Chairman, it disturbs me to think that many qualified students will be unable to begin or continue their college education in the fall due to the lack of student grant and loan funds from the Federal Government. While all of us want a substantial reduction in the Federal budget and have so voted on previous occasions, it seems that loan programs such as NDEA, allowing the individual to help himself, are more worthy of retention than others based on pure welfare. Several university and college presidents in Florida have written to me concerning the reduced funding for these programs. One said:

The projected cutback will force us to deny assistance to approximately 700 qualified students in the 1969-70 academic year.

Another said:

Our institution has diligently adhered to requirements and suggestions by the Office of Education to actively recruit and commit financial assistance to students in the early stages of their secondary school career. Money has been promised, hopes have been built and now it appears they cannot be fulfilled.

And Dr. Charles N. Millican, the president of Florida's newest institution of higher learning, Florida Technological University in Orlando, said:

The National Defense Student Loan program has been the major source of college aid for ten years. Many students will be unable to attend college unless these funds are increased. It is tragic to have qualified students turned away from the university because no financial aid is available to them. Now that the government has begun these programs, it seems imperative they be continued in keeping with our national goals and purpose.

I cannot agree more. And those who recommend that the federally insured loans through banks, credit unions, and savings and loan associations be utilized to offset these other forms of aid are not, in my opinion, being very realistic. While I like the approach, it is not working. Not a single financial institution in one of the largest counties in my district is making any new loans under this program at the present time. Only five of the more than 30 financial institutions in this county are even in the program, and many times they make loans only to those students who come from families with financially stable backgrounds.

As one of the 22 Congressmen who spent a week visiting various college and university campuses throughout the Nation, I can tell you from personal contact with administration, faculty, and students that these programs are vital to higher education in America. It is my belief that any student who is qualified to attend college and is ready to devote four years of hard work for a degree, but does not have the necessary finances, should be afforded the opportunity through a government loan. This is not a handout. The loan must be repaid. This is the type of program that is needed in this country where people are given the opportunity to help themselves. I therefore call on my colleagues to support additional NDEA student loan funding.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, there is no more important work for the Congress than our duty to insure that future generations have the intellectual capacity to cope with the challenging world of tomorrow that we have erected for them. They cannot meet this challenge without an opportunity to develop their minds, their skills, and their spirits to the fullest extent.

The amendment by Congressman JOELSON provides additional funds beyond those proposed by the Appropriations Committee for such programs as vocational education, aid for low income children, library and textbook materials, guidance and counseling, educational equipment, increased student loan funds, and a substantial increase in impact aid.

The people of my 30th Congressional District, educators, school board members, college officials, and, most of all, parents, support increased funds for education.

These are responsible, intelligent people who are aware of the dangers of inflation, which concern us all. They believe, as I do, that the welfare of the children and youth of this country can-

not be sacrificed in the name of false economy.

Tax reform will bring additional revenues. Let us use a small portion of this and whatever savings we can make in the defense and other hardware budgets to provide for an investment in the most essential factor in the formula for a bright future for our Nation—the minds of our children and youth.

Specifically, Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment and, in particular, NDEA title V, guidance and counseling.

In the fiscal year 1969, this program was given \$17 million—a small figure compared to what is needed for an effective program. Is it not inconceivable that in the proposed budget for fiscal year 1970, absolutely no funds were requested for this purpose at all? The amendment only requests that we restore the \$17 million to try to meet this need.

This program fulfills one of the most basic needs in education today—that of face-to-face contact with the youth of our Nation. In order to learn, one must be instilled with the desire to learn. If a child is not learning as he should, why is he not? Testing is done to determine a child's learning level; interest is taken in personal problems which might hinder him in his learning process. These problems—and many more—our counselors study and correct; and they must be handled personally, not with books or computers.

Guidance and counseling, title V-A of the National Defense Education Act, is in dire need of increased funds. But instead of an increase, what does the committee-reported bill hold for this vital field? Almost elimination. One out of ten counselors in America is paid from title V-A funds. What will happen to them?

More importantly, what will happen to the children whom they help year after year?

The estimated personnel loss in this field is 4,000 from the State Departments of Education as a result of the budget recommendations for fiscal year 1970. A loss of one person in this field is a backward step and a detriment to our educational program and to our children. The loss of 4,000 would be a disaster.

It is entirely out of character for the Congress to ignore the needs of education, but that is what this bill would do. What we are striving for now is not, unfortunately, the improvement necessary for this program, but rather for the mere survival of the existing facilities and personnel. Already this field is one of the most neglected in the majority of the States; so how can we possibly consider reduction or elimination of these funds in the coming year?

In the interest of our children's education and, in turn, the future of our Nation and its continuing growth, I recommend that we vote for the amendment before us today, and bring funding for guidance, counseling, and testing—title V-A of NDEA—back up to last year's level.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the Joelson amendment.

The funds contained in this amendment, less than one-half of 1 percent

of the 1970 budget, will at least enable us to begin meeting the great unmet need for more effective education programs on all levels.

The committee bill, by itself, and even with the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) means that funding for the important new education programs in 1970 will not be much higher than last year's level. But increasing costs will result in an actual cutback in programs even if Federal funding stays the same or is increased slightly.

For my State, Minnesota, the Joelson amendment means an additional \$8.5 million to our local school districts and an additional \$3.5 million to our colleges and universities. Without these necessary extra Federal dollars, I know that educational progress will be stalled in Minnesota next year.

Several days ago I received a telegram urging support for a larger education appropriation from Stuart Rider, chairman of the Minneapolis Board of Education. Because Mr. Rider's statement expresses the need for increased funding so effectively, I am including it with my remarks:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., July 24, 1969.
Representative DONALD M. FRASER,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Minneapolis Board of Education unanimously recommends your active support of full funding for the pending HEW education appropriations. We further recommend that the individual categorical programs be maintained and not grouped, since such groupings will destroy promising programs. In a time of mounting school crises we feel an urgent need for massive Federal assistance to provide the kind of education program that not only can place men on the moon but can educate men to live peacefully and creatively on our planet.

STUART W. RIDER, JR.,
Chairman, Minneapolis
Board of Education.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlemen from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

In 1965, the Congress responded to the Johnson administration's exhortation to upgrade our educational system with the passage of the Secondary and Elementary Education Act of 1965. This action represented a significant part of a large commitment by the Federal Government to help both the "disadvantaged" and "estranged" in our country. In 1969, both the greatness of man's epic journey to the moon and the malaise of our urban crisis give rise to an even greater challenge to America's educational system. At no time in our Nation's history has the education of our 60 million schoolchildren loomed into such importance as it has today.

In view of these considerations, I believe that the Joelson amendment would give increased meaning to the numerous programs which were previously authorized by the Congress. It is clear that increased funding is vitally necessary if the effectiveness of the numerous programs is going to be continued and expanded. At stake is the educational welfare of 60

million students and millions of others who seek to uplift themselves.

The Joelson amendment would provide sufficient funds for 90 percent of the authorization under Public Law 874—impact aid program. My own State of Hawaii is no exception in being heavily dependent upon the funds from this program.

As one of the focal centers of the Pacific region, Hawaii is the site of a very high concentration of military installations and personnel necessary to man them. Substantial numbers of children of both military and civilian personnel employed at the various military installations attend Hawaii's public schools, nearly all of which are situated off the military bases. Funds from the impact school aid program have been most essential in helping to maintain the high quality of education which is offered to these schoolchildren. The Hawaii State board of education has budgeted for its 1970 needs in reliance of the receipt of impacted school aid funds. Failure to appropriate adequate funds would thus imperil the educational future of these children and represent a callous disregard of their assessed needs.

At a time when the demands on our colleges and universities are increasing almost proportionately with our contemporary knowledge explosion, the Joelson amendment would also provide a small but necessary amount for the construction of 4-year undergraduate academic facilities. If we hope to give meaning to our insistent advice to graduating high school students to pursue higher education then we must provide sufficient appropriations, particularly in view of the continuing financial pressure on our institutions of higher learning, for the accommodation of increased numbers of students. And at the same time, unless more funds are allocated for direct Government loans as authorized by title II of the National Defense Education Act, many of these young aspiring students will have no way of financing their higher education.

In sum, support for the increased funding included in this package amendment would establish not only what is fair and just, but it would also insure today's educational well-being of those upon whose shoulders will some day rest the responsibilities of this great Nation.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which is being offered today to increase education assistance programs by about \$890 million in an effort to meet the educational needs of America as it enters the 1970's.

At a time when increased numbers of students are trying to enter college and are in need of assistance, at a time when interest rates are at the highest levels in our Nation's history, and banks are making almost no loans to families for college assistance—even under the Government's guaranteed loan programs—it is unconscionable for the Federal Government to provide less money for student college assistance in fiscal 1970 than it did in fiscal 1969. College administrators and students currently enrolled in school depend on a continuing level of

commitment from the Federal Government; the bill we have before us breaks faith with that commitment.

One of the programs being cut is the National Defense Education Act. This is the act that the Congress enacted to overcome the technological, scientific, and educational gap which had developed between the United States and the Soviet Union. This is the act that gave us the educated and trained manpower to put men on the moon. This is the act which has opened whole new vistas of opportunity to us as a nation. Yet in the same week that the first moon walkers are in quarantine we are being asked to cut the NDEA program which has proven to be such a success.

The effect of these NDEA cuts will be severely felt everywhere. In Cuyahoga County, in which Cleveland is located and which has a population of nearly 2 million, the NDEA student loan allocation for the coming school year to 10 colleges will be \$563,443 less than it was in the just completed school year. Case Western Reserve University, for example will receive about \$300,000 less than last year. John Carroll University will receive 40 percent of what it received last year. How can students or administrators of these fine institutions possibly make any rational plans with such drastic slashes in the loan fund?

Approval of today's amendments is also vital for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, both public and private. Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Act will be increased by \$180,800,000. This will mean that assistance to school districts with children from low-income families will receive extra and desperately needed funds to provide better quality education. Only with increased funding of this program can the cycle of poor education, poor opportunity, and poverty be broken. The amendment will also provide an additional \$131,500,000 for vocational education through the States. If this increase is not approved, many on-going programs in the States will have to be curtailed or stopped. In our increasingly complex and technical society, a trained and skilled work force is a must. If we fail to provide the opportunity for learning skills, unemployment and disillusionment will become a growing and permanent feature of our society.

To fail to provide these needed education funds or even match the funds appropriated last year will be to force the local school districts either to curtail their services or to attempt to provide them through increased local levies. To curtail the services is to curtail our future as a nation. Yet local districts face an impossible task in obtaining adequate increases in levies. The taxpayer's revolt, spurred by the surtax and the awareness of injustice in the Federal tax code, has displayed itself where it hurts the most—in local school bond issues and levies. This year we must not reduce our commitment to American Education or our local school systems will be irreparably damaged.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Joelson amendment. I want the RECORD to show that I

feel that the Federal Government has an even larger commitment to education and that the Joelson amendment is a step in the right direction.

If we examine the trend of national commitments to education throughout the world, we note that the United States spends less at all levels of government together than the Soviet Union on education. We also note that the United States ranks low among all nations, non-Communist and Communist, in the amount of tax dollars spent for education in proportion to the total tax dollars collected. As others have said: We have won the moon race, but will we win the education race? We must be prepared to commit the necessary resources to our Nation's future, and our young people must be well-educated to handle the momentous problems of tomorrow.

During the debate that has occurred, there have been several references to the Public Law 874 program as a "bonanza." I am not certain what the implication is with respect to the term being used in this context. If the suggestion is that the impacted aid program is a bargain or an extra and undeserved dividend, I think it would be well for those who have used the term to confer with their local school officials about whether the Federal payments under the program even match the actual maintenance and operation costs incurred with federally connected students. I think their experience will be the same as mine that the Public Law 874 program does not meet these costs. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, it is important that we approve the Joelson amendment so that our school districts will receive at least 90 percent of their entitlement under the program.

As one might expect, throughout the debate there have been references to the budgetary impact of the Joelson amendment. It certainly is true that it provides for an additional \$895 million for nine education programs. But that amount does not even match our annual subsidy to the cotton and wheat growers of this Nation. Surely, we can afford to provide commensurate support for our education systems. Also, there is the matter of a \$3 billion budget surplus for the recent fiscal year. It would be my hope that we can utilize a portion of the surplus in programs that are investments in our Nation's future. The Joelson amendment represents such an investment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I recommend the adoption of the Joelson amendment.

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

(Mr. GOLDWATER (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Chairman, the schools of our country are faced with the increasingly difficult tasks of providing an education for our youth and building a foundation for the future of our Nation. They are in a financial squeeze whereby the numbers of children keep rising and the tax base on which they must depend primarily for their

support is constantly shrinking. Some school districts have the additional burden of educating children whose parents either live or work on Federal property or both—thereby depriving the school districts even further of their basic operating revenue.

The federally impacted areas program has been in operation for the last 19 years and has been successful in balancing these inequities by providing funds to school districts which are overburdened because of Federal installations. By far the largest portion of the federally impacted areas program is Public Law 81-874 for school maintenance and operation. Because there are no strings attached to this aid, the program conforms with my belief that the Federal Government must not control our schools. Funds from this act have assisted schools in over 375 congressional districts, and which are attended by over half of our schoolchildren.

The HEW appropriations bill (H.R. 13111) would effectively cripple this program by removing funds for entitlement under category B—those children whose parents either live or work on Federal property. If this cut is allowed, the effects would be devastating. In California alone, the 1970 estimated entitlement is over \$100,000,000, but the proposed cuts would reduce this figure to nearly one-fourth of that amount. In the country as a whole, the proposed cut would reduce the program to nearly one-third of its total entitlements.

Two areas will be severely curtailed by this proposal—our big cities, and the communities surrounding our rural military installations. These are the very areas which have been found to be in the most desperate financial situation.

My own district, of course, is keenly concerned with the potential impact of the 3b student cuts, which the administration has proposed. I can, of course, recognize serious inequities which exist in the present program. Unfortunately, efforts to amend Public Law 874 in an attempt to alleviate these problems have failed.

Although I am in favor of such reform, I am nevertheless convinced that the retributive act of completely eliminating funds for 3b students is not the answer to the problem. If and when reform becomes attractive enough to invite action, it would in my judgment call for a gradual reduction of funds, not an across-the-board cut.

The consequences of such a cut are disastrous to the school districts of our country. Los Angeles city schools for instance would face a revenue loss of nearly \$4 million. Without adequate time to prepare for such a loss, and with the recent record of school bond defeats, I am convinced that the scope and quality of our youngsters' education would have to be seriously curtailed.

Let us examine another ramification of the problems involved with the appropriation bill as reported by committee. And that, of course, is the economic level of those areas which are affected by the Federal aid to impacted areas.

In my district, there are two principal military establishments, Edwards

Air Force Base, and the China Lake Naval Weapons Center. Both are located in desert areas of southern California, and in each case, the base represents the major economic factor of the area. The economic level surrounding military installations is often inadequate because of an inflexible tax base. It is impossible to expect educational opportunities to remain constant when this tax base offers such little room for expansion. One school district which I represent stands to lose upwards of \$55,000 if full funding is not granted. This would result in an increase of \$2.20 per \$1,000 of assessed valuation, if H.R. 13111 is approved intact. To expect depressed areas to bear that kind of increased burden is ridiculous. To expect the children of our Federal employees to attend schools which offer inferior educational resources, simply because the Federal Government is not prepared to meet its share of the burden is disgraceful; and says nothing about our commitment to make a military or Government career as attractive as possible.

Surely, this Congress can find areas in the national budget which will lend themselves to economies, without sacrificing quality education for our children.

In order to restore this vitally needed program to the minimum level which will effectively carry out its purpose, I am strongly in support of this or any amendment, which will provide the necessary moneys for the program. This will allow payments to all the school districts which are faced with the burden of Federal activities and will help us to meet our evergrowing responsibility to the youth of our Nation and, therefore, the future of our country.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, as we close debate on this particular section of the bill, may I quickly sum up. The Joelson amendment and my substitute are both in the second degree, which, for all practical purposes, will lead us into the parliamentary situation where we will have a vote on the Smith amendment to the Joelson amendment first. If that is defeated, then there will be a vote on the Robison amendment to my substitute. Thereafter, we will vote on the Michel substitute to the Joelson amendment. If that carries, there will be no vote as such on the Joelson amendment.

The Joelson amendment adds \$894.5 million to the bill over and above what we have in the bill. The Smith amendment to the Joelson amendment adds \$73.1 million, making a total package, if we were to adopt the Smith amendment to the Joelson amendment, of \$967.6 million over and above what is in the bill.

If we adopt my amendment alone, we increase the committee bill by \$318.9 million. If we add to my substitute the Robison amendment, which involves \$110.4 million, we will have a package then in that substitute of \$429.3 million.

I know the pressure is on. When I got back to the office last night, there were 35 to 40 telegrams dealing with the action that took place on the floor yesterday.

We know about the talk of full funding. It strikes me that the educators,

who ought to be the smartest people in this country, do not know what takes place in the two-step legislative process we have in Congress. They ought to know we have a separate authorizing bill and then we have an appropriating bill. How many of us have heard it said in the authorizing process that, "Oh, the figure is too high, but don't worry about it, the Appropriations Committee will take care of it."

I believe we have to look at a few other items that will show what takes place in this two-step process. In model cities we are funding at 36 percent of authorized entitlement; in water and sewer projects, we are funding at 25 percent of entitlement; in neighborhood facilities, we are funding at 36 percent of entitlement; and in waste treatment grants we are funding at only 21 percent of entitlement.

This is nothing new. It has been going on ever since Congress came into being.

I must say my friends have also been calling me and asking me to bend a little bit. I must also tell you I supported the motion in committee to increase the first part of this section of the bill by \$84 million. I am now adding to it \$318.9 in my amendment, so I have a figure of \$402.9 million above the Nixon budget. If I had heard anybody say 2 weeks ago that I would take such action, I would have said he was crazy. I cannot believe it myself. I awakened this morning at 5 o'clock, and I was distressed about this action of mine. How can I justify it?

First of all, I think we must agree on priorities. The President is making his trip, and we know we want to get this war over with. Second, we know we must curb inflation and get our financial house in order so we can do all the additional things we would like to do on a broader scale. But we are not able to do so now because of the fiscal situation.

We cannot do it simply by raising taxes or the prime interest rate or the rediscount rate. The best thing is to cut Federal expenditures or at least keep them in line with the President's budget.

The Federal Government has to take the lead in setting the tone, and Congress has not done so up to this time. I recall when President Johnson said:

We have to combat inflation. We have to do all these things. The last thing we want to do is to impose wage and price controls.

President Nixon takes the same position. We do not want to impose wage and price controls.

Let me wind up here with a few simple statistics.

The President in his revised budget cut the adjusted Johnson budget by \$4 billion. Now, we have heard some horns tooted around here about the fiscal year 1969 ending up with a \$3 billion surplus. Let me remind the Members that \$8.4 billion of that surplus comes about by an increase in the trust funds receipts, overexpenditures from those trust funds.

Have we had any legislation on this floor yet to increase social security benefits? At one time they were supposed to be raised 7 percent. It is said now that they should be raised 10 percent. I expect that with the cost of living going up as it is, the increase will be even

more. That increase has to come out of the trust funds.

Before we start to spend the surplus we had better think about where the surplus came from.

I pointed out yesterday that since April 1 uncontrollable spending has risen \$2.5 billion, according to the President's statement. If what is going on over in the other body ends up with no extension of the surcharge, we will lose \$10 billion of revenue.

So we have to take a stand here in this Congress today. I have gone overboard in proposing amendments here to increase this bill by \$400 million. I hope the Members will support the substitute amendment and vote down the Joelson amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized to close debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, a curtain speech is always as tiresome to the speaker as it is to the audience. I have been on both sides of those footlights, and I know just how you feel and just how I feel.

I want you to know this. I have said this to many of the Members here on the floor, in the hallways and the cloak-rooms, and I say it now so you will be sure: I urge the adoption of the Michel substitute amendment.

I said that when the budget came to my committee it was utterly unrealistic. I said it in my opening remarks yesterday, and for the purpose of emphasis I say it now. I am not changing my colors.

Now, my friend from New Jersey and I have lunched together countless times since he has been here gracing these Halls. He will leave in September. He will not have the great privilege—at least I doubt it—of voting for his own amendment on the final passage of the bill. He will be in the ivory tower of the court in the great State of New Jersey. God grant him well.

But with all my friendship and with all my affection and with all my regard, Mr. Chairman, I will not be a party to giving him a going away present of \$1 billion.

I was amazed that the amendment got to the floor. Technically it is here, but it violates by its presence the intent and the spirit of the rules of this House for generations, for appropriation bills are considered paragraph by paragraph by paragraph for amendment, points of order or whatever else the rules provide. But it is here.

This package—I have heard about it for weeks. I recall the lines from a play. I will have to leave a bad word out. The crown prince said to his father:

This package, this baggage, this creature, this hydra-headed monster, this thing which casts a blot upon the escutcheon, sire, of this noble house.

This has been a great 2 days. I did not limit debate until everybody wanted it limited, and believe me there were people who were after me today to limit debate. Oh, no. My grandfather McCarthy would turn over in his grave if I tried to stop

people from talking, beginning with his grandson.

Now you have heard the arguments pro and con here. This is not a question of who is for motherhood, who is for children, who is for education. There are \$10 billion in the various Federal budgets for educational elements of all kinds in this Government. \$10 billion. That is neglecting to educators and the children? Oh, no.

I am amazed at my mail and the fine, dedicated educators I have met who have not the remotest idea, really—they are not fakers, they are good, honest people—of the distinction and the difference between authorizations and appropriations. These fine people have not the remotest idea. They are teaching civics and history and education and are urging participation—and properly so—by their students in government and politics. Authorization, authorization. They forget the privilege constitutionally of this House, Mr. Chairman, that you should stand by appropriations, appropriations.

Oh, I hope their visits to this hallowed Chamber in these 2 days will give them a message for their students. They never before learned it themselves. It is amazing, is it not? It is amazing, but it is true. So, you see, their trip has not been wasted.

Mr. Chairman, on the Joelson amendment I have one gesture—thumbs down.

The CHAIRMAN. The first vote occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. SMITH) to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BRADEMAs) there were—ayes 81, noes 152.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. SMITH of Iowa and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 97, noes 206.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROBISON) to the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL).

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. ROBISON and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 117, noes 188.

So the amendment to the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL) as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MICHEL and Mr. JOELSON.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 160, noes 197.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question occurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. JOELSON and Mr. FLOOD.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 242, noes 106.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 26, strike out lines 1 through 7.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

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), \$202,167,000, of which \$187,000,000 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: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be available to pay local educational agencies pursuant to the provisions of any other section of said Act of September 30, 1950, until full payment has been made of the amounts to which such agencies are entitled pursuant to sections 3(a) and 6 of Title I of said Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: On page 26, strike out lines 8 through 22.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, while I did not offer an amendment to the pending bill, I want to strongly indicate my belief that the funding level recommended for the Teacher Corps is inadequate for a program with a good record of accomplishment in an area of vital need.

Although the bill as reported by the committee contains an increase of \$837,000 in the appropriations for this pro-

gram from the fiscal year 1969 level, I would hope that the other body would provide the full \$31,100,000 requested by the Nixon administration.

The Teacher Corps has won strong local support and the endorsement of the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers. Through a unique partnership of Federal funding and program format, the Teacher Corps provides an opportunity for local initiative and local creativity in attacking the problem of attracting and training of teachers specifically for poverty area schools.

The failure to provide the requested appropriations will not significantly alter the size of the Teacher Corps program, as much as it will affect the ability of the Teacher Corps to operate efficiently with the funds that are provided. This is a problem which has plagued the Teacher Corps and more particularly the local school systems and universities that have been involved in making it work. The idea of forward funding has been before us for a good deal of time. Its merits have been argued and reargued. It therefore may not arouse much concern or attention at this time, but that does not make it any less vital to our educational process. It cannot be emphasized too strongly that good programs take time to plan and execute. It takes time to recruit and select good people to carry them out. We deny our local school districts, universities and the Teacher Corps this time, when we cut this appropriation, and we deny ourselves and the children and communities this program serves.

The Teacher Corps has provided communities and universities with the opportunity to test concepts and programs which they, because of lack of money, personnel or organizational structure, could not institute themselves, but which, with Teacher Corps support, they have been able to implement and eventually expand into their regular programs.

And the Teacher Corps has proved an impetus for volunteer efforts. It has provided through its team structure a mechanism which can tap community members' and students' willingness and ability to serve and work for improvements in the quality of education and the school system, within the institutional school framework.

Again, may I state, Mr. Chairman, that I am very disappointed at the recommended level of funding in this bill for this important program. I hope that it can be restored.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

HIGHER EDUCATION

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 and 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), \$785,839,000, 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 under title I of the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 which amount 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, \$181,306,000 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.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: Beginning with line 13, on page 27, strike everything down through line 21 on page 28.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

For carrying out the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as amended (20 U.S.C. 1241-1391) (except section 102(b) and parts C and E of title I), and section 402 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, \$357,216,000, of which not to exceed \$300,336,000 shall be for State vocational education programs under part 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 G of said Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. JOELSON

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOELSON: Beginning with line 22 on page 28, strike everything down through line 17 on page 29.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. JOELSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

LIBRARIES AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

For carrying out titles I, III, and IV of the Library Services and Construction Act, as amended (20 U.S.C., ch. 16), titles I and II (except section 224) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001-1033, 1041), the Adult Education Act of 1966 (20 U.S.C., ch. 30), and part IV of title III (except section 396) of the Communications Act of 1934 (40 U.S.C. 390-395, 397-399), \$126,209,000, of which \$35,000,000 shall be for grants for public library services under title I of the Library Services and Construction Act, \$2,281,000 shall be for grants for cooperative networks of libraries under title III of such Act, \$2,049,000 shall be for grants for State institutional library services under part A of title IV of such Act, \$1,334,000 shall be for library services to the physically handicapped under part B of title IV of such Act, \$9,500,000 shall be for community service and continuing education programs under title I of the Higher Education Act, \$5,500,000 shall be for transfer to the Librarian of Congress for the acquisition and cataloging of library materials under part C of title II of such Act, \$50,000,000 shall be for adult education programs under the Adult Education Act of 1966, and \$4,000,000, to remain available until expended, shall be for educational broadcasting facilities under part IV of title III (except section 396) of the Communications Act of 1934.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, had the Joelson package amendment failed I was prepared to offer an amendment to increase student loans. Every day I receive a number of letters from students and their parents in North Dakota who are desperately looking for help in meeting the rising cost of college education. I think that certainly most of my colleagues will agree that the opportunity for young people of this Nation to attend college should be based on their ability, motivation, and desire, rather than family finances or connections. This, of course, is the reason the Congress established the student loan program in the first place.

Although I understand student mail seeking advice on financial help is reaching near-avalanche proportions in most all congressional offices, the problem is not a new one. The important difference is that we used to be able to refer these people to either their college or university financial aids officer, where they could apply for a direct loan under the national defense student loan program, or they could go to a local lending institution and apply for a loan under the guaranteed student loan program. Under one of these programs, we were reasonably confident the student could get the help he needed.

Today, this is no longer the case.

As the prime interest rate on bank loans has increased to 8½ percent, the 7-percent interest ceiling on guaranteed loans has kept the supply of funds from lending agencies for this purpose far below the demand. It is estimated, as a matter of fact, that one out of three college freshmen who seek a guaranteed loan this year will be turned down.

Because the blame for spiraling interest rates clearly rests with the Federal

Government, the responsibility for correcting the student loan emergency to the greatest extent possible belongs to the Congress.

In the Appropriations Committee, I introduced an amendment to bring the amount available for direct loans to the full amount authorized by the law. While this amendment was defeated in committee, I am glad that the Members of the House had an opportunity to vote on this key section. While the Joelson figure was less than I proposed, it is a step in the right direction.

I am aware the House Special Subcommittee on Education, under the leadership of our colleague from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, has opened hearings on ways to keep the guaranteed loan program from becoming totally ineffective. I believe, however, any serious consideration given to raising the interest ceiling on student loans or otherwise offering additional incentives to lending agencies will cause them to adopt a "wait-and-see" attitude, stopping all student loan activity until congressional action on any of the subcommittee's recommendations can be completed.

August and September, of course, are the peak months for making student loans. Colleges will begin their fall terms within 60 days, and, in the meantime, I understand the Congress will be taking its summer recess. For these reasons, I believe it is essential we act now to make sure adequate loan funds will be available to help as many qualified young people as possible get the education they want and need.

Besides the pressure put on the direct student loan funds by the declining availability of guaranteed loans, additional demands are resulting from the expansion of the equal opportunity grants. While this program makes money available to the very needy students, each grant dollar awarded must be matched by financial help provided by the college or university they attend. This year, it is recommended that \$159.9 million be distributed under the EOG program, and it is my understanding, many schools will be using direct student loan money to match these grants.

By adding \$47,694,000 to the amount approved by the Appropriations Committee for direct student loans, bringing the total to \$229 million, we will be making further education available to more than 100,000 young people who might well otherwise miss out completely on the advantages of higher education. I submit there is no wiser investment our Government can make in this Nation's future.

In conclusion let me point out that this is different from most Government programs in that it provides loans which are paid back with interest. Another factor to consider is the dividend received in the form of increased tax collections resulting from the increased earning power of those who have been able to get a higher education. Thus, while most of us support this amendment for its humanitarian benefits, a strong case can be made for it as an ultimate economic benefit to the U.S. Treasury.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PRYOR OF ARKANSAS

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas:

On page 29, line 19, after "titles I," insert "II,"

On page 30, line 3, strike out "\$126,209,000," and insert in lieu thereof "\$135,394,000."

On page 30, line 5, after "Construction Act," insert "\$9,185,000, to remain available through June 30, 1971, shall be for grants for public library construction under title II of such Act."

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, it is with some degree of reservation that I, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations, offer an amendment to this bill—especially in light of the fact that the very distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania and his splendid subcommittee have labored so long, so well, and so diligently to bring this monumental piece of legislation to the floor today.

But I speak today not in my own behalf but rather in the behalf of the public libraries of America.

The committee bill as presented at this time, notwithstanding the adoption of the Joelson amendment, is absolutely penniless in the area of moneys set aside for the construction of public libraries. The amendment I offer would fund \$9,185,000, the exact amount of last year's appropriation, into section II of the Library Services Construction Act.

This amendment, by funding only at the present level, will grant assistance to 93 public library facilities across America in fiscal year 1970. There is a total today of 276 construction projects reported to be waiting when funds ultimately become available. This is a matching fund program which I think has done a great deal for this country. These funds can be used for the construction of new buildings, additions to existing buildings, renovating, alterations, and acquisition of library facilities, and is undisputedly a program which has yielded untold benefits at a minimum cost.

But should we fail to adopt this amendment, I must stress the fact that no funds are in this bill to assist public libraries in the area of construction in fiscal year 1970.

Actually, Mr. Chairman, we are today asking for a relatively small amount to keep a great and meaningful program alive—a program which in 4 years has supported over 1,500 library projects in addition to supporting the theory that State and Federal Governments can, will, and must work together.

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I support the gentleman's amendment and wish to compliment him on offering the amendment.

The gentleman is exactly right in his statement that there is not one dime in the budget for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I thank the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, there are some things that Government should and should not do—but one thing we can do is to at least provide the impetus, the inspiration, and basic mechanics to see that all Americans are afforded the opportunity to read—whether in a library within a city, a bookmobile in a remote rural area, or in the quiet of one's own living room.

Mr. Chairman, in America, education must not die with the diploma. It must be a continuing, enriching process wherein the individual is afforded not only the opportunity but also the encouragement to read.

This is a sound amendment. It is an investment and a very splendid and worthwhile program that this Congress must not let die.

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague on his very good amendment to this legislation. This bill, H.R. 13111, does not provide any funds for the construction of libraries and \$9 million is certainly a small amount for this purpose.

Mr. Chairman, we have one of the best library systems in the United States in the State of Maryland and I urge that these funds be included in this bill so that much needed libraries can be constructed throughout the country; as well as in my own State of Maryland. The best system in the world is inadequate if the facilities are inadequate.

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the gentleman and say that I strongly support his amendment to restore funds for public library construction.

I was quite distressed by the committee's failure to recommend any funding at all for title II of the Library Services and Construction Act.

Since the enactment of Library Services and Construction Act, title II, I know that my State has benefited greatly from this program. Public library systems in Minnesota have received \$2.7 million for construction programs. This amount has been matched by \$4.1 million in local funds. Last year, for example, title II funds enabled the Minneapolis Public Library to begin construction of a new branch facility which will serve one-sixth of the city's population.

Our failure to appropriate funds for this program will be a grave setback for public library construction throughout the country. Since the authorization for title II extends through fiscal year 1971, many library systems have developed long-range construction programs with the assumption that some Federal construction money would be available at least for the next few years.

I can see no justification at all for putting the needs of the public libraries

at the bottom of our list of national priorities. But that is exactly what we will be doing if we do not adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR).

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Arkansas on his amendment. I hope it is adopted by the Committee of the Whole. I feel that it would be very dangerous to cut funds for libraries so deeply. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas provides modest support for libraries which is fully justified by the acute needs. This amendment deserves to pass. I trust it will receive great support from the Committee.

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to take this opportunity to congratulate my colleague in his very fine presentation.

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the remarks of my colleagues and thank them very much.

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

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Pryor amendment allocating \$9,185,000 for public library construction. This is a mere fraction of the amount already authorized by this House for this vital program, which has proved its worth and certainly deserves a better fate than to be left out of this year's budget and appropriations altogether. Nine million dollars is certainly a modest sum for new library construction in relation to what this Nation is spending on other programs.

There are considerations of economy to support the budget and committee cuts, of course, and they have generally an undeniable validity. But they entail serious social costs, whatever their money savings. Reading is indispensable to any self-governing society; and libraries are the fountainhead of reading. It is children who will bear the brunt of this saving and in the long run it may be dangerously expensive. It is one of those hidden prices paid for the war which, when added all together over time, can be ruinous to the Nation's security.

Man's ability to develop his talents to full potential and to contribute to the continued progress of society depends upon his opportunity to fulfill his educational needs. In turn, education depends upon information which libraries provide. The rapidly accumulating mass of information available is straining the resources and the ability of libraries everywhere to cope with its organization and dissemination. To throttle libraries in this fashion is to diminish greatly the opportunity for education itself to function effectively. Everyone has a stake in

this: the businessman, the technician, the college student, the parents of school children; and all responsible citizens concerned for the future quality of American life.

Let me repeat here an excerpt from the testimony I offered to the appropriations subcommittee last spring when they had these items under consideration.

After citing some critical situations involving communities in northwest Iowa which have been relying in good faith on the assumption that this program would continue to be funded, and which will be unable to proceed with library construction without such funds, I said:

This has certainly been a program which has proved its merit. It has extended the blessings of literature and of the printed word to people all over this country, and I just want to urge as strongly as I can that sufficient funds be restored to the Library Services and Construction Act so that this work can go forward.

These words apparently fell on deaf ears in the subcommittee, which failed to include any amount for this purpose, but I renew them now. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this very necessary amendment.

Mr. PRYOR of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for their remarks in support of the amendment I have offered.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Our friend in the well has not quite given you the picture. The title of this appropriation is "Libraries and community services." This bill is already \$18,500,000 over the budget for this appropriation. I want you to know that your committee knows exactly the circumstances. The committee has been taking advice from the experts throughout the Nation who appeared before the committee. In going over this budget we were advised by the experts to place priority at this time on library services. That is what we were advised to do by the people we think know best. They are the experts in this field of library and community services nationwide.

I do not presume to argue that there is no further need for library construction—not for a minute, not remotely. Of course there is. But the needs are not nearly what they were only a few years ago, thanks to you, Mr. Chairman, and this House. Since the enactment in 1965 of the legislation adding construction to the overall library assistance program, these appropriations have supported over 1,500 construction projects. With so much having been done by this House and the Congress to cut down this backlog of need, for 1 year you can stand by, under all the circumstances, without doing any great damage to our public libraries. I suggest that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support one of the most worthwhile programs of the Library Services and Construction Act by cosponsoring an

amendment to H.R. 13111 which would fund title II, the public library construction title of the Library Services and Construction Act at \$9,185,000; the level of last year's appropriation.

The authorization for fiscal year 1970 was \$70 million—the budget recommendation was zero—a decrease of \$70 million—completely stripping the funds seriously needed for public library construction and for the administration of the individual State plans for construction.

The States have been working diligently to raise the required matching funds for this worthy program in order that they might continue their important work on this needed and challenging job—a job which has been successful and helpful to many persons from every walk of life.

Even with the restoration of money to the fiscal year 1969 level of \$9.185 million, this will meet only 2 percent of the need in 1970. In 1969, 6 percent of the need was met.

For the RECORD, I would like to define "public library construction." It not only means the construction of new public library buildings, but also includes the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings for use as public libraries and the initial equipment of such buildings with the exception of the actual books. Other eligible expenses covered under title II of LSCA include funds for the acquisition of land and the architect's fee.

Florida was allocated \$459,680 in fiscal year 1968 under this title and with this money 14 of the construction project proposals were approved—of which, 12 were new buildings, two for remodeling, and one for an addition to the existing building.

Seven of the new buildings were central libraries in the cities of Coral Gables, Lake Park, Madeira Beach, North Park Beach, Pinellas Park, St. Petersburg Beach, and Sebring. New branch library buildings were in Blountstown, Tampa, and West Orange, with the Maryland Avenue Branch in Tampa being constructed in the model cities area. The district library of Merritt Island is obtaining a new central building. In Daytona Beach, the Florida Council for the Blind will have a new building which will permit increased service to the blind and physically handicapped in conjunction with the State library.

The two projects which consisted of remodeling existing central library structures were in Cocoa Beach and Hallendale. The Cocoa Beach building program also included the construction of an addition.

In Florida alone, there were six construction projects which were completed in the fiscal year 1968.

Since the inception of the Library Services and Construction Act, the Florida Library and Historical Commission has awarded some 43 construction grants. Of the 43 grants, 20 have been officially completed, 12 have been completed to the point that they are open for public use, nine and under construction and two have been approved but the construc-

tion is not yet underway. Approximately \$8,900,000 will be expended for library construction when all of these are officially complete.

In my own district, for example, I am proud to mention that the first project under title II of the LSCA in the State of Florida was the construction of the Bay County Library in Panama City in October 1964. So far, in my district alone, there have been four projects completed with a total Federal expenditure of \$411,786 and the total matching expenditure of \$346,000.

This is only a small sampling of the constructive and meritorious work which has been accomplished and some just begun with funds under this vital title II of LSCA. To try to overlook the total good this program has had in all 50 States would be difficult for anyone to do although it is plain to see the severe damage which would be caused by the failure of this amendment.

The 276 construction projects reported to be waiting for construction funding in fiscal year 1970 represent a total of \$156 million. Following the average funding pattern by source since the beginning of the program, two-thirds of the total would be available from non-Federal sources, leaving a need for \$52 million in Federal funds in fiscal year 1970.

Many of the towns and cities which need these construction funds have already voted on the bond issues for matching funds and some of the bond issues which have already been passed are likely to expire if Federal funds are not appropriated for these projects in fiscal year 1970.

In the amendment we are proposing today we are recommending \$9,185,000 the amount of the Federal allocation for fiscal year 1969. It is not enough but it will help to keep this important project going until the fiscal situation improves and we can provide the funds actually needed. It is only 1 percent of the amount the committee has just approved for other educational programs. If the House feels the Nation can afford \$900 million above the figure in the bill for education, the membership should by all means approve the amount requested by this amendment for library construction.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I certainly rise in support of the statement of the gentleman. I am always sympathetic to the pleas made by the chairman of the subcommittee, but I would like to call my colleague's attention to the fact that no program in this country has been more enthusiastically received by the States, and no program has received more matching grants by the States than this program to build these libraries. A nation that ignores its humanities and forgets its libraries cannot survive very long. I think as long as we are moving forward to meet the needs of the country, let us go ahead with this \$9 million.

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

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I am a firm supporter of the Labor-HEW appropriations bill before us today, but I also support the efforts which are being made on the floor this afternoon to substantially increase the funds for fiscal year 1970. Of particular concern to me is the need to increase funds for our libraries across the Nation. I would like to enclose a letter which was recently received in my office from a prominent constituent outlining the tremendous progress which has been made in my congressional district with library services moneys.

ONONDAGA LIBRARY SYSTEM,
Solvay, N.Y., July 16, 1969.

Congressman JAMES M. HANLEY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HANLEY: I appreciate the gracious reception that you gave me last Wednesday when I appealed to you to take whatever action is necessary to have the House Labor-HEW Appropriations Subcommittee, and the House Appropriations Committee increase federal aid to public libraries.

The enclosed literature explains the national value of the Library Services and Construction Act of 1966. However, let me briefly list how the federal funds have been utilized during the past two years in Onondaga County.

The Onondaga Library System Board of Trustees requested and were granted money with which to:

1. Purchase a \$35,000 Bookmobile with which Syracuse Public Library will bring books, magazines and records to Syracuse's inner-city this summer;
2. Establish an 18 county recruiting and training program to relieve the drastic shortage of librarians;
3. Launch an experiment in Manlius Public Library to prove that each library—no matter how small—should have a special young adult book collection;
4. Enable Syracuse Public Library in 1968 to encourage culturally-disadvantaged children to read;
5. Plan new library building in Syracuse, Jordan, and East Syracuse;
6. Construct a new building for LaFayette Public Library. (Money for Fayetteville, Onondaga Hill and Baldwinsville library building was denied due to a shortage of funds.)

If adequate federal funds are voted in FY 1970, the Board of the Onondaga Library System plans, among other things, to request funds to continue the recruiting project, and the planning and construction of new buildings, as well as bringing new services to Onondaga County. For example, the Onondaga Library System hopes to increase the number of films, records and pictures it can make available to the residents of the county. This is in line with the OLS Board's desire to make all libraries in the county serve as cultural banks for their respective communities, instead of only dispensing the more traditional products of a library—books and magazines.

In view of the fruitful ways in which HEW funds have been, and will be, used in the 34th Congressional District, may I respectfully request that he exert serious effort to have funds for libraries and education increased in the FY 1970 Budget.

If you wish additional discussion or information, please communicate with me.

On behalf of the Onondaga Library System, and the American Library Trustee As-

sociation, I thank you for your interest in this matter.

I remain,

Very truly yours,

DANIEL W. CASEY,

Former President, OLS; Director, Library Trustees Foundation of NYS; Chairman, Endowment Committee, ALTA.

My constituency has a great deal at stake in this bill, Mr. Chairman, through a variety of programs, not the least of which is impacted areas funds. I support vigorously, the attempts to restore full funding.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. FRYOR).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Flood) there were—ayes 138, noes 63.

So the amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACDONALD OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts: On page 30, line 3, strike out "\$126,209,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$130,834,000"; and on page 30, line 17, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,625,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD) for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the point comes too late.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation has already been amended. I direct the attention of the Chair to page 29 of the bill, to the paragraph entitled "Libraries and Community Services." The figure itself is on page 30.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, in support of my point of order that this has already been amended, and the gentleman's amendment is, therefore, not in order.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, could I be recognized?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. Is it in order to raise a point of order when the Chairman has recognized the gentleman for 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had not proceeded in debate, although the Chair had recognized him.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the Chair had already recognized the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I can still stand up. I was on my feet. The gentleman from Illinois amazes me. I had the courtesy, knowing the timing—and I am no amateur at this business—until my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts had the amendment read. I deliberately waited until that was done. The gentleman is completely incorrect.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, the fact remains I asked a parliamentary inquiry

as to whether or not the gentleman from Massachusetts, having been recognized, the point of order raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in order. I think that is a perfectly proper inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not raising a question about the right of the gentleman from Illinois to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania was already on his feet. The gentleman from Massachusetts had not started his remarks, and therefore no debate had intervened between the reading of the amendment, and the Chair upholds the right of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to raise a point of order.

Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Of course I do, Mr. Chairman. I think the Chair—and I say it in all due respect—has erred twice.

I had been recognized and I had started my remarks about this amendment, which is point No. 1.

Point No. 2: If I understood the chairman of the subcommittee correctly, he raised the point that the amount of money in this section had already been amended. I point out to the gentleman that this amendment changes money that was already in the original bill, and therefore I seek to go forward to be heard on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule on the point of order.

The Pryor amendment modified the sum of \$126,209,000, to \$135,394,000. Therefore, it is not subject to further amendment.

The gentleman seeks to amend that in his amendment, so that part of the gentleman's amendment is not in order, and the Chair sustains the point of order on that part of the gentleman's amendment.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Could I be enlightened as to when a Member who has been recognized and starts to talk has given up his right of recognition?

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order can intervene before debate is conducted on an amendment, particularly when the chairman of the subcommittee is on his feet seeking recognition. There had been no debate on the merits of the amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. My last inquiry, Mr. Chairman: Does this preclude my offering this amendment at any later point during debate on this appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot offer an amendment to the \$126,209,000, because that has already been amended, and though it is not for the Chair to instruct the gentleman as to his rights, however, in response to the question, the gentleman could offer the part of the amendment that dealt with the item on line 17 because it was not changed by prior amendment.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: On page 30, line 12, after the word "Act" strike out "\$5,500,000" and insert "\$7,356,000."

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I hasten to speak on behalf of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. It will provide \$7,356,000 for title II-C of the Higher Education Act. This provides funds to the Library of Congress to assist libraries in cataloging their collections. The \$7,356,000 provided by this amendment represents the amount approved in the budget originally submitted by the Johnson administration.

The need for this particular program is evident. The cost of cataloging is often more than the price of the book or manuscript being cataloged. Before this program was provided by the Higher Education Act of 1965, libraries were wasting untold millions of dollars each year in duplication of effort. Each library individually cataloged each book for its own library.

Libraries competed with each other for scarce, skilled catalogers. The inability of some libraries to afford catalogers and the inability of others to find catalogers meant that many library users did not have access to publications, simply because they were not cataloged.

This program has solved many of these problems. It has made it possible to catalog each book one time and quickly make copies of the card for each book available to any library. The smallest and poorest library in the country now has access to skilled catalogers. Duplication of effort has been eliminated. Readers find that they can get more materials at more libraries and can do this more quickly than before. The program has been a success. It has been particularly appreciated by university libraries who face a particularly difficult task in remaining abreast of new publications. This is why the Association of Research Libraries strongly supports this amendment. Among the many university libraries which have indicated support for full funding of title II-C of the Higher Education Act are the University of Pennsylvania, University of Texas, University of Michigan, University of Florida, Yale University, University of North Carolina, University of Illinois, Florida Atlantic University, Ohio State University, Duke University, University of Washington, Dartmouth College, University of Chicago, Pennsylvania State University, Cornell University, Princeton University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, University of Nebraska, and the University of Connecticut.

The program has also had another payoff. It has permitted libraries to save

money. Illustrative of these savings is the experience of the Pennsylvania State University library which estimates that this program saves them \$170,000 per year. The funds saved by libraries exceed many times the cost of providing this service. And the funds saved are often used to acquire new publications. The savings permitted by this program have consequently contributed immeasurably to the ability of libraries to make new acquisitions.

There are two reasons why Congress should provide the money for this program as provided by this amendment.

First, the knowledge explosion is now an established fact. Anyone who has helped his high school children do their homework recognizes this—perhaps with a bit of bitterness. The number of new publications each year exceeds those of the past. More money is needed to keep present services at the present level.

Second, the Library of Congress has acquired a very highly skilled cataloging staff since the start of this program. For the past 3 years the Library has intensified its efforts to recruit and train catalogers and supporting staff. The development of this staff has now reached the point where it could pay huge dividends. A budgetary cutback would force reduction in personnel. The loss of highly specialized personnel would be incalculable. It would be very costly to replace and it would waste the money which has gone into training over the past several years.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. This program has provided a worthy service and it has done it well. We should not force libraries to again duplicate their efforts and waste their resources. This amendment will insure the continued effectiveness of this program.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

I would like the attention of the Members so that you will know what is going on here. Here this. I want you to know, you who are so strong for the libraries today, and I include myself in that category, I want you to hear this and see what my friend from New Jersey is doing. I direct your attention to page 30 of the bill, line 3. Here is the amount—\$135,394,000 for libraries and community services. The gentleman from New Jersey with his amendment does not raise that figure one dime. What does that mean? That means the additional money he wants for this particular part of the program must come out of the hides of the libraries for which you are so strong. It must come out of their hides, because he provides no additional money in total.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, your committee raised the appropriation for this activity \$1 million, from \$4.5 million to \$5.5 million. They had \$4.5 million and we gave them another million, making it \$5.5 million, which is reasonable under all the circumstances.

Of course, you will defeat this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. MACDONALD OF MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts: On page 30, line 17, strike out "\$4,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$8,625,000".

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would add \$4,625,000 to the fiscal year 1970 appropriation for grants for educational television and radio facilities. It would restore the appropriation for this program to the figure provided by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in its original estimates to the Bureau of the Budget.

This is the matching grant program which provides the catalyst for construction of new educational television and radio stations and improvement of the facilities of existing stations. The grants go to public school systems, colleges and universities, and other public and private agencies to enable them to purchase the equipment that they need to produce instructional and public broadcasting programs and to transmit them to the public. The recipients of the grants themselves provide most of the money for the equipment, and they provide all of the money for land, buildings, vehicles, and other items not covered in this program, as well as the funds necessary to operate the stations once they have gotten on the air.

Mr. Chairman, we are all familiar with the practice of appropriating funds for a new program at a relatively low level, for the first 2 or 3 years, until we have had a chance to evaluate its effectiveness, to see whether it is achieving the purpose we had in mind when we enacted the enabling legislation. But this is not an experimental program or a mere demonstration project, contrary to the inference of the small size of the requested appropriation. It has been going on for 7 years now, and it has an outstanding record of achievement. It deserves a better fate than the \$4 million appropriation the bill would give it.

During the first 3 years a total of \$32 million was obligated in 161 grants to 148 stations in 47 States. To date, the program has helped to fund construction of 102 new ETV stations—more than half of those now operating—and to improve and expand the facilities of 74 already existing stations.

Two years ago, the original authorization ran out, and we voted to extend the program for another 3 years. But the appropriations have lagged far behind the level we authorized in the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In that act, we authorized \$38 million for 1968 through 1970, but only \$4 million has been appropriated. Approval of the amendment that I have offered would raise the total to about \$13 million—still only about a third of the original authorization.

Mr. Chairman, I have the honor to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Communications and Power, which held hearings recently on a bill to extend this program for another 5 years. Nine of our colleagues in the House of Repre-

sentatives and Governors of 10 of our States, testified to our committee, of the effectiveness of the educational stations in their communities, and of the importance of this program to their States. I can report that there is widespread recognition that all of the stations, despite their inadequate resources, are doing a good job and many of them are performing a truly outstanding service to America. We learned that the program has been highly effective in generating State and local support once the Federal Government has helped in the critical first phase of capital development; every Federal dollar granted has generated \$11 in local funds. But we also learned that there is a real sense of urgency and concern that if this program is starved for funds for another year the hopes and aspirations of the several States for beginning or improving their educational television service may be dealt a serious setback.

There is a backlog of applications on hand at HEW right now for more than \$32 million under this program. The applications have come from 43 States, and each one represents a pledge of local matching dollars from State legislatures, from school systems, or from community groups. We will put that money to work—or let it lie waste—in proportion to the appropriation that we make for this program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this program of aid to educational broadcasting is one of the few bargains we have left in this country. It is an opportunity we cannot afford to miss. The amendment requests a very modest increase—\$4.6 million—in the appropriation, and I respectfully urge its approval.

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

(On request of Mr. OTTINGER and, by unanimous consent, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

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

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the gentleman on his amendment. It is my privilege to serve on the subcommittee under the gentleman from Massachusetts. We know the merits of public broadcasting. It is a tremendous force for economy in education, for efficiency in education, and for giving quality instruction to youngsters who otherwise might not be able to receive it.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be unanimously supported by the members of the committee.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me to be a most compelling point that the gentleman in the well has made on this amendment and that is the fact that for every dollar we invest in educational television there is generated another \$11 in local funds.

This is unquestionably—based upon any kind of cost-benefit ratio that the

Army Engineers might apply—the very best bargain we have in this appropriation bill today.

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

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for offering this amendment. The request is reasonable. Public TV is a great media for providing education. It must be made better. If we are to provide better education through this facility, then we will have to provide the funds to allow it a reasonably good opportunity to succeed.

The gentleman's amendment is surely proper, and I congratulate the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the ears of the Members. Now, watch this. Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to know exactly what is being done again. This is a replay of the last amendment.

Now, the libraries that are so dear to your hearts, and mine, here is what happens. Page 30, line 3, the gentleman's amendment, does not raise the \$135,394,000 a dime, not a dime. You know what happens? It comes out of the hide of your libraries. Everything he wants must be taken away from your libraries. Do not forget that. That is what he is doing, just so you will know. Remember I told you.

And, in addition, this bill is the exact amount of the budget request, the exact amount for educational broadcasting facilities requested in this budget. It is also the same amount as we appropriated last year on this floor for exactly the same purpose.

Finally let me add this: I know something about this cause. This is a good thing. There is no limit to the horizon of this educational broadcasting program. I can wax eloquent on it, on how good this is, but it is not ready yet. It must creep before it runs. Double the amount of the budget request? And it comes out of the hide of your libraries.

Mr. Chairman, I suggest the same thing as the prior amendment for exactly the same reason.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. I decline to yield at this time.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. I recognize, of course, that the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the distinguished chairman of the committee, of course, is laying it on the line here that this money now, because of his point of order a little bit earlier, is going to have to come out of some other program. But I do want to say that there is no program more needed and no program that produces more additional support in the communities than this program on support for these educational television programs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join particularly with my colleague from California (Mr. VAN DEERLIN), in the statement he made that there is no finer bargain

than this program which was authorized some years ago, but unfortunately it has never been funded to the extent it should have been.

I am not pinning that on any administration, but unfortunately our friends on the Committee on Appropriations apparently have never been sold, or have never seen the benefits that can accrue to properly fund the program on educational TV.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I would like to make an inquiry of the chairman of the subcommittee, if I may have his attention, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood). I agree with his point concerning the money contained on line 3, which, in my original amendment, I wanted to have raised. I would like to ask the gentleman if he would agree to a unanimous-consent request that that money be so raised.

Mr. FLOOD. Why, you break my heart, my good friend—of course not.

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. I know that you want to protect the libraries and so do I.

Mr. FLOOD. The answer is, "No."

Mr. SISK. I will yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he would like to make a further comment.

I recognize his statement was correct. But I simply wanted to state, I think it is a bit unfortunate that we were denied a provision or raise in amount. But I still say the purpose for which the amendment was intended, by the gentleman from Massachusetts, will stand up along side of any other use of funds in this \$120 million—now some \$130-odd million. I still believe the amendment should be adopted and permit more flexibility in educational TV.

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

Mr. SISK. I am glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. I do not quarrel with the intention but I am chairman of an appropriation committee and there is a road to a certain place paved with good intentions.

Mr. SISK. Oh, I recognize that, and I have great admiration for my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Let me say, I know the gentleman does an excellent job and there is nothing personal in my criticism here. All I am saying is that this is an excellent program and unfortunately it has always been underfunded.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SISK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I would direct a question to the gentleman from Massachusetts. In your view does this amendment indeed take away money from the library fund?

Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts. No, I was merely making the point that

the chairman of the subcommittee had made.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. The amendment offered by the gentleman has some Members confused and that includes me. I am a great supporter of libraries. But if your amendment is going to take money away from this fund, I think we should know this before we vote on your amendment.

Mr. SISK. The problem here, of course, is that the total amount of money which the gentleman from Massachusetts originally sought to raise is not all for libraries. It is for a number of services. There is no question but that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct that even that total has to be taken, this increase in educational TV, but not necessarily from the construction fund of libraries.

I think that should be cleared up.

As to the total of \$130 million plus—I do not have the exact figures, but of course that is for a variety of services—construction funds, and so forth, and all these community service programs, and there is no question but that out of that pool of course would have to come the increased amounts for educational TV—but not necessarily from the construction fund for libraries.

This is up to the agencies how they distribute the fund.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I would like to see educational TV built up much more than it is and for us to do anything to help because we have so much commercialism and criticism of our commercial TV. But if it is going to harm some of these other activities, and this is a point I want to make clear, I cannot support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SISK. Of course, the reason why, as I say, my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania was raising his point of order, which I recognize, and here again I think in fairness that we should understand is that we are caught in a trap.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MACDONALD).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 54, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATION FOR THE HANDICAPPED

For carrying out the Act of September 6, 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 611-617); and section 302 and title V of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, as amended (20 U.S.C. 618, 42 U.S.C. 2698, 2698a, 2698b); the Act of September 2, 1958, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2491-2494); title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 871-880); and the Handicapped Children's Early Education Assistance Act of 1968 (20 U.S.C. 621-624), \$84,540,000, of which \$29,190,000 shall be for grants to States under part A of said title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. CAREY

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CAREY: On page 31, line 6, strike "\$84,540,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$100,000,000".

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we could call this amendment by many names. It might be called the rubella amendment. About 1965 we had an onset of German measles which vastly increased the population of deaf and blind children, with the result that all the money in the bill could be spent for those children and it would not be too much.

It may surprise some members of the committee to find that our total commitment to handicapped children for education is about \$5 per year at the Federal level, at a time we were spending \$1,500 per student in higher education, much more in vocational education, as we should, and much more in Operation Headstart, as we should. It is 3 cents per day for the handicapped child, but by reason of the good work of many Members of this House who have taken handicapped children's education to heart, we have nine new programs that have come into being during the life of this appropriation. As a result, we have work done by men like the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. AYRES), who has helped us with the deaf-blind, and the gentleman from California (Mr. BELL), who has helped us with the mentally retarded, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUINN), who joined me in sponsoring the preschool bill for all handicapped children, and all of those who have joined in passing the authorization legislation to increase the commitment that we have made to the learning disabled. These programs for those who are unable to participate by reason of a handicap in the regular education programs have, in a sense, brought to life and merged—in many, many more programs, so that finally in the last few years we have begun to help those who have not had any kind of assistance before through Federal legislation.

At the same time, almost the same week that he made the commitment that we should go to the moon, President Kennedy said:

The children of this country who have felt the hand of fate must never suffer from neglect.

But there is neglect now, because local school districts, local school boards, and State educational institutions cannot possibly provide the operations, the services, and the teachers needed to do the new things that we are able to do for the deaf-blind, for the blind, for the deaf, the mentally retarded, and the emotionally disturbed. Only we can do this. Only we can do this.

I am heartened to come here this day. I have been away from the Chamber for some time because fate intervened in my life, and I know this better than I ever knew it before, that this day is a joyful day because we stood up, all of us, and said, "We are not going to desert our children. They are growing up. We have only one chance to change their lives, and this is our chance."

And tonight we can do something to change the lives of handicapped children by simply responding to the request made by the administration through Secretary Finch, who requested \$100 million for the programs for all the handicapped children. All I seek to do by my amendment is to respond to the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, justified by the programs that we passed in this Congress, to make our commitment quite evident to the handicapped children in this hour.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment to assist the handicapped children in this country.

Surely they do take priority in this matter. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to have the opportunity to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) to increase the appropriations for programs of the education of handicapped children.

I am pleased to see that this will provide \$5 million to title VI-A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, because there are few such instances where grant-in-aid to State and local communities can so directly be returned to be used by our State and local communities. The return to our local community and our States can be judged by the consequences; the cost of institutional or residential care is approximately \$200,000 per handicapped person. The cost of providing a full elementary and secondary education for the handicapped is approximately \$20,000 per child. The Nation's handicapped children have the potential input to our economy of \$15 billion if they are provided with the special education and services necessary for them to realize their personal and economic potential.

The State of Louisiana has over 300,000 known children of school age who are handicapped and in need of special programs and services if they are to realize their personal and economic potential; 92 percent of these children are not now receiving these needed services. An estimated 19,000 special education teachers are currently needed in Louisiana alone. While these figures are overwhelming, they do show forward progress.

The funds requested will prevent the loss of gains made in the last decade and will enable programs, at the local and State levels, to continue their orderly development toward meeting the needs of our Nation's handicapped population.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE).

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York for offering this amendment. I think it is necessary. I think it is of a high priority.

One does not even have to compare this with the amount we put in by the Joelson amendment, or anything else we

have done like reaching the moon. This money is needed. It is money that will be wisely spent because the programs, even research, are so soundly based.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Minnesota for his contribution. He has done much in the committee to help in the authorizing of this legislation.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I compliment our distinguished friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY), for offering this amendment.

This is an amendment to take care of the urgent needs of handicapped children.

It is of a top priority and it should be adopted.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his remarks.

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

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER).

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, as one who has worked under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman, my colleague from New York (Mr. CAREY), on programs for the disabled and disadvantaged children over many years, I congratulate him for this amendment, and for his unstinting efforts, imagination and leadership over many years on this subject, and I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this committee and House have no quarrel with this program. If this amendment is defeated—as it should be—let me tell Members how much will be in this program: \$84,600,000. This is \$5 million more than was appropriated for 1969. The proposition now with this amendment is to add \$15 million to an \$85 million program in addition to the \$5 million that the committee has already increased it over last year's level.

I have no quarrel with the purpose and with the intent, and neither does the committee, but under all the circumstances this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. My subcommittee has held very extensive hearings on this whole subject of handicapped children. I can think of no more worthy amendment than the amendment now before this body.

There are 55 million children attending public schools in this country and another 8 million children attending private schools. The testimony before our committee shows that four out of every 10 children in this country suffer from some form of handicap. There are 10.5 million children suffering hearing defects, 12.5 million children suffering eyesight defects, and 5.5 million children suffering either emotional problems or

learning disabilities. We have approximately 25 million youngsters in this country who urgently need help.

The most expensive kind of education in America is education for the handicapped. All over this country there are parents who have youngsters who unfortunately suffer from some form of handicap, some emotional instability, or some learning defect. These parents have suffered quietly.

All over this country, if we look, we can see what limited facilities are available. No form of our educational process is more sadly neglected than that of providing education for these handicapped youngsters.

I tell the Members, July 30, 1969, can very well be called Emancipation Day for the children of this country. This Congress stood up and recognized the educational needs of American children. Let us not stop now.

I am in sympathy with what the chairman of this subcommittee has said, but I tell Members they will never have a greater opportunity to walk out of this Chamber 10 feet tall than if they vote for this amendment, because if anybody needs help, it is the handicapped children of this country. The parents up until now have suffered quietly, quietly pleading and begging. There is not a Member in this Chamber who has not had a parent come to him and say, "Look, I have a child who is handicapped. Where can I go to get help?"

They talk about \$100 million. This is a pittance when one compares the enormity of the need for the youngsters with a handicap in America to that figure.

If we really want to make a contribution toward solving some of the social problems of this Nation, this is the place to do it, here with this amendment. I congratulate my colleague from New York for offering the amendment.

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

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Has the gentleman thought about how much nerve gas \$15 million would provide?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I do not know that the question is germane. In fact, I believe this is much too serious a subject for facetious remarks like that.

I am seriously concerned about these handicapped youngsters. There are Members in this Chamber who serve on that committee, who have been listening to the testimony. We have a bill coming in next week to add to this category of children with learning disabilities. There are perfectly normal children who for some unknown reason reverse letters, who read letters upside down. There are youngsters with all sorts of other disabilities, youngsters in no other way identifiable, who are perfectly normal citizens. They need help desperately.

With all due respect for the chairman of the subcommittee, whom I respect highly, I hope the Members will support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ECKHARDT. Mr. Chairman, I must admit a degree of facetiousness in

my question to the distinguished Member from Illinois, but I am quite serious in the point I wish to make, which evidently evaded his keen discernment. It is this: Where we are dealing with \$15 million to be expended on the humane programs, such as those of education and help to the handicapped, such a figure looms up as an enormous expenditure.

But when we are dealing with a \$350 million appropriation for chemical and biological warfare, hidden in various items in the military appropriation, no such economic scruple seems to trouble the Armed Services Committee or the Appropriations Committee.

Chemical and biological warfare includes research on offensive and defensive chemical and bacteriological agents and delivery services, the procurement, manufacturing, stockpiling of these materials and devices, and the maintenance of facilities for greatly increased production should the United States feel pressed to use these devices in time of war. It also includes the present large scale production and use of chemical anticrop and personnel agents in Southeast Asia.

Costs, as admitted by the Pentagon for fiscal 1969 are as follows:

	Millions
Research and development.....	\$90
Procurement	240
Operations and maintenance.....	20
Total	350

Now, on the other hand, here we have engaged in a program providing facilities and services for the investigation, prevention, and suppression of communicable diseases by the direct development, advancement, and demonstration of knowledge and techniques, through research grants, and through the prevention of the introduction of communicable diseases from foreign countries.

Total expenditures for fiscal year 1969, \$41.4 million; total expenditures for fiscal year 1970, \$38.7 million break down as follows:

	Millions
Laboratory improvements:	
Fiscal year 1969.....	\$6.0
Fiscal year 1970.....	6.3
Prevention and control:	
Grants:	
Fiscal year 1969.....	6.8
Fiscal year 1970.....	2.9
Direct operations:	
Fiscal year 1969.....	27.7
Fiscal year 1970.....	27.6
Program direction and management services:	
Fiscal year 1969.....	1.9
Fiscal year 1970.....	1.9

Therefore in 1969 we spent at least \$350 million to be in a position to trigger disease and here we have spent \$41.4 million to prevent disease, less than one-eighth as much.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my dear friend from New York, the author of this amendment, of course, makes a very good case, as anyone in this House could make. How can one stand here and talk against handicapped children of any kind, or any handicapped person?

As to increasing the amount, why \$15 million? Why not \$50 million or \$100 million?

What do the Members think this subcommittee does all through the year, hearing the testimony of people with impassioned pleas, and rightfully so? We could "shoot the moon" on cancer research, heart research, or whatever. We have to try to do a job here, and it is a tough job. Anyone could out-demagog anyone else in this House by offering amendments to push up everything else.

I say, as the chairman has said, we have provided an increase here over last year of \$5,690,000. The main increases are \$2,055,000 for the early childhood program, \$1.5 million for regional resource centers, and \$1 million extra for the deaf and blind centers.

It seems to me we have done a pretty good job. It puts one in a bad position to argue against the gentlemen and to say they ought not have more.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to my chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Is it not true that in this bill we have provided for an expenditure of more than \$17 billion for the current fiscal year, to try to meet many needs, insofar as reasonably possible under all the circumstances?

I believe it would be well to point out that in addition to this increase for the handicapped we have provided in this bill \$33 million for mental retardation, which relates to the welfare of children, and for innumerable other hundreds of millions of dollars which relate directly and indirectly to the welfare of children. There is maternal and child health and welfare, and this bill's provisions contain \$284,800,000 in that area.

There are innumerable programs in the bill designed to be helpful to children. This would not exclude the handicapped children, who can be considered and must be considered, along with the \$85 million included in the particular paragraph to which the amendment relates. As a matter of fact, I understand that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that it now spends over half a billion dollars on mental retardation.

Mr. MICHEL. That is correct.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield?

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

Mr. CAREY. I do not like to disagree with the statement of the chairman of the committee or of my distinguished colleague from Illinois, but two things must be recognized.

This House, in its good will, has changed the definition, so that we have brought into eligibility for these programs more children than before. Therefore, we are subdividing the original amount which was available. That is why we are reaching more children but have less money to do so per child.

When the chairman speaks of maternal and child health benefits it does nothing for the education of the handi-

capped. When he speaks of money in the next section for the mentally retarded it is for facilities for physical care and not education.

Mr. Chairman, we have discovered something which is more important than the rocks on the moon. We have discovered that we can actually educate handicapped people to perform and have a full life of employment, to be usable and have utility in our economy.

When we invest in education for the handicapped, as we did for vocational rehabilitation, we are putting Americans back into employable opportunities. That is just what we seek here. It has nothing to do with the section that the chairman cited.

Again I point out to my distinguished colleague from Illinois, when he speaks of \$15 million being too much, this is exactly what Secretary Finch said he had to have in order to run his department with the new programs that we gave him. We authorized him to extend help to more people. He announced this and he told the deaf, the dumb, the blind, the mentally retarded, and the emotionally disturbed in a press release, "We are going to do more for you." Now we say that we will do just a little bit less because more children are now eligible than there were before. So you are subdividing the amount unless you increase the appropriation to meet the justified request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Finch. I stand with Mr. Finch and I make this the "Finch amendment," and I hope the gentleman from Illinois will help me to pass my amendment.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, if I might respond to the gentleman from New York, I do not see anything in our hearing record which discloses that the Secretary was asking for that kind of an increase. We did not get that kind of testimony at all. It may very well be that at some public gathering some place somebody might have gotten carried away about particular needs in the future, but all we have to go on as a committee is what we hear in these 9,000 pages of testimony over several months' period of time.

Mr. CAREY. Will my colleague yield further?

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. If Secretary Finch said at some public gathering where he was carried away that he is asking for one-half cent per day more for handicapped children, then I will carry him away on my shoulders. This is what he should say in public, in private, and before your subcommittee.

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

(Mr. MICHEL asked and was given permission to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. MICHEL. I take this extra time only because I would like to have just a little bit of my own time. I felt I should be gracious and give my opponent an opportunity, but I do want to be heard.

As I said, we have done a pretty good job here. The gentleman from New York

makes a point about what we are learning with respect to handicapped children. Let me say in my own home community of Peoria, for example, in the last few years we have constructed what we call an allied agency center where we have \$1.5 million of Federal grants which we matched with money that was raised locally. For the first time in the country we have drawn together under one roof cystic fibrosis, palsy, crippled children, mentally retarded, physically handicapped, into eight different agencies which have heretofore been all on their own. For the first time we have our own pilot project specifically aimed at educating and caring for these handicapped children. We have a daily attendance record there of 600. I know what the gentleman is talking about. This is a very serious problem throughout the country. But I am saying again that we have not really gotten the testimony in our hearing record here in which there was a request for more money than we provided, and I hope that the committee will stick by us.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Is it not true, however, that the amount in this bill is less than the budget requested?

Mr. MICHEL. Yes. As a matter of fact, it is \$1.25 million under the budget request. As I said, it is an increase of \$5.6 million over the spending level for 1969. The chairman of the committee indicated that.

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

Mr. MICHEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. That is so, and that is entirely for research. It had nothing to do with services and it was only the amount of the increase over 1969 for research.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I just want to say briefly before we vote on this amendment that it is true there was a cut in the appropriation from the budget request. Also I want to state, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY) does not just pick some figure out of the air. He picked the sum that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare asked the Bureau of the Budget for. HEW felt that they could move ahead with these programs and spend this money wisely.

Mr. Chairman, when it comes to research I have been in touch with the problem of children with handicaps for quite a long time.

I know a decade ago how little was known about training the handicapped with the few teachers that were available. We do not have enough teachers now. We have about 80,000 teachers for the handicapped but we need about 250,000. There are enough teachers in the country who have the knowledge to teach normal children although we do not have enough teachers of the capability that everybody wants. They probably never will. The handicapped do not have enough teachers, highly quali-

fied, partially qualified or even with little ability in the specialties needed to reach the handicapped.

Mr. Chairman, there are two things that are of utmost importance. First is the number of teachers with the skill to help these children learn to lead a more normal way of life. The most satisfying thing one can experience is to see the result of a capable teacher working successfully with a handicapped child. However, we still do not have enough teachers to perform this task. We have started preschool programs for the handicapped and research and demonstration are paying great dividends for the handicapped. Research projects have been a great help for the handicapped, but the benefits are not limited to them. What we learn on the backstroke in programs for the handicapped is of tremendous importance to every child, the children of the constituents of yours and mine.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this is an important amendment and that it should be adopted.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment and I wish to compliment the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. QUIE) for his statement. We have both worked on the committee involving the handicapped. I also recognize the great importance of what the chairman of the subcommittee has said involving increased appropriations. However, I do know that this is one of the most important areas of education that we can support and I compliment my friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY), for offering this amendment. I enthusiastically endorse and support it.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mrs. CHISHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Carey amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like to say here, ladies and gentlemen, that I am most happy, most happy, that the gentleman from Brooklyn has offered this amendment. This is one of the things that concerned me—to see the complete elimination of title 6(a) from the ESEA program which is directed toward the multihandicapped children of this Nation.

I do not want to speak to you from the standpoint of a politician, but from the standpoint of an educator, who has just emerged from that profession during the last 4 years and have had experience in this field. I was in a position to know what was happening to the multihandicapped children of this Nation and to know many children in the Nation that have multiple handicaps that are still in the homes of their parents in their respective communities. This happens, because there is no place for these children to go. The parents are upset over this fact, because of the public school situation. These parents go to community agencies, but there are no available facilities there to help these children. Many of these children are hidden in

closets when friends come to the home, because of the fact that the parents have no place to send these children. They are ashamed and embarrassed, because the children are vegetating day by day. And, indeed, these children have no one to speak out for them except those of us in the U.S. Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that these children have a right to receive some kind of training and help so that that they, too, can enjoy their right to receive some kind of training and help so that they, too, can enjoy their rightful share in this society.

How dare we in this House of Representatives this evening talk about this problem in terms of dollars and cents? We all, of course, realize that our children are the most valuable things we have in this country. It is very disturbing to me that we have to consider this problem in terms of dollars and cents. We must place this problem in the terms of the highest priority.

Mr. Chairman, I speak very emotionally about this because, you see, I have been traveling up and down the communities and have been into the homes of people who have handicapped children before I came here and have listened to the heart-rending cries of the parents of these children of this country who do not know what to do with a handicapped child.

Mr. Chairman, Representative CAREY has introduced a most marvelous amendment here this afternoon. I ask the gentlemen of this House to please support this amendment. The problems of the multihandicapped children deserve the highest priority of any in every category of our educational efforts. These are the children who are blind, deaf, and handicapped. They will be grateful for what we do. Please support this amendment.

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

Mrs. CHISHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important to point out that the authorization on this bill is \$206 million. My colleague from Illinois talks about how the Committee on Appropriations holds extensive hearings, and as I listened to the distinguished chairman expound on the sanctity of the Appropriations Committee I waited for him to start walking on water.

But my committee also has worked, and we have held extensive hearings, and the appropriation proposed in this bill, even with the \$15 million amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York, will not even begin to meet half of the authorization that was recommended on the basis of very extensive studies.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. CAREY).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FLOOD) there were—ayes 95, noes 43.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

EDUCATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND
WORLD AFFAIRS

For carrying out title VI of the National Defense Education Act, and section 102(b) (6) of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, \$18,000,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will only take a minute, but I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee about the \$18,000,000 expenditure for education in foreign languages and world affairs.

Now what is being done through a program to educate people in world affairs? Is this more of a handout for foreign aid—the foreign handout business?

Mr. FLOOD. I can understand my friend's inquiry. This is an exercise in semantics. Perhaps we should have changed the title.

This "world affairs" comes about mainly because the budget contained funds for the International Education Act in this paragraph and the committee turned down that part of the request as we have turned it down 3 years in a row.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is no "world affairs" in this except by way of semantics in the language; is that correct?

Mr. FLOOD. There are the Fulbright-Hayes training grants and foreign language centers and fellowships under the National Defense Education Act. That is about it, because we allowed nothing for the International Education Act.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

MENTAL RETARDATION

To carry out, except as otherwise provided for, sections 301 and 303 of the Public Health Service Act, as amended, relating to the prevention, treatment, and amelioration of mental retardation, parts C and D of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act (42 U.S.C. 2261, et seq.), and section 4(a) (1) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended, \$33,629,000, of which \$8,031,000 shall be for grants for facilities pursuant to part C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, to remain available until June 30, 1971: *Provided*, That there may be transferred to this appropriation from the appropriation for "Mental health" an amount not to exceed the sum of the allotment adjustment made by the Secretary pursuant to section 202(c) of the Community Mental Health Centers Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DANIELS OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey: On page 36, line 16, strike "\$33,629,000," and insert in lieu thereof, "\$37,000,000."

On page 36, line 16, strike "\$8,031,000," and insert in lieu thereof, "\$12,031,000."

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would increase the appropriation for the prevention, treatment, and amelioration of mental retardation from \$33,629,000, to \$37,000,000, of which \$12,031,000 shall be for grants for facilities pursuant to part

C of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act. Specifically, this will be an increase of \$4 million for the construction of facilities. This modest sum would restore the original \$12 million appropriation. The \$8 million requested by the administration and recommended in this H.R. 13111 can only be viewed as an abrogation of a commitment by the Congress to the States and voluntary agencies which undertook in good faith to implement the program which Congress proposed to them so enthusiastically in 1963 and again in 1967.

As of December 1968, some 242 construction projects had been approved for Federal assistance. The Federal share is \$48 million against a non-Federal share of nearly \$100 million. When completed, the buildings will house services which will reach an estimated 63,000 retarded children and adults—less than 5 percent of the estimated number of those who are believed to need such specialized services. As a result of treatment, many of these people could live productive lives; they can add to the country's productivity rather than be a liability. To cut these funds is false economy.

Estimates submitted by the responsible State agencies indicate that the current need for construction is in excess of \$200 million, and that, if Federal funds were to be made available, applications for \$100 million in Federal aid would immediately be forthcoming. Only 2 years ago we recognized the magnitude of this need by enthusiastically passing extending legislation with a 1970 authorization of \$50 million.

As my colleagues in this House know, the authorizing legislation requires allotment to the States with a minimum of \$100,000 to each. If we permit the appropriation to fall below the already inadequate level of \$12 million, we produce a distribution which discriminates very unfairly against the more populous States. The allotments from an \$8 million appropriation for 1970 would result in a reduction of 40 percent for the larger States.

On a per capita basis, at the \$8 million level the largest States will receive only one-fifth as much as the smallest States.

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

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I am pleased to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to think that an amendment of this type would be voted down by the membership of this body this afternoon, especially after we have made the commitments to the States for such an important matter as mental retardation and that the facilities will not be constructed—even some of the facilities that have already been started, and that there should be a cutback here.

Mr. Chairman, we should not renege on that commitment. We should fulfill our obligations. The Department has made an estimate of what it will take to carry out these commitments. The gentleman is offering an amendment to carry out the budget request. I am most

hopeful that this amendment will be approved because we cannot afford to turn our backs in this area of mental retardation at this stage of the game after we have made this commitment to the States.

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman. I would like to point out that in 1964 and again in 1968, the people of New Jersey voted bond issues for construction—one purpose of which was to provide matching funds to carry out the intent of the Federal legislation which we offered the States as an inducement to move more rapidly in the direction of developing community facilities.

Voluntary agencies pledged their assistance also. At no small expense a State plan was developed which, at the authorized level of Federal aid could, by 1972, provide every county in our State with a center for the day care and training of the most severely and profoundly retarded and multiple handicapped youngsters of school age. Activity centers for adults too handicapped to benefit from vocational rehabilitation would have followed. It is an orderly, planned program.

Much time, effort, and money was spent on its development. The people and the legislature supported it and voted their share of the funds. It is embarrassing to me to have to tell them that we are proposing to give them \$195,000 where they might have looked for \$1½ million that adequate funding could bring them. Moreover, I have been informed that other States are also in danger of being left high and dry.

Mr. SANDMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. SANDMAN. I think the only appropriate way to ask for an increase of any kind in an appropriation such as the one we are dealing with today is to show what has been appropriated is inadequate, rather than trying to pull the "hearts and flowers" bit. In this connection, my colleague from New Jersey has outlined what we have done in our State in connection with the day centers. The people of our State have approved \$5 million for this project, a project which has an overall cost of \$7 million. It will put one county day center in each of the 21 counties of the State. If this cutback is permitted, the entire program is set back. It not only is set back, it falls, because instead of getting the amount which was committed to the State, equal to 40 percent, the State's amount receivable under this appropriation would be less than 16 percent. I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to tell you why I am opposed to the amendment, which provides an increase in the amount of the bill for the construction of Community Service facilities. The amendment increases the bill by \$4 million. The Johnson budget was \$8,031,000, the Nixon administration agreed with the Johnson administration,

and this committee agreed with both, and properly so. I will show you why. I repeat for purposes of emphasis that the amount in the bill is exactly the amount in both of those budgets. That has value and merit for your consideration—plus this, and this is of great significance: the amount of this bill is already more than \$2 million, over \$2 million, above the 1969 appropriation on this very item. Almost without exception the construction program in the HEW budget, as far as construction is concerned, has been cut below 1969, some of them have been cut out entirely.

This is consistent with the guidelines generally followed by the Congress, and the guidelines set down by both administrations, and the guidelines set down by the committees handling this bill.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, with all due respect for my sister State of New Jersey—where, since I wore diapers, we have gone to the shore from the coalfields of Pennsylvania—we stand by this budget. We have no quarrel with the purpose, but it has already fared much better than most construction programs.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, faced with those circumstances—the defeat of this amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we all understood the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey. It is not that the cut was \$4 million: the action of the Appropriations Committee was \$4 million below the expenditure, the appropriation of fiscal year 1969. I think if the gentleman from Pennsylvania will reexamine his figures, he will find the gentleman from New Jersey is absolutely correct.

In an area where a commitment has been made on mental retardation to the various States of this Union and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, saying they need this extra money, it just does not make a great deal of sense to vote down an amendment of this type, when we need the facilities all over the Nation for the mentally retarded.

Mr. Chairman, I am certainly hopeful the House will adopt this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I want to reassert very flatly what I just reported to the Members. I do not know what juggling of funds between fiscal years has been done in their bookkeeping.

I have in my hand—and did Members ever hear that expression before, "I hold in my hand"—and so on, on the radio and television? I hold in my hand the appropriation figures, and I reported to Members exactly the 1969 and 1970 appropriation figures.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise along with my colleagues from New Jersey to point out a national problem. This national problem is that of the mentally retarded and what we, as a Congress, should do to help in this area. We can understand ap-

proaching the problem as the Appropriations Committee has. We understand they have not all the money in the world. They have to decide what they can spend and in what certain places. As the gentleman from Illinois said, certainly he is in favor of helping the handicapped, but he cannot raise it another \$50 or \$100 or \$200 million.

But, Mr. Chairman, the unconscionable thing about this is we are not requesting an increase. We are requesting restoration of a cut. It was \$12 million for the past 2 years, and if the previous administration had requested a cut, and the present administration requested a cut, I believe we, as a Congress, would not be able to face our people at home if we went along with it.

Mr. Chairman, we may have a question of priorities in this Nation, but certainly help for the mentally retarded should not be put in the category of a priority. It is a duty and a moral obligation this Nation has to take care of its mentally retarded.

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

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. PERKINS).

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to suggest to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania that the way to get out of this matter is to take the figures of the various State departments to see how much their cutback is in every State of the Union.

I say to the gentleman that he will find a difference of \$4 million between the amount in this appropriation bill and the amount that was appropriated last year, and the States have already been notified of this cutback. That is the statement we stand on.

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BELL of California. I should also like to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that perhaps as a result of this night's work he will realize perhaps too low a priority has been assigned to something of great national interest; that is, our educational needs in this Nation. That is where the big bulk of the trouble is. Perhaps we should establish a higher priority for the educational needs in this country and a lesser priority for other things.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, if this money has been cut from expenditures in other years, that money has gone someplace else. Many of us wonder where the money goes which is taken from the mentally retarded.

We hear about the administration sitting down and setting goals and priorities. Someone would sit back and say, "What is the first priority?" Of course, the first priority is bullets and bombs. Then the question is asked, "Where are we going to take the money from?" And someone else might say, "We can take \$4 million from the mentally retarded. They probably will not know."

Let us not have this happen in this House in this bill, because people would say things about the present administration and the present Congress if this

should happen today. I know they would be saying things, because I would be saying them myself.

I wholeheartedly support the amendment of my colleague from New Jersey, and I certainly hope we will restore the cut from previous years for the mentally retarded.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the amendment proposed by my distinguished colleague from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS) to maintain the level of appropriations for construction of facilities for the mentally retarded at the level of the last 2 years, namely \$12 million.

Mine is one of the many congressional districts which has not yet felt the beneficial impact of the Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act of 1963.

The people of Monmouth and Ocean Counties are vitally interested in providing locally for the retarded. Our public schools have greatly expanded their programs and two recently opened sheltered workshops have provided a vehicle for vocational rehabilitation services. But there are other unmet needs—for nursery school programs for toddlers, day training for the most severely handicapped of school age who are not acceptable in school, and independent living activities for retarded adults not attending the workshops.

Those latter services are offered in my district through the voluntary efforts of the Monmouth and Ocean Units of the New Jersey Association for Retarded Children. Such laudable efforts deserve a better setting than the famous House on Hudson in Red Bank—an antiquated frame building, a former residence, a make-do facility.

This picture is, I know, not unique to Monmouth County. Inadequate, even hazardous facilities, are found in every State.

I want—as I am sure so many of my fellow Members want—to see in every part of the country as well as in my own, modern, well-designed facilities worthy of the programs they house and worthy of the dignity we should accord even the least—the most handicapped—of our fellow citizens.

In all fairness, we who have supported this legislation and the earlier appropriations should see that it continues to be supported at a level which is at least worth the time and effort which the Federal Government, the State governments and the eligible agencies must spend to administer it.

I wholeheartedly support this amendment and urge my colleagues to similarly support any and all efforts to assist our handicapped Americans.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. DANIELS).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PERKINS) there were—ayes 62, noes 52.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION AND CONTROL

For carrying out the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968, \$5,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds contained herein shall be used to make

grants, under Title I of said Act, in excess of the following: (1) \$12,500 each to the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, (2) \$50,000 to each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. PEPPER

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PEPPER: On page 37, line 18, strike out "\$50,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is to increase from \$5 million to the budget request of \$15 million, on page 37, line 18, the amount for carrying out the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968.

The committee report on page 36 states that apparently the reason why the distinguished committee did not approve the budget request for so vital an item as the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act was because at the time of the committee hearings on the budget request planning grants had not been made.

Well, now, this afternoon I talked on the telephone to Mr. Sussman, head of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Division. He tells me now, under title I, 37 grants have been made to 37 States totaling \$1.5 million. Also under title I, prevention grants have been made in 17 instances for \$400,000, and under title I, for rehabilitation, 10 grants have been made totaling \$300,000 to States or State agencies.

Under title II, for training, 49 grants have been made for \$1.7 million. Under title III, for technical assistance to State and local authorities and private agencies, there have been nine special grants, for a total of \$228,000, which consumes the \$5 million provided in the bill less the \$650,000 which was diverted to the Violence and Crime Commission.

I asked Mr. Sussman whether they needed the total \$15 million provided by the budget. He said it is for assistance to the schools, to YMCA's, YWCA's, boys clubs, police boys clubs, mental health institutions, and parole and probation authorities to try to deal with this very vital question of how to diminish and prevent juvenile crime.

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

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

Mr. PERKINS. I certainly want to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment and compliment the distinguished gentleman from Florida for offering his amendment. If his amendment does anything at all in this area of juvenile delinquency prevention, we should certainly appropriate the modest amount he is asking for, increasing this expenditure by \$10 million.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

As chairman of the Crime Control Committee of this House which was set up recently, I say that we have had hearings where we discovered that juvenile

crime makes up about half or more of the total crime problem in this country. If we can stop this juvenile before he or she becomes a hardened criminal, we not only save a boy or girl but also the potential victim of their violence.

I hope the distinguished chairman of the committee will accede to this amendment and help a little bit at least to save boys and girls from crime.

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

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

Mr. MEEDS. I wish to join in the remarks of the gentleman in the well and commend him for bringing this deficiency to the attention of the House.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Chairman, I would also like to commend the gentleman on his amendment. As one of the sponsors back in 1961 of the original Juvenile Delinquency Act, I have a particular interest in this legislation and hope his amendment to provide adequate funds will be adopted.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the able gentleman from California, one of my fellow members of the Crime Committee (Mr. WALDIE).

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Chairman, I, too, wish to commend the chairman of our Select Committee on Crime and Violence and compliment him for bringing this matter to the attention of the committee members at this afternoon's hearings. I do not recall any dissent from the view which he has expressed so ably in the well.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REID).

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman in the well for his amendment and say that I, too, will support him and hope others will, also.

Mr. PEPPER. I hope the amendment in conformity with the budget request will be adopted.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. And, let me read to the members of the committee from the hearings. I refer to part 6, page 387, under the center head "Planning Grants." I had the witness, Dr. Garrett, and the colloquy reads as follows:

Mr. FLOOD. The main part of your program, title I, \$2,650,000. That is for the current fiscal year?

Dr. GARRETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. FLOOD. Over 2 million dollars for planning. How is your planning doing?

Dr. GARRETT. First of all, we have not made any grants yet. Those grants will be made in the last month of the fiscal year. We do know from the States that planning is going on because of the fact that, under the Omnibus Crime Bill, there is provision made for including juvenile delinquency planning there. In view of our rather close relationship with the law-enforcement group, we have access to what is going on there and we have given

the States the option under title I that, if their planning is adequate, they can come in for action programs under this.

Mr. FLOOD. Have any states or other jurisdictions completed their so-called comprehensive plans that you are aware of?

Dr. GARRETT. So far as we know, no comprehensive plans have yet been submitted to the LEAA.

Mr. Chairman, imagine the situation in which this amendment places your committee. Even if they have made the planning grants now, this Committee, this House, Mr. Chairman, has little idea, except the information which comes within the jurisdiction of a special committee as of this afternoon, what in the world they are going to do with this money. With reference to planning, based upon the testimony before your committee from Dr. Garrett, Mr. Chairman, there is nothing at all. That is why we passed it by.

We say let them do their planning and let them come back to this committee next year and tell us what the programs are.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is an arrow shot into the air for \$10 million above what has been recommended. Let them come back next year like everyone else does and we will hear them. If they are right, we will be the first to support them, but not under this hit and miss method. This is not the way even to run a railroad—\$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that the amendment should be defeated.

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

Mr. FLOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. The chairman will remember that the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Wilbur Cohen, in his testimony before our committee had two items in which he suggested reductions from the budget. One of them was the \$25 million for experimental schools. He said that they only needed \$2.5 million. And with reference to juvenile delinquency he said he would cut that \$10 million, because they do not know for sure what they want to do, and we ought to be doing more planning before we jump in with both feet.

That is the testimony of the former Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare before our subcommittee.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind this House, while I suspect that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania is very busy on his own committee, he would have you believe that no one knows anything about this program. I would recommend that he, first of all, read the debate on the floor of this House on the 1968 Juvenile Delinquency Act which was approved unanimously. There was not a single dissenting vote, and I say to you that everyone of you Members voted for this bill and you voted for \$50 million authorization in the first year. You did it because we held extensive hearings in my committee and there was overwhelm-

ing testimony as to the urgent need for this legislation.

It is no accident, Mr. Chairman, that more than 50 percent of the arrests in this country are arrests of young people under the age of 21. The highest rate of crimes committed in America are in the age group of 15 to 17.

The highest number of arrests in this country for all offenses are among those under 21; 30 percent of all those arrested in America are under 21; 20 percent of those arrested are under 18. And the highest rate of increase in crime in this country among young people is not in the poor communities, nor in the ghettos. The highest incidence and the highest increase in juvenile crime in America is in the middle-income, white suburban communities of America.

The report says they did not give us any more money because there were no plans. This committee has not given this act a chance to get off the ground. They underappropriated last year, and now they want to do the same thing this year.

We have testimony, volumes of testimony, before my committee on exciting projects all over America by communities who want to finally do something with this problem of juvenile crime.

I know of no greater waste of human resources in this country than the youngster who is led into crime, and becomes a criminal for the rest of his life.

So I say to the distinguished chairman of the Crime Committee in this House that he is asking you for \$10 million—and every one of you Members have voted not for \$5 million, not for \$10 million, every one of you are on record as authorizing \$50 million to make some significant start against this problem of juvenile crime in America.

Now, we are asking you for \$10 million more. I hope you are going to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida. I hope you give us this money so that this situation can finally get going on this problem of dealing with America's No. 1 problem.

There is not a Member in this Chamber, a man or woman, who will not agree with me that the most important single problem in America today is the alarming rate and the alarming increase of crime among young people.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to remind our colleagues on the committee of the comment made by our colleague from California earlier in the debate today that if we really mean business about controlling crime, and eliminating violent crime in our streets, if we really care, then we will do something about educating our American youngsters. It would seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that the first place to start is in the specialized programs where we are aiming a high-powered rifle, and not a shotgun, at these youngsters who have had an early brush with criminal activities.

The highest rate of criminal activities in this country is among the 16-year-

olds, and the next highest among criminal activities are from the 15-year-olds. Only last Friday the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and his subcommittee, held hearings in New York, and we heard for hours the desperate and tragic stories of young kids 10, 11, and 12 years old who were involved in drug addiction. And I am talking about main-line drug addiction. I am talking about barbiturates, amphetamines, and heroin. I am not talking about marihuana.

The \$10 million that we are talking about that is in dispute today is \$10 million that will not be shot into the air, it will be shot directly to the heart of the matter. It is not enough for action programs. It is barely enough for the very planning and the very organizing that our distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania told us was so necessary.

The Office of Law Enforcement Assistance in the Justice Department, and the National Institute for Crime Control and Law Enforcement in the Justice Department could snap up this \$10 million and use it in the next 6 months just to create programs to help juveniles who have taken on a horrifying life of drug addiction. This is just the bare beginning of the plan that we desperately need to keep the young people out of a life of crime. No investment of our resources could be as worthwhile and effective as this desperately needed investment in planning and educational programs to keep our young people out of a life of crime.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was a member of the subcommittee that developed the first juvenile delinquency bill. That was about 8 years ago. I wonder if anybody can stand and tell me what has been accomplished under this program.

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. What has been accomplished?

Mr. PUCINSKI. A great deal has been accomplished. I was a member of that committee. I remember the first bill—the first bill that the late President Kennedy brought to this House was a juvenile delinquency bill. We passed it and allocated \$10 million for research.

Out of that research we have gotten a great deal of information. There are programs all over this country.

When the distinguished Chairman says that no one has plans, I invite him to look at the reports of the research that has gone on for 4 years.

The States are now ready to move ahead with positive programs as the result of the very bill that the gentleman helped to put together.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They were supposed to make a report in 3 years but they never even made a report.

I would like to do something for juvenile delinquency, but I want to see some plans. We have \$5 million here in this bill for that and if they can come

up with some reasonable plans, we can give them \$10 million more or whatever is needed.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The reports are available and I will be very happy to show the reports to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. The reports were supposed to be on demonstration projects.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is right.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. They were supposed to award contracts for local projects and then report whether or not they worked.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Which they actually failed to do. They took the money and regardless of the requirements of the law, they spent the money where they wanted to and developed other programs that had nothing to do with juvenile delinquency.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman is in error. The reports are available. The reports have been evaluated on the very point that we are making here and these States are now ready to move ahead. We have gone through the planning stages and gone through the developing projects and research projects, and our bill, the 1968 bill, bars this kind of further research and we want action now. That is why we want this money.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. A while ago some of you said it was for planning and now you say it is not for planning but for grants.

Mr. PUCINSKI. No, I never said it was for planning; no, sir. Check the record. I never said it was for planning.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. PEPPER).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PEPPER), there were—ayes 52, noes 94.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH OR DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For grants, contracts, and jointly financed cooperative arrangements for research or demonstration projects under section 1110 of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1310), \$11,500,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KYL

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KYL: On page 38, after line 11, add the following language: "Provided, that no funds appropriated by this act shall be used to conduct experiments, pilot operations or programs involving guaranteed annual wage."

(Mr. KYL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KYL. Mr. Chairman, I want first to read two lines from page 37 of the committee report:

The committee approved this proposal with some hesitation—

Speaking of cooperative research and demonstration projects. The second quotation is as follows:

Secretary Finch has made it clear and has emphasized the point that this is not a proposal for a guaranteed annual income.

All this amendment does is to seek to relieve the worry which the committee had and to seek to assist the Secretary in carrying out the purpose for which he asked for this money. In the interest of time, I would be happy to yield to the Chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, if he desires to speak for or against the amendment.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances which are declared, I will yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I am happy to respond. As I understand the gentleman's amendment, he would merely insert in the bill what the sense of the House would be, and the Secretary, in response to our inquiries, said exactly what the gentleman provides in his amendment. I see no reason why we ought not to accept it and then make everybody happy, although we cannot go that far. But we are going to conduct some kind of demonstration, or whatever it may be.

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

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

Mr. QUIE. Does your amendment say "guaranteed annual wage"? This language is "guaranteed annual income." Do you look upon a guaranteed annual wage as synonymous with guaranteed annual income?

Mr. KYL. They are interchangeable, I would say to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized.

Mr. BURTON of California. I do not think there is any question confronting the country that is a more difficult one, no matter what one's political philosophy, than how we as a country might best deal with the problem of either the nonworking poor or the working poor or the "incapable-to-work" poor. I think it is somewhat ill-advised in light of the statements in the press, where on August 8 the administration is scheduled to come up with its program in this area. I would think if I were on your side of the aisle for that reason, or for those of us on our side of the aisle that really cannot say that we know how this Congress should best proceed in this area, I think we are needlessly hobbling the administration in an area where we need a good deal more information than we have.

Also it is perfectly obvious that any proposal they come up with is going to have to receive the approval of this House and the Senate. But it is at best politically myopic to in any way fetter the administration at this time on a matter of this very grave importance and, as I stated earlier, a matter that few thoughtful people in the field can possibly believe they have the only answer to. This one Member does not have an idea of how he might best proceed. I would like the administration to proceed unfettered, and let us evaluate what they have got, and let us not be so absurd as to tie their hands when we need

the information even more perhaps than the administration does so we can best evaluate what, if anything, we want to do with reference to their proposals.

I would hope we would reject the amendment.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, the amendment offered by my colleague (Mr. KYL) is very much in order if for no other reason than to protect HEW from itself. If the message contained in the report is correct, then I think the Congress, this House, has nothing to fear. It is nothing more than a reiteration of what has been said before. I believe it would be very much in order for the House to accept the amendment.

Second, if I may proceed, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, as a member of the Committee on Poverty, I must report that the OEO to date has spent \$13 million on evaluations, reports, and surveys—and most of them are doing nothing more than gathering dust.

We are in a process now, I will say as a member of this committee, of making many changes in the OEO program. We are shifting Headstart. We are establishing many centers. We have shut down Job Corps centers. This administration will, in the near future, send up to this House a message on a new comprehensive manpower training program.

Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is in order and should be adopted by this House. I certainly urge its adoption.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCHERLE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that President Nixon is to make an announcement on August 8 as to what form or what plan he is going to recommend to deal with this problem of family supplemental allowances or a guaranteed annual income or whatever revisions will be proposed in the welfare program.

I wonder if, perhaps, the distinguished minority leader would care to comment on whether or not this amendment may tie the President's hands. I do not see that this amendment is necessary, and I would hate to see the President not be able to move or to be embarrassed in some way in making an overhaul of the welfare program.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Chairman, if I may answer my colleague from Illinois, first of all, if this administration recommends a 2-year continuation, I am totally and unequivocally opposed.

Second, if the administration is for \$2 billion, I am opposed totally and unequivocally also.

Furthermore, even if the President does send up a message, this Congress will act as far as it deems advisable and not necessarily in support of the recommendations from downtown.

I have been a little disappointed myself.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment of my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, it is rather appalling that an amendment would be proposed seriously to prohibit the expenditure of funds for the purpose of conducting experiments, pilot operations or programs related to the question of income maintenance. It is known that there is a debate within the Nixon administration itself on this question. I am somewhat amazed that members of the President's own party would want to prevent his administration from undertaking pilot projects in an area where there is deep public concern.

The idea of a guaranteed annual income or a negative income tax has been advocated by economists of both conservative and liberal orientation. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has promised that a report on the administration's position will be soon forthcoming. I would think that those who so readily decry public assistance welfare programs and their acknowledged failures would want to encourage the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the very least to investigate the advantages and disadvantages of some kind of income-maintenance program. In order to gather data of any value, it will be necessary to conduct test programs and analyze and evaluate the results.

As the author of the first guaranteed annual-income legislation to be introduced in the Congress (H. R. 586), I am very much concerned that pilot programs be carried on and that the Congress recognize the need for a new approach to the question of providing income for those 30 million Americans living in poverty.

I note that the language of the Kyl amendment refers to a guaranteed annual wage. Of course, there is a difference between the concept of a guaranteed annual wage—long a goal of the labor movement—and a guaranteed annual income. It seems clear, however, from the debate that the gentleman is referring to a guaranteed annual income.

It would be blind folly for the House to prohibit the use of funds for a study of income maintenance. The need to study not only this approach but also other approaches to the problems facing welfare recipients in our major urban centers should be obvious to all but the most myopic. I urge the defeat of the Kyl amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KYL).

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. KYL), there were—ayes 89, noes 50.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. KYL and Mr. BURTON of California.

The committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 115, noes 77.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.
The Clerk read as follows:

PAYMENT FOR SPECIAL BENEFITS FOR THE
AGED

For payment to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund, as authorized by section 228(g) of the Social Security Act, \$364,151,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROSENTHAL

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROSENTHAL: On page 41, after line 4, insert the following:

"CONSUMER CREDIT TRAINING

"For carrying out consumer credit training under the Federal Credit Union Act of 1968, \$300,000."

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I am slightly embarrassed that the amount I am seeking to restore in this bill is such a small sum of \$300,000, but maybe we can make a valid case for it. At any rate, I kind of think so.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment would restore to the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions \$300,000 for administering Project Moneywise, a valuable consumer program which has helped 250,000 poor people to better manage and conserve their money.

A number of leading consumer spokesmen have recently made the point that while Congress has been eminently successful in enacting important new consumer laws, it has oftentimes failed to appropriate sufficient money to properly administer those laws. Unless \$300,000 is restored to the appropriations bill for the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions, an important operational low-income consumer program, called Project Moneywise, will come to an untimely end and Congress will again stand accused of having failed to adequately fund needed consumer programs.

Judging by the statement on page 38 of the Appropriations Committee report, the request for \$300,000 for consumer credit training had the support of the committee in principle, but was disapproved on the grounds that "many other agencies are carrying out" such training.

This is not correct. The Bureau of Federal Credit Unions is the sole Federal agency equipped to carry on this work. Through the Bureau's Project Moneywise, it has done so for 3½ years. It is important to note that this budget request was supported in both the Johnson and Nixon fiscal 1970 budget submissions and the funds authorized in the Federal Credit Union Act of 1968.

Accordingly, the request for \$300,000, deleted by the Appropriations Committee, represents the only Federal involvement in credit union training. What is unique and vital about Project Moneywise is that it not only trains people in the operation of credit unions and stresses the importance of low-cost credit, it encourages and leads to the actual establishment of credit unions for the poor. In its brief existence, Project Moneywise has contributed to the organization of 242 of the 670 credit unions serving the poor, with assets of over \$30 million.

This money is poor people's capital—funds they have slowly accumulated

through regular savings at credit unions. The training afforded by Project Moneywise helps credit union leaders to improve their operations, to intensify their thrift promotion and counseling programs and results in the formation of new credit unions to meet the needs of poor people who are not now being served.

There is really very little point in exploring the existence of the loan shark, the credit merchant, or the unavailability of low-cost credit, without offering the poor an alternative source of credit. Project Moneywise accomplishes this by providing a way of life centered on the credit union and enables the poor to shape their own economic destinies.

This is another example of a program, Mr. Chairman, that has been successful. If we terminate it now based upon some whim or caprice, we would be deluding people who have raised \$30 million in capital savings. One of the most important things is the individual homeowner and it is important that his wife learn how to use their own funds and savings. That is exactly what this program does.

This, as I said earlier, was recommended by the Johnson budget, by the 1970 Nixon budget, but the committee took it out by saying that other Federal agencies perform these services. The fact of the matter is that if one takes the time to read these hearings they will find there is no other agency that would accomplish this purpose. This is a useful thing.

Mr. Chairman, very frankly, I would hope that the Committee would see the wisdom of this amendment and perhaps agree to it.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. However, it is difficult for me to speak against the amendment in view of the eloquence of my friend, the gentleman from New York, but these are the facts. We went into this, Mr. Chairman, at great length. I have many of these units in the coalfields especially and you can imagine the situation which existed during the distressed economic era of the past 5 years. We have many of them. They have been a great asset. I have been very close to it. I examined the problem very carefully.

This committee, under no circumstances is opposed to programs aimed at better credit and money management. We all need it, not just Tom, Dick, and Harry, but Sally, Irene, and Mary. This request was denied for a very good reason. Everyone wants to get into this act.

For instance, in many of your hometowns you have the antipoverty program, the Office of Economic Opportunity. They have a program they call comprehensive consumer action. Wonderful. They say, "they are designed to mobilize members of a community around a credit union or other source of local credit for the purpose of attacking common economic problems." How do you like that? That is the same thing, but dressed in a different way.

Then the public assistance program includes, and I quote, "Services to fami-

lies to improve money management." We were told by a lady for whom we have the highest regard, Miss Mary Switzer, the Administrator of the Social and Rehabilitation Service, that this is one of their important programs.

Do you follow me?

Also in HEW, there is the adult basic education program, which goes into this very same field.

Then over in the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Service makes a big thing of helping rural people with their family budgets and money management.

I do not think we have to worry about any gap areas if this program of the Federal Credit Unions is not funded. I think our worry should rather be that we have duplication among these other programs.

I trust that the amendment will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ROSENTHAL).

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

HOWARD UNIVERSITY
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the partial support of Howard University, including repairs to buildings and grounds, \$20,445,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to ask some member of the subcommittee a question or two concerning this appropriation.

As I read the language, it provides for the partial support of Howard University, including repairs to buildings and grounds.

Does this mean that money is being appropriated by the Federal Government to repair the buildings that were gutted by fires set by arsonists not too many months ago at this college?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there is no doubt about it. This money is appropriated for Howard University.

Mr. GROSS. And the money will be—
Mr. FLOOD. Later on we can have an amendment to discuss the whys and the wherefores as to what should or should not be done. But the gentleman is asking a rhetorical question, which he rarely does?

Mr. GROSS. I am asking what?

Mr. FLOOD. I do know, of course, that the gentleman is asking a rhetorical question for the first time in his career—and it has been an illustrious one. The gentleman knows the answer is "Yes."

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not know that the answer is "Yes," because I know of no reason why the Federal taxpayers should be made—

Mr. FLOOD. Does the gentleman want an answer, or does the gentleman want to tell me?

Mr. GROSS. I suggest there may be a different answer; something that is more palatable and logical.

Mr. FLOOD. Is this a question or an explanation?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentlemen will proceed in order.

The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Which gentleman is proceeding out of order, if I may address a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN pro tempore. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GROSS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I know of no reason why the taxpayers of the United States should be called upon to repair or to rebuild structures on the Howard University campus in Washington, D.C., that have been deliberately gutted by fire.

I know of no reason why funds are to be expended from this appropriation or a previous appropriation by the Federal taxpayers of the Nation to pay \$30,000 to indemnify the Washington, D.C., Fire Department for the loss of a fire truck which was deliberately set afire and destroyed while attempting to put out the recent fires on the campus of Howard University—fires that were deliberately set by rioting Negro students.

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

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

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I would say that my understanding might be a little different from what the record would indicate at this time. We had these hearings a week before the riots. The justifications for the expenditure of this money could not have included the repair of these buildings.

I would assume that before they could be repaired, there would have to be an appropriation and new justifications. That would be my understanding of the situation.

But I do know that it was a week before the riots because some of us asked the president if he did not think that there was going to be a riot in view of the fact that they had three buildings that had been occupied and they failed to dismiss even one student. He said, "Oh, no, I do not think that our failure to dismiss a student is going to cause us to have a riot or to encourage a riot." But that is what happened.

Mr. GROSS. That was only 1 week after the president at Howard University said that everything was serene and tranquil at the university; is that not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Yes; that is true.

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and I do not want to see Federal taxpayers of Iowa and elsewhere being taken for the purpose of repairing and constructing buildings which had been deliberately destroyed by fire—or to indemnify the Washington, D.C., Fire Department for the loss of a fire truck that was destroyed while it was on a mission to put out those fires.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. My understanding is, and I think the record reflects this, my understanding is that there has been no justification for these expenditures in this budget. That is my understanding.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman for his response.

Mr. MICHEL. I would note further that on page 954 of volume 6, we have detailed here \$146,000 for special re-

habilitation and renovation of three elevators in the young women's dormitory and some replacement of furniture—but that has nothing to do, as the gentleman has suggested, with the riots.

Incidentally, most of the increase \$2,214,000 for Howard University over the expenditures of last year is for the increase of faculty salaries to bring them in line with other schools and for some new teaching positions.

So the gentleman's fears can be allayed to that extent. But I certainly expect that probably in next year's budget there might very well be some request here to repair the damage that was done, as suggested by the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 208. None of the funds contained in this title may be used for any expenses, whatsoever, incident to making allotments to States for the current fiscal year, under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, on a basis in excess of a total of \$500,000,000.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against section 208.

Mr. Chairman, the authorizing legislation in 1967 provided that the figure on line 2, page 50, should be \$600,000,000 instead of \$500,000,000.

So this affects the allotments in the various States of the Union and it is outright legislation on an appropriation bill, the effect of which is to reduce the entitlements of the States.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. FLOOD. Yes, I do, Mr. Chairman. This is not a new attack. This language is completely negative. I do not know how you can be so absolutely negative. This is completely negative language. It is clearly and distinctly a limitation and nothing more. It is a limitation upon the use of these funds in the bill.

In addition to that fact, Mr. Chairman, it also qualifies under what you and I well know as the famous "Holman rule." The language of that rule covers the retrenchment of expenditure, and the language in the bill clearly retrenches expenditure. That is my position, Mr. Chairman. I suggest that the point of order be overruled.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is no limitation. It is an outright change and affects the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as to his statement about the Holman rule. The gentleman cited the Holman rule to substantiate his argument. To what part of the provisions of the Holman rule does the gentleman refer?

Mr. FLOOD. There is that section of the Holman rule which states very clearly that it deals with the retrenchment of expenditures. The words are from the rule itself, a retrenchment of expenditure. I am sure the Chair is aware of that.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair understands the Holman rule, the Holman rule, in the provision referring to retrench-

ment, relates to a specific retrenchment. The Chair is not aware, of course, of the expenses that are involved in the handling of this particular \$500 million appropriation.

Mr. FLOOD. I might suggest further that this will be \$600 million without this provision. It will be \$600 million, and that certainly is a retrenchment in expenditure as provided in the rule.

Mr. PERKINS. \$600 million is the allotment base provided in the original act of 1967, and they just arbitrarily changed the figure from \$600 million to \$500 million.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would say the original allotment of \$600 million does not restrict the committee from reducing it to \$500 million, as I understand.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan may proceed.

Mr. O'HARA. The language of section 208 states as follows:

SEC. 208. None of the funds contained in this title may be used for any expenses, whatsoever, incident to making allotments to States for the current fiscal year, under section 2 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, on a basis in excess of a total of \$500,000,000.

There is no showing, certainly, on the face of the section that it would cost any more or any less to make allotments on the basis of \$500 million or on the basis of \$600 million, and certainly there is no showing of saving necessarily on the face of the section.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. HOLIFIELD). The Chair is prepared to rule. The Chair has listened to the arguments both for and against the point of order. The Chair cannot find any reason for ruling that this is other than a negative limitation, and the Chair so rules; that this language is a limitation on the expenditures contained in this act, and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Chairman 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.

THE GREAT AIR RACE

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

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on May 14, 1969, four FAA air controllers received the Empire State Building award for the "Most meritorious and original effort" in the Great Air Race of 1969.

The four men—Nick Kleiner, John Staut, Jim Ean, and Jim Scorse—acting as individuals, entered the race from the Empire State Building to the Post Office Tower in London to illustrate the plight of the average American air traveler.

Nick Kleiner left Manhattan at 5:30 p.m. on May 4 and he arrived at the Post Office Tower in London 10 hours, 55 minutes, and 21 seconds later. The return trip took Kleiner 11 hours and 49 minutes and while he recorded the slowest time in the race he earned the "original effort" award.

Traveling by subway, bus, taxi, London tubes, and Carey bus, Kleiner demonstrated the frustrating experience the average tourist must combat in getting from our cities to and from our airfields. His total roundtrip times were, 9 hours, 18 minutes on the ground and 13 hours and 27 minutes in the air.

Nick Kleiner's ingenuity was rewarded at the May 14 awards banquet in London where he received a \$2,400 prize on behalf of his team and the congratulations of Prince Philip and Prince Michael.

Mr. Speaker, this story highlights the need for imagination and new initiatives to update our Nation's airport systems. In New York we face a crisis because a fourth and fifth jetport which should have been constructed have not even been planned. Air congestion in New York produces delays across the United States and the average tourist must set aside hours to reach the airport from our inner cities.

There is no simple answer to this problem but certainly the first step must be a more progressive and determined effort by the FAA to exert leadership in this field. The people who hold administrative positions in the FAA must stop catering to the airlines and begin representing the people.

Perhaps the FAA should study the details of the great air race and recognize the contribution made by four FAA employees to public awareness of a frustrating problem.

I congratulate Nick Kleiner and his teammates for a job well done and I advise the FAA to pay closer attention to the average air traveler and his plight.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S STATEMENT ON CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE STUDY

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

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on July 3, 1969, the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee met in Geneva, Switzerland. The Committee met to consider concrete proposals for arms control. High on the Committee's list of topics to consider was the question of arms on the seabeds and chemical and biological warfare.

President Nixon sent a message to the Committee from Key Biscayne, Fla., expressing some of his thoughts on the topics under consideration. He also announced that the United States and Russia would begin the strategic arms limitation talks at the end of July.

I was pleased to read in the press that day that President Nixon had commented on the chemical and biological warfare study prepared by the Secretary General of the United Nations, U Thant. President Nixon, said that he welcomed the study because it will draw the at-

tention of all mankind to an area of common concern. He went on to say:

The specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world.

This statement expresses traditional attitude of the American public on these forms of warfare and is very much in keeping with statements of Presidents Coolidge, Harding, Hoover, Roosevelt, and Eisenhower.

I was perplexed, however, when I asked the White House Press Office to send me a copy of the statement on July 16, 1969, to find that the sentence, "The specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world", had been crossed out in black ink. I wondered who had changed President Nixon's original statement, if in fact it had been changed. I understand that the change had been made at the urging of the Department of Defense.

When a reporter from the Buffalo Courier-Express asked the White House Press Office about the change in the statement, he was told that the text released from Key Biscayne was just a draft and that the version being released by the Press Office was the correct statement.

To clarify this matter, I contacted Mr. Bryce Harlow, Assistant to the President for Congressional Relations. I was most pleased to learn from him yesterday that President Nixon's original statement has not been changed. This information resolves the confusion surrounding this matter. I am including in the RECORD at this point the text of President Nixon's message to the 18-Nation Disarmament Committee:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO THE 18-NATION DISARMAMENT COMMITTEE

I have followed closely the activities of the spring session of the Disarmament Committee, and Ambassador Smith has reported to me on the prospects for progress in the near future.

As the conference resumes its work after a recess of 6 weeks, I would like to address the following thoughts to the members of the Committee:

First, the ground has been prepared for concrete arms control negotiations. In addition to the valuable suggestions by many members of the Committee, draft agreements have been submitted by the United States and by the Soviet Union to prevent an arms race on the seabeds. Although differences exist, it should not prove beyond our ability to find common ground so that a realistic agreement may be achieved that enhances the security of all countries.

The framing of an international agreement to apply to more than 100 million square miles of the earth's surface lying under the oceans is a high challenge to our vision and statesmanship. I ask the participants in this Committee to join with us in elaborating a measure that is both practical and significant. With good will on all sides and a fair measure of hard work, we may achieve agreement in the course of this session. With each passing day our seabed becomes more important for the security and well-being of all nations. Our goal should be to present a sound seabed arms control measure to the 24th General Assembly of the United Nations.

Second, the Secretary General of the United Nations has just issued his study on the effects of chemical and biological war-

fare. Experts from many countries have contributed to this important work. I am pleased that an expert from the United States, Dr. Ivan Bennett, has also played a role in the study. We welcome the Secretary General's study, since it will draw the attention of all mankind to an area of common concern. The specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world.

The delegation of the United States is prepared to examine carefully, together with other delegations, any approaches that offer the prospect of reliable arms control in this field.

Third, in my letter to Ambassador Smith on March 18 at the opening of the first session of this Committee, I reaffirmed United States support for the conclusion of a comprehensive test ban adequately verified; I stated my conviction that efforts must be made toward greater understanding of the verification issue. I am pleased that, during your first session, serious exploration of verification problems took place. The United States delegation will be prepared to continue to participate in efforts towards greater understanding of this key issue. It is only by means of careful study, with due regard for all of the relevant technical and political considerations, that progress can be made.

Fourth, I recently announced that the United States hopes to be able to commence talks with the Soviet Union on strategic arms limitations around July 31 or shortly thereafter. When these talks begin, which I hope and trust will be soon, they will of necessity be bilateral negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States Government is, however, deeply conscious of its responsibilities to its allies and to the community of nations.

While these talks progress, it is particularly important that multilateral negotiations continue in this Committee in an atmosphere of determination and promise. Arms control is without dispute a subject of direct concern to all nations, large and small. The wisdom, the advice, and the informed concern of many nations are needed in a continuing body such as this to ensure that no opportunities are missed to achieve genuine progress.

This Committee clearly is the world's pre-eminent multilateral disarmament forum. Its record of accomplishment, which needs no recital here, is greater than that of any other disarmament committee in history. I trust that your Committee will continue its efforts with all of the combined skill and dedication which its members have demonstrated in the past.

The negotiation of sound arms control and disarmament, like all work contributing to peace, must be an integrated and comprehensive effort. Progress in the tasks of your Committee will be a contribution to a world of peaceful international cooperation, a world where fear and conflict are supplanted by the honest give-and-take of negotiation aimed at meeting the legitimate aspirations of all.

The United States will work in every way to bring us closer to such a world.

NIXON MAPS SOUTHEAST ASIA ROLE

(Mr. BERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to insert in the RECORD the column of David Lawrence in the Washington Evening Star's July 29 edition.

I particularly call attention to the statement Mr. Lawrence makes in the latter part of the article in which he is

talking about peace in Vietnam and says this:

If everybody were to keep his mouth shut, North Vietnam would be much worried and would be begging at the peace table for an end to the war. The weakness of the position of the United States is that it has announced an intention of getting out of Vietnam, and many prominent members of Congress have been demanding an even more speedy withdrawal than has been contemplated."

The entire article is as follows:

NIXON MAPS SOUTHEAST ASIA ROLE
(By David Lawrence)

Most Americans are not very familiar with the problems of Southeast Asia, and when the President of the United States decided to visit the heads of governments in the region, it wasn't apparent on the surface just what was his basic purpose.

Nixon felt that there was a pressing need, or he would not have gone on such a trip so early in his administration when he is confronted with many other problems. The Nixon journey is the result of a carefully laid plan that can have long-range effects on American foreign policy.

Nixon wants to make it clear, of course, that withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam doesn't mean abandonment of protective measures for the smaller nations of the area. He reiterates that the United States will live up to its commitments, but intimates that the nations cannot expect American troops to do the whole job.

The President took occasion in Indonesia to speak of American aid as something that should be based on policies "mutually helpful to us both." At present, \$120 million of economic assistance is given annually to that country, which has 110 million people and certainly needs outside help.

Nixon predicted that Indonesia's natural resources and private enterprise are heading for significant development in the next five years. But he also pointed out that he doesn't want to expand any U.S. defense commitments in Asia.

The same concept was applied by the President when he arrived in Bangkok. He said the United States would honor its obligation to defend Thailand against possible Communist aggression or subversion. There are 47,000 American troops in Thailand manning six air bases which are useful in fighting the war in Vietnam as well as the "secret war" in Laos, which has been overrun in part by 70,000 North Vietnamese supporting the Communist faction in that country.

Nixon, in one of his speeches, emphasized that the United States is bound by the Southeast Asia Treaty and that Americans and Thais have been willing to fight in Vietnam to protect the rights of free people. He said he stands firmly with Thailand against those who would threaten it from inside or outside its borders.

But the main point of Nixon's approach was outlined in Bangkok when he declared:

"Our determination to honor our commitments is fully consistent with our convictions that the nations of Asia can and must increasingly shoulder the responsibility for achieving peace and progress in the area."

The President believes that future economic development must be accomplished on a regional and co-operative basis. The United States is willing to offer a considerable amount of help, but only after being satisfied that Asian leaders will take the initiative and rectify some of the problems and procedures—such as domestic corruption and misuse of aid money and materiel—which have heretofore impaired the value of American assistance.

One of the reasons for the visit to Southeast Asia at this time is to confer with American ambassadors in the area and get

their suggestions about a formula for future American co-operation, especially on the economic side.

All this means that, while the United States wants to assist Southeast Asia, it is not going to do the job alone and expects a substantial effort, both military and economic, to be made by the countries themselves.

On the whole, the value of the President's trip cannot be measured at this time, because North Vietnam is still obstinately refusing to make any concessions at the Paris peace negotiations. Unfortunately, there have been too many voices expressing dissent inside America against the Nixon policies. If everybody were to keep his mouth shut, North Vietnam would be much worried and would be begging at the peace table for an end to the war. The weakness of the position of the United States is that it has announced an intention of getting out of Vietnam, and many prominent members of Congress have been demanding an even more speedy withdrawal than has been contemplated.

Open diplomacy is worthwhile where treaties and new policies are being formed and no war is going on. But there should never be a public disclosure of military operations or plans, because this sometimes has the effect of telling the enemy that the other side is cringing and so eager to withdraw that it will pay almost any price for peace.

CRISIS IN OUR NATION'S EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

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

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there are no bargain basement price tags on education, and I am deeply disturbed at the recommendations by the administration which could create a crisis in our Nation's educational programs.

Acceptance by the Members of the House of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations bill would result in a 66-percent cut in Federal aid to libraries and a 25-percent cut in the budget of the Office of Education.

We simply cannot afford such ill-advised action in the false name of economy.

The administration recommends the elimination of moneys for the elementary and secondary school libraries program. These are the funds which provide for the purchase of books for children in public and private schools.

It also calls for a 50-percent cut of funds for grants for public libraries under provisions of the Library Services and Construction Act, and a 33-percent reduction for programs under the supplemental services section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

There must be something basically hypocritical about a policy which preaches self-help and then takes away the books and educational programs which allow those who want to, to better themselves.

Will such fund reductions actually play a role in reducing our Federal budget?

Hardly. By reducing library allocations from fiscal 1968's level of \$135,000,000 to \$46,000,000, the proposed cuts would trim the Federal budget by one-twentieth of 1 percent.

The proposal is as futile in saving money as it is destructive to our educational system.

It is my hope that my fellow Members of the House will approve the amendment proposed by our colleague, Representative CHARLES S. JOELSON of New Jersey. This package amendment would add nearly \$900 million to the committee bill for education programs.

Failure to grant passage of this important amendment could destroy a major portion of our educational progress.

Equally as important as the restoration of these funds is the defeat of a provision in section 407 of H.R. 13111. This is the provision which would cut off all Federal aid to an institution of higher education if it does not certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that it is in compliance with the requirements of this section.

We are all deeply troubled with the unrest, and in some cases, the outright anarchy that has existed on some of our campuses. But action by the Congress which would punish the innocent and guilty alike, as section 407 would do, would only compound the problem and serve to the advantage of the campus revolutionaries.

It is my feeling that the responsibility for the maintenance of order on the campus lies with the academic community, and at the State and local level. We must not place the Federal Government in the role of enforcer of rules and regulations on every campus in our Nation.

Academic freedom is a cornerstone of our educational system. Passage of section 407 could set a dangerous precedent for the complete control by the Federal Government of our institutions of higher education and an end to academic freedom as we now know it.

TRANSPORTATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(Mr. GUDE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the Congress, I have been deeply involved in many matters affecting the government of the District of Columbia. At present transportation is by far the most pressing regional issue.

I have long worked for freeways in the belief that all segments of the District of Columbia community will truly benefit from the prompt implementation of the long-planned highway system, no less than from rapid rail transit.

A professional public opinion survey released today reveals for the first time that the majority of Washington, D.C., residents support the concept of the completed freeway system. The survey was conducted by Oliver Quayle & Co. of New York, a nationally known opinion research organization.

I call attention to this poll because it offers further evidence to discredit those noisy zealots who have obstructed transportation progress in the Nation's Capital and who are not truly representative of the majority sentiment.

This survey outcome is especially striking following as it does the years of

demagoguery and misrepresentation on the part of freeway opponents who have sought to falsely portray the transportation issue in terms of suburbs versus city, or black versus white.

Those in the District of Columbia government who wish to move ahead, genuinely represent the people. Those outside the government who have blocked every effort to implement the freeway system, have contributed absolutely nothing to all the considerable efforts of responsible citizens and community leaders to build a rapid rail transit system here.

May the responsible authorities take note of this survey and be reminded where the people really stand on this most significant issue. Beyond that, all that needs to be done is to comply with the law, the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1968.

A great deal has been alleged recently to the effect that any agreement by the City Council to proceed with freeways would represent capitulation to blackmail. The case is precisely the reverse. We in Congress are urging the city to comply with the law, as opposed to surrendering to intimidation by nonrepresentative and irresponsible forces.

I have long felt that antifreeway extremists who would readily sacrifice the vitally needed transit system in their opposition to roads, care little for the city or its transportation needs. And I am convinced that they are less concerned about freeways or their merits than as an easily demagogued, phony issue that provides a rallying point in the militant competition for political power.

Today's survey again confirms my judgment that they do not represent a majority. And the Congress must continue to insist that the Council be aware of this. Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit the following statement of the Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington, and their synopsis of the survey by Oliver Quayle & Co., for the benefit of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION FOR METROPOLITAN WASHINGTON, JULY 30, 1969

(Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade; District of Columbia Board of Realtors; National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc.; Federal City Council; Metropolitan Washington Savings and Loan League; District of Columbia Bankers Association)

Before discussing the contents of the citizen attitude survey, I'll take just a moment to provide some of the background of our involvement in transportation matters in the Nation's Capital.

The Federal City Council's Transportation Committee began its studies some 15 years ago at about the time that the half-million-dollar mass transportation survey was initiated. Our own studies convinced us that no single mode of transportation could by itself meet the demands of the city and the region.

We have since been unwavering in our advocacy of a balanced system of transportation incorporating rapid rail transit, a modern freeway network, efficient bus service, and a program of planned parking.

During the early 1960's, it became apparent that the business community needed to speak with a single collective voice on behalf of rapid rail transit which was then in the early

stages of planning and development. The Joint Committee on Transportation was formed composed of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, District of Columbia Board of Realtors, National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc. (Downtown Progress) and the Federal City Council. The Committee was later expanded to include the Metropolitan Washington Savings and Loan League and the D.C. Bankers Association.

The Joint Committee likewise adopted a position in favor of balanced transportation.

One of the recent efforts of the Joint Committee came last year in anticipation of bond referenda for the Metro system.

We retained the services of Oliver Quayle and Company of New York to test the attitudes of voters in the suburban jurisdictions. Mr. Quayle is generally credited with being one of the nation's most accurate opinion pollsters. His surveys are based on most sophisticated statistical techniques. He predicted that the Metro bond referenda would pass by a margin of better than 70 percent. You will recall that the final tally was 71.4 percent.

Early this year, as the District government began to wrestle with the Congressional directive on freeways, a hue and cry was raised to the effect that nobody in the District wanted additional freeways. The source for this claim was a question asked in the Democratic primary of May, 1968. What very few people know is that the question asked on that Democratic primary ballot was:

"Shall the Democratic Party support legislation providing that before a new highway in the District of Columbia can be authorized, it must be approved in a referendum conducted in the District?"

The vote was 93,524 in favor, and 4,986 opposed. We all believe in the importance of referenda. What disturbs us is that the vote has since been characterized as a disapproval of the idea of building any freeways. This simply is not true. Considering the wording of the question, I am surprised that the vote was not 100 percent.

When this misinterpretation began to be accepted as fact, the Joint Committee on Transportation felt it was time to get a professional evaluation of actual citizen attitudes towards freeways in the District. Naturally, we turned to the Quayle firm—a company of proven competence—to conduct the required analysis.

When we asked Mr. Quayle to conduct an opinion survey, we did so for our own guidance. At that time, we had no thought of releasing the results of his work to the public.

Events of recent weeks have led us to believe that this information should be made public.

The survey showed the following to be true:

A majority of District residents want more freeways.

More Negro than white residents feel that freeways are needed.

There is less opposition to freeways in the District of Columbia among Negroes than exists among whites.

More residents of the District prefer the 1968 Highway Act to the 1968 D. C. City Council-National Capital Planning Commission plan.

More Negroes than whites in the District need the freeways to commute to their jobs in the city.

Rather than characterize the survey, we would prefer to present it to you in its entirety so that you can exercise your own objective judgment on the statistical results.

In closing, let me point out again that every study that has been made has pointed up the importance of rapid transit to the economic and social well-being of this community.

As we see it, the District government now has in its hands the fate of the Metro system. The District can either comply with the 1968 Highway Act and clear the way for construction of the Metro system, or refuse to comply and continue to hold up progress in meeting the transportation needs of the area. Clearly, the latter choice is contrary to the wishes of the majority of the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Virtually every reputable study of the last decade stresses the need for additional freeways in the District. The Quayle poll indicates that a majority of D. C. citizens favor additional freeways. We think the time is long past due when the city should get on with the job of providing the balanced transportation system that the city and the region require for sound growth.

A SURVEY OF PUBLIC OPINION IN WASHINGTON, D.C., REGARDING NEW FREEWAYS

(A synopsis prepared by the Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington)

SURVEY METHODOLOGY

Personal interviews were conducted with adult residents of Washington D.C. in their homes in February, 1969. A modified area probability sample was drawn. The cluster size was kept small so as to maximize the number of points sampled. The sample was drawn with attention to even geographical distribution, age and sex of respondents, based on census tract information. Of the total number of completed interviews, 77% were conducted with Negroes in order as accurately as possible to reflect the racial mix of the District's population.

Findings (with undecided out):

1. Rating given Washington's present system of roads, streets, highway, and parkways:

[In percent]

Excellent or pretty good.....	42
Fair or poor.....	58

2. Rating given Washington's downtown parking facilities:

Excellent or pretty good.....	11
Fair or poor.....	89

3. Automobile ownership: 61% of respondents owned one or more automobiles.

4. Automobile use:

a. 61% of respondents owning cars use them to get to work in Washington. Of these, 55% of White respondents and 66% of Negro respondents use their automobiles to get to work in Washington.

b. 19% of respondents owning cars use them for shopping and errands in Washington. Of these 29% of White respondents and 14% of Negro respondent use their automobiles for this purpose.

5. Method of transportation most often used by respondent or head of household to get to work (regardless of car ownership).

Household car.....	42
Car pool.....	6
Bus (or buses).....	23
Walk, taxi, etc.....	29

NOTE.—Cars, including car pools, are most used for commuting to work by residents in the two economic extremes of the community: the more affluent Northwest and the least affluent Southeast. Buses are used by one resident in four in all sections except the Northwest. A majority of those using buses are dissatisfied with the service provided.

6. Most needed transportation improvement:

By transportation system (all respondents):	
New rapid rail transit system.....	52
More freeways.....	25
More downtown parking facilities.....	23

By transportation system (white and Negro):	
New rapid rail system:	
White	64
Negro	48
More freeways:	
White	21
Negro	26
Downtown parking:	
White	15
Negro	26

NOTE.—The overwhelming demand for the Metro system comes from both blacks and whites, but more blacks than whites feel parking and freeways are most important and fewer give top priority to Metro.

7. Knowledge of plans for additional freeways:

a. Better than 3 out of 5 residents have heard or read something about freeway plans or proposals. Knowledge is extremely high among whites. A large minority of Negroes however, say that they are not sure or that they have heard or read nothing about new freeways.

b. When asked *what* they had heard about new freeways, most respondents made neutral comments. Unfavorable reactions, however, came more from Whites than from Negroes.

c. Opinion has not polarized on this question. The survey showed, however, that knowledge tends to make people more unfavorable than favorable toward new freeways, and that this tendency is stronger among knowledgeable whites than among knowledgeable blacks.

8. Rating of idea of building new freeways in city:

Excellent or pretty good idea:	
White	44
Negro	56
Fair or poor idea:	
White	56
Negro	44

NOTE.—Negroes are more inclined to favor the idea of new freeways than Whites.

9. Major advantages of building new freeways:

Would provide faster transportation:	
White	19
Negro	21
Would relieve congestion on local streets:	
White	14
Negro	13
Will help get to work faster:	
White	7
Negro	13

10. Major disadvantages of building new freeways:

Will displace too many people, destroy homes:	
White	38
Negro	49
Will cause more congestion:	
White	12
Negro	4
Will take away city's charm:	
White	12
Negro	1

NOTE.—Negro residents are a great deal more inclined to feel that they will personally benefit from the construction of new freeways, and the one reason forcing many to feel otherwise is the problem of displacement and relocation.

11. Attitudes toward two specific freeway proposals:

NCPC-District of Columbia City Council Plan (Dec. 1968):	
Approved:	
White	62
Negro	54

Disapprove:	
White	38
Negro	46
1968 Highway Act Plan (Public Law 90-495):	

Approve:	
White	57
Negro	59

Disapprove:	
White	43
Negro	41

Choice between building new freeways as proposed in one of the plans mentioned above and building no new freeways:

New freeways:	
White	54
Negro	60
No new freeways:	
White	46
Negro	40

NOTE.—Respondents were shown map of each and the approximate locations of their homes on each map were pointed out.

12. Preference between two specific freeway proposals, assuming that one would be implemented:

NCPC-District of Columbia City Council plan (Dec. 1968):	
White	35
Negro	34

1968 Highway Act Plan (Public Law 90-495):	
White	65
Negro	66

NOTE.—The analysis showed that the 1968 highway Act Plan derives most of its support from middle income white-collar working people, both black and white who live in the *Northeastern* and *Northwestern* parts of the city. By the same token, major support for the more restricted plan comes from older, retired or business and professional people who are either rather affluent or poverty-stricken, and who tend to live in the *Southwestern* area of the District.

The major conclusions to be drawn from the survey results are the following:

1. Washington, D.C. residents are neither highly critical nor greatly disturbed over their transportation problems. Yet, they are anything but satisfied with the present situation. They want improvements, mainly to enable them to get to and from work faster and easier.

2. Although the community is split between two large segments on the freeway question, more residents favor than oppose the building of new freeways.

3. If freeways are built most would want an expanded network which would provide direct access to suburban highways.

4. Neither this nor the entire freeway question is a racial issue. Although there is a definite feeling by Negroes that they, more than Whites, would be forced out of their homes by freeways, Negroes want new freeways more than Whites.

5. Residents most strongly in favor of new freeways tend to be middle class working people (White and Negro) in white- and blue-collar families and are also inclined to be men more than women.

6. Residents who most strongly oppose new freeways tend to come from either the upper or the lower segments of the city's population. They are also the older, retired people who either do not go to work or who are professionals, small business owners, or top level businessmen.

7. The most telling arguments for new freeways are that they will provide faster and easier transportation to and from work both in the city and to the suburbs, faster, better bus transportation, and will relieve congestion on local streets. The opening up of new job opportunities to Negroes in the

suburbs is also rather important to black residents.

8. The one overwhelming reason for opposing new freeways is that they will throw people out of their homes, and that these victims will be unable to find adequate and decent replacement housing.

9. On the whole, residents realize that the new Metro system cannot replace the need for new freeways.

10. The more a resident now knows about proposed plans for new freeway construction, the more likely he or she is to oppose them, but after all arguments have been aired, new freeways are still more popular than no new freeways.

11. Although residents are highly dissatisfied with downtown parking facilities, as yet the argument that new freeways will only aggravate this situation is not a major motivating factor behind opposition to freeway construction.

12. The arguments that freeways will either help or destroy the city's economy are not particularly persuasive.

PROJECT MONEYWISE

(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, there is an unfortunate omission in the Health, Education, and Welfare portion of the appropriations before us which would eliminate a credit union training program, Project Moneywise. Federal credit unions are serving poor people in many cities across the country, including Chicago. Project Moneywise is a training program devised by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions to help these credit unions do a thorough job of serving their members.

There are about 450 Federal credit unions serving poor people in the cities, and they are serving over 120,000 poor people. These credit union members themselves have amassed close to \$20,000,000 in savings. It is significant to note that not one single cent of Federal funds has gone into this dollar figure. The poor themselves have saved this money, in many cases it is the first savings they have ever accumulated.

Project Moneywise was organized by the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions on a pilot basis under an interagency funding agreement with OEO. Both agencies saw a need for the training of credit union people in order to make their credit unions more effective. Due to the fact that the Bureau's operations are self-supporting, with expenses for its chartering, examination, and supervision programs offset by income from fees assessed on Federal credit unions, it was necessary for the Bureau to seek outside funding for the program. The evidence of over 3 years of work with the program resulted in a decision by the executive branch and the Congress to transfer the funding from OEO to the Bureau so that the program could be operated directly by the Bureau as an adjunct to its self-supporting activities.

Chicago is one of the cities that badly needs credit union training. It has several Federal credit unions serving the poor, perhaps the best known is Pilsen Neighbors Federal Credit Union, but there are others. These credit unions have a continuous need for this training, and they will not get it unless the \$300,000 request

is restored to the Health, Education, and Welfare budget.

I think the issue will become much clearer in the future, with the enactment of H.R. 2, which the House so overwhelmingly approved on Monday. This bill would establish the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions as an independent agency, and would clarify its programs for the benefit of the Congress. The agency would no longer be buried within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, where its very specific and productive programs can all too easily be equated with welfare or education programs which are totally dissimilar.

NINTH ANNUAL PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF THE 17TH DISTRICT OF OHIO

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK), is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, this year I delayed distribution of my ninth annual questionnaire to give the people of the 17th Congressional District more time to view the programs and policies of our new President and his efforts on their behalf. This delay has, I believe, proved fruitful. Response to the poll was excellent and the sincere concern of many persons was again expressed by the hundreds of personal notes, letters, and marginal memos.

As in the past, I continued my policy of sending the questionnaire to voters of all political persuasions: Republicans, Democrats, and Independents. The questionnaire went to all parts of the 17th district, not only the full counties but those of which I represent only a few townships.

Several points are quickly noticed: First, there is a great desire for control of lawlessness in the Nation whether the lawlessness is on the campus or in the

streets. Answers to a question on whether Federal funds should be denied to disruptive college students brought a "yes" response from 92 percent. A question of imposing a mandatory prison sentence on persons convicted of using firearms in the commission of a felony elicited a 92.4-percent response.

On the question of Vietnam there appears to be a major shift of opinion. Last year's poll indicated that within the 17th district 18 percent favored withdrawal of American forces on a unilateral basis. This year, 42.9 percent marked this same response; 51.6 percent stood in favor of either continuing with present military strategies and tactics or sharply intensifying them. From comments included with returned questionnaires and my many discussions with persons and groups at home it seems that more than even the people are simply fed up with the attrition tactics of the past few years. They are for the most part not against our efforts to help preserve the self-determination of South Vietnam, but they are against spending American lives in a winless effort. The poll tends to bear this out.

With a fervor almost equal to that with which Americans support their men on the battlefield, Americans oppose the actions of deserters and draft dodgers.

The responses to a question on granting amnesty to deserters, draft dodgers, and those who were imprisoned rather than serve proved interesting in the negative response. Of the three options, 68.3 percent of the people did not choose any of them. About 6 percent approved amnesty for those who fled the country to avoid the draft, 22 percent favored granting amnesty to those imprisoned for their objections, and only 3.8 percent for the deserter from the Armed Forces. Thus, the remaining persons, nearly 70 percent, either do not have an opinion or oppose

amnesty to any person who shirks his Nation's military service.

In the 17th Congressional District a clear majority of the people favor proceeding with the modified anti-ballistic-missile system proposed by President Nixon. The figures are 54 percent for deployment, 31.4 percent against, and 14.6 percent with no opinion.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased with this year's questionnaire. I believe it was written in an eminently fair manner, distributed inclusively, tabulated precisely, and that it covered a broad range of domestic and foreign policy questions. Some of those included, in addition to topics I have mentioned are: the military draft, Post Office Department, voting age, cigarette advertising, the National Labor Relations Board, taxes, and electoral reform. I, therefore, believe it is a representation of opinion in the district which I serve.

In contrast to other years I have this year added a new phase to the questionnaire procedure. After distributing the poll, but prior to final tabulation and publication of results, I answered the questionnaire myself. I think it only fair that having asked my constituents to respond I should give them the benefit of my view on the same questions. My answers were, of course, made fully available to all news media in the district. In many areas the people and I fully agree; on some we disagree, but on all the issues we have gone on public record with our stand. In addition, I include my responses following the tabulated answers. They are in the same form distributed to the press.

To my knowledge this is the most comprehensive annual opinion poll taken of this area of Ohio and an excellent supplement to other efforts which I make to seek out the thoughts of the people. I include the poll and the tabulations of responses in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

(In percent)

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. If the Paris peace talks are abandoned or reach a hopeless stalemate would you then favor:				6. Do you believe the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) should be replaced by a system of labor courts?	33.4	40.2	26.4
(a) Continuation of our present military strategies and tactics?.....			9.8	7. Viewing the economy as it stands today, would you favor renewal or the 10 percent income surtax when it expires on June 30?	20.4	68.5	11.1
(b) Unilateral withdrawal of U.S. troops.....			42.9	8. Experts predict that the world population will double before the year 2000 and there is widespread expectation of famine on an unprecedented scale in many parts of the world. Do you believe these predictions warrant intensification of the Federal Government's present limited role in population control efforts?	61.1	26.3	12.6
(c) Sharp intensification of the total war effort.....			41.8	9. At the conclusion of the Vietnam conflict, would you favor granting amnesty to any of the following: Those who—			
(d) No opinion.....			5.5	(a) Fled the country to avoid the draft?.....			5.9
2. President Nixon has asked the Defense Department to develop detailed plans for eventually ending the draft. The first step will be to make major revisions to correct inequities. Which of the following proposals do you favor? Check 1.				(b) Were imprisoned because of objections to the war and refusal to serve?.....			22.0
(a) Substitute for the present system of priorities and deferments a lottery or system of "random selections".....			34.6	(c) Deserted while a member of the armed services.....			3.8
(b) Permit fulfillment of military obligation through alternate national service such as Peace Corps, VISTA, etc.....			24.1	(d) No opinion.....			68.3
(c) Work toward outright abolition of draft.....			28.8	10. Do you favor proceeding with the modified (ABM) antiballistic missile plan proposed by President Nixon?	54	31.4	14.6
(d) No opinion.....			12.5	11. On the issue of gun control what should the Federal Government do? Check 1.			
3. In which of the following ways would you prefer to have your vote for President and Vice President counted? Check 1.				(a) Require Federal registration of all firearms.....			29.9
(a) Proportional plan—under which the electoral vote in each State would be distributed in proportion to the popular vote in each State.....			7.6	(b) Continue ban on interstate shipment of handguns but do not enact additional Federal restrictions on firearms.....			37.1
(b) District plan—under which electors would be chosen by districts in the same manner as Representatives and Senators.....			6.4	(c) Remove Federal restrictions enacted last year.....			26.0
(c) Direct plan—under which electoral college would be abolished and the President and Vice President would be elected directly.....			73.9	(d) No opinion.....			7
(d) No change—favor present system with electoral college apportioned primarily according to population of State.....			9.3	12. Should the Federal Government impose mandatory prison sentences on persons convicted of using firearms in the commission of a felony (much like the mandatory 3-day jail sentence for drunken driving conviction in Ohio).....	92.4	3.3	4.3
(e) No opinion.....			2.8	13. Should Federal aid be denied college students who engage in disorderly demonstrations which disrupt the administration of our colleges?.....	92.1	3.4	4.5
4. Do you believe that cigarette advertising should be banned from radio and television programs?	62.1	34.0	3.9	14. Do you support the proposal to convert the Post Office into a Government-owned corporation to operate on a self-supporting basis?	63.7	23.3	13.0
5. Do you approve of the federally proposed welfare regulation which would eliminate investigations of most welfare applicants in favor of a declaration of need?	14.0	81.3	4.7	15. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age:			
				(a) to 18?.....			21.1
				(b) to 19?.....			36.5
				(c) No opinion.....			42.4

YOUR CONGRESSMAN ANSWERS HIS QUESTIONNAIRE

(By John M. Ashbrook)

Each year for nine years I have asked the people of the 17th District to answer a public opinion poll. The results are a great help in gauging the tenor of political opinion, forecasting the importance of issues and judging the concerns of the people.

The Ninth Annual Legislative Questionnaire is now being tabulated and I will soon announce the results. However, I think it only fair that, since I have asked your opinions, I should in return make my views known to you. Your right to know where I stand is certainly as important as my desire and need to know your position. Here are my opinions and a brief reason:

1. (c) If the Paris peace talks are abandoned or reach a hopeless stalemate, I would sharply intensify the war effort without major troop commitment. We have a legitimate reason for halting this advance of Communism. Unilateral withdrawal would signal our unwillingness to challenge the Soviet Union's aggressive plans for world domination. We should allow the South Vietnamese to take the war to the North just as the North now mortars Saigon and strategic areas in the South. We could bomb the Red River Dike System, blockade Haiphong and interdict supplies with minimum troop commitment.

2. (b) Draft laws should be reformed with a view to allowing alternate national service such as the Peace Corps or VISTA as a means of fulfilling military obligation.

3. (b) I prefer the District Plan for election reform. It is workable, it could be enacted through constitutional amendment adopted by the requisite number of states (some plans could not) and it continues the checks and balances wisely incorporated in our Constitution.

4. (yes) Cigarette advertising, in my view, should be banned from radio and TV programs. If granted by mandate of Congress, the Federal Communications Commission could exercise such power. The evidence indicates that the public welfare is directly threatened and therefore Congress, through the FCC, could and should act.

5. (no) Interpretations of needs vary. In some states, those who earn as much as \$12,000 are considered "needy" and can get housing assistance.

6. (yes) The National Labor Relations Board should be replaced by a labor court, or at the least a new system of adjudicating conflicts. The NLRB is presently a political body handing down legal decisions, often prepared and promulgated by second or third level officials. This is unjust to both labor and business, and their record is extremely poor.

7. (no) I emphatically oppose extension of the surtax or additional taxes. The same end can be achieved through reduced spending by the government.

8. (yes) Yes, population control is needed but it must come from individual conscience and education, not government order. The government can supply information and help those who desire such assistance. Welfare mothers with 10 or 12 children they can't support are the best indication of need for this assistance.

9. I rarely say "never" but I would not consider this at any time under circumstances in "a" and "c." Those in "b" category might deserve different consideration.

10. After a long period of study I believe that we should deploy an ABM system. I am convinced that it is necessary and I support the Safeguard program. It is defensive, not offensive. Doubts should be resolved on the side of our future security.

11. (c) I would remove many federal gun restrictions, primarily those directed at the private owner, the collector, and the sportsman. I not only oppose additional restrictions but have introduced legislation in this

Congress to lift restrictions on long guns and ammunition.

12. (yes) Mandatory prison sentences for convicted felons who use firearms when committing a crime should be approved. This is a responsible and effective approach to the firearms problems.

13. (yes) We have no obligation to underwrite through federal programs those who violate the law and consciously riot and disrupt.

14. (no) Any needed changes can be made if there is the will to do so. We cannot evade our responsibility by simply giving the problem to someone else. Congress should retain jurisdiction over postal rates, personnel, and operation.

15. (a) I have long believed that the voting age should be lowered to 18, and I first introduced legislation to this effect as a member of the Ohio General Assembly in 1957. Responsible, enlightened, and concerned youth of today are well qualified to vote. The Hippies are a small minority. I would support a compromise amendment for 19 year old voting.

FOREIGN INFORMATION ACT

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, some of the finest unsung heroes of our country today are those serving overseas for the U.S. Information Agency.

Many of USIA's foreign service officers are exceedingly able, dedicated men who are making considerable sacrifice in the service of their country—sacrifice for themselves and their families. Many of them are assigned to remote outposts in subtropical villages where living and working conditions are very difficult and often dangerous. Most of them are experts in communication between people and that is the reason they are there, making an effort to interpret the United States and its policies to people in support of this country's objectives.

The most effective of these people are not only articulate but, equally as important, they are good listeners. They are men who have faith in their own country, and who demonstrate their faith quietly, modestly, convincingly.

Our Government is fortunate to have these people. But I am disturbed when I hear that many of their colleagues formerly in the USIA foreign service have resigned to take other positions.

It is my understanding that over the years USIA has continually suffered from low morale and turnover in the lower and middle levels of foreign service people. This surely must have a negative impact on effectiveness of the Agency.

Looking into it further I learn that USIA's objectives have been in search of clear definition almost since the beginning in 1953. And its methods have been unsure. This has been an Agency with an identity problem.

It has suffered from too frequent change of top leadership. It has not been given the attention it deserves either from the White House or from Congress.

It probably is fair to say that neither the Government nor the country as a whole has yet come to fully acknowledge the importance of Government informa-

tion programs overseas to our overall national security.

And partly for this reason the Agency has drifted for too many years. If my information is right they are doing there today just about the same things they were doing 10 and 15 years ago.

The same assumptions have prevailed regardless of changes in Presidential administration. The same people, basically, are making the same judgments and operating the same way they did in 1953 and 1963.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is not good enough. This is one of the most sensitive operations this Government directs. It must be vigorous, innovative, and it must be capable of change when change is the interest of U.S. foreign policy operations.

The need for thorough reexamination of USIA programs is a difficult thing to dramatize. Yet it is a concept that is becoming ever more recognized.

In December 1967, the Republican Coordinating Committee recommended it in its report, "The American Image Abroad."

A year later the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Organizations and Movements held hearings and produced an excellent report urging this kind of basic review.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on Information, headed by Dr. Frank Stanton of CBS, has issued very persuasive reports both this year and last year strongly urging this action.

A communication specialist, Arthur E. Meyerhoff, has written a book on the subject called "The Strategy of Persuasion."

Several newspapers have given editorial support to the idea.

There now exists an Emergency Committee for a Reappraisal of U.S. Overseas Information Policies and Programs. The chairman is Mr. Edward L. Bernays of Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. Bernays has conducted a survey of leading U.S. foreign correspondents overseas, and of the correspondents of other countries serving in this country, and has found that 73 percent of them believe a thorough reappraisal is required.

To achieve this objective I have introduced H.R. 12726, with eight distinguished cosponsors. They are the Honorable JOHN A. ANDERSON, of Illinois, ROBERT TAFT, JR., of Ohio, J. GLENN BEALL, JR., of Maryland, DANIEL BUTTON, of New York, HOWARD POLLOCK, of Alaska, DANTE FASCELL, of Florida, GEORGE ANDREWS, of Alabama, and SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of Maryland.

This bill seeks to implement the plan of the U.S. Advisory Commission: The establishment of a committee for the purpose of organizing a thorough and searching reexamination of U.S. Government information programs overseas.

What are some of the questions which should be considered in this kind of reappraisal? There are very many questions, some dealing with basic organizational structure, others with objectives, others with methods, and others with policies.

Following are just a few of the questions which illustrate what we mean when we refer to a searching reexamination.

First, What, exactly, should USIA be expected to accomplish? What are its built-in limitations and what are the opportunities open to it?

Second. What about the information activities of other Government agencies abroad? Is there enough coordination?

Third. Should considerations of public information overseas be made a greater part of U.S. foreign policy decisionmaking? If so, how do we achieve it?

Fourth. Should educational and cultural exchange programs be transferred from the State Department to USIA?

Fifth. Or should USIA be transferred to State and merged there with existing educational and cultural programs?

Sixth. Should greater use be made of non-Government communication resources both in this country and abroad? Should the techniques of advertising be exploited to a greater extent?

Seventh. Should USIA/Washington have greater direction of programs in individual areas and countries? Or should the field officers operate more independently of Washington?

Eighth. Is USIA trying to work with too many programs? Is it scattering its shot where it should be concentrating on fewer methods?

Ninth. Does USIA rely unnecessarily on citing quantity of radio broadcasts, magazine articles, et cetera, for establishing evidence of effectiveness? Or should greater attention be given to quality?

Tenth. How, exactly, should the agency seek to justify itself? Do the Congress and the agency alike have unrealistic hangups about USIA's justification?

Eleventh. Does the function of overseas information have adequate recognition at the State Department and the National Security Council?

Twelfth. Should the major thrust of USIA programs be directed at the elite of foreign countries, or at the mass of their populations?

Thirteenth. Should we be operating information programs in friendly and highly developed countries such as Canada, as well as elsewhere?

Fourteenth. Should much greater attention be given to exchange of persons?

Fifteenth. Is the agency's research adequate to the needs?

Sixteenth. Is the appropriate function of USIA that of a trumpet reporting on events in a straight manner? Or should it be openly and unashamedly more propagandistic in nature?

Seventeenth. What about USIA's personnel? Is there a morale problem? Is training adequate? Are selection procedures effective? Is turnover too high?

Eighteenth. Should the Congress and the public have more information about how USIA guides its foreign service officers in dealing with sensitive domestic problems in their activity abroad?

Nineteenth. Is there adequate sense of innovation in agency leadership? Or do the old assumptions of years ago still determine the day-to-day activities?

Twentieth. How can the need for public understanding and support of USIA's function be reconciled with the innate problem of any Government agency directing information to its own citizens?

These are 20 questions which seem important to me. I am sure there are 20 others, or 200 others, which also cry out for solution in the overall determination of overseas information programs.

I invite support for this legislation as a means of serving the interest of our national security.

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK RESOLUTION

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Flood) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, whether our people wish to recognize it or not, the primary problem in the world conflict is the reality of the captive nations. If there were no captive nations, we would not be in Vietnam; we would not be debating the essentially secondary issues of the ABM, MIRV, and a score of others. This is no oversimplification; it is a basic formula of thought and insight that too many of us, in the whirlpool of our daily preoccupations, never seem to contemplate. Just think of it—no captive nations and thus the absence of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism—what becomes of the relevancy of these issues?

It is because of the primacy of the captive nations issue that our people, as well as free world allies, commemorated this July the 10th anniversary of the captive nations week resolution, which Congress passed in July 1959. These Americans and others will never allow us to forget the primary problem while our energies and time are being absorbed by secondary and tertiary issues. In time and with certitude, they are confident that our policies and actions will, alas, conform with the necessity of this primary issue.

As in previous years, it is my privilege to indicate by continuous example the success of this 10th anniversary. Continuing with what was shown by example in the July 16, 1969, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I commend these following select examples to the reading of our Members:

First. Proclamations of the Week by Gov. Keith H. Miller, of Alaska, Gov. Don Samuelson, of Idaho, Gov. Louie B. Nunn, of Kentucky, Mayor Walter E. Washington, of the District of Columbia, Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago, President Sidney Levis of the Borough of Queens, the city of New York, Mayor Malcolm E. Ellis, of the city of Schenectady in New York State, Mayor A. L. Rasmussen, of Tacoma, Wash., and Mayor August P. Petrillo, of Mount Vernon, N.Y.; second a message of the week by Dr. Phan Huy Quat, chairman of the World Anti-Communist League, as published in the July 11 Freedom Center News in Korea; third a report in the June 1-15 issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin; fourth a news account in the July 20 Free China Weekly; fifth a report in the July 18 issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C.; sixth a news item in the July 7 edition of the Tempe Daily News in Arizona; seventh a commentary in the July 23 issue of the Buffalo Evening News; eighth

another commentary in the July 20 edition of the Sunday Star of Washington, D.C.; and ninth a typical program of the week in the County of Erie in New York State:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive people for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, Keith H. Miller, Governor of the State of Alaska, do hereby proclaim the period July 13 through July 19, 1969 as Captive Nations Week in Alaska, and call upon all Alaskans to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and rededicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the State of Alaska to be affixed this second day of July in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-nine.

KEITH H. MILLER,
Governor.

Attest:

ROBERT W. WARD,
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION, EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF IDAHO

Whereas the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czecho-Slovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies

and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence:

Now, therefore, I, Don Samuelson, Governor of the State of Idaho, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in the State of Idaho, and call upon the citizens of this State to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Idaho, at Boise, the Capitol, the first day of July, in the year of our Lord, Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-nine and of the Independence of the United States the One Hundred and Ninety-third.

By the Governor:

DON SAMUELSON,
Governor of the State of Idaho.
Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY THE GOVERNOR,
COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Whereas, Many nations of the world have been deprived of the freedom we know as United States citizens, having been forced by imperialistic powers to accept subjugation and enslavement as a way of life; and

Whereas, The freedom-loving peoples of these captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, In July, 1959, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote established the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and on July 16th of this year a Presidential Proclamation will precede addresses in Congress as a highlight of the 10th anniversary of the passing of the Captive Nations Week Resolution;

Now, therefore, I, Louie B. Nunn, Governor of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, do hereby proclaim July 13-19, 1969, as Captive Nations Week in Kentucky, and call upon the citizens of Kentucky to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed people all over the world.

Done at the Capitol in the city of Frankfort this 9th day of July in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred sixty-nine and of the Commonwealth of Kentucky the one hundred seventy-eighth.

LOUIE B. NUNN, Governor.
ELMER BEGLEY, Secretary of State.

PROCLAMATION BY THE COMMISSIONER OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Whereas, by a joint resolution approved July 17, 1959, the Congress authorized and requested the President of the United States of America to issue a proclamation designating the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all captive nations of the world; and

Whereas, there is a strong belief that the observance of "Captive Nations Week" throughout our country and our community will serve the cause of America and the entire free world; that the keeping alive of the spirit of liberation is the free world's most effective instrument; and

Whereas, it is deemed appropriate and proper for the people of our community to extend to the peoples of the captive nations our support and sympathy for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence:

Now, therefore, I, the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13-19, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week," and invite the people of the Nation's Capital to participate in the observance of this period by offering prayers in their churches and synagogues for the peaceful liberation of the peoples throughout the world who are denied their fundamental human rights.

WALTER E. WASHINGTON,
Commissioner of the District of Columbia.

PROCLAMATION, OFFICE OF THE MAYOR, CITY
OF CHICAGO

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, Slovakia, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 36-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the City of Chicago is linked to these captive nations through the bonds of family, since numbered among the people of Chicago are hundreds of thousands of our citizens who through nativity or ancestry treasure the heritage which endowed them with the culture and industry which are theirs; and

Whereas, these nations have been made captive by the imperialistic, aggressive and heartless policies of communism; and

Whereas, the peoples of these communist-dominated nations have been deprived of their national independence and their individual liberties; and

Whereas, it is appropriate and proper to demonstrate to the peoples of the captive nations the support of the people of the City of Chicago for their just aspirations for freedom and national independence; and

Whereas, the people of Chicago, as do all the people of the United States, want for the peoples of the world the same freedom and justice which is theirs:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby designate the week beginning July 13, 1969 as Captive Nations Week.

I urge the people of Chicago to join in the programs arranged for observance of the occasion, and I urge all of our churches, our educational institutions and all media of communication to observe the plight of the communist-dominated nations and to join in support of the just aspirations of the people of the captive nations.

I especially encourage everyone to concretely demonstrate his or her interest in the people imprisoned in the captive nations by their attendance at or participation in the parade to be held on State Street on Saturday afternoon, July 19 at 12:00 p.m.

Dated this 26th day of June, A.D., 1969.

SIDNEY LEVISS, PRESIDENT, BOROUGH OF
QUEENS, THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
PROCLAMATION

Whereas, all peoples throughout the world seek a life that affords each his personal freedom and the pursuit of happiness, and

Whereas, this freedom is not given to all, and today we find that many nations are captives of greater powers who overwhelmed them in the guise of friendship, and

Whereas, the week of July 13, 1969 is Captive Nations Week in accordance with a ten year proclamation of the President of the United States of America and Public Law 86-90, and

Whereas, the following nations today exist in captivity; Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, China, Cossackia, Croatia, Cuba, Czech., Estonia, Georgia, East Germany, Hungary, Idel Ural, North Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Mongolia, North Caucasus, Poland, Rumania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tibet, Turkestan, Ukraine and North Viet Nam,

Now, therefore, I, Sidney Levis, President of the Borough of Queens, The City of New York, proclaim the week of July 13, 1969, Captive Nations Week in Queens, and urge all our residents to recollect that freedom has a high price in terms of eternal vigilance against its undermining.

Done at Borough Hall, Kew Gardens, in The City of New York, on this tenth day of July, in the year of Our Lord, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

SIDNEY LEVISS,
President, Borough of Queens.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war and the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week;

Now, therefore, I, Malcolm E. Ellis, the Mayor of the City of Schenectady, New York, do hereby proclaim the week of July 13th through July 19th, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" in the City of Schenectady, and call upon our citizens to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

MALCOLM E. ELLIS,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF TACOMA, WASH.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in

bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with the support for the just aspirations of captive peoples for freedom and independence

Now, therefore, I, A. L. Rasmussen, Mayor of the City of Tacoma, Washington, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969, be observed as Captive Nations Week in Tacoma, and call upon the citizens of this City to join with others in observing this week.

A. L. RASMUSSEN,
Mayor.

PROCLAMATION, CITY OF MOUNT VERNON, N.Y.

Whereas, the imperialistic policies of Russian Communists have led, through direct and indirect aggression, to the subjugation and enslavement of the peoples of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, Mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Cuba, and others; and

Whereas, the desire for liberty and independence by the overwhelming majority of peoples in these conquered nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to any ambitions of Communist leaders to initiate a major war; and

Whereas, the freedom-loving peoples of the captive nations look to the United States as the citadel of human freedom and to the people of the United States as leaders in bringing about their freedom and independence; and

Whereas, the Congress of the United States by unanimous vote passed Public Law 86-90 establishing the third week in July each year as Captive Nations Week and inviting the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate prayers, ceremonies and activities; expressing their sympathy with and support for the just aspiration of captive peoples for freedom and independence;

Now, therefore, I, August P. Petrillo, Mayor of the City of Mount Vernon, New York, do hereby proclaim that the week commencing July 13, 1969 be observed as *Captive Nations Week* in the City of Mount Vernon, New York, and call upon the citizens of Mount Vernon to join with others in observing this week by offering prayers and dedicating their efforts for the peaceful liberation of oppressed and subjugated peoples all over the world.

AUGUST P. PETRILLO,
Mayor.

[From the Korean Freedom Center News,
July 11, 1969]

MESSAGE ON THE CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

The following is the message delivered on July 1, 1969, by Dr. Phan Huy Quat, World Anti-Communist League Council Chairman, on the Captive Nations Week—Ed.

I wish to extend my warm greetings to all WACL regional organizations and member-units on the tenth anniversary of the "Captive Nations Week" movement. In my capacity as WACL Council Chairman, I sincerely laud your efforts in sponsoring commemorative anti-slavery activities this year in compliance with the resolutions adopted at the 2nd General Conference in Saigon last December.

As millions of enslaved peoples behind the iron curtain, in spite of odds and adversity, are waging an heroic struggle against their

ruthless Communist oppressors, the commemoration of the "Captive Nations Week" by WACL members is the most fitting act of freedom-loving peoples in support of their cause and will certainly serve to enhance their morale in their fight to regain national independence and sovereignty.

I do hope that our combined message, through various channels and media, will be conveyed to the captive nations as a display of free world determination to smash the Communist empire and to render all-out support to the liberation of all nations now under Sino-Soviet rule. I wish all WACL members every success in the observance of the Captive Nations Week.

[From the Ukrainian Bulletin, July 1-15, 1969]

PREPARING FOR 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

WASHINGTON, D.C.—May 26.—The following memorandum, prepared by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the National Captive Nations Committee (NCNC), has been sent to various organizations and groups in preparation for the 10th observance of the "Captive Nations Week" this July:

In two months we will be observing the 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution. As in previous years, NCNC is coordinating the Week observance and, on this special occasion, urges each of our 37 organized committees to prepare and act on the following plans:

1. The Week falls in the period of July 13-19, 1969 and is highlighted as "The 10th Anniversary of the Captive Nations Week Resolution," and calls for maximum use of all available media to focus attention on the captive nations.

2. A quick response to inquiries on the background of the Week can be furnished by providing copies of NCNC's chairman's book *The Vulnerable Russians*, which is now in its second printing and can be acquired by writing to the Georgetown University Book Store, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. 20007.

3. The "10th" can also be impressively featured by ordering "10th Anniversary Captive Nations Medals" in silver and bronze from Mr. Viktors Viksnins (312-588-2085) of the Captive Nations Friends Committee, 4146 N. Elston Ave., Chicago, Ill. 60618. These would make wonderful presentations for persons to be honored in your area. NCNC has ordered a quantity to honor Congressmen and Senators at the Washington Banquet.

4. Most important for our cause and the fundamental importance of the captive nations to U.S. security is the 10th Anniversary Banquet planned by NCNC for Wednesday, July 16, 1969 at the University Club, 1135-16th St., N.W., Wash., D.C., at 6 p.m. (reception), 7 p.m. (dinner). To show full solidarity of our effort, your committee is requested to order at least a table of 8 at \$12.50 a person. Individual captive nations groups will order their tables according to nationality background. Dr. Ku Cheng-kang of China and Mr. George Meany, AFL-CIO President, will be honored on this momentous occasion. Because of limited seating at 200, orders will be honored on a first-come-first-serve basis, with a deadline of June 30, 1969 and submitted with check payable to the National Captive Nations Committee to our financial secretary, Mr. Walter Pretka, 797 Princeton Place, Rockville, Md. 20850. This is a high point of this year's observance, and we depend on your enthusiastic cooperation for our mutual success.

5. The themes we propose are: "The 10th: Let's Not Forget the Captive Nations"; "Only An Honorable Peace With Self-Determination by South Vietnam"; "A New, Realistic Policy Toward Russia and the USSR"; "Let's Launch Now on This 10th a Drive for America's 200th Anniversary of the Spirit of Independence in 1976."

6. Enclosed is our brochure for publicized use in your area and in preparation for a Captive Nations Conference in Washington this September, about which we would appreciate your views at the forthcoming July Banquet.

[From the Free China Weekly, July 20, 1969]
FREE WORLD URGED TO HELP ASIAN ANTI-RED COUNTRIES

A Chinese civic leader has issued a strong appeal to all people in the free world to support Asian countries in checking Communist expansion.

Ku Cheng-kang, a member of the National Assembly and honorary president of the World Anti-Communist League, made the appeal on July 12 before his departure for the United States.

Ku, who is also head of the China chapter of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, went to the United States for a three-week visit at the invitation of the U.S. Captive Nations Committee.

He said that the "Captive Nations" movement was launched by the United States ten years ago to emancipate the enslaved people behind the Iron Curtain. This movement should coordinate with the Freedom Day movement initiated by the Republic of China 15 years ago and unite the forces of East and West for the cause of liberty.

"I hope my visit to the United States will help achieve that purpose," Ku said.

"During my tour of the United States, I will convey to the American people the strong aspiration of the Asian people for freedom and their determination to strive for the wellbeing of mankind."

He emphasized that people in the Western world should give firm support to the nations in Asia to enable them to safeguard their independence and freedom and world peace and security as a whole.

Ku was accompanied by U.S. congressman Edward J. Derwinski, who had come to Taipei on July 8 particularly to take part in a rally held on July 10 to observe Captive Nations Week.

Derwinski said that he was deeply impressed by the unwavering struggle of the Chinese people to liberate their compatriots now under the yoke of Communist tyranny on the China mainland.

Addressing a rally marking Captive Nations Week in Phoenix City, Arizona, on July 15, Ku described the Chinese Communist regime in Peiping as aggressive and vulnerable.

Ku said that to shatter the Iron Curtain and eliminate the threat of a nuclear war, the free world must have the courage to support the liberation struggle of the people on the Chinese mainland and seek the realization of a new world order.

He said peoples behind the Iron Curtain are longing for liberation. "We in our generation consider their liberation our unavoidable responsibility," he said.

Communist tyranny will not perish by itself, he told the rally. The present divisions and chaos within the Communist bloc are not accidental. They are the results of an awareness in the free world of Communist aggression, the rising of national spirit, progress in democratic government and promotion of a social well-being that has stopped Communist external expansion, he added.

Ku went on to say that the most important task in the present struggle for freedom is to actively support the people behind the Iron Curtain in their struggle against tyranny.

He pointed out that the Communist rulers, facing the crisis of an internal revolution, will resort to all possible means to strike and suppress the anti-tyranny revolutionary forces. The tragedies of Hungary and Czechoslovakia and Mao's "cultural revolution" represent Communist struggles and counterattacks against the forces of freedom.

The tough anti-Communist leader emphasized that we should establish an international anti-Communist front and an urgently needed regional security system, and fight to the end for the freedom of mankind. He quoted Abraham Lincoln—"If my brothers are still slaves, I am not a free man"—in an appeal to the free world to help the captive peoples.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, July 18, 1969]

CHINA'S KU BUSY THERE—BUSY HERE

The tight schedule of the working trip to the United States of Ku Cheng-kang precluded his wife's coming along. He has been too busy for leisurely sightseeing or partying.

The reception at the Chinese embassy last night was an exception, however. Ku, member of the Presidium, National Assembly, Republic of China, and chairman of the Political Committee, Asian Parliamentarians Union, met members of the Chinese community here, as well as other guests at the party given by Ambassador and Mrs. Chow.

The honor guest goes today to Chicago. Wednesday night he was presented with an award at the dinner given him by the American Committee of Captive Nations Assembly at the University Club and was honored yesterday at a luncheon on Capitol Hill given by Rep. Edward Derwinski, R-III, where he met members of the House subcommittee on the Far East. The congressman attended last night's reception.

An adviser to President Chiang Kai-shek, Ku is one of the busiest men in free China. He is one of the founders of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, inaugurated in Korea in 1954. He has since been president of the China Chapter.

Another cause which occupies much of Ku's time is the job of providing relief to Chinese compatriots suffering on the mainland, as well as the millions who have escaped to free areas. The Free China Relief Association, established in Taipei in 1950, has provided relief to millions.—J.P.

[From the Tempe (Ariz.) Daily News, July 7, 1969]

EMPHASIS ON YOUTH AT CAPTIVE NATIONS RALLY

A tribute to America's "silent majority" of young people is in the offing when the Arizona branch of the Captive Nations Committee stages its 11th annual rally at Grady Gammage Memorial auditorium on the Arizona State University campus, Tuesday, July 15.

The 8 p.m. program, open to the public, will be a Valley highlight of national Captive Nations Week, July 13-19, a week initiated by resolution of the U.S. Congress in 1959 as a time for observances to remind the world of the plight of the people in captive nations of the Red Empire. It also symbolizes, for billions of captive peoples, the dedication of America to their freedom and independence.

The accent will be on youth at the Tuesday rally with participants for the evening to include Ron Patty and his new group, That Certain Sound; the Impact '69 singers; the internationally acclaimed Mia Dancers; Scottsdale Boys' Band and Valley Eagle Scouts who will be presenting the flags of the captive nations.

Featured speaker for the evening will be Dr. Ku Cheng-kang, deputy foreign minister of Nationalist China.

Patriotic and religious songs will be presented by That Certain Sound and Impact '69. The Mia Dancers, who have been seen on the Ed Sullivan television show as well as in appearances throughout the world, will present their colorful folk dances for the program. Scottsdale Boys' Band will provide the instrumental music.

Said the spokesman for the Captive Nations Committee, "With the riots and turmoil caused by many college students today, we lose sight of how the majority of our young people really feel about this great land of ours. On July 15, we will have a chance to witness the true spirit of today's youth... as these youth groups join in expressing their love and faith in this country of ours as we remember those peoples who have lost their basic freedoms and human rights—the one billion captive peoples of the captive nations behind the Iron, Bamboo and Sugar Curtains.

Admission for the rally will be \$1 for adults, children and students admitted free.

[From the Buffalo (N.Y.) Evening News] IS RUMANIA CAPTIVE?

Last week was Captive Nations Week, duly proclaimed as such by President Nixon in observing a tradition of more than a dozen years. Instigated by Congress, the presidential proclamation deploras the fact that certain nations are under the domination of outside governments.

On August 2 and 3, President Nixon will be visiting Romania on his round-the-world tour. When someone inquired whether President Nixon will be visiting a "captive nation," White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler curtly replied: "The proclamation speaks for itself."

Romania was not mentioned in the proclamation, although it is usually considered one of Russia's satellite countries.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, July 20, 1969]

A PROCLAMATION WITHOUT TRUMPETS

When President Nixon issued his proclamation for Captive Nations Week there was little public or press reaction.

But when Nixon signed the proclamation Monday he certainly recalled another one issued back in 1959. That one, from the late President Dwight D. Eisenhower, assailed the Soviet government for "imperialistic and aggressive" policies—and came at a time when then-Vice President Nixon was in Moscow.

The then-Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev stirred a controversy when he told Nixon, "This resolution stinks."

Since then, the yearly proclamations have been studied for possible indication of changing U.S. policies toward the Communist world. As the years have gone by, the proclamations have been milder in tone.

Nixon, who has talked of replacing the era of confrontation with one of negotiation, purposely appears to have soft-pedaled the whole affair. In a key passage, he urged Americans "to renew their devotion to the high ideals on which our nation was founded and has prospered and to sustain with understanding and sympathy the just aspirations of the peoples of all nations for independence and human freedom."

COUNTY OF ERIE OFFICIALLY SALUTES CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK, JULY 20-27, 1969

PROGRAM OF EVENTS

Message of the county executive

Whereas, Public Law 86-90 was enacted 10 years ago. This law establishes Captive Nations Week, and in so doing, our representatives themselves also established that we, Americans, do not bow to despotism whether it comes from the Court of St. James or the Kremlin or Peking; and

Whereas, Today Communism has erected a cruel carrier of barbed wire, minefields, manhunters, bloodhounds and machine guns. It has re-established colonialism behind an Iron Curtain, where civilized nations labor under the boot of tyranny. The same ruthless armed oppression has been used against

the open resistance in Budapest or the peaceful attempt for changes in Prague.

This political oppression and economic exploitation of the Captive Nations is committed in the name of a political system which has been proven to be obsolete and reactionary. Communism attempts to stabilize its system through the bloodshed and misery of others. Fomenting small wars throughout the world is an oft-used strategy; and

Whereas, The peoples of the Captive Nations look to us for sympathy, encouragement and help. We have witnessed that bridges cannot be built to these countries. The puppet governments of Moscow insists that any contact with the West and Freedom be denied their people; and

Whereas, We should ensure that these puppet governments receive no economic help from the West. To this end, we should avoid buying any products of these countries because the hard currency so acquired by these governments is used to subvert our own freedom. We must keep in mind that these goods we buy were denied our enslaved brothers.

Now, Therefore, I, B. John Tutuska, County Executive of the County of Erie, Do hereby proclaim the week of July 20-27, 1969, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the citizens of Erie County to support and observe this week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the County of Erie to be affixed this 2nd day of July, 1969.

B. JOHN TUTUSKA,
County Executive.

Highlights of events

Sunday, July 20

A.M. Religious Observances and Prayers in the Churches of Erie County.

2:30 P.M. Civic Opening of Captive Nations Week Program in front of the Buffalo and Erie County Public Library in Lafayette Square.

1. Presentation of Colors—Arthur F. Kilichowski, New York State Commander, Army and Navy Union of America.

2. National Anthem—The Misses Marika Zahariev and Pam Merz.

3. Invocation—Rev. Paul Kantor, Pastor, Hungarian Reformed Church of the West Side.

4. Placing of wreaths at the Memorial to the Captive Nations.

5. Welcome by Mr. Albert J. Weinert, Chairman, Erie County Civic Committee to Observe Captive Nations Week.

6. Introduction of Master of Ceremonies, Walter V. Chopyk, by Mr. Albert J. Weinert, Chairman E.C.C.C. to Observe C.N.W.

7. Proclamation: Hon. B. John Tutuska, Erie County Executive and Honorary Chairman E.C.C.C. to Observe C.N.W.

8. Speaker: Mr. Michael J. Kogutek, Department of New York State Commander, American Legion; President, Chamber of Commerce, Lackawanna, N.Y.

9. Benediction: Rev. Paul Kantor, Pastor, Hungarian Reformed Church of the West Side.

10. "Youth Salute the Captive Nations"—Library Aud.

Wednesday, July 23

12:30 P.M. Civic Luncheon sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo, President Harry W. Halbersleben presiding, and the ECCTO-CNW in the Buffalo Athletic Club in Niagara Square.

Speaker: Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, National Chairman and Founder of Captive Nations Week, Washington, D.C.

Topic: "Education for Freedom Through Contrast."

Tickets: \$2.80 (includes gratuities).

Reservations: Call 634-1166.

A special art exhibit will be held in the Buffalo and Erie County Library, Lafayette Square from July 22-August 4, 1969. Paintings and other materials depicting the plight of the captive nations, completed by recent refugees from the Iron Curtain countries.

All events are open to the public. No admission charge will be made except for the Civic Luncheon on Wednesday, July 23, at the Buffalo Athletic Club.

*Erie County Citizens Committee To Observe
Captive Nations Week*

Honorary Chairman: Hon. B. John Tuska, Erie County Executive.

Chairman: Albert J. Weinert, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Public Relations Director: Walter V. Chopyk, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Secretary: Mrs. Marjorie Lovejoy, United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

Treasurer: Clement Sakas, Lithuanian Club of Buffalo.

Resolutions: Dr. Lazlo B. Szimonisz, Hungarian Freedom Fighters Ass'n.

Youth Concert: Vladymyr Kowalyk, Ukrainian American Youth Ass'n.

Color Guard: Arthur F. Kilichowski, New York State Commander, Army and Navy Union.

Captive Nations Flags: Zef Priszka, Albanian Societies.

Arrangements: William J. Tracy, Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Members of the Committee

Dr. John Juhasz: Actio Hungarica.
Dr. Michael Saikewicz: Ukrainian Congress Committee of America.

Rev. Paul Kantor: American Hungarians of the Niagara Frontier.

Dr. Voldemar Kirss: Estonian Committee.
Francis M. Kindl: Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Tacho D. Kuntscheff: Bulgarian Club of Buffalo.

Eugene V. Massucci: Army and Navy Union of America.

Wasył Sharvan: Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations.

George M. Wong: Chinese Golden Dragon Society.

A. O'Neil Kline: Kiwanis Club of Buffalo.
Dr. Stephen Gredel: Croatian Delegation.

Ting Fong Wong: Chinese Golden Dragon Society.

Romas Maslioniis: Lithuanian Club of Buffalo.

Vidis E. Malejs: Latvian Society.

Charles Quagliana: United Anti-Communist Committee of WNY.

DAY OF BREAD RESOLUTION

(Mr. PURCELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution which would establish a "Day of Bread" in the United States, along with a "Harvest Festival Week."

One of my goals, as chairman of the Livestock and Grains Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, has been to encourage a closer working relationship among producers, processors, food manufacturers, and retailers. To the extent that this relationship breaks down I believe they fail to serve the best interests of themselves, their stockholders, and the consuming public.

Therefore, I was delighted that the National Association of Wheat Growers, the Millers' National Federation, and the American Bakers' Association have given

wholehearted endorsement to plans for a "Day of Bread." These organizations and others have already made provision for administration, coordination, and funding of the program.

Mr. Speaker, wheat is perhaps man's oldest cultivated crop; more wheat is produced than any other commodity; and it provides a staple food in some 43 countries having a population of nearly a billion people. Bread has served mankind well and will continue to do so as long as there is a need for nutritious, low-cost food products. I firmly believe it deserves the recognition I seek for it in this joint resolution—both as bread itself and as a symbol of all foods.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Southwestern Miller, a highly respected and widely read trade paper. I agree with the comment that the plans for the "Day of Bread" are wonderfully innovative and appropriately bold and ambitious in scope.

The editorial follows:

SUPERB "DAY OF BREAD"

The decision made by major segments of the breadstuffs industry to join in sponsoring a "Day of Bread" in the United States this October 29 hold enormous promise as a promotion program for the industry. The program plans are wonderfully innovative and appropriately bold and ambitious in scope. Of its many exciting elements, perhaps the most unique is the hope that the observance of a "Day of Bread" will become worldwide, as an event that would cross national barriers in celebration of the contributions of wheat-based foods to the world. The appropriateness of such dimensions for the program is indicated by the fact that bread provides more nourishment for the world than any other food, serving as a staple in the diets of 43 countries with an aggregate population of almost a billion people.

As delineated by H. Howard Lampman, executive director of the Wheat Flour Institute, the many facets of the program center on the observance of the "Day of Bread" by simultaneous luncheons held throughout the United States, and dinners in Europe. Congress will be asked to adopt a resolution proclaiming a "Harvest Week," of which the "Day of Bread" would be an outstanding event. Beyond the simultaneous luncheons and dinners for top government officials, the program will include such elements as an annual awards program for print and broadcast media to recognize the best coverage in each medium of some phase of wheat production, flour milling and baking. Many additional imaginative details are under discussion for incorporation into the program—regular schedule of press releases, communications to church leaders and contacts with chief editorial writers.

The program is drawn from the observance of a Day of Bread in West Germany, an event started in 1953 and gaining in success as a promotion device in the intervening fifteen years. The West German innovators worked closely with Mr. Lampman in aiming for an international observance. Contacts are planned with milling and baking and wheat producer interests throughout the Western hemisphere and in Europe and Africa to stimulate their participation.

It is perhaps no more than a coincidence that the announcement of the "Day of Bread" plans came in the same week as the news that the Wheat and Wheat Foods Foundation at last has been formally structured and is moving toward seeking enabling federal legislation to provide financing.

The objectives for the "Day of Bread" and for the Foundation are identical insofar as the promotional aspect is concerned. In fact, the detailed Foundation program prepared several years ago includes just such an observance as one of the approaches that could be sponsored by the new organization. Even the participants in the Foundation and the backers of "Day of Bread" are the same—wheat producers, millers and end-product manufacturers.

Once the Foundation becomes a viable organization with adequate financing, the "Day of Bread" could be simply incorporated as one of its on-going activities along with its general commitment to research, educational and promotion on behalf of wheat foods. What is needed is administration, coordination and funding for the "Day of Bread" program as if the Foundation were already in existence. Too great a reliance on voluntary activities and independent committees in the 50 states where an observance is hoped for, with neither central direction nor specified budgeting, would threaten the success of the observance. The idea of the "Day of Bread" is too valuable to leave to the change of a hoped-for "Happening." Now that the sponsoring organizations have expressed their endorsement, the program directors must be given the support necessary to carry forward on a superb promotion idea.

LEAD POISONING OF UNDER-PRIVILEGED CHILDREN

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, America and those supposedly leading this Nation are much taken these days with glamor, scandal, and mortality. Commendable goals to center significant activity upon, I am sure. Yet while they are busy attacking gains in the areas of human rights we have made in the past, perhaps they will take a moment to contemplate the fate of a growing number of children in our society, especially in the slum areas of our large cities. Many are dying of lead poisoning.

They are mainly small children who eat bits of paint and plaster that peel from walls and ceilings of dilapidated housing—of which the major metropolitan areas have a plethora. Often they eat these pieces of debris because they are simply available.

This constantly worsening situation was ignored until recently. The New York Scientists Committee for Public Information and the New York Citizen's Committee to End Lead Poisoning, among others, publicized the extent of this affliction, and the damage it could and was producing in small children. Much credit is due to my distinguished colleague from New York, Mr. WILLIAM F. RYAN, who has done pioneering work in the Congress in this area.

I am therefore pleased to join him in sponsorship of three measures aimed at making a total attack upon this horrible problem. H.R. 9191 would establish an HEW fund for local grants which would allow identification and treatment of victims.

H.R. 9192 is aimed at the problem itself—peeling interior lead-based paint in substandard housing. Under this measure, HUD could make local grants for detection of such paint, requiring

owners and landlords to remove it from interior surfaces.

H.R. 11699 would require local jurisdictions to submit for HUD approval effective plans for removing this menace before receiving Federal funds for housing rehabilitation or code enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the evil has been identified, blocked out and condemned. There is really no argument that can be mustered against these excellent measures, which, if enacted and enforced, would effectively counter and stamp out this malady. We know our duty to our own citizens. Yet it must be asked, in all seriousness, whether we shall act. Cost would not be severe; \$21 million would cover complete programs for the first 3 years. We burn up that much in ammunition daily in Vietnam. We throw away that much in waste in our Military Establishment every few days, as overwhelming evidence has shown. We spend that much on subsidizing foreign dictators every month.

I fear, however, that this hope and these measures may go the route of the rat control measure of not so distant memory on this floor. These are the children in our Nation. And they are voiceless. And helpless. Who will extend a hand in compassion to them? How many votes do they have?

Mr. Speaker, this country is busily engaged in placing every major priority last, and every minor one first. Will we ignore these pleas as well? Time will tell. Conscience will remind. Justice will be demanded. The piper will call for his price for this dance, too. We shall all pay it.

A CORPORATION INVESTIGATES THE CONGRESS

(Mr. PODELL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. PODELL. Mr. Speaker, for the second time in recent years a corporation has sought to carry out an investigation into the personal affairs of a private citizen involved with legislation affecting that industry. In this case, Gilbert S. McInerny, vice president and general counsel of the American Home Products Corp. of New York, confirmed that his corporation had ordered an investigation of a staff member of the U.S. Senate Finance Committee.

The bill involved would provide for financial assistance for drug purchases made under the Government's medicare and medicaid programs. It would promote low-cost drugs under their generic names at expense of chemically identical, higher-priced drugs sold under their trade names. This is a measure directly aimed at aiding our elderly on the skyrocketing cost of drugs, and I have sponsored exactly identical legislation in the House. It affects close to 20 million older Americans.

American Home Products is the 89th largest industrial corporation in the Nation. Its net income was 10.3 percent on 1968 sales of \$1.8 billion. Prescription drugs account for 35 percent of its business. Patent medicines make up 17 percent more. Its prescription drug subsidiaries are Wyeth Laboratories, Ayerst,

Fort Dodge, and Ives Laboratories. Its patent medicine divisions are Whitehall Laboratories and the O. M. Franklin Serum Co.

Mr. Speaker, the case involving Ralph Nader and General Motors was serious enough, showing how boldly a major corporation would act, disregarding civil liberties and personal privacy where an individual is concerned. This case is far worse. A major corporation dared to hire private investigators to enter the Senate itself and seek personal data on a staff member engaged in working on and drafting legislation. A congressional investigation is certainly in order.

This same measure has been submitted to this House. What was attempted upon the other body certainly can be expected here. I believe a precedent must be set and a law passed which would make it utterly prohibitive for any enterprise affected by pending legislation to contemplate and carry through such an outrage. The Congress must be sacrosanct as far as such investigations are concerned, and the time to establish this principle is immediately.

What is to prevent such an organization from perpetrating upon a Congressman or a Senator what it sought to perpetrate upon Mr. Nader and Mr. Constantine of the Senate Finance Committee staff? What they have tried once, they will attempt again. We can expect such occurrences again and again.

Mr. Speaker, I am offering a bill today in the hope that this House will recognize the necessity of serving notice upon any future offenders who are tempted to follow a similar path. The legislation introduced will establish severe penalties upon those perpetrating these acts and will serve notice upon those contemplating same.

FARM INCOME

(Mr. POAGE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, for years I have stressed the need for reciprocal understanding between rural and urban Congressmen regarding legislation, and to the fact that it is in the long-range interest of residents of cities that they support measures to increase farmer income.

I have urged that they encourage their Congressmen to vote for bills to increase farm income and thus assure adequate food supplies at reasonable prices.

It was most refreshing, Mr. Speaker, to find that an urban district Congressman, the Honorable DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, of Chicago, has expressed similar views in an article published in "Agri-industry News" published by the Corn Refiners Association.

With a hope that all my colleagues, especially those representing city districts, will read Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI's statement, I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE FARMER'S FUTURE—A GROWING CONCERN FOR CITY CONGRESSMEN

(By Representative DAN ROSTENKOWSKI)
(Editor's Note: Congressman Rostenkowski, an influential member of the Ways and

Means Committee, and member of the Democratic leadership, represents a district in Chicago.)

Just 15 years ago, 165 members of the House of Representatives came from districts with 20 percent or more rural population. Today only 49 come from such districts.

In 21 states, not one district has as much as 15 percent farm population. In fact, in my home state of Illinois, the nation's leader in agricultural exports, only two of our 24 congressional districts have more than 15 percent farm population, and none has more than 25 percent.

Numerically, rural power in the House is rapidly declining. In part, this reflects simmering problems of too little income, too few jobs and ever-shrinking opportunity. Containing and curing these problems is a matter for increasing concern on the part of urban congressmen. For one reason, the deterioration of rural areas causes more congestion and further intensification of the problems besetting our great cities.

Actually, the traditional conflict and competition for funds and power between urban and rural congressmen has become a wasteful drain of energy and resources.

Today, urban and rural problems are closely related. Yet, they too seldom are treated as such, and the time has come for representatives on both sides to bend a little.

Urban congressmen need a better understanding of agricultural production adjustment programs. There should be wider appreciation for the fact that Americans eat better, and at less cost in relation to income, than any other people. In addition, urban representatives must recognize that rising food prices do not reflect a substantial rise in profits for farmers. The farmer is still getting only about three cents of the price of a loaf of bread.

In response to the American farmer's truly remarkable production record, urban congressmen must be willing to help develop and enact programs that not only insure an adequate and stable food supply, but also insure fair income for those farmers who do not now make enough.

Congressmen from predominantly rural areas must reciprocate by supporting programs that may primarily benefit urban Americans, and other programs, such as those that provide food assistance, that benefit people throughout the country.

They must recognize that with seven Americans in ten now living in the cities, there is an urgent and justifiable demand for cleaner air, clearer water and a reduction in congestion.

These objectives—like fair prices for farmers, and improved opportunity in rural America—are in the national interest, and as such cut across the now fading boundaries that have so seriously factionalized Congress in the past.

LOCATE FEDERAL BUILDINGS IN RICHMOND, CALIF.

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the present office space situation of the Social Security Administration payment center in San Francisco is serious enough to warrant immediate consideration of consolidating the present four offices into one.

I am in complete agreement with the General Services Administration as to the physical needs of the consolidated office, and believe that a site within the Richmond Redevelopment Agency's downtown project, or a similarly situated location, would be ideally suited for the

payment center location. Situated on the bay area rapid transit route and having office space large enough to accommodate the center, the Richmond site would be convenient for presently employed workers, and would provide an excellent source of skilled and efficient workers to supplement the work force.

I should like to insert in the RECORD an editorial carried in the Independent, Richmond, Calif., on July 12, 1969, setting forth most eloquently the need for the establishment of the Social Security Administration payment office in Richmond, Calif.

**"PURPLE HEART" CITY DESERVES
GOVERNMENT BUILDING**

The Federal Government has an opportunity today to atone for some of the injuries inflicted on the City of Richmond, injuries which earned the city the title of "The Purple Heart" city. It earned that "heart" because the Federal government dumped more than 90,000 workers here during World War II to work in the shipyards, and then left Richmond with a serious problem when the shipyard work was abruptly cancelled as the war ended.

But Richmond fought back. It built a new city hall complex. It brought in new industry. It expanded the city's boundaries. It made the police and fire departments two of the best in the nation. And it spent literally millions of dollars in services for the people.

Today Richmond, or the downtown area of the city, is being rebuilt and redevelopment has taken over block after block of land, planning for the time when new buildings to house new businesses or offices, can be constructed.

Today Richmond is one of several sites being considered by the General Services Administration for construction of a huge Social Security Administration Office for the Bay Area.

Today Richmond's site for the proposed building is one that meets the requirements of the Federal government. The area for the building, between Macdonald and Bissell avenues, and Eleventh and Fourteenth streets, meets the criterion that it be near the Rapid Transit facilities; that it provide ample parking area for 2,000 people who would be employed in the building, and that it be near services and business. The price that the Redevelopment Agency, owners of the property, is placing on the property is well within the requirements of the Federal agency, and on the whole cheaper than the other sites, particularly those in El Cerrito and Berkeley.

The requirement that private capital build the building and lease it back to the Federal government, is met with the offers of three reputable firms to do the work.

Construction of this GSA building in Richmond would be a shot in the arm for the Redevelopment program, and would go a long way toward overcoming some of the injustices which the Federal government inflicted on Richmond.

Both Congressman Jerome Waldie in Washington and Assemblyman John T. Knox in Sacramento are backing Richmond's bid for the project. They have friends in Washington to whom they can turn. But on the merits of its case, and of its record in aiding the war effort, Richmond should be selected for the building.

**GUILLOTINING THE EDUCATION
BUDGET**

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, Claude M. Ury, one of my constituents, has called to my attention an article by Sylvia Porter that effectively points out the deficiencies of the proposed national education budget.

I include the text of this article:

**YOUR MONEY: BACKWARD STEP IN EDUCATION
(By Sylvia Porter)**

This coming Thursday, July 24, the House Subcommittee on Appropriations will complete a bill to provide cash for the national education budget during the 12 months ending July, 1970. In the form prepared by the Nixon Administration, this bill would startingly downgrade education to a very low place on our list of national priorities. It would erase several education advances achieved under the administrations of Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. Specifically, in its Nixon Administration form, this bill would:

Slash the total U.S. Office of Education budget from \$4.1 billion in fiscal '68 to \$3.2 billion in fiscal '70, an incredible reduction of 25 per cent at a time when more and better education is a must;

Reduce to zero funds for school library materials under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

Reduce to zero matching funds for materials and equipment for elementary and secondary schools under the National Defense Education Act of 1958;

Reduce to zero funds for guidance and counseling services, also under the Defense Education Act passed during Mr. Eisenhower's administration;

Cut in half funds for college library materials under the Higher Education Act of 1965;

Cut in half matching funds for public library programs and materials under the Library Services and Construction Act of 1956, another Eisenhower education law.

In summary, it would eliminate entirely three education-library programs and emasculate another two and shrink to less than 1½ per cent of our Federal budget the total we spend for education-libraries.

The fact that this is a very real threat and may well happen is just starting to penetrate education circles; until now, U.S. educators couldn't bring themselves to believe that the Nixon Administration deliberately would adopt such policies of retreat on education in an era of explosive social unrest.

They are fighting back. A National Citizens Committee to Save Education and Library Funds (SELF) under the chairmanship of the world-respected Dr. Detlev W. Bronk, president emeritus of the Rockefeller University, is publicizing the crisis.

On July 9, 150 trustees of libraries from 33 States marched on Washington to obtain pledges of votes for restoration of the funds from 100 lawmakers.

A fight on the House floor seems a certainty.

No one denies the need for curbing Federal spending now. This is imperative to dampen inflationary psychology and control the price-wage spiral. But what is swelling the Federal budget are such items as military spending in general, the Vietnam war in particular, skyrocketing interest on the national debt. As one comparison, Texas Democratic Senator Yarborough cites the fact that we are spending \$21,666 per American for ammunition to fight the Vietnam war—against 25 cents per American for libraries and teaching materials. As another, while our national education budget is threatened with mutilation to the \$3 billion-a-year range, interest going to owners of the U.S. debt is soaring above an annual \$17 billion.

These cutbacks would wipe out libraries in areas where the need is greatest; for instance, many bookmobiles would disappear in regions of New Mexico where the Indians and

Spanish-American migrants live. Countless hundreds of thousands of children would be injured permanently; the key cause of failure in school is inability to read.

In the words of New York Republican Senator Javits, "Guillotining the education budget is not responsible fiscal belt tightening." Or even more to the point, as Yarborough asks in obvious disgust:

"What kind of priorities do we have in this country?"

**THE URGENT PROBLEMS OF CBW
AND THE PUBLIC'S DEBT TO CON-
GRESSMAN MCCARTHY AND MR.
SEYMOUR HERSCH**

(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, during the past several months, the efforts of two valiant individuals, Congressman RICHARD MCCARTHY of Buffalo and Mr. Seymour Hersch of Washington, have brought the nightmare problems of chemical and biological warfare increasingly to the attention of the public. Our enormous debt to Congressman MCCARTHY and Mr. Hersch becomes more evident with every new disclosure of the dangers this Nation faces as a result of present CBW policies.

In March 1968, what was ultimately described by the Army as a "malfunction" during open-air testing of the lethal nerve gas VX at Utah's Dugway Proving Ground resulted in the death of more than 6,400 sheep. Only a providential change in wind conditions, followed by a heavy rain, prevented a major disaster to travelers on nearby U.S. Highway 40—remarkable luck to say the least, considering that a lethal dose of VX is one milligram, or approximately one-fiftieth of a drop.

For 14 months the Army denied that it had anything to do with what happened to the sheep. Maybe it even believed its own denials, for it appears not to have been daunted in the least by what almost happened to everyone in the neighborhood, and what did in fact happen to the sheep. In fact, it was after Dugway that the Army prepared to transport by rail some 20,000 tons of the deadly nerve gas GB, as well as other lethal and near-lethal agents, from Rocky Mountain Arsenal in Colorado to Earle, N.J. Thanks largely to the efforts of Congressman MCCARTHY, enough public opposition to this strange procedure was generated to force reconsideration and a search for alternative methods of disposal.

Meanwhile, other perturbing facts about the CBW operation have been coming to our attention. We have learned that a well for the disposal of poisonous wastes was drilled 2½ miles deep into the Rocky Mountain Arsenal. In the 5 years that followed, some 1,500 earthquakes shook an area that before that time had not had a quake since 1882. One effect of a major quake might of course be to turn loose the massive supplies of nerve gas stored at the arsenal. Is there a connection between the well and the quakes? The Army thinks not. The people living nearby are not so sure.

Next Congressman MCCARTHY reported evidence that we are testing many biolog-

ical agents on Eniwetok atoll in the Marshall Islands. Perhaps the tests are considered too dangerous to be conducted nearer home. It also develops that we have been shipping nerve gas to West Germany in small amounts for years, apparently without worrying about the 1954 West European protocol, which stipulates that West Germany can only receive NATO-approved CBW materials, and which prohibits the manufacture or stockpiling of these weapons.

One of the more unsettling disclosures is the news that certain chemicals, including nerve gas, have been tested extensively in open air at the Edgewood Arsenal in Maryland and at Fort McClellan in Alabama. After the Dugway disaster, which killed thousands of sheep more than 47 miles from the presumed test area, the testing of these agents at a location only 12 miles from Baltimore seems difficult to understand.

A few years ago there seemed slight signs of hope in this generally bleak picture. Edgewood Arsenal and Fort McClellan agreed to stop open-air tests of nerve gas pending a scientific study. President Nixon ordered a full-scale review of the CBW program, and stated that "the specter of chemical and biological warfare arouses horror and revulsion around the world." Seventy-six of us in this House joined in a resolution urging President Nixon to resubmit the Geneva Protocol of 1925 to Congress—a protocol that calls for the no-first-use of "asphyxiating, poisonous or other gases, and of bacteriological methods of warfare," and that could represent the first meaningful step toward effective control and disarmament in this complex and urgent field of weaponry.

Now these signs of hope fade in the glare of more recent events. As a result of what the Pentagon calls a "mishap," 24 Americans were injured by the lethal nerve gas GB, which, it turns out, was being stored at Okinawa. One wonders now if only "mishaps" and "malfunctions" will bring word to the American people about what gases are stored where, and for what purposes. One wonders also if we really best guard ourselves against hypothetical Russian attacks by subjecting ourselves to an endless series of Dugways and Okinawas.

Has the Army decreed that "malfunctions" and "mishaps" will be no more, and that when they occur against regulations, winds will only blow in providential directions? Are we to go on imperiling everyone in Baltimore, Denver, and heaven knows where else on the theory that they will not mind perishing if something goes wrong just so it is not the Russians who are to blame? Is there no urgency to seeking international agreements to control weapons that are in some ways more dangerous even than thermo-nuclear bombs? Are we mad?

So our special admiration and gratitude go to Congressman McCARTHY and Mr. Hersch, whose remarkable book, "Biological and Chemical Warfare: America's Hidden Arsenal" deserves the attention of thoughtful Americans.

I include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times:

THE LUNACY OF GERM WARFARE

Dean Swift himself could not do justice to a world which over the centuries and with great skill has eliminated disease one by one for the sake of humanity, and then systematically bred the germs of those diseases as a possible weapon of war. Yet all the major countries, even those that have the nuclear power to wipe out the earth's population several times over, persist in the solemn lunacy of stockpiling lethal bacteria and poisonous gases in the name of national defense.

Fortunately a few rays of good sense have been penetrating this Kafka-like realm, and it is at least possible that the world may be spared further hazardous progress along a particularly gruesome road. Among the hopeful signs, the first in recent weeks was the vigorous campaign against the chemical and biological warfare program of the Defense Department by Representative Richard D. McCarthy of Buffalo. It was Mr. McCarthy who induced a rare briefing of Congressmen on the subject by hitherto reticent officers of the Pentagon. And it was the same Congressman who almost singlehandedly prevented the crosscountry shipment of several hundred freight cars filled with obsolete but deadly gas bombs the Army irresponsibly planned to dump in the Atlantic.

Entering into the questioning spirit, the Senate Armed Services Committee has just voted to cut out of the defense budget all funds for researching offensive measures in the field of chemical-biological warfare. President Nixon himself has shown a marked interest in moves to reduce this whole category of armaments. He has ordered a full-scale review of the program and pledged to the opening session of the Geneva Disarmament Conference that the United States would seek "reliable arms control" for this potential type of warfare, which "arouses horror and revulsion throughout the world."

Perhaps even more significant, the United Nations has just issued a report that should be required reading for responsible government officials around the globe. It documents not only the frightful dangers of chemical and biological warfare but the folly of their contemplated use as well as their total unpredictability, their possible destruction of the environment even where they do not immediately wipe out a whole population, including those who initiate their use; and the easy and frightening proliferation of such weapons among nations that cannot afford nuclear armaments.

In transmitting the work of the fourteen distinguished scientists who drew up the U.N. report, Secretary General U Thant has appealed to all states to accept the Geneva Protocol of 1925, renouncing the use of chemical and biological agents—a declaration ratified by sixty nations but not by the United States—and to eliminate such agents as quickly as possible from their arsenals.

If these steps are taken, such is the irony of the situation, the world would breathe more easily at having to ward off only the threat of nuclear destruction.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for the balance of week, on account of death of personal aide.

Mr. GRAY (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today, on account of attendance at a funeral.

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. SISK, for 1 hour, on Monday, August 4, 1969, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. ASHBROOK, for 15 minutes, today, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHALEN), to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRAY, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. BIESTER, for 1 hour, on Monday, August 4.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA), to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FLOOD, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. TUNNEY, for 30 minutes, on July 31.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia prior to vote on the Joelson amendment.

Mr. GROSS to revise and extend his remarks during colloquy on the bill H.R. 13080.

Mr. HANLEY and to include extraneous matter during remarks in the Committee on the Whole.

Mr. ECKHARDT to revise and extend remarks and include extraneous matter immediately after statement of Mr. PUCINSKI on Carey amendment.

Mr. COHELAN to include extraneous matter and tables immediately following his remarks in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BELL of California to include extraneous matter with remarks he made in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin to extend his remarks during consideration of Teacher Corps paragraph on page 27 of H.R. 13111.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WHALEN), to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PETTIS.

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts.

Mr. ESCH.

Mr. WATSON.

Mr. WYMAN in two instances.

Mr. WYATT.

Mr. ESHLEMAN.

Mr. KLEPPE.

Mr. FOREMAN in two instances.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio.

Mr. HASTINGS.

Mr. KEITH.

Mr. SHRIVER in two instances.

Mr. MCCLURE.

Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. DERWINSKI.

Mr. WOLD.

Mr. DICKINSON.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. SCHWENGEL.
 Mr. FREY.
 Mr. SCOTT.
 Mr. BUSH.
 Mr. SNYDER in two instances.
 Mr. CHAMBERLAIN in two instances.
 (The following Members (at the request of Mr. MIKVA) and to include extraneous matter:)
 Mr. LONG of Maryland in three instances.
 Mr. RODINO in three instances.
 Mr. MONTGOMERY in two instances.
 Mr. HANNA.
 Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON in two instances.
 Mr. STUCKEY in two instances.
 Mr. MCCARTHY in three instances.
 Mr. DINGELL in three instances.
 Mr. RARICK in three instances.
 Mr. PICKLE in three instances.
 Mr. HATHAWAY.
 Mr. DE LA GARZA in three instances.
 Mr. ANDERSON of California.
 Mr. ROYBAL in six instances.
 Mr. HAMILTON.
 Mr. LOWENSTEIN in three instances.
 Mr. PURCELL.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 59. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within the Army National Guard Facility, Ethan Allen, and the United States Army Materiel Command Firing Range, Underhill, Vermont; to the Committee on Armed Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, July 31, 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:

1003. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting the third semi-annual report of the Selective Service System, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(g) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1004. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the need for improvement in the receipt and storage of military supplies and equipment, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1005. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal under the law; to the Committee on House Administration.

1006. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide additional revenues for the highway trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1007. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the imposition of waterway user charges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

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. WILSON of California: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 12884. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to assure confidentiality of information furnished in response to questionnaires, inquiries, and other requests of the Bureau of the Census, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-407). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE 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. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 85. An act for the relief of Dr. Jagir Singh Randhawa (Rept. No. 91-401). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 348. An act for the relief of Cheng-huai Li (Rept. No. 91-402). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 564. An act for the relief of Mrs. Irene G. Queja (Rept. No. 91-403). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FEIGHAN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Concurrent Resolution 33. Concurrent resolution favoring the suspension of deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 91-404). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RODINO: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1695. A bill for the relief of Alfredo Caprara (Rept. No. 91-405). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EILBERG: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2817. A bill for the relief of Delilah Aurora Gamatero, with amendment (Rept. No. 91-406). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 13188. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DE LA GARZA:

H.R. 13189. A bill to provide that certain aircraft may travel between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico without requiring the owners or operators thereof to reimburse the United States for extra compensation paid customs officers and employees and immigration officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLÉNBOEN:

H.R. 13190. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 13191. A bill to authorize appropriations to be used for the elimination of certain rail-highway grade crossings in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 13192. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage higher education, and particularly the private funding thereof, by authorizing a deduction from

gross income of reasonable amounts contributed to a qualified higher education fund established by the taxpayer for the purpose of funding the higher education of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself and Mr. MILLER of Ohio) (by request):

H.R. 13193. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for payment by handler assessments of the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (for herself and Mr. QUITE):

H.R. 13194. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to authorize Federal incentive payments to lenders with respect to insured student loans when necessary, in the light of economic conditions, in order to assure that students will have reasonable access to such loans for financing their education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BEALL of Maryland, Mr. BRAY, Mr. BRINKLEY, Mr. BROXHILL of North Carolina, Mr. BURKE of Florida, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DENT, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. KING, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. POWELL, Mr. QUILLIN, Mr. WEICKER, Mr. WYMAN, Mr. BIESTER, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. LUKENS, Mr. McDADDE, Mr. McMILLAN, and Mr. MARSH):

H.R. 13195. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that U.S. flags be presented to parents of deceased servicemen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. SIKES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. ZWACH, Mr. McCLOURE, Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. CLEVELAND, Mr. FISH, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HAYS, Mr. POLLOCK, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SAYLOR, Mr. SEBELIUS, Mr. WOLD, Mr. WYLLIE, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. FRIEDEL, Mr. PETTIS, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. RUPPE, and Mr. CARTER):

H.R. 13196. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that U.S. flags be presented to parents of deceased servicemen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HASTINGS (for himself, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. WHITEHURST, Mr. TAFT, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. FREY, Mr. FLOWERS, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 13197. A bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code to require that U.S. flags be presented to parents of deceased servicemen; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KOCH (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. MAILLARD, Mr. MESKILL, Mr. MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK, Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 13198. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 13199. 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. LOWENSTEIN (for himself and Mr. ADDABBO):

H.R. 13200. A bill to prohibit commercial flights over land areas of the United States until the problem of sonic boom has been solved and its effects controlled; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 13201. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 13202. A bill to amend the act of August 13, 1946, relating to Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of the United States, its territories, and possessions, to include privately owned property; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13203. A bill to establish an urban mass transportation trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 13204. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code in order to prohibit personal investigations by private organizations of congressional employees engaged in the development of legislation affecting the interests of such organizations; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIEGLE:

H.R. 13205. A bill to establish in the State of Michigan the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STUCKEY:

H.R. 13206. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATKINS:

H.R. 13207. A bill to permit the sale of certain low-rent housing to the Borough of Upland, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 13208. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from \$600 to \$800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 13209. A bill to incorporate the Association of American Law Schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 13210. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the granting of authority by the Federal Communications Commission for the broadcast of pay television programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 13211. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to

elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 13212. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 13213. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the establishment of emergency detention camps and to provide that no citizen of the United States shall be committed for detention or imprisonment in any facility of the U.S. Government except in conformity with the provisions of title 18; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCLURE (for himself, Mr.

ANDERSON of Illinois, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. DENT, Mr. FISHER, Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTI, Mr. MEEDS, Mr. MELCHER, Mr. MINSHALL, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. SHRIVER):

H.R. 13214. A bill to authorize the minting of clad silver dollars bearing the likeness of the late Dwight David Eisenhower; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MESKILL (for himself, Mr.

WEICKER, Mr. MONAGAN, Mr. ST. ONGE, Mr. GIALMO, and Mr. DARDARO):

H.R. 13215. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the Connecticut-New York railroad passenger transportation compact; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 13216. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to double the amount of the basic personal income tax exemption allowed a taxpayer; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER (for herself and Mr. FOUNTAIN):

H.R. 13217. A bill to provide for the balanced urban development and growth of the United States; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.J. Res. 849. Joint resolution to redesignate the area in the State of Florida known as Cape Kennedy as "Cape Canaveral"; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.J. Res. 850. 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. PURCELL (for himself, Mr.

HULL, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. CABELL, Mr. RABICK, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. STEED, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. EVANS of Colorado):

H.J. Res. 851. Joint resolution requesting the President of the United States to issue

a proclamation calling for a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.J. Res. 852. 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. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 309. Concurrent resolution, second listing of operating Federal assistance programs compiled during the Roth study; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FINDLEY (for himself, Mr.

FULTON of Pennsylvania, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. SANDMAN):

H. Con. Res. 310. Concurrent resolution relating to an Atlantic Union delegation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H. Res. 504. Resolution urging the President to resubmit to the Senate for ratification the Geneva Protocol of 1925 banning the first use of gas and bacteriological warfare; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

247. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Florida, relative to the redesignation of Cape Kennedy as "Cape Canaveral," which was referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 13218. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph E. Begnoche; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H.R. 13219. A bill for the relief of Frank E. Dart; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO (by request):

H. Res. 505. Resolution referring H.R. 13148 to the Chief Commissioner of the Court of Claims; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

198. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City Council, Boston, Mass.; relative to pollution in Boston Harbor, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REFUTATION OF THE 1966 FDA DRUG POTENCY STUDY

HON. ROBERT DOLE

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 30, 1969

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, since 1966, a much publicized pilot potency drug study conducted by the Federal Food and Drug Administration has been disputed by the pharmaceutical industry. The essence of the conclusion reached by the FDA in that study is "that one out of every 14 drug units manufactured—in the United States—is violative just

from potency alone." From 1966 to the present, FDA representatives have repeatedly in press releases, statements before congressional committees, and speeches affirmed their support of the 1966 study. Supportive discussion or comment about the study has also appeared in printed congressional hearings and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The industry, I am informed, has sought to obtain for its rebuttal of the FDA study reasonable coverage in congressional publications so that the public, and scientific researchers may judge between the facts as presented by the FDA and the industry and reach their own conclusions as to the validity of the position of either.

Mr. President, I take no position in this matter at this time. I am a newly elected Member of the Senate and newly appointed to the Small Business Committee and to its Subcommittee on Monopoly. Before this subcommittee there have been numerous discussions about the validity of the FDA's pilot potency study. I have not had an opportunity to study fully the comparative positions of industry and the FDA on this matter. I do, however, intend to do so, but believe that in the interest of equity and fair play, industry is entitled to have its position made as fully known as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extensions of Remarks in-