

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR RANDOLPH URGES THAT WE FACE THE FACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE—ADDRESSES NATIONAL PARK SERVICE SEMINAR—GROUP DISCUSSIONS HELPFUL IN UNDERSTANDING PROBLEMS AND APPROACHES TO SOLUTIONS

## HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, throughout the Nation there is a growing awareness of the relationships between the natural and manmade worlds. As our population grows so do the demands made on our natural environment increase. Consequently, the need to maintain a proper and useful balance between man and his surroundings takes on new importance.

The National Park Service is fully aware of these contemporary problems and has dedicated itself to environmental conservation.

To aid in keeping its personnel abreast of the problems and the tools for solving them, the National Park Service regularly conducts a variety of training programs.

It was my privilege on September 4 to address the executive environmental management seminar conducted by the Park Service at its Stephen T. Mather Training Center at Harper's Ferry, W. Va. Sixteen high level Park Service managers participated in the 3-day seminar at this national training facility under the capable direction of Raymond L. Nelson, supervisor of the center.

Following my remarks I engaged for more than 2 hours in a question and answer discussion with the seminar participants. I was impressed with their concern over environmental problems, not only as they relate to the Park Service but to the economy in general.

Mr. President, the critical problems currently facing our environment are of great importance to every citizen and to every Member of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the Park Service environmental management seminar be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPEECH BY SENATOR JENNINGS RANDOLPH AT THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE SEMINAR, STEPHEN T. MATHER TRAINING CENTER, HARPER'S FERRY, W. VA., SEPTEMBER 4, 1969

FACING THE FACTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGE

In this Training Center, named for a forward thinking leader, we gather to exchange views on a vital issue inherent in our times. Stephen T. Mather was concerned with "Environmental Management." Seminars such as this are excellent opportunities to really nail the pieces together. I expect to leave this meeting with more knowledge of your problems than you will of mine.

There is the current ferment in Washington and across the Nation which is aimed

at establishing a national policy for environmental quality.

At a time when man can finally reach out and explore the moon in person, too many Americans find themselves wallowing in an environment which is becoming almost as hostile as the surface of the moon.

Astronauts Armstrong, Aldrin, and Collins were protected from the harsh conditions of outer space, safe inside expensive total environment chambers called space suits.

The tens of millions of us who watched their fascinating space adventures through the marvels of live television across 250,000 miles were at the same time breathing fouled air, drinking water of doubtful purity, walking over some of the billions of tons of solid waste discarded each year by our society.

It is gratifying that we express concern over the conditions of this environment. It is an important first step to realize that a problem does exist. It is necessary to recognize that pollution can degrade the environment to the point where man, as we know him, cannot survive. And it is vital to realize that man's social activities have a direct bearing on the condition of the environment.

The National Park Service has been charged with a broad responsibility to insure against environmental pollution. A key section of the Act passed by Congress in 1916 succinctly set forth the mission of the Service:

"... to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objectives and the wildlife and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

The Act specifically implied that this responsibility extended to the vast National Park System. But it is significant that the System has expanded six fold since that time, from less than 5 million acres to more than 29 million acres today.

Congress intended that the National Park Service not only be concerned with the original parklands, but that it apply its talents and knowledge to insuring that future Federal parklands and contiguous areas remain unimpaired. Indeed, who has better reason or facility to watch over the natural beauty of our land or to monitor the quality of the environment than the men and women who have devoted their lives to that task?

Secretary of the Interior Walter J. Hickel, on June 18, recognized this fact in a statement of management philosophy which concluded that one of the most challenging jobs of the Service is "to participate actively with organizations of this and other nations in conserving, improving, and renewing the total environment."

The National Park idea began with the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872. At that time, Congress wanted to preserve the outstanding natural features and scientific wonders found there.

Congress expanded the National Park Service role to the field of recreation in 1936. The Park, Parkway and Recreation Area Study Act authorized studies of recreational areas for inclusion in the System. A decade later Congress authorized the Service to administer recreation areas under jurisdiction of other Government agencies.

Other legislation greatly expanded the Service's role in environmental quality. For example, the Cape Cod National Seashore Act authorized for the first time the use of appropriated funds at the outset to buy parklands, and in 1964 the Congress established a Land and Water Conservation Fund and passed the Wilderness Act. We broke tradition in 1966 with the Historical Preservation

Act by extending support to state and local historic preservation efforts.

As you know, the Senate Committee on Public Works, which I chair, has substantive jurisdiction over the Federal highway programs. Recently the Committee authorized \$41 million for the construction and improvement of highways within (and some highways approaching) national parks, monuments and recreational areas, and of National parkways, parks, and monument roads. These funds are administered jointly by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce.

We are pleased that the National Park Service is actively engaged in planning these highways with a view toward scenic and environmental preservation.

What all of this connotes is the fact that Congressional concern with the quality of the environment has placed a large burden of responsibility on the National Park Service. We have felt that the Service is a logical administrator of these large and important programs because of the resources and talents within your ranks.

You know of the 1963 report by the Advisory Committee to the National Park Service on Research, issued by the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council. The report points out that the National Park Service has the responsibility of administering the national parks in accordance with the purposes for which they are or may be set aside by specific Acts of Congress. It emphasizes that knowledge about the parks and their problems is needed to discharge this responsibility. Such knowledge comes from research, especially research in natural history and the physical and biological systems of nature.

The report indicates that research in natural history by the Service has been "only incipient, consisting of many reports, numerous recommendations, vacillations in policy, and little action." Research by the Service, the report said, "has lacked continuity, coordination, and depth. It has been marked by expediency rather than long-term considerations. It has in general lacked direction, has been fragmented between divisions and branches, has been applied piecemeal, has suffered because of a failure to recognize the distinctions between research and administrative decision-making, and had failed to insure the implementation of the results of research in operational management."

This indictment, slightly outdated, underscores problems experienced not only by the National Park Service but by many branches of government to whom the quality of our environment is entrusted. There is a general lack of over-all direction and coordination not only within agencies but between them. There are too many examples of agencies working at cross-purpose with other agencies, often within the same Department.

The Committee on Public Works has recognized this problem and is attempting to rectify it.

In June, I cosponsored with 40 of my colleagues a new bill, the "Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1969," to establish a national policy for the environment. This bill was appended to the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969 (S. 7) as Title II of that legislation.

Title II provides for more effective coordination of Federal air quality, water quality, and solid waste disposal programs, and for the consideration of environmental quality in all public works programs and projects. More importantly, it calls for the coordination of all Federal research programs

which improve knowledge of environmental modifications resulting from increased population, urban concentration, industrial development, and other activities of our society.

Lest it be forgotten, S. 7, the Water Quality Improvement Act itself, goes a long way in providing for better quality of the environment. Senator Edmund S. Muskie, Chairman of our Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, worked to give us a vehicle which will prevent catastrophes like the Santa Barbara oil spill that dumped millions of barrels of black, sticky oil on the beaches along the West Coast.

The Committee on Public Works has also recently approved a bill extending and amending the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 to provide for continuing programs for mine land reclamation and pollution control. This legislation will give new emphasis to health projects for early childhood health, nutrition and education, and to research and action programs to eliminate "black lung" and other occupational hazards to miners' health. The acid mine drainage section of the bill is aimed at cleaning the nation's streams and impoundments of the Appalachian region.

It is difficult to measure the effect of this bill, but perhaps some examples of the problem in economic terms would help.

It is estimated that over 3 millions tons of acid are discharged annually from active and abandoned underground and strip mines in Appalachia. The commercial value of this acid—if recovered and used in the processing of steel, rayon, and so forth—would be approximately \$90 million. In addition, some 150,000 tons of aluminum, worth \$12 million is washed away—enough to make 6,000 Boeing 707 airplanes. And 500,000 tons of iron, worth about \$50 million, are washed down the nation's rivers every year.

The cost of this blight is staggering in terms of losses and damage to waterworks, bridges, boats, culverts, and other structures, and the higher water treatment costs for industries and municipalities. The loss of recreational areas for swimming, boating and fishing is even worse.

Yes, the Committee on Public Works has acted to halt the flow of acid waters from the mines, particularly those in West Virginia and other coal producing states. The reversal of water conditions in the area should provide for many useful parks and recreation areas in this beautiful mountainous stretch of the country so near the major population centers of the East Coast.

The new legislation also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to assist in the sealing and filling of voids in abandoned coal mines, the planning and execution of projects to control mine fires, the sealing of abandoned oil and gas wells, and the reclamation and rehabilitation of strip and surface mined lands in areas with potential for future growth. This, too, will provide for the reclamation and development of areas which have been scared and degraded.

Erosion and sediment control and reclamation of land which has been misused by poor farming and forestry practices is another area for which the legislation provides. The Act authorizes contracts of up to 10 years for assistance to landowners or operators in the Appalachian region to establish measures for the conservation and development of the region's soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Late in July, I introduced a bill to establish the first regional interstate compact to control this nation's air pollution. Pursuant to the intent of the Clean Air Act of 1963 and in accordance with provisions of the Air Quality Act of 1967, the measure gives approval to an Interstate Compact on Air Pollution between West Virginia and Ohio, with provision that the States of Pennsylvania and Kentucky may join at some future date.

Congress has become increasingly aware of the dire consequences of dirty air. Beginning with the Clean Air Act of 1963, we have made it clear that our mandate from the people is to turn the tide against the creeping contamination of our citizens, particularly the young and the elderly, and fouts our property at costs ranging into the billions of dollars each year.

The Compact was passed by the separate State legislatures twice in order to meet the intent of Congress as revised in the 1967 Act. This is proof that the states are concerned over the quality of the environment just as we in Washington are concerned.

Now we turn to another problem which faces us—solid waste. Americans waste billions of tons of solid materials each year. From our homes and offices, each person contributes almost five and one-half pounds of garbage and miscellaneous trash every day to our over-strained refuse system. The cost is more than \$4.5 billion a year. And the figure will reach eight pounds per person a day by 1980.

Added to that, industrial wastes contribute another 3.2 pounds per person per day; agricultural wastes from animal feedlots, packing houses, lumbering operations, and other related industries produce another 30 pounds per person; and 7 million automobiles are junked each year, many to rust along the roadside or decay in auto graveyards.

Natural resources—the raw minerals and biologicals from which all of our products come—are the reservoir from which society draws its material sustenance. Although there is a growing awareness of the need for aesthetic resources such as space for recreation and natural beauty, the basic resources are soil, air, water, and minerals, including fuel. Minerals and all sources of energy gain in relative importance with advancing technology and expanding industrialization.

Throughout history, those nations with access to minerals, and the technology for using them, have gained ascendancy. Before World War II, the leading powers also were leading coal producers. In order of declining rank, the five leading coal producers were: the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, the USSR, and Japan.

That the military victory went to the side with the greater capacity to convert iron and coal into tools of industry, and weapons, is more than coincidence. It is a fundamental fact. And it is axiomatic that the United States must have a continually increasing supply of minerals if we are to meet the needs of our burgeoning population for a comfortable standard of living and for national security.

At the same time, other natural resources must be preserved and protected. Purely industrial and economic considerations must be weighed against their impact on the environment.

Industrial wastes and municipal sewage pollute our streams. So does sediment from agricultural activities, highway and urban construction, and burned-over forest lands. Automobiles pollute the air. Beer cans defile the countryside. Although water pollution is reaching intolerable levels, the loss of soil by erosion is at least as serious, and is inextricably involved with many water pollution problems, especially those resulting from surface mining and construction activities.

Man now has the power to control many of the elements of nature. He can destroy the soil, render air and water unusable through pollution, kill every form of life—himself included. He now can manipulate genetics and create life in a test tube.

If he has this power to destroy, he also has the means to conserve and protect. Whether he has the wisdom and self-restraint to take effective action in the remainder of this century may well determine the course of man's future years on Earth.

Earlier this year I cosponsored with Senator Muskie and nine other colleagues a new bill—S. 2005—the "Resources Recovery Act of 1969," aimed at cleaning this Nation's solid waste problem and turning those used resources back into grist for our industrial mill. This legislation is keyed around research and demonstration of effective ways of collecting, transporting, and recycling or disposing of the billions of tons of solid wastes which we as a Nation generate.

We have held field hearings in Boston and Jacksonville. We are planning more in other regions of the country, including Washington. We hope to get at the heart of the problems and develop meaningful solutions for handling them.

The American public is not strictly to be blamed for the problems of solid waste which are pushing dangerously near the crisis stage. It can, in fact, be documented that we are not a nation of slobs who go about scattering the remains of the last picnic over the landscape.

The majority of Americans keep their homes and lawns neat and clean. They are proud of the appearances of their cities and parks. They generally look for places to deposit their trash to prevent the ugliness of litter.

Nowhere is this preoccupation with cleanliness more evident than in the National Parks. The parks around the nation's capital are visited by more than 15 million persons each year. Almost all of these visitors use the National Capital Parks, administered by the National Park Service. Park service officials report that a great deal of effort is spent just cleaning up. More than 300,000 cans of trash were picked up and disposed of last year, at a cost of about \$500,000.

But there is a conscious effort on the part of the general public to keep their parks clean, despite indications to the contrary. One of your colleagues reports that on particularly heavy weekends—long weekends like the Fourth of July and Labor Day—the trash baskets in the parks are filled to overflowing, but the excess litter is usually piled around the baskets and not scattered over the landscape.

Studies show that a big part of the problem is a lack of facilities for disposal of trash. Municipalities with long experience in the field have found that more trash-baskets spaced at frequent intervals along the streets are an inducement to citizens to keep the cities clean. No one minds carrying a small handful of Polaroid film backing or an empty soft drink bottle a few yards to drop it into a receptacle. But when the pockets begin to bulge and the hike down the trail is still long, it is easier to toss the trash into a nearby bush than to make the extra effort.

The President's Science Advisory Committee, in "Restoring the Quality of Our Environment," reported that the nation annually must dispose of 48 billion metal cans a year (250 per person) 26 billion bottles and jars (135 per person), 65 billion metal and plastic caps and crowns (338 per person), plus more than a half billion dollars a year of miscellaneous packaging material. A new report by the Midwest Research Institute shows that packaging consumption will increase more than 40 per cent by 1976.

The number of visits to National Park areas increased by 90 per cent during the past eight years, according to your Director, Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr. During the next 10 years, the forecast is for a further increase of 125 million—to more than 276 million by 1979. Outdoor recreation activities are growing twice as fast as the population, and the National Park System visitations are increasing several times faster than outdoor recreation activities generally.

With these figures in mind, and with the

knowledge that ever more and newer disposable packaging materials and other products of modern industry will be greatly expanding, it might be well to plan for easier, better, and quicker disposal and collection systems for the National Park System to cope with what promises to be a tremendous problem. The easier it is for Americans to dispose of waste, the easier the total job of solid waste management and the cleaner our parks and playgrounds will be.

Insurance of environmental quality, not only in our parks but throughout the entire nation, is becoming increasingly important as our population expands and the demands on our resources increase. Yesterday's conservation battles were for the establishment of the parklands you now administer. Today's conservation battles are for beautiful cities, clean water and air, better, safer, cleaner highways, and the preservation of open space.

The problems of environmental quality are becoming too great for any one agency or any one group to encompass. Despite the considerable competence of the staff of the Committee on Public Works, we, too, are finding it difficult to keep abreast of the many areas over which we have jurisdiction.

To cope with this situation, we are now embarking on a new venture, unique to the Congress, which will involve scientists and engineers and other experts directly in the policy-making operation before it begins. We are creating a panel of experts which will meet with the members and staff of the Committee informally to discuss problems before they are generally recognized. The members of the panel are appointed on a rotating basis, selected because of their expertise and because they can generate fresh new ideas about problems relating to environmental quality. Many of them will be young men and women who have not had much opportunity to participate in the process.

With this Panel, we intend to bridge the gap between the laboratory scientists who are first to come to recognize these problems and the legislators who must deal with them—too often after much damage has been done. We hope to be able to come up with constructive, preventative legislation which will guarantee future Americans the right to quality of living, as expressed by the absence of pollution, freedom from crowding, noise and other deleterious byproducts of our rapidly growing society.

I have told you much of what we are doing in Congress to insure environmental quality.

For the last few minutes let me digress and give you some thoughts about the National Park Service. As Mr. Hartzog has said, and I agree, parks do not exist in a vacuum. It is important in planning, he says, that you consider the total environment in which the park exists.

For the Service has taken some steps in the right direction. For instance, I understand that in order to avoid overcrowding, traffic congestion, and pollution from automobiles, at least two major parks, including Yosemite, are using new shuttle services to take visitors around the grounds.

I have also suggested that some planning be undertaken to alleviate the trash problem in the parks.

Beyond this, however, a number of interesting suggestions have been made by various people to increase the Park Service's activities in other areas of environmental quality.

In its Advisory Committee report, the National Academy of Sciences-National Research Council provided a number of recommendations which, if followed, could bring greater understanding of the total environment, as well as providing baselines for environmental quality. For example, the report suggested that the natural history re-

sources of each national park should be inventoried and mapped. And research, both by Park Service naturalists at each park and by interested visiting scientists, should be organized to provide a complete record of the biota and the physical properties of the parks. Universities, private research institutions, and qualified independent investigators should be encouraged to use the national parks in teaching and research. In fact, organized research programs should be developed to involve these experts on a long-range basis.

For us to come to grips with the problems of pollution and environmental degradation, knowledge about the natural biological and physical systems is extremely important. To set standards for air and water pollution, it is imperative that scientists have baselines of purity for our rivers and lakes and the unpolluted wilderness areas available almost exclusively in the national parks.

If Congress is to pass meaningful legislation, and if the government—all agencies—is to carry it out, it will require the talents of dedicated men and women who have extensive training in the sciences, who interact with nature, who appreciate the needs of society, who understand the problems of industry, and at the same time are knowledgeable about the limits of our environment. Thus it is important for National Park Service people to seek to make even greater contributions to the over-all quality of our environment. I have confidence in your creative and constructive efforts in the achievement of workable and worthwhile programs.

THE LATE HONORABLE  
BARRATT O'HARA

HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying tribute to an outstanding and beloved American. All of us have been saddened by the death of the distinguished former Congressman of Illinois' Second District, Barratt O'Hara. If proof were necessary, Representative O'Hara's career in Congress demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that energy, creativity and the pursuit of justice are not solely the property of youth.

At a time when most men would be ready to retire, "Battling Barratt," as we affectionately knew him, won his first House seat at the age of 66, and was for many years our oldest Member. At the time he came to Congress, Representative O'Hara had already won outstanding success in enough careers for several active men. At the age of 13, he accompanied his father on a diplomatic mission to Nicaragua and stayed on to join a Smithsonian Institution party exploring Central American jungles. At 15, he ran away from home to join the volunteers fighting in the Spanish-American War. He served as a corporal at the siege of Santiago, became chief scout for his brigade, and was awarded the Cuban Order of Military Merit.

After attending the University of Missouri, he became sports editor of the St. Louis Chronicle at the age of 20, then moved to Chicago where he was sports editor of the American, and later Sunday

editor of the Examiner. Meanwhile, he won a law degree from Kent College of Law in Chicago, edited and published Chicago magazine, wrote a history of boxing, entitled "From Figg to Johnson," and at 30 became the youngest Lieutenant Governor in the history of Illinois. A brief stint as president of a movie company followed, then Army service as Judge Advocate General of his division in World War I, and finally law practice. As a defense attorney who obtained acquittals for more than 90 percent of his clients, he won the public admiration of Clarence Darrow.

Elected to the House in 1948, he was defeated for reelection, but came back in 1952 and stayed through the 90th Congress. With a zest for debate and new ideas unexcelled by many younger Members, he was a champion of liberal causes and the emergence of new African nations. As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Africa, he made an outstanding contribution to American understanding of emerging nations and the forces of anticolonialism. During the fear-plagued McCarthy years, he fought to abolish the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Soldier, journalist, Lieutenant Governor, motion picture executive, radio commentator, lawyer, and Congressman, Barratt O'Hara was indeed one of our Nation's outstanding citizens. We mourn his passing, for he will be sorely missed. His life was as full and rich and varied as any man's might be, and it spanned the period of America's development into the world's greatest power. This Nation will never forget him.

CIVIL RIGHTS NOT DEAD

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, last month Mr. Robert J. Brown, special assistant to the President, who is Civil Rights Coordinator in the White House, addressed the National Dental Association. I ask unanimous consent that his excellent speech, in which he outlines the various civil rights activities underway in this administration, be printed in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS OF ROBERT J. BROWN, SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT TO THE 56TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL DENTAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. President, President-elect, Speaker of the House of Delegates, other officers, delegates and friends.

It is a privilege and pleasure to have a part in the program of such a distinguished organization. The National Dental Association has a proud history of accomplishments. Opening the doors for Black dentists has not been easy.

In these difficult and critical times, things are not going to get easier—they are going to get tougher. The burning issues of today are no longer whether you can eat at a

Southern lunchcounter but rather to develop and initiate effective programs to feed the poor of our nation, rural and urban. They are:

Developing and initiating the best possible health care programs for the young and needy.

Making sure that every man can practice his profession or vocation with all of the available tools in any hospital, on any building, in any office in this country.

Making sure that all of the restrictive covenants against the sale of land to Black people and other minorities are voided by the law of the land.

Making every effort to see to it that this nation is a nation of peace. They are:

Ridding our nation of the basic causes of the riots which trouble our cities, large and small.

Making justice an essential part of any and all law and order efforts.

Initiating and bringing into being a meaningful family security plan to replace an outworn, outdated and demeaning welfare system.

Giving hope to those who have lost it.

Inclusive in all that I have said thus far and all that I have not said is the prime issue of *bridging the gap between young and old, black and white, rich and poor*. This must be done if our country is to move ahead in a creative, constructive and peaceful manner.

We do not have all of the answers. No one does. Contrary to what you may have heard, we in the Nixon Administration solicit your ideas, suggestions, constructive criticism: and above all, your support.

The normal question today, among Black people in particular, is to ask "support for what?" I want to take this opportunity to set a few records straight. Until this Administration:

No Black man had ever served as a general counsel of any major department of government. James Washington, a former Howard University Law School Dean now serves in this capacity in the important Department of Transportation.

For several decades, the National Dental Association along with the NAACP, the Urban League and other major black groups protested to the White House that a black man should sit on the three man U.S. Civil Service Commission which regulates more than 3 million Federal jobs. James E. Johnson, a black man, now serves on this powerful Commission. I might add that he is also the Vice Chairman.

There has never been a black assistant postmaster general; Assistant Surgeon General or Director of the Women's Bureau in the U.S. Labor Department. There is now.

At no time did the U.S. Department of Justice file a suit against the restrictive covenants which have kept black people and other minorities out of decent homes for generations until this Administration.

They say we softened the school desegregation guidelines, and yet numerous suits have been filed and millions of dollars cut off from segregating school districts. In fact, for the first time in our history a suit has been filed against an entire state school system. And the Chicago Board of Education has been given two weeks to take corrective steps in desegregating its faculty.

Until this Administration:

No free food stamps were given to the poor and no comprehensive program had ever been advanced to feed our hungry. We have submitted to the Congress a 2.5 billion dollar program. Even my good friend, Dr. Ralph Abernathy admitted publicly that this program went further than any other Administration has dared to go. However, I must add that he also did not think it to be enough. Nonetheless, our program is designed so as to spend wisely and diligently whatever is necessary to do an effective

job. Our goal in this area of concern is to eliminate hunger from our land.

There were no proposals to take the poor off of the Federal tax rolls. We have proposed a program to do just that.

We have proposed a general strengthening of the unemployment insurance system. We are asking each state to cover at least 50% of a workers wages and permit workers to receive benefits while enrolled in training programs designed to increase their employability.

In our first seven months, we have moved steadily and effectively ahead. I ask all of you to keep an open mind and heart. Toss away that age old so-called black anti-Republican attitude. All we ask of you and all we ask of all Americans is to be judged on what we are able to accomplish. As Carl Rowan put it the other day in his Washington commentary: "For where Mr. Nixon is entitled to the applause of the black community he ought to get it."

There are many of us who believe that black and white leadership must present the kind of courage to the people of this country to praise as well as criticize—to stand up and be counted for what is right and denounce what is wrong. America is searching for this kind of leadership. I am sure that much of it can be found in this distinguished group.

The people, black and white, are asking for and demanding results. The time for beautiful rhetoric has run out. In the words of the street, "no more shucking and jiving." We must concentrate more on producing meaningful results in our local communities for the masses of this country. At the same time, we must say to all of those who would let emotion rule, "to fight a Sherman tank with rocks, sticks and 22 rifles—is not only ridiculous, but very stupid."

So that there be no mistake about where I stand, I think the right of peaceful protest is vital to our way of life. *I endorse it fully*. The neglected area of Black studies is important to all of America. And I have been black and proud for 34 years now (and beautiful too). Just in case somebody doesn't know, I am a bona fide, first hand living witness and victim to the experiences of hunger, poverty and violence.

In other words, I know about most of the hang-ups which one might have who happens to be black. Some months ago, I picked up a little book by Turner Brown, Jr. (no relation) which many of you may have read. It gives an overview about the author's conception of what being black is all about. He says

Black is—not having to get in the mood to sing the blues.

Black is—suffering the ultimate blow of being automated out of the Sanitation Department.

Black is—being accused of causing trouble but always winding up as the casualties.

Black is—when you meet the devil to sell him your soul he gets embarrassed and says, "I can't give you quite as much as I offered you over the phone."

Black is—when you're playing "eeny, meeny, miney, moe" and the thing you catch by the toe is a tiger.

Black is—when you're bringing your suit home from the cleaners and you get busted for stealing it.

Black is—being told you ran down a neighborhood that was fifty-years old when you finally got to move in.

Black is being issued a credit card by a pawn shop.

In addition to my recently assigned responsibility as Civil Rights Coordinator in the White House for the Administration, I have been working in the area of minority business enterprise.

On March 5th, the President created an Office of Minority Business Enterprise. This

office in the Department of Commerce is designed to spur the growth of minority-owned business across the country. OMBE is the coordinating body in the Government's efforts to give minority group members a larger piece of the mainstream economic action.

This office now has a staff and it is operational. Within a few days, the President will appoint a "blue ribbon" advisory committee to work in this area.

Let me make it clear that OMBE is no substitute for other efforts that are underway in the national program to bring minority citizens into full participation in the American society and economy. Jobs are the first essential; we all recognize that. Minority enterprise will not replace any existing program; it is a supplementary program, not a conflicting one.

I would also like to stress that this program is a "no-strings" program. It is intended to help persons operate businesses both inside and outside the ghettos—wherever their interests, talents and activities take them.

In the short time that OMBE has been in existence, Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans has announced several programs of great aid to minority business enterprise.

The following test programs already announced are:

a. A *National Institute for Minority Business Education* at Howard University, and subsequent university management assistance centers (with HEW).

b. A *Voluntary Credit Corporation* to provide loan guarantees through the (Negro) National Bankers Association (with OEO and SBA).

c. A *Shopping Center Development Program* with the Reverend Leon Sullivan of Philadelphia who will send trained developers to establish centers in 13 cities (with SBA, and EDA of Commerce).

Other examples of programs under development include:

a. Active efforts to stimulate more Small Business Investment Corporations, owned and directed by major corporations, to operate in minority areas.

b. Negotiations and meetings with franchisers to bring about more minority automobile dealerships, gasoline stations, and other retail franchises. Chrysler has agreed, for example, to give the first 25 automobile dealerships to minority members.

c. The enlistment of accountants and management consultants on a national voluntary basis to provide direct assistance to new minority entrepreneurs.

d. Examination of ways in which minority business enterprise can participate in the life insurance industry's second billion dollar commitment for urban action.

I want to reiterate that civil rights is not dead in this Administration. It has not been put on the backburner. It is on the front burner and "We are going to take care of business."

In the immediate days ahead we ask you to take a good long hard look at our civil rights and general domestic thrust. Our commitment in this area is forward.

We believe that it will be deeds, not words that will bring us together. With the help of the National Dental Association and other groups across this nation, we intend to perform and deliver.

Let us seek to broaden our perspective and move ahead together. This Administration is going to be about helping people and making America better for all people.

In bringing the disadvantaged blacks, the poor whites, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and any other groups into the mainstream of American life, most of you might want to consider yourselves as drum majors—the kind of drum major Martin Luther King, Jr. said he wanted to be in his last sermon, and I quote him here:

"I want you to say that day that I tried

to be right and to walk with them. I want you to be able to say that day that I did try to feed the hungry. I want you to be able to say that day that I did try in my life to clothe the naked. I want you to say on that day that I did try in my life to visit those who were in prison. And I want you to say that I tried to love and serve humanity.

"Yes, if you want to, say that I was a drum major. Say that I was a drum major for justice. Say that I was a drum major for peace. I was a drum major for righteousness.

"And all of the other shallow things will not matter. I won't have any money to leave behind. But I just want to leave a committed life behind.

"And that is all I want to say. If I can help somebody as I pass along, if I can cheer somebody with a well song, if I can show somebody he's traveling wrong, then my living will not be in vain.

"If I can do my duty as a Christian ought. If I can bring salvation to a world once wrought.

"If I can spread the message as the master taught. Then my living will not be in vain."

At the close of life the question will be not, how much have you got, but how much have you given; not how much have you won, but how much have you done; not how much have you saved, but how much have you sacrificed; how much have you loved and served, not how much were you honored.

Thank you.

#### HEARING HIGHLIGHTS

### HON. GEORGE BUSH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, the weeks before recess our Republican Task Force on Earth Resources and Population held three hearings.

The subjects discussed at these hearings were: the hereditary aspects of human quality, the activities of the Earth Resources Survey Program Review Committee, and the environmental problems created by our rapid rate of population growth.

So that all Members of the House can share the information we heard, I offer our hearing highlights for the RECORD:

HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 5, 1969

Dr. William Shockley, Professor, Stanford University.

Dr. Arthur Jensen, Professor, University of California at Berkeley.

Dr. Shockley stated that he feels the National Academy of Sciences has an intellectual obligation to make a clear and relevant presentation of the facts about hereditary aspects of human quality. Furthermore, he claimed our well-intentioned social welfare programs may be unwittingly producing a down breeding of the quality of the U.S. population.

Specifically, Dr. Shockley feels the National Academy of Sciences should answer the following question: "Is or is not your 1967 statement on *Human Genetics and Urban Slums* now clearly out of date and unsound as a result of the analysis published in the Winter, 1969 issue of the Harvard Educational Review by Dr. Jensen and its subsequent review by Dr. Crow?"

Dr. Shockley believes that such a question is partially justified on the basis that one of 3 authors of that 1967 statement, Dr. James Crow, now seems to feel that the statement falls to adequately consider new theories of genetic quality.

On the basis of studies completed by Dr. Arthur Jensen, Dr. Shockley claimed: "I believe that the voting citizens of the United States can and should endeavor to make their government seek objectivity to formulate programs so that every baby born has high probability of leading a dignified, rewarding and satisfying life. Letters from government organizations show that hereditary factors are essentially excluded from present studies of our social problems.

#### HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, THURSDAY, AUGUST 7, 1969

Dr. John Naugle, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Chairman of Earth Resources Survey Program Review Committee.

Mr. Leonard Jaffee, NASA.

Dr. William T. Pecora, Department of Interior.

Dr. T. C. Byerly, Department of Agriculture.

Dr. Robert M. White, Department of Commerce.

Dr. William MacDonald, Department of the Navy.

Mr. J. Robert Porter, NASA.

Dr. Naugle explained the organizational structure of the Earth Resources Survey Program Review Committee, of which he is chairman. The committee is divided into three separate subcommittees: The Status of Benefits Subcommittee, the Status of International Affairs Subcommittee, and the Status of Oceanography Subcommittee.

Thus far the ERSRPC has taken up the following items:

Status of Congressional and Budgetary issues;

Approval of Earth Resources Technology Satellites A and B;

Progress report on Benefits study;

Proposal to establish subcommittees;

Review of BOB and Congressional activity;

Discussion of Program Memoranda on ERTS;

Interagency transfer of funds;

Schedule for NASA aircraft;

FY '70 plans of ERS related efforts in different agencies;

Discussion of means to disseminate ERS program research information.

Earth Resources Technology Satellites A and B are scheduled to become operative in the first quarters of 1972 and 1973. The design lifetime of these satellites is one year. It will cost approximately \$70 million to design, build and launch ERTS A and B, but if we can then use them as prototypes, it will cost us only \$15 million to make operational repeats.

The ERSRPC has a preliminary study which estimates Earth Resources Satellite gains. In the area of water and agricultural systems management, it would cost \$1-1.5 billion to maintain an ERTS program for 10 years. It is estimated that in this country we would benefit by \$9-10 billion from such a program. Other countries would receive information worth \$10-11 billion. Dr. Naugle feels that once data is received from these satellites, the gains we will enjoy may be much greater than we can possibly estimate.

#### HEARING HIGHLIGHTS, TUESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1969

Dr. Paul R. Ehrlich, Stanford University.

Dr. Ehrlich described some of the most crucial environmental problems in this country and in the world. Before any progress can be expected in these areas, however, we must first deal with population control problems. Dr. Ehrlich suggested that strong bipartisan support of the President's proposal to establish a commission on Population Growth and the American Future would be the most constructive initial step of the Congress.

One-half of the world's population is not properly fed. By the year 2000, our present population will have doubled and yet the

people will expect to be living and eating better than they do today. Dr. Ehrlich explained that the most optimistic experts claim that the best we can hope for is only to maintain the present per capita food supply and standard of living.

Dr. Ehrlich explained that our own government must realize that all of our environmental problems are directly related to our population growth. He hopes that the Presidential commission will clearly relate the United States to the total world situation. In the year 2000, the United States will constitute 6% of the world's population, and will use at least 1/2 of the world's unrenewable resources.

The populations of the lesser-developed countries will double in 20-25 years. It would be naive to assume that those countries will be able to double their exports, imports, number of lawyers and doctors, or food production. History has proven that similar situations breed national instability and international conflicts. Dr. Ehrlich explained that because biological warfare gives every country a "poor man's hydrogen bomb," we must plan to avoid unnecessary instability. Even now unrest is growing over water supplies which are agriculturally so necessary.

The sea produces 20% of the world's animal protein. It is estimated that the sea could potentially yield 5 times the present amount without damaging the sea's own reproductive processes. Dr. Ehrlich explained that without proper legislative control we are now ruining many of our most productive fisheries by allowing fishermen to bring in as large a catch as possible.

#### SOVIET NAVAL POWER

### HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, America's supremacy of the sea has never been in greater jeopardy. The Soviet seapower has never been greater, and it is growing at a rapid rate while the United States is cutting back. The Soviets boast that their navy is second to none.

The U.S.S.R. celebrated their Navy Day this year on all the oceans of the world. Their warships were off the Florida coast during the Apollo launch; a missile-carrying cruiser with escorts appeared off Zanzibar; another cruiser stood off the coast of Finland; scores of nuclear subs prowled the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Indian Oceans; and about 65 Soviet ships patrolled in the Mediterranean. This armada outnumbered the powerful U.S. 6th Fleet. It included subs, a missile-carrying cruiser, and a helicopter carrier. It is reported that the Soviets intend to station their missile submarines along our Atlantic seaboard, in the Gulf of Mexico, and off San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Mr. President, this is the threat and the challenge to our declining seapower. Before some of my distinguished colleagues seek to reduce funds for maintaining a modern Navy, I suggest they make a comprehensive review of the Soviet naval threat. As a start, I recommend they examine the intelligence supporting the address made by Adm. T. H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, to

the Veterans of Foreign Wars in Philadelphia on August 19, 1969.

His remarks present a clear analysis of the threat and the critical situation we face in the Soviet's growing sea-power. Any further cuts in our naval power will contribute to the Soviet goal of supremacy of the sea. Adm. Sergei G. Gorshkov told the Soviet people and the world that:

The USSR today has a naval fleet and aviation equipped with nuclear rockets equal to any strategic tasks of an offensive nature on all seas and oceans of the world.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Moorer's address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

ADDRESS BY ADM. T. H. MOORER

My remarks this morning will take two directions:

I have been invited to discuss the nature and portents of a Soviet bear who has demonstrated a new fondness for deep salt water—and the opportunity to do so is as welcome as it is timely.

Secondly, I want to address our National maritime posture in terms of its ability to meet the Kremlin sea-based challenge—now and in the future.

It has been said repeatedly that, in the last few years, the Soviets have "discovered the meaning of sea power."

In some respects, as I will point out later, this seems to be the case; but there is much evidence which shows that the Kremlin is not really a newcomer to the scene of major naval enterprise.

A most likely but forgotten example is her shipbuilding history—particularly as it relates to men-of-war.

We know that from the end of the 1920's to the start of World War II, the Soviets laid down something on the order of 500 warships. These included 4 cruisers, 37 destroyers and 206 submarines delivered to the fleet prior to the war.

We know, also that at the start of that war, Stalin had 219 ships under construction in shipyards which were able to give him promise of rather amazing combatant ship production: 2 or 3 battleships, 10 cruisers, 45 destroyers and 91 submarines.

Even today, it is significant to consider that in mid-1941 almost 300 of a planned 325 submarines were either completed or building; that the keels of battleships had been laid; and that more were planned.

What we can take from this is the fact that Russian expertise in new ship construction—in quantity production of combatants of all types—is a long-established capability.

Therefore, it is obvious their talents in naval design, production and seamanship are not as new as we sometimes tend to believe.

What is new, however, is the maritime strategy of what had been a land-oriented, geography-bound Kremlin. This new strategy, in my opinion, represents both a major shift in concept and the first signs of a real and substantial challenge to free world maritime supremacy.

In my opinion, we may fix the first indications of this shift in strategy in 1956—about the time of the Suez crisis—when the Soviets clearly changed their maritime posture from one defensive in nature, to an offensive one featuring world-wide interests and capabilities. At the same time they have continued to surge ahead on new ship construction, making full use of their considerable background to which I referred earlier.

If we were to regard the impact of the Soviet shipbuilding effort from the stand-

point of numbers, it must be credited as being the most significant employable challenge appearing on the world stage since the end of World War II.

One of my main concerns as a navyman—and, as a Member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—focuses on the buildup and potential of their much-heralded submarine force.

There is no doubt in our minds—or theirs—that their submarine force today represents the main threat to free world control of the seas in the event of hostilities.

Consisting of more than 350 units, their force differs from western submarine forces in many important respects—beyond that of sheer numbers:

It is entirely of post-World War II vintage; no longer operating even one of the old ships such as comprise a large portion of western forces.

It is a three-dimensional threat: complementing torpedoes and ballistic missiles, which we have, with the guided cruise missile, now unique to the Soviet inventory.

About 12 per cent of their increasingly potent force can launch strategic missiles without warning.

More than 16 per cent carry 400 nautical mile cruise missiles designed primarily for use against land or sea targets.

The remaining 72 per cent, armed with torpedoes or mines, can be deployed to sever western lines of communications and to contest command of the seas. We are aware, too, that certain significant developments by the Soviets, presage even greater strength and operational versatility in the under-seas area.

A tremendous capital investment has given them what experts term the most modern submarine yards in the world. As one result we estimate that by 1970, Soviet nuclear construction capacity may reach 20 units a year—and that a "crash" program with no constraints on manpower or materials would allow a considerably higher number to be produced.

There is, for example, one Soviet submarine yard that has several times the area and facilities of all United States submarine yards combined.

We know several new types of Soviet submarines have come into being—most are nuclear; all are capable of increased speeds and higher performance. One new class, which emerged in 1968, is comparable to our Polaris submarine.

Their new ability to operate independently—over long distances from home—occasionally under the ice—and for extended periods of time—must be marked well.

As recently as 1963, their submarines rarely left local waters.

You may have read that the Soviet force, which steamed into our back yard not long ago, included four submarines in addition to a cruiser, destroyers, a tender and oilers.

This was typical of the new practice of making themselves "visible" almost anywhere there is deep water. In my opinion, this practice is the heart of the Kremlin effort to exert their influence wherever and whenever it will serve short or long range political, economic or military objectives.

Paradoxically, one of our own precepts has been that there is no better instrument of foreign policy or a means of establishing presence in a strategic area than by use of sea power. Evidently, the Soviets have watched us do this over the years and they know that in this century, the oceans have enabled us on many occasions to extend our power overseas and to project it ashore in defense of other free nations.

Therefore, I think it is safe to conclude that they are keen observers who have profited as a result of our experiences, tactics and developments—perhaps, even more than we have in some respects.

In other areas of their race for naval supremacy, they give unmistakable indications that they are determined to succeed.

One of these areas is their merchant marine—and the facts and figures connected with this Kremlin lunge seaward—plus a new *modus operandi* should be—and is—a cause for increasing concern.

Let me interject at this point that a nation's total sea power cannot be viewed in terms of warships alone.

Sea power, inescapably, derives from the quality and quantity of a nation's merchant marine, shipyards, fishing fleet, and oceanographic enterprise—as well as its combatant forces, i.e., the sum of its maritime potential.

If we can be said to have demonstrated a lack of appreciation for this definition, the Kremlin, on the other hand, seems not only to fully appreciate it, but is actively applying it.

In this context, the rise of their merchant marine has been phenomenal.

In 1950, they had only 525 ships totalling 2.5 million tons.

Today, we place the figures at over 1400 ships and over 11 million tons with a prediction that they may reach 20-23 million tons by 1980. Their potential is rising.

On the other hand, in 1950, we had 1900 ships or 22 million tons. Since then, we have suffered a decrease of 800 ships amounting to 7 million tons of seafight capability. Today, we have 1,100 ships or 15 million tons and while our quality is far greater, the quantity of our merchant marine is declining rapidly.

What these statistics mean to us economically overshadows equally important political and military considerations.

Our merchant ships, today, carry only about 5.6 per cent of this Nation's total foreign trade. Our national goal, which has been pronounced, is an increase to 30 per cent.

The State-owned and controlled Soviet merchantmen—in noteworthy contrast—today carry 50 per cent of the USSR's international seaborne trade, and they predict an increase to 75 per cent by 1980.

Another factor to be considered is that we are an insular nation and one having to import 66 commodities classed as strategic and critical. It is indeed a sobering fact that we must rely on foreign flag ships to carry 95 per cent of these imports.

It is also sobering to look at this from a dollars and cents standpoint. Dependence on foreign shipping obviously can add to our balance of payments deficit.

One maritime industry study showed that if the percentage of U.S. trade carried in American ships from 1960 to 1967 had been as high as existed before World War II—something like 35 per cent—our nation would have been able to count a positive balance of some 5 billion dollars instead of a deficit of about 23 billion dollars.

All told, there have been something like 35 studies of our merchant marine—its problems and its future—over the past three years alone! Typical of the several conclusions was this one from the Senate Commerce Committee:

"The clear lesson gleaned from our committee's study is beyond dispute: The U.S. merchant fleet is in critical condition, its future is in doubt, and remedial action of a major nature is essential if the United States is to remain a leading sea-faring nation."

Underscoring the criticality mentioned in this particular conclusion is age or obsolescence—and this problem affects more than one element of the American total sea power package:

80 per cent of our merchant ships have observed twentieth birthdays whereas 80 per cent of the Soviet merchant fleet is less than 10 years old.

Nearly 60 per cent of our warships, upon which our forward defense strategy depends, are 20 years old or more. But, in the Soviet navy, of the 1000 or more surface combatants and submarines currently boasted by the Kremlin, less than one-fourth of one per cent are past the 20-year mark.

Their growing maritime strength gives the Soviets the capability of projecting their presence into countries where they formerly had no appreciable influence. My most recent information shows that their ships visit nearly 900 ports in about 100 countries on an annual basis.

Thus in ports of developing countries, this is a major way they are giving credence to their claims to scientific and technological supremacy. Moreover, such visibility certainly enhances the appeal of the Soviet system as one to imitate in the case of national development.

We, in the Navy, continue to remind ourselves that the Soviets introduced missiles into Cuba by their merchant marine we must never forget, also, that the bulk of support for the war economy of North Vietnam is being taken there by Soviet merchant ships.

In the same category, two other elements of Soviet sea power are engaged in fishing and ocean research.

Their fishing fleet of over 4,000 vessels and their hydrographic-oceanographic survey and research fleet of about 130 ships is the largest and most modern in the world.

And they are deployed all over the world—off both our coasts and to all major fishing grounds, including the polar regions.

Aside from these inherent capabilities to support military and political purposes, the Soviet fishing fleet is of great economic import; it provides about 25 per cent of the protein for the Soviet diet.

Since 1954, some four billion dollars has been invested in this fleet and facilities ashore, and many trawlers costing more than two million dollars each have been constructed.

I know you have heard of the Soviet intelligence collection ships. These are mostly trawler hulls equipped with modern electronic surveillance gear and used for intelligence collection against U.S. and NATO forces, particularly naval forces. They station these ships off polaris bases. They attempt to monitor fleet exercises and tests, and they observe our space activities.

As with the other elements of their sea power, the Soviets are telling us by deeds that they are challenging us in all the oceans and that they are building sea power which can project their political and economic power as well as their military power.

I might pause to point out here that where it regards their sea-based posture, Kremlin boasting has kept pace with the step-up in their oceanic activities.

Their principal spokesman is a gentleman named Gorshkov who has the title of "Admiral of the Fleet of the Soviet Union." In reality, he is my counterpart—or other chief of naval operations.

The Soviet admiral's volubility has covered almost all aspects of their oceanic resurgence.

A statement of his a few years ago went like this:

"The flag of the Soviet navy," he said, "now proudly flies over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later, the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

On their last navy day observance, he was quoted as saying:

"The USSR today has a naval fleet and aviation equipped with nuclear rockets equal to any strategic tasks, including tasks of an offensive nature, on all the seas and oceans of the world."

Admiral Gorshkov also said in a radio broadcast to the Russian people last July:

"For the first time in its history the Soviet nation has acquired a powerful ocean-going navy. It has become the world's greatest naval power, capable of taking its line of defense out into the ocean."

These pronouncements are not without some substance; to paraphrase an old adage, it might be said that, by their words, as well

as their deeds, we shall or have come to know them.

These words take on more significance when we look at what Gorshkov was doing with his "new" navy as the Kremlin celebrated Navy Day, 1969:

In addition to those we saw off Key West, a missile-carrying cruiser with escorts appeared off Zanzibar.

Another cruiser stood off the coast of Finland.

A Soviet helicopter carrier maneuvered in the Eastern Mediterranean.

Scores of nuclear subs prowled the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Indian Oceans.

Visits to Chile and Peru were being planned.

And units of his Pacific Fleet returned from a six months cruise in the Indian and Pacific Oceans covering more than 30,000 miles and visiting 30 states. This then, broadly, is the challenge.

During interviews, after speeches, while testifying on the "hill"—and elsewhere—I have been repeatedly asked the question:

"What are we doing about it?"

My answer is that we are trying to keep things in proper perspective.

From the standpoint of the two potentially hostile fleets, it is sometimes alleged that we the U.S. Navy are espousing what might be called a "numbers game."

This is far from the truth of the matter.

The fact that Soviet submarines total out to more than 350 doesn't cause us to reach for the same number or more—nor have we ever entertained a reaction of this nature.

We don't attempt—nor should we ever attempt—to match ship for ship.

This would be foolish—in our Navy we have entirely different missions from what the Soviets see for their navy; consequently we do not think in terms of counterparts.

We have formed our Navy—and I hope we continue to form it—so that we have the capability to conduct operations commensurate with our mission.

In this regard, our capability at present—and I mean as I stand here—is adequate.

Because of our Polaris force—and that highly mobile weapons system known as the aircraft carrier—we can meet any challenge mounted against this nation on, over, or under the high seas; which as a navyman I must point out cover 70 percent of earth's surface.

That we can is based on superb people, conventional convictions and the curious habit history has of repeating itself.

Today's navyman and marine are superb. They are:

The best educated;  
The most responsible;  
The hardest working; and  
The most ingenious and imaginative young people we have ever had in the naval service.

My tribute is well-founded. Your Navy today is all-out; ships are involved in an unprecedentedly high number of diversified and difficult operations—in Southeast Asia, the western world Antarctica—or, as you saw on television recently, recovering our great space team.

Whatever the national requirements, they have been met—in spite of circumstances occasionally which might have stymied navymen of earlier days.

Our ability to meet the challenge has certainly been extended and enhanced by our conviction in the conventional weapons, weapons systems, crisis—or was as we see it in Southeast Asia.

To a large degree, the "heavyweight" of this conviction has been—and should remain—the aircraft carrier—which, as all of you undoubtedly know, is currently undergoing one of its periodic reevaluations as to our Nation's continued need for them.

I use the word "periodic" because we have

been through this before and the principles have not changed; namely:

The aircraft carrier is an extremely effective system we have to serve either a strategic or technical need for air combat forces.

With its air wing, it is a positive means by which we can control the sea or air, if required in most vital areas. We saw this at Suez, Lebanon, Cuba, Vietnam and off North Korea.

It is a logical substitute for the fast-diminishing number of U.S. air bases located at critical points worldwide. U.S. overseas air installations have dropped from nearly 150 in 1954 to around 45 in 1968.

Except for Polaris, there is probably no item of U.S. sea power the Soviets would prefer us to cut back more than our aircraft carriers.

The last point is one to restate. I believe our aircraft carriers are the key to our present superiority. With too few, or none, the Soviets would probably be the leading naval power.

It is axiomatic to note that we have been "caught with our carriers down" on the eve of two major wars.

At the start of WW II we had 8 carriers. The two-ocean war required us to surge to 111—24 of which were large attack carriers, mostly of the Essex class.

Prior to Korea, cutbacks left us with 7 carriers active; 20 in mothballs.

Again a surge became necessary from 7 to 18 at enormous cost and with severe strain on manpower and already over-burdened facilities.

At the start of Vietnam we had 15 attack carriers; later adding one more which we had to borrow from our anti-submarine warfare force—for a total of 16 which we are operating today.

Unlike our Korean war situation, we no longer have a surge capability. None are in mothballs—all the attack carriers we own are in service or being built.

These varying carrier force levels reflect the fact that there never has been a set or magic number of carriers—nor is such a number realistic. National requirements for positioning employable air strength is the sole determinant. It has been as high as 111, as we saw in WW II—what the future dictates is to be seen, but I would not be surprised if we find that 16 gave way to a national need for a greater number based on current trends and possible circumstances—particularly the need to balance the loss of forward land-bases.

How we arrive at carrier force level figures is often misunderstood. Actually, it is the American people who determine the so-called "magic number."

Attack carrier force levels are determined by the national strategy.

During times of peace, our national objectives and our foreign policy determine the national strategy and the peacetime military posture required by that strategy.

During time of war, the number of carriers is directly related to the strategy of that particular conflict. For example, during WW II the nature of the campaign in the Pacific caused us to rely heavily upon carriers, and, as I pointed out, the U.S. Navy had well over 100 carriers of all kinds in its operating forces during WW II.

Today, our national strategy relies heavily upon the concept of forward deployed general purpose forces capable of responding to a range of contingencies in overseas areas of primary national interest. These forward deployed general purpose forces provide this country with a flexibility of response.

An effective tactical air capability is an essential element of these general purpose forces. Both sea-based and land-based tactical air are required in order to provide support for the forward deployed concept of our planned national strategy, across the range of contingencies.

There are those who say that the carrier is vulnerable, exorbitantly expensive and has outlived its usefulness—and support their contention by pointing out that the Soviets would have had them if they were a wise investment.

Taking last things first, geography, more than any other reason, has kept the Soviets out of the aircraft carrier business. The routes of egress from Soviet naval bases to the open oceans are, by way of choke points, controlled by other powers. For an aircraft carrier such a situation could spell disaster in a shooting war. If the Soviets were to gain control of the points, however, the situation might change.

Where questions of carrier vulnerability, high cost and continued usefulness arise—as they have, consider these key points:

In some 50 wars or near-wars since 1946, we have not lost a carrier or had one damaged owing to hostile action. Even counting WW II, no carrier of Essex, or later design has been lost.

None has ever been captured or used against us.

Even when damaged, such as *Enterprise* was by several of her own bombs exploding, she could have been back in full action in a few hours if necessary.

We believe the carrier is less vulnerable than a land base—the record shows that carriers are no more vulnerable than any alternative.

Cost-wise, the overall price of a carrier air wing, including carrier escorts and support, is no greater than land based air wings and their base support. We are in the same "ball-park" here.

As to continued usefulness, I believe I have covered this aspect—the nuclear carrier, *Nimitz*, has a predicted operating life-span of 30 years, and there is no doubt in my mind we are going to need her until she reaches mandatory retirement.

As I conclude, let me say that the cost of our military programs is being debated and that we are on the threshold of far-reaching decisions.

I know that all of us—you veterans of many wars we have had to fight—and those of us on duty today, welcome such debate as long as things are kept in a reasonable perspective.

We have heard, seen and read:

That our Nation is overly-concerned with militarism;

That a military-industrial complex exists which is an evil entity;

That congressional indulgence of the military man and machine has put us where we are today;

I say such indulgence, if it existed, has been fortuitous.

The enlightened Congressmen who have fully recognized the Nation's needs can be thanked for where we are today—and they will put us where we need to be tomorrow, next year, and anytime thereafter.

I wish our critics would tell us what's wrong with being number one—the richest, healthiest, happiest, most progressive Nation of all time—

And for the time being, one that can exercise that most precious of our national attributes: freedom of action on the oceans. Thank you.

## RAILROADS

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it seems as though passenger railroad service is fast becoming a thing of the past.

The arguments for discontinuance are many and complex, running from financial disaster on the part of the railroad companies to obsolescence of the system.

The pressure for discontinuance is great and is put forth in such a way that one would almost think that there is only one side to the story.

The Washington Post recently ran a two-part series on passenger trains by James E. Clayton. Mr. Clayton's story is a fair and informative analysis of the situation, and deserves the attention of my colleagues. I submit it at this time for the RECORD:

#### PASSENGER TRAINS ON GRIM TIMETABLE

(By James E. Clayton)

For a decade or so, the railroads have been telling anyone who would listen that railroad passenger service in the United States is dying. Now the moment of death is almost predictable. It will come, except for commuter trains and perhaps those in two or three densely populated corridors, certainly within ten years, probably within five years, unless the railroads or the federal government change present policies.

In retrospect, it is possible to pick the time at which passenger trains went into their final throes. It was December, 1966, when the Stanford Research Institute reported to the Southern Pacific that it could not find an economically sound base for railroad passenger service in the West. The institute recommended that those Western railroads which had not already given up on passenger service adopt a "deficit reduction policy," a policy which would lead inevitably to death.

The railroads took that report to heart. Confronted with it, those railroad executives who had contended that there was a future for the intercity passenger train found the task of justifying passenger traffic deficits to their stockholders almost impossible. Added to it was the decision of the Post Office Department to remove railways post office cars from service. As a result, many railroads began programs of passenger train curtailment.

In 1966, for example, passenger trains traveled 164.3 million miles. In 1968, the total was 124.6—a drop of 24 per cent. In the same period, the miles traveled by noncommuter passengers fell about a third as did the revenues attributed to passenger trains. The decrease in revenues for hauling mail on passenger trains accounted for half of this drop. As could be expected, the deficits of passenger service, as reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission, jumped by more than 20 per cent in two years to a total of \$486 million in 1968.

During the last 12 months alone, the number of intercity trains has dropped 20 per cent. There are less than 500 remaining in the entire nation and petitions to discontinue about 50 of those are pending before the ICC. Dallas now has no passenger service. The last train on the St. Louis-Detroit, once the home of the famed Wabash Cannonball, is threatened with replacement by a bus. Even the California Zephyr, which provides the finest ride in the country as it cuts through the Colorado Rockies and the Feather River Canyon in California, may not live until next summer.

Railroad executives claim that the death of the long-distance passenger train is inevitable. The airplane has stripped it of passengers who are in a hurry and the private automobile, with the interstate highway system opening up the countryside, has taken away the rest. Only in places like the East Coast corridor, where millions of people live, where distances between major cities are relatively short, and where the highways are still jammed, is there any chance of survival for noncommuter trains.

The argument has now been bolstered by a study conducted by the ICC into the actual costs of railroad operation. The study claims that eight major railroads—the C & O-B & O in the East, the Southern and Seaboard Coast Line in the South, the Illinois Central in the Midwest, and the Santa Fe, Great Northern, Missouri Pacific, and Union Pacific in the West—lost \$118 million in 1968 by operating passenger trains. None of these made money the ICC says, with the loss ranging from \$3.5 million on the Missouri Pacific which carried only 300,000 passengers to \$26.6 million on the Santa Fe which carried 1.5 million passengers.

The ICC calculates that for every dollar the Santa Fe took in for passenger service it spent \$1.80. The figures for the other railroads are similar, ranging from \$1.45 spent for each dollar received by the Illinois Central to \$2.43 spent for each dollar of revenue by the Southern. Add to this the fact that the average age of the railroad coaches now owned by the eight railroads is 19 years and that replacement of them must soon begin and you get a feeling for the size of the railroad problem. The ICC estimates that within 10 years about 40 per cent of the existing cars should be replaced at a cost of \$132 million.

It is possible to argue with those figures or to contend that bad management, not the preferences of the traveling public, is the reason for them. But it is impossible to argue with what the ICC told Congress: "Significant segments of the remaining intercity service, except for rail service in high density population corridors . . . will not survive the next few years without a major change in federal and carrier policies."

Only one of the railroads studied by the ICC has shown an increase in passengers during the last decade. That was the Illinois Central which carries heavy traffic between the Southern states and Chicago and from two large universities. Its financial loss in 1968, according to the new study, was \$5.4 million.

The case of the California Zephyr illustrates the industry's view of its problem. In a speech a year and a half ago, the president of the Burlington Lines which operates it compared its costs between Chicago and Denver with those of a 727 jet airplane. Average revenue for the train was \$5,000 per trip, for the airplane, \$3,400. Costs were \$5,400 per train trip and \$2,500 per plane trip. Result: a loss on every run for the railroad and a profit for the airline.

Of course, passenger trains are only a small fraction of railroad operations in the country today. Only about 5 per cent of railroad revenues come from passenger service and the profit on freight more than wipes out the passenger deficit.

Nevertheless, the facts of the situation today raise two serious questions that only Congress can answer. Is railroad passenger service worth continuing outside of corridors like Washington-New York? If it is, how can it be saved from imminent death?

#### SHOULD GOVERNMENT RUN THE RAILROADS?

(By James E. Clayton)

The easy way to explain the current death throes of intercity passenger train service is to blame it all on stupid management. Passenger trains would still be popular and profitable, the argument goes, if only the men who run the railroads had the foresight, imagination and daring of those who run the airlines.

There is just enough truth in that argument to make it sound plausible. No one has any idea how many potential passengers have forsworn train travel forever because of bad service encountered in the past. Dirty trains, surly crewmen, outdated policies, and the refusal of most railroads to attempt any modernization of such processes as the making of reservations or the buying of tickets has

undoubtedly helped the airlines and the automobiles take passengers away.

But it is not the whole story. There are still some fine long-haul passenger trains in operation—from Washington to Florida and Atlanta, from Chicago to Florida, New Orleans, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle. And on many of those runs the railroads still lose money.

Their inability (or refusal, as you like) to modernize trains and crew requirements have run up costs. So have the mausoleum-like stations that sprinkle the landscape and the refusal of state regulatory agencies to let them abandon many unproductive local stops. Strangely enough, while all other forms of transportation have been speeding up in recent years, railroads have been slowing down. Between 1953 and 1965, airlines cut their travel time from Chicago to San Francisco in half, bus lines cut theirs by 10 per cent, and the railroad travel time lengthened by 12 per cent. The Denver Zephyr made the run from Chicago to Denver in a little more than 12 hours in 1936 but the best train on the same line now takes almost 17 hours for the trip. The reasons are speed limits imposed for safety by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the fact that in 1936 the run was non-stop while the train makes a dozen or so stops today to serve small towns once served by now non-existent trains.

The Interstate Commerce Commission's recent report on the out-of-pocket deficits on passenger service did not attempt to study whether passenger trains can be operated profitably. There are steps that could be taken which would certainly reduce the deficits—eliminating stops, speeding up and improving service, cutting station overhead, changing crew requirements, and so on—but these would require a complete revolution in railroad management and practices as well as a high degree of cooperation between management and labor and between the railroads and various state regulatory bodies.

Given the current posture of the railroads, no such revolution is on the horizon. What the railroads now have in mind is quite clear: either to get out of the passenger business entirely except for commuter lines and a tiny handful of trains in densely populated corridors or to have the federal government subsidize them and provide low-cost financing for the replacement of worn-out equipment.

Such a program might make sense if the railroads had a reputation for competing with other modes of transportation for passengers. But given the history of the last two decades, there is no guarantee that anything would change except the size of the subsidy.

One frequently mentioned alternative is for Congress to create a national railroad agency, perhaps along the lines of Comsat, to operate passenger trains by leasing them from the railroads. It would determine where and when passenger trains should be operated, promote railroad travel, and perhaps take over the entire business except for the actual manning and operation of the trains.

The ICC asked several groups what they thought of this idea and got a flat rejection from the Association of American Railroads. However, it got an endorsement for that kind of approach from the railway labor unions, from a majority of the state public utility commissioners and from the membership of the National Association of Railroad Passengers.

But even the creation of such an agency would not answer the basic question of whether the passenger trains make any sense in the nation's transportation scheme of the 1970s.

Perhaps the major reason that passenger service is now facing an imminent death is its inability during the last two decades to compete with automobiles and airplanes. For

the business traveler, who wants to get there and back as rapidly as possible, the airplane is hard to beat. For the family traveling on vacation or otherwise, the interstate highway system has made automobile travel easy.

It may be that the airways and the new highways will be so crowded in a few years that people will return to the trains. In that case, the overnight runs such as New York or Washington to Chicago or Atlanta and Chicago to New Orleans or Denver might attract businessmen who get tired of circling airports. Or the vacation traffic might boom with the families of an affluent society deciding that the easiest way to see the country is to take a train and rent a car.

But that kind of situation may not develop. A whole generation has now grown up regarding the railroads as a method of getting somewhere only if all other methods fail. This factor alone has convinced some railroad men that there is no future at all in passenger trains except for commuters and in short corridors—New York to Washington or Boston, Chicago to Cleveland, and San Diego to San Francisco.

Given the large sums of tax money poured into highways and airports by all levels of government, the railroads believe that governmental policies have knocked all the props out from under their passenger business. They are now in the process of telling the federal government that it must either prop them back up, take over, or consign the long-haul passenger trains to the Smithsonian.

**MEDAL OF DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE AWARDED TO DR. RALPH E. GIBSON**

**HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, Dr. Ralph E. Gibson, of Chevy Chase, Md., recently retired after 22 years as director of the Applied Physics Laboratory of the Johns Hopkins University.

On July 9, 1969, Dr. Gibson's contributions were recognized by award of the Medal for Distinguished Public Service, highest honor bestowed by the Department of Defense on a civilian.

Robert A. Frosch, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, made the presentation in ceremonies at the laboratory. The citation accompanying the Medal lauded Dr. Gibson for "distinguished public service and exceptionally outstanding contributions to the Department of Defense in areas of fleet ballistic missile systems, military and scientific satellites and supporting research and exploratory development."

During the quarter century Dr. Gibson has headed the laboratory, it has grown into one of the Nation's leading scientific institutions. In recent years it has broadened its work to seek improvements in biomedical engineering, urban transportation, and other civilian problems. For example, an automatic motor once used to actuate the wing of a missile now operates an experimental artificial hand.

Born in England, Dr. Gibson is a graduate of the University of Edinburgh where he received his Ph. D. in physical

chemistry. He came to the United States in 1924 on a Carnegie research fellowship and later served as an adjunct professor of chemistry at the George Washington University.

During World War II, he served as the first director of research of the Allegany Ballistics Laboratory, Cumberland, Md.

This latest accolade for Dr. Gibson is a well-deserved tribute upon his retirement.

LETTER INDICATES TONE OF THE TIMES

**HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, beneath the seemingly quiet surface of events which has characterized these past summer months, I am beginning to sense more and more restlessness by the people of our Nation.

I believe much of the tension is created by the continually growing alienation between individual citizens and the institutions which surround them. And it is not just the troubles in our slums and ghettos and the insurgence arising on our campuses which stand as powerful testimony to this gap. At an increasing rate, the anger and the fury comes from what President Nixon likes to term "the forgotten Americans"—the guy with a couple of kids who owns his home, has a car or two, and considers himself a happy member of the great middle class.

We see this anger vented often now. And the topics covered range over a wide subject area—from tax reform and Federal spending levels to continued concern and bewilderment over this country's military and foreign policies.

Over the past months, the degree of this sentiment has noticeably stepped up. I saw it in the responses made by many constituents to my annual questionnaire; I see it in the tone of letters sent daily to my office.

Just before the recent recess, I received a letter from one of my constituents, Mr. Robert Snell, who lives in my hometown of Monterey Park, Calif. Although I certainly do not agree with all its points, I would like to share this letter with the rest of my colleagues because I think it aptly represents, in a concise manner, the emotions and frustrations typical of so many Americans.

The letter follows:

MONTEREY PARK, CALIF.,

August 8, 1969.

DEAR SIR: Today my son left for Vietnam; not by choice, but due to the bungling, incapable and irresponsible type of leadership we have been faced with the past few years, including the past seven months. His mother and I spent 21 years teaching him a sense of pride, right from wrong, and the true meaning of law and order, and we can truthfully say he has always been a first class American citizen. I guess that is the reason he accepted his notice to report for induction with never a thought of being a draft dodger or trying to avoid it in any way.

Actually, he or any of the rest of the draftees fighting in Vietnam should not

even be in the service; it is strictly unconstitutional. Of course the Constitution of the U.S. hasn't meant anything as far as the rights of we law abiding citizens of the country have been concerned for several years. It seems to me that when I was studying the history of the United States during my high school days, there was an article, number thirteen, of the constitution, that made the following statement:

"Neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime whereof the Party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the United States, or any place subject to their jurisdiction."

I really can't make any claims to brilliancy but my interpretation of the foregoing statement definitely concludes that the drafting of men comes under the classification of involuntary servitude.

Up until the past few years I have always been proud to say that I was an American citizen. I always considered myself a law-abiding person, was patriotic enough to volunteer during World War II, spending two years in the South Pacific. However, during the past five years my way of thinking has certainly changed and I blame it all on the way our so-called representatives, senators, judges and leaders in government have let this country become what it is today. I have always been registered as a Democrat, but never voted a straight ticket; always tried to vote for the better man, regardless of party. From now on, I can sincerely say that I'm going to be even more careful to check the qualifications, and just what he really stands for before casting my vote.

President Nixon made the statement while campaigning: "That it was time for new leadership when a fourth-rate nation, like Korea, could push a powerful nation, like the United States, around". Well, as far as I'm concerned we still don't have that leadership; it's still the same old game of politics that we had before he took office. Sure, he leads the people to believe that he is doing something in Vietnam with all of his baloney about troop withdrawal. He doesn't say anything about all of the men that are being sent over there to replace those coming back; most of whom had spent eleven or twelve months there anyway and were due to come home. Naturally, he chose prime television time to show the boys getting off of the planes at McChord Field, in Washington State. Our television station gave full coverage to the happy occasion; however, a few minutes later the commentator said: "Now we'll show you another occasion, not so happy". This contained scenes of, as many or more, servicemen boarding planes leaving for Vietnam, from McChord Field. Mr. Nixon no doubt didn't plan on having that part of McChord Field included in his little political scene. During his four month training period at Fort Ord, Calif., my son said that there were from four to five hundred combat troops sent out weekly, to Vietnam. This didn't include the support units, mechanics, cooks, clerks, etc., that also had orders for Vietnam. No doubt there are the same percentages of men being sent out from Fort Lewis, Wash. and various other forts throughout the country; so just who is Mr. Nixon trying to fool with his withdrawal farce?

I also might take the liberty of using Mr. Nixon's campaign statement, with a little different phrasing. It also seems to me that it's time for new leadership in this country, when fourth-class citizens, criminals, rioters, looters and other types of undeniably undesirable people can get away with causing so much chaos, disorder, disruption of schools and fear in this country. What about the businessmen, who have their stores burned and looted? And we decent people who aren't even safe on the streets anymore, day or night; don't we have any rights? What about all of these dope

peddlers who are infesting our schools like rats? Might as well be bringing Bubonic Plague. Why isn't something being done about that situation?

Give me back the good old days when we had some law and order in this country; dope peddlers and criminals were taken care of properly and looters were shot on sight. If I were just newly married I would make sure I didn't have any children as this country isn't a fit place to raise children anymore.

Although all of our so-called leaders deny it, this country is definitely sick, and I'm sick right along with it. I'm sick of seeing my tax money going to foreign aid, welfare payments, government waste, the billions of dollars spent on space programs, protection of the criminal element, the asinine decisions of the courts, the inequity of the tax structure and the lack of law and order in this country.

Despite all of the foreign aid, just show me one country that has shown any friendship or appreciation as a result of receiving these billions of dollars in loans and materials. Just talk to anyone that has travelled in Europe, or anywhere else in the world and they will all tell you that the people and governments of those countries hate our guts and everything the United States stands for. Some of them no doubt have reason to; our wealthy citizens and big companies exploit them, on the pretense of improving their countries, building factories, mining, drilling for oil, etc. While all of the time they are only making millions of dollars for themselves. Then, when the people get fed up with the situation, and uprise against them; our government, at our expense, has to protect the interests of these big companies. I say let these parasitic companies invest their money, build factories, etc. at their own risk.

As to the welfare situation, I'm entirely against giving able-bodied people something for nothing, at my expense. I'm fifty years old; have worked ever since my first year in high school and have never expected to get something for nothing as long as I could do a day's work. I'll go along with taking care of the handicapped or people who are sickly or too old to work, but as for the rest of them, I say if they don't work, they don't eat and to hell with them. The W.P.A. might have not been the best thing in the world but at least the people had to get out and do something constructive for their money. Why bring farm laborers into this country from Mexico and other places? Put these able-bodied parasites, who are on welfare, out there and make them work for a living for a change. If the wages they make doing that isn't enough for a decent existence, then make up the difference out of the welfare money; but at least make them get out and work.

The space program and putting a man on the moon is no doubt a wonderful achievement, but the money that has been spent could certainly do a lot of good right here on earth. There are too many problems right down here to be solved, making this a better place to live, to be spending all of that money on some bleak, barren and lifeless planet. At the rate taxes and the cost of living continues to spiral upward I just don't think I can afford the trip to Mars.

Sure would be nice to know that there was some law and order again; be able to take a family to the park, without being set upon by a gang of hoodlums; or have to have the children watching a sex orgy or pot party in progress. It's quite a shame and disgrace when decent citizens can't even walk the streets of the nation's capital at night, for fear of being robbed, raped, beaten or even killed. Sure, Mr. Nixon was going to take care of that situation also, but I've yet to hear any reports of any improvement.

So, in conclusion I'll go along with the statement that it's time for new leadership. Let's either go all out with all of the forces we have to win the war in Vietnam, or get

the hell out of there entirely. Let's forget about the result of the elections in 1970, or even the future, which is what Mr. Nixon seems to be worrying about, more so than lives of our Sons' and relatives.

This is just one of the many letters I'm writing various representatives, senators, the President and anyone else I think might help bring this country back to normal. Since you are the Representative from our district, I wanted you to be the first to know just how I feel about the present state of affairs. I might repeat again that from now on, I'll be very careful in making my decision as to just who I will cast my vote for, and try to influence everybody I talk to, to do the same.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT I. SNELL.

#### SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA REGIONAL HEALTH COUNCIL IS BECOMING COUNTRY DOC'S DREAM COME TRUE

#### HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on the hills and in the valleys of a nine-county area of southern West Virginia a vision is coming true. It is the dream, shared by many, of a country doctor to provide adequate medical care, preventive and corrective, to the residents of this rural area in the heart of Appalachia. The Southern West Virginia Regional Health Council, under the guidance of its chairman, Dr. Daniel Hale, began in August its second year of medical service to the people of Fayette, Logan, McDowell, Mercer, Mingo, Monroe, Raleigh, Summers, and Wyoming Counties. The program was initiated and is being carried forward under the Appalachian Regional Development Act. It has been my privilege and responsibility to sponsor this measure.

Dr. Hale, with the assistance and cooperation of many colleagues and interested persons, both public officials and private citizens, has initiated a comprehensive and innovative attack on the health problems in these nine counties.

An article in the Raleigh Register, Beckley, W. Va., of July 29, 1969, describes the goals, accomplishments, and excitement of this program which is tangible evidence of progress which can be achieved through the cooperation of citizens and their government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Southern West Virginia Regional Health Council Is Becoming Country Doc's Dream Come True," by Niles Jackson, be printed in the RECORD.

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

SOUTHERN WEST VIRGINIA REGIONAL HEALTH COUNCIL IS BECOMING COUNTRY DOC'S DREAM COME TRUE

(By Niles Jackson)

PRINCETON.—The dream of a country doctor is being turned into a massive assault on disease, ignorance and the destitute economy that plagues these craggy Appalachian hills.

In a land where "toothaches are an accepted thing," Dr. Daniel Hale has molded

his dream into an imaginative regional health program that is approaching a concept of total planning—housing, health and economy.

Those working with Hale's Southern West Virginia Regional Health Council believe if the idea is successful here, it can offer a new life for similarly troubled areas elsewhere in the world.

The far-reaching plan to revitalize this mountainous, nine-county region and its 500,000 residents was turned into reality last August with \$5 million in federal funding.

The council, under the guidance of Hale and Dr. Allen Dyer, intends to scatter satellite health centers throughout the area. Programs in the planning stages include use of a medical helicopter and a six-car traveling railroad clinic.

Projected plans for the next five years would put the council to work in the fields of housing, stream and air pollution control, sewage disposal, recreation, industrial expansion and manpower training.

The aura surrounding the council has caught the imagination of the area's professional people and several have moved back from more lucrative urban practices to work with the council.

The current staff numbers 115. Of these, 75 are professional people—doctors, nurses and others. Dr. Hale and the council's 300 board members donate their time and services on a part-time basis.

The council has requested another \$5 million in federal aid and \$6 million for new projects for the present fiscal year, Dyer said this week.

He said the council expects to be self-sufficient within five years because its programs are geared to a fee basis. It also intends to train its own personnel, drawing 200 yearly from the region's unemployed.

When possible, Dyer said, the services will be paid for by the recipients, or the costs will be absorbed by the council. The council is getting more and more of its money from local and private sources, he said.

The wide array of medical services, with the addition of psychiatrists, psychologists and physicians expert in public health, nutrition, dentistry and family planning, will prove more comprehensive than those found in many cities "when looking at the overall, general picture," Dyer said.

Hale, a native of Princeton, and his associates chose this medical no man's land to test their theory because it is one of the country's hard-pressed areas—some of the worst in Appalachia, they said.

Dyer, who worked in the area for 10 years with the U.S. Public Health Service before joining the council, said the region has "very high rates of typhoid, infectious hepatitis, heart disease, chronic dysentery, tuberculosis and just about any communicable disease you can name."

For example, hypertension heart disease occurs at the rate of 65.3 per 100,000 persons in Raleigh County, while the national average is 37, Dyer said. The incidence of infant mortality is 33 compared with 24.8 nationally.

"The children run a course of health hazards more acute than anywhere in the United States," a council booklet says.

Hale said "the need for a regional health program here hit me several years ago when I visited a public school and saw most of the second and third graders with mouths full of cavities."

"I talked to the principal and he said toothaches are an accepted thing. Many people accept illness as a way of life and never see a doctor until they are critically ill," the general practitioner said.

The region had several health centers before the program got under way, Hale said, but a fierce mountain pride kept many of the poor from using them.

Despite handicaps and the size of the job,

much has been done during the first year.

A heart screening service examined more than 15,000 children in seven months and found 13 serious heart defects. Several hundred other cases were isolated for additional examinations.

More than 400 women were examined in a cancer clinic and six were diagnosed as having the disease. Five have undergone surgery and the sixth is receiving cobalt treatments.

A family planning clinic in one county drew 400 women and a clinic for diabetes examined 100 persons. Students are being treated for tuberculosis and mental health services now are available in all nine counties.

Within a few months, construction will begin on a solid waste disposal project in Logan County, a public health center in Fayette County, and health centers in Mercer and Raleigh counties will be expanded, the council said.

Longer-range projects include a 24-hour referral service and poison control project, satellite health centers in five counties and extended care facilities in six more counties.

The council plans to lease telephone lines and radio facilities, establish a data management system, build up to 100 housing units and devise an emergency care system.

The council currently is using the nation's first computer analysis of heart conditions through telephone hookups to Mt. Sinal Hospital in New York.

Dr. Hale, who describes himself as "just a country doctor," said he has talked with representatives of several industries who, having heard of the council's work, are considering locating new plants in the region.

"This can be a new beginning for southern West Virginia," he said, "a renaissance, if you like."

#### THE MOON AND 1976

### HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, increasing attention is being given to the bicentennial of the American Revolution. The National Commission recently met to discuss ways and means of observing our 200th anniversary, and later this month, the Commission will meet again to conduct hearings on selection of a city for the principal national observance.

James Reston, in a column appearing in the New York Times, summed up the importance of the bicentennial, and I would like to bring to the attention of other Members his remarks which appeared in the July 18 addition of the New York Times entitled "The Moon and 1976":

THE MOON AND 1976

(By James Reston)

One of the lessons of the present spectacular voyage to the moon is that the American mind and the American political system seem to need great challenges and clear goals to work at their best.

Humiliations and disasters help, too. The American people are watching this flight with their uttermost pride, but it was the hurt to their pride—first in the Soviet Sputnik 1 flight of 1957 and then in Yuri Gagarin's first human venture into space in 1960—that created the psychological and political conditions for the United States decision to go to the moon.

Even then, President Kennedy might not

have aimed so high as the moon if it had not been for his disastrous gamble at the Bay of Pigs. After that it was clear that something had to be done. Thus the formula for success: disaster, challenge, and a vivid objective to be achieved by a date certain.

#### THE NEW GOAL

Fortunately, these same ingredients exist for another great adventure in the seventies. It would be hard to describe our race relations as anything but a disgrace, and Vietnam makes the Bay of Pigs look like a regrettable incident. The challenge to the American pride, imagination and organized intelligence of these stains on the national record is clear and the two hundredth anniversary of 1776 is just close enough and yet far enough away to give us a definite target in time.

#### THE COMPLICATED JOURNEY

It is, to be sure, a more complicated journey, it is harder to concentrate the mind on creating a just and decent society than it is to mobilize the intelligence and machinery to rocket to the moon. Human nature is more volatile and less predictable than the chemicals, fuels, and measurable mathematics of rockets and electronics. Still, the challenge is clear and the anniversary of the nation's birth has emotional and political possibilities that should not be underestimated.

In July of 1969, we are just seven years away from the 200th year since the Declaration of Independence. That is two years less than the time between the decision to go to the moon and the present culmination of that decision, but it is a goal of great historical significance, and it provides an opportunity to channel the energies and talents of the American people toward the national purpose and ideal.

That is not a new idea. President Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon have all talked occasionally about it. The citizens of Philadelphia actually led the parade, and committees of distinguished citizens have been formed all over the country to prepare for the great celebration.

But it has not yet become a central point and aim of national policy and is not part of the conscious public mind. The funds, the brains, the organization that went into the objective of going to the moon have not been mobilized and directed toward achieving certain definite social and economic objectives, and this is a missed opportunity.

#### THE PRESIDENT'S OPPORTUNITY

There is an enormous difference between appointing committees for a celebration seven years away and setting a goal for achieving definite national, state, and community goals. It takes leadership from the White House, organization and funds to create a national awareness of problems to be solved in thousands of communities by July of 1976, but this could be done.

It is much more difficult than persuading the Congress to appropriate funds to beat the Russians to the moon and then organizing the scientists, engineers and industry to produce the machines and train a limited number of brave men.

#### THE EDUCATIONAL PROBLEM

Landing successfully on 1976 involves making the voyage and the goal, or at least the question, clear to the leaders of every community of the nation, but the thing could be done. Not with the precision of the astronauts, to be sure, but greatly to the achievement and redemption of the ideals of the American Declaration.

If done, this might be more important to the Republic in the end than landing on the moon. But the moon project may have given us the key. It had imagination. It mobilized intelligence. It had a specific goal within a specific time, and the goal was to do something no man had ever done before.

Maybe the analogy is wrong. Space science and political science could not be more different. But the whole idea of America was to create a society nobody had ever created before, and it could be that the moon-men, with their concentration, purpose and time schedule have shown us the way.

### THE HARRIMAN ENIGMA

#### HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the RECORD an article by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., which appeared in the August 24, 1969, issue of the Hearst newspapers, entitled "The Harriman Enigma."

"What Mr. Hearst says about "Honest Ave, the hair splitter," is true of much of the Democrat leadership. As Mr. Harriman criticizes Mr. Lodge for failing to do what he, Mr. Harriman, could not do in much greater time, so also are the Democrats castigating the Nixon administration because it is not doing many things which the Democrats, with full control of Congress and the White House, did not do when it would have been easy for them to take such actions. The editorial follows:

#### THE HARRIMAN ENIGMA

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

SAN FRANCISCO.—For some months I have been increasingly puzzled by public statements from Averell Harriman, our former chief negotiator at the Paris peace talks, in which he seemed to suggest that continuation of the Vietnam conflict is all this country's fault.

What amounted to sniping at the Nixon war policies hit a new low this week when Harriman took a shot at the integrity of the President and indirectly—at that of our present chief negotiator in Paris, Cabot Lodge.

"We've been talking peace in Paris," he said, "but we haven't really been making an effort to stop the fighting."

Harriman declared further that he is convinced the White House is still seeking a military solution in Vietnam and added that the United States keeps mulling opportunities to de-escalate the fighting.

These latest remarks by a man so long regarded as an elder statesman are more than puzzling. They—and the attitude they reveal—are downright amazing.

I have known the former New York governor well for many years, both socially and professionally, and always have considered him as a friend. I remember kidding him when he tried unsuccessfully to snag the Democratic presidential nomination back in 1956, by calling him "Honest Ave, the hair splitter."

It grieves me to have to say that, in my estimation, his latest attack is neither fair nor statesmanlike. It grieves me, but in a matter of this kind the welfare of my country comes first.

Just what Averell thinks he might be accomplishing is beyond me. He certainly is not helping the President or Cabot Lodge in their attempts to achieve peace. And if he thinks he is helping the Democrats of his party politically, his reasoning sounds senile.

The only half-way sensible explanation is that he is suffering from a bad case of sour

grapes—that he is somehow trying to prove that his own failure in Paris would have turned out differently if he had stayed there instead of being replaced.

Even this fails to hold water much better than a sieve. Harriman has spent a great portion of his mature life in diplomatic missions. He should be among the last to criticize those engaged in the most delicate diplomacy of all—trying to end an incredibly complex war.

Furthermore, he knows from bitter personal experience in Paris just how unyielding and uncompromising the Communists are. For him to suggest that the enemy might have responded more favorably if we had been more cooperative is sheer nonsense.

Harriman knows darn well that it is the United States and our South Vietnamese allies which have made every single move toward ending the war; that the enemy has offered not a single compromise whatever.

He also knows, just as everyone knows, that the Nixon administration has gone even further than that of Lyndon Johnson. Not only has the Johnson bombing halt been continued, American troops are being withdrawn.

As Secretary of State William Rogers declared on Wednesday, this country has taken every sensible risk to end the war and intends to continue the policy, apparently by withdrawing even more of our troops in the months immediately ahead.

You simply don't win a war by withdrawing your troops, yet Harriman says President Nixon is still looking for a military victory. Not even the Fulbrights and McGovern have said anything as weird as that.

So the Nixon administration hasn't stepped up anything except possibly to increase our willingness to run military risks to further de-escalate the fighting.

All this seems so obvious. And that is why the Harriman statements, coming from one as informed as he is, as experienced as he is, are so puzzling and so astonishing.

Instead of putting the blame for lack of progress in Paris where it belongs—on the unyielding enemy—Harriman blames his own country and its leadership.

I can no longer call Averill Harriman "Honest Ave." I won't call him dishonest, either, but there definitely is a kind of intellectual dishonesty involved in his behavior.

At the very least he is not sticking to the record; to what he knows is true. For he knows that both the Johnson and Nixon administrations have made the most amazing concessions in the hope of peace.

It is simply not in accord with the spirit of truth to suggest, as Harriman suggests, that we might have had peace now by some mysterious means, other than what we already have tried, and are trying.

Sure, you could get peace tomorrow just by pulling all our troops out of Vietnam; by abandoning our allies and our commitments. Everybody knows that, and Harriman in particular.

If he wants us to lay down our arms and quit, why doesn't he come right out and say so?

And if he doesn't, why does he belittle the motives of his own countrymen who are doing their best to end the war?

You tell me. I can't figure it out. My old friend has become an enigma to me.

The final record will show that this dreadful war was stretched out for unnecessary years—and that thousands of American men died unnecessarily—because of the prattlings of soft-headed people who would take peace at any price.

These people range from beatniks all the way up to our lawmakers and even to our statesmen.

All are guilty of giving aid and comfort and encouragement to the enemy by their chattering.

And that's the truth.

### SEX EDUCATION—HEADSTART

#### HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the American Psychological Association is holding a convention in Washington, D.C.

While one group of the psychologists were doing their thing by marching on the White House to stage an antiwar protest, another group on a panel at the same convention discussed sex education guidelines for infants by recommending that parents should "get together to encourage, help, and foster sexual play in their preadolescent children,"—and envisioned "sexual playpens" in nurseries.

The psychologists may sound really "hung up"—but consider that Robert Finch and James Farmer, of HEW, are already talking about the education of infants 14 to 21 months of age and projecting programs for unborn children.

Is this what "Headstart" implies?

Mr. Speaker, I include several news articles:

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 4, 1969]

SEXUAL ANXIETY BEGINS WITH THE DIAPER

Psychologists offered unorthodox views of sexual anxiety, puritanism and the sex revolution at today's sessions of the American Psychological Association.

Dr. Robert A. Harper, a Washington psychologist, told one group that parents should get together "to encourage, help and foster sexual play in their pre-adolescent children."

This approach, he said including such devices as parent-supervised "plan pens" for nursery school children, could prevent "sexual hangups" caused by America's "prudish culture."

Dr. Harold Greenwald, a New York psychologist appearing on the same panel, blamed the first signs of sexual anxiety on the mother diapering her child. He said films show the mother always removes children's hands from their sex organs.

Greenwald complained that even enlightened parents, who tell their children all about sex, forget one thing—"that it's fun. They almost never explain that sex is exquisitely pleasurable."

To make sex fun, Harper's program calls for a more open attitude on contraception and abortion. Population control—even going as far as taking away most persons' right to produce—is also part of his plan.

"Fear of pregnancy and venereal disease still has strong puritanical force in preventing many young people from achieving constructive sex attitudes and actions," said Harper.

Referring to his "play pen" proposal, Harper said "vigorous and joyful sex play in the nursery school is obviously shocking and abhorrent only to those who still think sex is a basically undesirable activity."

His plan for sexual play pens is but one part of a "revolutionary program to demolish certain cherished myths in our social morality" that keep Americans from enjoying the "full and fulfilling experience of our sexuality."

"I think we need block-buster intensive therapeutic efforts, financed by the Federal government and run independently of the schools," said Harper.

By the time children reach school, he said, they have developed anxiety and guilt feelings that can't be changed by sex education courses "taught by a beesy and birdsy adherent to the basically puritanical mores."

## PSYCHOLOGISTS STAGE ANTIWAR PROTEST

(By Gordon Pettay)

Braving intermittent rain and isolated sneers from bystanders, some members of the American Psychological Association and their students and sympathizers demonstrated in front of the White House yesterday to protest the war in Vietnam.

The demonstration was arranged by Psychologists for Social Action as an offshoot of the APA convention currently under way here.

To one cab driver on the street, the sight of the men and women padding through the rain confirmed his suspicions: "They're crazy," he said.

A young man who had joined the marchers agreed with the cab driver's diagnosis, but he cited different symptoms. He resented the energetic marshals trying to keep the rambling psychologists in line. "They're neurotic," he said, "telling us to speed it up, get in close and not to block the traffic."

But the psychologists were in dead earnest. Many carried placards saying, "Sanity and War Don't Mix", "War is Insane, Psychology for Peace Now".

Weary radicals, tired of demonstrations, threw good natured barbs at the marchers as they passed Dupont Circle.

At the White House, Jack Sawyer, co-chairman of the action group read a copy of a letter sent to Robert Finch, secretary of health, education and welfare, saying in part: "We cannot do the work we are trained to do because of the brutalizing effects of mass murder in Vietnam."

The psychologists also sent three books to President Nixon to aid him in his foreign policy decisions. They were: Ralph K. White's "Nobody Wanted War: Misperception in Vietnam and Other Wars"; Herbert C. Kelman's "International Behavior: A Social-Psychological Analysis," and Joseph H. de Rivera's "The Psychological Dimension of Foreign Policy."

The march began with 88 of the psychologists and their students at the Sheraton Park Hotel on Connecticut Avenue. At the Washington Hilton, another 71 joined the group, but, by the time they reached the White House, the straggling line had been filled out to 219 by recruits along the way.

## AS SECRETARY BOB FINCH SEES IT: SERVE THE YOUNG FIRST

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Nixon Administration, in its search for solutions to our domestic ills, will put new emphasis "on working with the family unit and especially the mother." This is the inside word from Robert Hutchinson Finch, Presidential confidant, self-avowed "political animal" and pragmatist-in-residence of the Nixon Administration. For America's future will be shaped in the home, he said, "with the schools playing only a secondary role."

## PRENATAL CARE

If Finch has his way, the federal government will start looking out for children even before they are born. "We must take care of pregnant mothers," he said, "to insure that children are well born." He cited the relationship between poverty and prematurity. "In the ghetto," he said, "prematurity is about three times the national average." He pointed out that premature children are more likely to be mentally deficient or physically disabled.

Finch also believes the government must start taking care of deprived children immediately after birth. "The relationship between the mother and child is perhaps the most important development factor," he said, "and that relationship is pretty well set within the first three years." He would rather spend the taxpayers' money to give children a

chance in life than to rehabilitate them afterward.

## HAS NIXON'S EAR

One of the most certain results of last November's election was that Bob Finch would be a power in the new Administration. Indeed, Nixon wanted him for a running mate, but Finch had no interest in the Vice Presidency. He was given his choice of Cabinet posts and he picked the department that is considered the most difficult to administer and the least likely to win him political plaudits—the Health, Education, and Welfare Department, known within the government as "the sprawling mess."

With more than 250 programs to administer—from air pollution control to the American Printing House for the Blind—Finch presides over a Balkanized empire whose 100,000 employees have never been fully united. His \$50 billion budget is under constant attack on Capitol Hill. At least three former HEW secretaries, Abe Ribicoff, John Gardner and Wilbur Cohen, warned him that the department was almost impossible to manage and that it would probably hurt his political career.

But Finch chose to be where the action is. "HEW deals with the crucial issues of our times," he said. "Once the Vietnam War is settled, this government must turn its chief attention to fighting the wars against poverty, ignorance and disease." The decisions he makes will touch the lives of some 200 million Americans.

Finch is not waiting, however, for the Vietnam War to end. Already he has plunged into the domestic battles, keeping his emphasis on the family and the young. He has merged the moribund Children's Bureau and the floundering Head Start program into a new Office of Child Development. His hope is "that the flexibility and family focus of Head Start will help infuse new force into our traditional approaches."

Because the first five years of a child's life largely determine his future, Finch will try to reach into the ghettos with nursery programs. "We know," he said, "that intelligence differences show up between different socio-economic groups of children as early as we can measure things like language and cognitive skills." This occurs, he said, as early as 14 to 21 months. "We have got to reach these kids," he declared.

## GEARED TO TODAY

By starting with the young, Finch reasons, we can build a better nation from the ground up. He has some positive ideas on how to go about it. The elementary and secondary schools, he points out, haven't changed their basic teaching methods in the past 30 years. Yet today's kindergarten children, conditioned by television, require a more imaginative approach. "Dick-and-Jane textbooks can't hold a candle to Captain Kangaroo," he said, "let alone the Mod Squad."

To cope with the TV generation, Finch would like to see a quiet revolution in the classroom. Indeed, he intends to lead the revolution by establishing a network of experimental schools in partnership with state and local governments.

## SACRAMENTO REPORT

(By State Senator John G. Schmitz)

## EDUCATIONAL TOTALITARIANS

At a time when public schools throughout the nation, and especially in the large states such as California and New York, have already become storm centers to a greater degree than ever before in our history, leaders in the field of public education are calling for almost total control over the child by the school, beginning at the age of two.

In the January 1969 issue of Today's Ed-

ucation, the journal of the National Education Association, an article by two professors of education at Indiana University outlines "drastic changes" which may be expected in the schools of the 1970's, on the basis of more than 400 books and articles already published. The authors predict that when these changes are complete, "educators will assume a formal responsibility for children when they reach the age of two."

Regular school attendance will then begin at age three with "experiences deliberately devised to increase the sensory input from which the children derive their intelligence"—a statement which blandly ignores the fact that children derive their intelligence, along with their life, from their parents.

What about parents who prefer to keep "formal responsibility" for their own children? The authors of this article caution their readers that "there could be a tinderbox quality to the introduction of mandatory foster homes and 'boarding schools' for children between the ages of two and three whose home environment was felt to have a malignant influence." They add that "the application of biochemical research findings, heretofore centered in infra-human subjects such as fish, could be a source of conspicuous controversy when children become the objects of experimentation."

Let us hope there will be more than simply a "controversy," for if American parents ever submit their children to mass drug experimentation in the schools, we will have entered upon a totalitarian age more terrible than any the world has ever known.

Already it has become standard totalitarian practice, demonstrated in both the Nazi and Communist states, to take children away from their parents very early and indoctrinate them with the ideology of the state. This same strategy is echoed very clearly in the Today's Education article when it refers to the schools of the 1970's as "clinics" whose purpose is to provide individualized psychosocial 'treatment' for the student." If that is not brainwashing, what is?

Already parents and children are being separated when the state disapproves of their "home environment." My staff and I have been working for more than six months with one such case in Orange County, in which a little boy was taken from his parents by the State on a legal pretext and sent nearly a hundred miles away to a foster home, where his parents were very rarely permitted to see him, because the juvenile authorities felt that they could do a better job of raising the boy.

Earlier this month the Senate Education Committee approved Senate Bill 982 to create a special credential for pre-school teaching. At the time I could not understand why such a credential was needed, since teacher credentialing in California has always been associated with the administration of schools for pupils in the age range subject to the compulsory education laws. (The only exception is the junior colleges, which were at first organized like high schools but their credentialing requirement is likely to be eliminated soon).

Now, in light of the article quoted above, I can see that this bill to create a special credential for pre-school teaching might well be a step toward compulsory education for children younger than six, whether deliberately intended as such or not.

The would-be educational totalitarians have already turned many of our schools into boiling cauldrons of crisis and strife. We dare not let them extend their turmoil into the lives of two- and three-year-old children utterly defenseless against it. With every passing day it becomes more urgent to develop good educational alternatives to the present school establishment.

## OBSERVATIONS ON OVERSEAS TRIP

**HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to visit in recent weeks a number of countries, some of them well off the beaten track insofar as congressional interest generally is shown. I had noted many times that a large part of the world, extending from Greece to Indonesia, is not well known in congressional circles, yet it comprises an area in which history is being made and in which conflicting ideologies are seeking dominance. The courts of history may well be affected by events which are occurring in these emerging and developing nations of the world. I am glad to report high morale and dedication of U.S. personnel in these areas—a stimulating and encouraging thing in view of the comparative isolation which many of them must endure. The trip was a most interesting experience which I propose to touch upon briefly here and to discuss in detail later.

I went at a time when U.S. prestige was at one of its highest points in years—largely as a result of the success of the man-on-the-moon program. There was no country that I visited whose people had not followed in some way the progress of the moon shot, and all of them were excited and thrilled at its outcome. Regretfully, we have not taken full advantage of the opportunities offered by the moon landing. In some areas, lack of planning or lack of publicity material has held back the showing of effective exhibits. In fact, only in Burma did U.S. representatives make what I considered full use of the opportunity. There, despite the fact that U.S. activities generally are curbed, an effective display was prepared in an unoccupied building. Photographs were displayed showing various stages in the space program.

There were models of a rocket and of the lunar landing craft, and a large and impressive model of the surface of the moon complete with landing craft, astronauts, and footprints. In another room, a movie was run continuously during the hours the exhibit was open. This outstanding exhibit was fully tailored to take advantage of the opportunity, and the U.S. team is to be highly commended for its work. It is disappointing that comparable efforts have not been made elsewhere.

I am very glad to state also that in South Vietnam the picture is much brighter for allied forces. The enemy has been hurt and hurt badly, and a continuation of military pressure will in time bring realistic negotiations in Paris. This I commented on in detail in Thursday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The allied military team has the combat situation well in hand, and our fighting forces are prepared to meet any new initiative the enemy may attempt. The Vietnamese have strengthened their government and their economy and they

are steadily assuming a strengthened and more effective combat role. More and more hamlets are being brought under government security. A total of 17 million people live in South Vietnam; 15 million of them live in areas of Government security. This security continues to gain ground and a strong pacification program is in progress despite a reversion by enemy forces to guerrilla-type assassination, coercion, extortion, and terrorism. The enemy has not won a single major engagement or captured an important city. Despite the cessation of the bombing, which greatly eased his supply problem, the allied forces by redoubled efforts have kept him off balance and seriously decimated his numbers. Nevertheless, the Communist is a stubborn enemy and he continues to fight. However objective our efforts may be at the Paris peace talks, we have no recourse but to maintain pressure on the enemy in Vietnam until those talks bear fruit. Thus far, realism at the peace talks has not been forthcoming because antiwar publicity in the United States and stress on troop withdrawals have convinced the enemy further concessions are forthcoming.

These favorable developments are offset at least in official circles in some areas by serious concern over future U.S. intentions regarding our commitments abroad. There is also the obvious fact that U.S. influence among most Mediterranean nations is largely gone and that Communists have made gains among some Southeast Asian nations. Russian missions are nearly everywhere offering credits and arms and taking in payment food or other products. One thing, however, is to be learned from the Russians. They offer hard rather than soft loans, and they give nothing free. They are better traders than we.

Talk of troop withdrawals and defense cutbacks in the United States have stimulated Communist activity in other parts of the world and may result in adjustments in policy by nations directly under Communist pressure. It would not take much at this stage to encourage defections of some of our friends to the other side.

For instance, Burma's socialistic Government may not now have reason to steer a more independent course. India's march toward socialism is more likely to continue. Nationalism of the banks there is a straw in the wind, and Russian influence is being exerted to obtain a naval base with which to enhance Communist activities in the Indian Ocean area. This is not a happy situation when one considers that India is the second largest nation in the world. Cambodia's slight shift away from the Communist embrace is more likely to remain an accommodation only, in preparation for the eventuality of an allied victory in Vietnam when that comes. Sihanouk does not want an unfriendly Thailand and South Vietnam on either flank. The Communists maintain constant pressure on the Government of Laos, a country where they hold as much territory as they want for a buffer zone despite a valiant fight by Government forces.

I was disappointed to note what I must interpret as a wait-and-see attitude by our representatives in Indonesia. As a result of a shift in government which occurred only because the Communists were in too big a hurry to assume control, there is now a favorable picture for Western interests in Indonesia. Many of that country's present leaders are friendly toward the United States. We should be moving actively to encourage stronger alliances with the West. Indonesia is one of the largest nations in the world, and it has definite ambitions for leadership in its area.

In this complex and sometimes confusing picture of developing nations, there are some bright spots. For instance, Singapore which, although rejected for membership in the Federation of Malaysia, is the brightest star in the area. Its progressive Government has made phenomenal progress in building homes to replace slums, in providing clean government, and in exercising and encouraging leadership in trade and industry. The Government pays cash for its needs and has a favorable credit balance. United States, take heed.

Now let me comment on what I regretfully must term a lack of enterprise and initiative by U.S. representatives abroad. I am puzzled to find reasons for this.

State Department forces certainly cannot be held accountable to isolationist or leftist efforts which may be influencing U.S. policies for different reasons but with the same effect at home. Their job is to represent the U.S. Government abroad, and I hasten to state that the United States has many able and dedicated public servants in its foreign missions and many who perform their duties in an outstanding manner. Nevertheless, I cannot escape the apprehension that State Department policies generally are not as vigorous in support of U.S. interests as they could be. I find many in our own service who agree that we give up too easily in confrontation or discussion with representatives of foreign governments. The hard-sell aggressiveness required for implementation of U.S. policies too often seems to be lacking. The power and prestige of the United States do not suggest a hat-in-hand approach or obeisance in our dealings abroad; nor do we need bluff and bluster. We have shown our good intentions time and again to nearly every country in the world; we should combine this background with strong implementation of U.S. policy in support of democratic ideals, and we should be sufficiently practical to limit our help abroad to those who help us.

An example of what I mean is shown in discussions now in progress on the return of Okinawa to Japanese rule. A number of years ago a commitment in principle was made to return Okinawa to Japanese jurisdiction, but no date was specified. Now, unaccountably, 1972 has become the year to accomplish this and the Japs are insisting that they spell out the terms under which the United States will continue to have base rights. Neither the date nor the conditions are justified

by the facts. Nevertheless, I find some U.S. representatives in Tokyo who accept the Japanese case as irrefutable and even argue for it; this despite the fact that we have poured \$3.6 billion into the rebuilding of Japan, that we provide military defense for Japan at our own expense, and that the Japs enjoy a billion-dollar-a-year trade advantage here.

It is hard to imagine Russia yielding on a question of territorial jurisdiction in this manner. They would simply say that the matter is not open for discussion at this time and that would be the end of it. Nor would the world get excited about it. We tend to lead ourselves into traps when it is not necessary.

It would be interesting to speculate also on the effect of an all-out effort by U.S. diplomatic personnel to bring about a settlement of the Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan. After conversations with nationals of both countries, I am convinced that however bold a front is presented on the question, that both countries would like very much to find a solution by partition and end this primary cause of dissent between them of the controversial area.

A matter of paramount interest is that of modernization of weapons for our own forces as well as for nearly all of our allies. The battle for modernization for our own forces is now being fought in the Senate. It is shocking to me that there should be any question about the requirement for modernization when it is obvious that many of our important weapons systems are now a generation behind their Russian counterparts. It has been well stated that if we are to draft men to fight we should at least give them adequate weapons with which to fight.

If the situation of weapons modernization is serious at home, it is much worse abroad. The weapons in the hands of our friends average two generations behind those in the hands of the Communists, whose countries they border. Take Turkey as an illustration. The Turks have rifles, tanks, and naval vessels including submarines which are World War II vintage. The Turks are well-trained and effective fighting men. There is realism and confidence in their ranks. Yet it seems inexcusable to expect Turkish fighting men to effectively repel superior numbers plus superior weapons in the hands of equally well trained and effective Russian forces at the Turkish borders or on the Bosphorus.

Taiwan is perhaps an even more impressive example, for this little country by its location and the temper of its government and its people, exercises the same restraint on Communist aggression that South Vietnam and South Korea are doing. Taiwan's defense forces serve to counter direct aggression from colossal Red China. Yet the Taiwanese forces, which cannot begin to match those of Red China in numbers, are not even making comparable progress in modernization. Each day their weapons are falling further behind those of Red China in effectiveness. Taiwan needs F-4's to replace aging and obsolescent F-86's. Red China is building Mig-19's and has Mig-

21's in inventory. Taiwan has no submarines, yet Red China has 33, including one guided missile submarine, and is building more.

One of the gravest omissions to me is the lack of shelters for aircraft protection in Taiwan. A loss of control of the air over Taiwan could be a prelude to disaster in the event of conflict between Taiwan and Red China. The memory of the wholesale destruction of Arab aircraft caught on the ground by Israel planes during the 6-day war brings a chill of apprehension when one considers the overwhelming superiority in numbers of the Communist Chinese Air Force. It appears essential that the aircraft of the Republic of China be protected from similar destruction by wave after wave of assault from Red aircraft.

I returned with the strong conviction that we are not giving sufficient stress to the various personnel exchange programs. Almost without exception, foreign nationals who train in our country return to their homelands to exercise influence which is favorable to the United States. This, I believe, is true for all types of exchange programs. However, there is a particular need to encourage additional foreign military personnel to take advantage of training in military missions and colleges in the United States. A very good example is Indonesia where the attitudes of U.S.-trained individuals who now have strong influence in Government have substantially reversed the strongly anti-U.S. policies of the previous administration.

I anticipate that considerable effort will be required to properly untangle the information which I have accumulated under pressure of time and distance in many parts of the world. In this I shall try to avoid the sensational, and I am genuinely anxious to present information to my colleagues in the Congress and to departments in the Government which will be of value and which will be constructive rather than destructive. The experiences gained are valuable to me, and it is my hope that the information which I have brought back will be useful. I shall make it available as rapidly as possible.

#### CONCERN ABOUT PROBLEMS IN HOUSING

**HON. JAMES G. FULTON**

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the September 1969 issue of *Better Homes and Gardens* magazine there is a section entitled "Six Men Who Share Our Concern About the Problems in Housing Today." One of the six men expressing concern about these housing problems is my friend, and distinguished colleague, JAMES A. BURKE of the State of Massachusetts.

It is a pleasure for me to place in the RECORD this excellent statement by Congressman BURKE regarding the continuing rise in home mortgage interest rates.

For those interested in reading the views of the other five men, the article can be found on pages 88 and 89 of the September 1969 issue of *Better Homes and Gardens*.

The article follows:

#### THE PROBLEMS IN HOUSING TODAY

(By JAMES A. BURKE, Congressman, Massachusetts)

This continuing rise in home mortgage interest rates is an intolerable situation. The housing shortage today is as bad as it was in the years right after World War II. Yet the increase in interest rates by banks is drying up the supply of money that is so essential for building an adequate number of houses.

Even today, it has become practically impossible for a family of four earning \$10,000 to \$12,000 to buy a home. First of all, they'll be hard pressed even to find a new house because—in too many areas—builders are concentrating on large-budget houses. Then, added to the principal, taxes, and insurance, the high interest rates being charged make the monthly payment prohibitive.

If a family earning this amount of income can't afford to purchase a home, then what chance is there for the poorer families living in overcrowded conditions in all of our cities? The current situation is very alarming and must not be allowed to continue.

Unless the banking industry can meet its obligation to provide adequate home financing at a reasonable cost, then Congress and government are going to have to interfere.

Social consciousness clearly demands that we make funds available to build better homes for more families, and governmental intervention may be the only way. We must find the means to give the total housing industry a shot in the arm that will compare to the original impact of FHA and VA guarantees on mortgages in the '40s and '50s.

We have a responsibility to see to it that money is not dried up in a sector as vital to our economy as housing.

DREW PEARSON

**HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, September 5, 1969

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, the entire Nation has suffered a great loss in the death of Columnist Drew Pearson. While we might not always have agreed with everything he wrote, I think it is safe to say that he performed a vital function for our democracy. He performed in a unique way the function that a free press must always play in any democracy. He was indeed the conscience of the Capitol.

At his funeral yesterday, which Mrs. McCarthy and I attended, former Senator Wayne Morse of Oregon eulogized Mr. Pearson as a citizen-statesman dedicated to the service of mankind.

Senator Morse cited Mr. Pearson's many acts of courage, Mr. Morse declared:

His innumerable clashes with dishonest and corrupt officials of all levels of government demonstrated a courage rooted in sincerity, conscience and conviction.

The Oregonian emphasized that while Mr. Pearson, of course, was aware of the

fact that the vast majority of public officials are honest and dedicated he exposed what he believed to be wrongdoing in the interest of sustaining our democracy and our form of government.

Mr. Morse also cataloged the list of humanitarian and patriotic projects which Drew Pearson spearheaded. These were less known than his newspaper columns and broadcasts but they told much of the man and his dedication and idealism.

Mrs. McCarthy and I were privileged to know Drew Pearson. In private life he was a kind, urbane gentleman. We will never forget the innumerable personal kindnesses which he lavished on us. We will miss him as a warm human being. We will miss his insights on the news of the day. Our deepest sympathies are extended to his lovely wife and to his entire family.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD at this time editorial obituaries which appeared in the Washington Post of Tuesday, September 2 and the Buffalo Courier Express of Wednesday, September 3:

DREW PEARSON

In the practice of his profession, Drew Pearson had the conscience of a Quaker and the touch of a stevedore. He was robust, free-swinging, sometimes very wild. But he was also strong in a muscular, purposeful, principled way, with the courage to be his own man always, and never mind what people said or thought of him. Rough and tough in public, in private he had the air of a gentleman farmer, which he was, and the manner of a gentle man, which he also was. Shy, self-effacing, detached, he was a moralist who was proud to be a muckraker in the strict dictionary sense—one who searches out and exposes publicly real or apparent misconduct of prominent individuals. Somewhere in these unlikely combinations lies the key to his extraordinary career as the most successful, in many ways the most effective, and certainly the most controversial journalist of his time.

He was controversial because his technique was scatter-shot, so that while he was often brilliantly or brutally on target, he sometimes hit the wrong target or missed altogether; it almost seemed as if this was conscious strategy, this readiness to risk being wrong now and again as the necessary price for being, more often, right. It was uniquely his own style and while his profession never had the grace or the guts to give him the big awards, tribute was paid in other ways; when Mr. Pearson printed the stories that others were too fastidious to be the first to print, the others suddenly had no compunction about printing them. It was also a style that exposed him to any number of lawsuits and any number of epithets and no end of criticism that he was careless with the facts; but it had the singular merit that when it paid off, it paid off big. And it also paid off, more often than not, on the side of good, which was something he saw in simple, moral terms; he was for honesty and against corruption, for the disadvantaged against the self-interest of the power elite, for peace and against war.

It is not necessary to chronicle here all his triumphs any more than it is necessary to catalogue the occasions where his fierce convictions and unique techniques may have combined to put him in the wrong. The simple truth is that he was more effective in his way than any man in his profession over the nearly 40 years that he was practicing it, and that at the time of his death at the age of 71, when other men might have begun to ease off a bit, he was still on top, with nearly

twice the readership of his closest competitor. So his success was immense, and so was his impact on his profession and on the Capital. Most of the time he had the right targets and the right causes, and he brought to his crusades a powerful, innovative and relentless force.

DEATH SILENCES MERRY-GO-ROUND CONDUCTOR

Controversy could well have been Drew Pearson's middle name. It was a definite part of him. He thrived on it. He was forever on one side or the other of almost any issue that had two sides. He crusaded for what he thought was right and attacked what he thought was wrong. He published information many a public figure or government official sought to withhold. He did not hesitate to insist in the face of denials. Occasionally he made mistakes, for many of which he later apologized. Occasionally he committed inaccuracies, many of which he later corrected. Covering, as he did for years, broad aspects of the Washington scene, he made some enemies. He had them by the dozens.

One thing Drew Pearson was not was afraid. He dealt freely in scandal and personalities. Often his disclosures caused lawsuits to be brought against him, mostly without success. He himself said his chief motive was to make the government a little cleaner, a little more efficient. It cannot be denied that his exposures of malfeasance and wrongdoing in government achieved an impressive measure of success. He regarded his column as an institution. His death at 71 will not end it. It will be carried on in the same tradition by Jack Anderson, his colleague for many years.

U.S. PRISONERS OF WAR MISTREATED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, now that our national leaders permit a full, open discussion of the savage and inhumane treatment suffered by American captives at the hands of Ho Chi Minh's Communist terrorists it becomes even more mandatory that we demand our captured servicemen be treated in accord with the Geneva Convention agreed to by North Vietnam in 1957. This agreement provided for identification of captives, humane treatment, inspection of prisoner of war camps, free exchange of mail between prisoners and their loved ones and release of wounded and sick prisoners.

The details of their detention related by recently released servicemen are so repugnant that they should be made known to every citizen. By awakening public opinion to the brutality of the Asian Communists we can unify our people and influence world public opinion to demand that Hanoi observe humanitarian treatment of our captured servicemen.

I have received a letter from the wife of Maj. Lawrence Barbay of my district who has been a prisoner of war in North Vietnam for 3 years. The Barbays have four children, the youngest having been born 10 days after her father's plane was shot down. The Communists have denied Mrs. Barbay even receiving one letter from her husband.

I have also received correspondence

directed to all Congressmen from the National League of Families of American Prisoners in Southeast Asia. The Defense Department advises us there are 340 known prisoners in Vietnam but over some 1,200 servicemen listed as missing, who may be captives but their plight not confirmed by the Communists.

Immediate positive steps are necessary. We cannot wait for peace talks, propaganda, or withdrawal. Any cessation without plans for return of our prisoners could well leave them forgotten—living casualties continuing to suffer every known kind of inhumanity and torture—as we have witnessed in past conflicts with our military men who have fallen into Communist hands.

It is tragic to consider that it was necessary for the prisoners remaining in captivity—who would be in jeopardy of reprisals and further torture—to request that our people be told the truth of Communist mistreatment of military captives.

I include the letters from Mrs. Barbay and the National League of Families of Prisoners in Southeast Asia, a news clipping, and the Dan Smoot Report for August 25:

SEPTEMBER 3, 1969.

DEAR MR. RARICK: I will try to write this letter to you and ask your help.

I don't wish to bring up old memories. I thought to write this letter before calling so I was going to write anyway about my husband, Major Lawrence Barbay, who is a prisoner-of-war in North Vietnam. You know what I don't know about a prison-of-war camp. Maybe you are the best one, to go to Congress and speak for us or to President Nixon. Remind him and them of all the families worried sick over their loved ones somewhere in North Vietnam.

It's been three years for my husband and no word and I am sure not too pleasant one's either. His are a lot worse than mine.

We have four children, the last born 10 days after my husband's plane was shot down.

Don't you think suggesting before the bulk of our military pullout is completed they could ask for release of sick prisoners, exchange of prisoners, release names of prisoners, or pay ransom for prisoners?

This should be most important now as time seems to be dragging and nothing is being accomplished.

Let's don't forget them. Let's get them home. They thought nothing of leaving their families to go and fight in what they thought was right. I am so proud of my husband and all the men who have sacrificed their time and families and themselves for this cause.

Thank you for reading this letter. I know you will help if at all possible.

God love you and your family,

Sincerely,

Mrs. LAWRENCE BARBAY.

NATIONAL LEAGUE OF FAMILIES OF AMERICAN PRISONERS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.

Alexandria, La., July 25, 1969.

Re Inhuman Treatment of U.S. Prisoners Captured in North Vietnam.

DEAR SIR: I hope that the above caption will serve to penetrate the secretarial barrier and ensure that my letter reaches you.

The plight of our United States serviceman captured in Vietnam is extremely serious and Defense Secretary Laird outlined the situation in a recent news conference far better than I can.

However, as the wife of Captain Hayden J. Lockhart, shot down and captured March 2, 1965 (he has never seen our four-year-old

son) I intend to use every opportunity to publicize and expose the inhuman treatment being meted out to our husbands and sons, servicemen of the World's greatest nation today. The North Vietnamese react strongly to United States public opinion and I believe that this is a weapon which we have not used as effectively as we should.

Sir, I represent a national group of wives and parents who turn to you for help in our publicity campaign. We request that you use your considerable influence to trigger off a wave of public feeling sufficient to influence the North Vietnamese; not only to provide better treatment of our prisoners but to demand their release immediately and not to wait for the outcome of the perpetual peace talks.

I am sending copies of this letter to Senators and Congressmen and other political leaders in the hopes of real and active support from the leaders of our nation. Please give this matter the most urgent attention—surely these loyal and steadfast men have earned this right.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. HAYDEN J. LOCKHART, Jr.,  
Area Coordinator.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star,  
Sept. 3, 1969]

FREED NAVY FLIER DESCRIBES HANOI TORTURE  
OF PRISONERS

(By David Braaten)

The North Vietnamese torture their prisoners of war, but American bombing raids are "a big morale booster" to the captives, a recently released Navy flier has reported.

Lt. (jg) Robert Frishman, 28, of Santee, Calif., spoke to a score of newsmen yesterday at the Bethesda Naval Hospital, where he has been since his arrival here Aug. 7. He was captured Oct. 24, 1967, when the F4 jet fighter he was piloting was shot down by a surface-to-air missile.

Frishman told a press conference the torture administered to American prisoners included beatings, suspension from the ceiling by ropes, burning of flesh with cigarettes and ripping out of fingernails.

Asked to tell of maltreatment he suffered personally, Frishman said that when he was first shot down he was "taken around in a truck to missile sites," where North Vietnamese hit him and threw things at him.

He lost a filling in a tooth, he said, when one North Vietnamese slugged him, and even though he had a severe arm injury he was bound with ropes.

Eventually, Frishman said, he just passed out.

At their release last month, Frishman praised the treatment he had been given by North Vietnamese doctors, who removed his elbow instead of amputating his arm.

Asked to summarize the attitude and morale of the prisoners still left in North Vietnam—many of whom Frishman said he had talked with before he was released—the Navy flier said it was "pretty hard on the men" now that the bombing had stopped.

He said it raised the prisoners' morale when they looked out the windows of their cells during a raid and saw the North Vietnamese running around. The walls of his cell would "just shake," he said.

Appearing with the officer at the news conference was Seaman Apprentice Douglas B. Hegdahl, 22, of Clark, S.D., who was captured in April of 1967 when he fell overboard from the cruiser Canberra.

Hegdahl was asked about pictures taken of him on Christmas Eve, 1968, showing him reading a letter from his parents and a copy of Newsweek magazine. An enlargement of the photograph showed the letter he was reading was dated April 2, 1968.

"That's about average," said Hegdahl, with a grin. He said he was allowed to see the news magazine "just long enough for the picture

to be taken," but that he was permitted to keep the letter from home.

Hegdahl said he never heard from the Red Cross while he was in captivity, and money his mother sent him never reached him. A Christmas package was also looted, he said.

Hegdahl, though thin, appeared in good health after his three weeks at the hospital. He said he had lost 60 pounds in captivity. Frishman, who was still pale and thin, said he lost 50 pounds.

The two Navy men were released in the custody of seven American pacifists, who went to Hanoi to pick them up.

#### THE DAN SMOOT REPORT

On July 3, 1969, the communist government of North Vietnam announced in Hanoi that three American prisoners would be released, "as a humanitarian gesture in observance of the United States Independence Day."<sup>1</sup>

On July 4, David Dellinger received a telegram from Hanoi officials, saying that a representative of "the American peace movement" must go to Paris for consultation with North Vietnamese representatives there, and that a delegation of "the American peace movement" must later go to Hanoi to pick up the three American prisoners and return them to the United States.<sup>2</sup>

The American peace movement is communist dialectics for American subversives who want a communist victory in Vietnam.

David Dellinger (a U.S.-hating, pro-Castro, new-leftist) is chairman of the National Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam (MOBES)—a coalition of some 250 "American peace movement" groups of hippies, Negro militants, and Vietcong sympathizers. Dellinger was an organizer of the communist-led attack on the Pentagon in the fall of 1967. He and his MOBES were also in the forefront of the mobs that tried to tear Chicago apart during the Democrat National Convention of 1968.

Under indictment by a federal grand jury for his 1968 Chicago activities, Dellinger is out on bail pending trial. His lawyer is the infamous William H. Kunstler of New York, who has represented dozens of subversive lawbreakers in the past decade.

Defendants in pending federal criminal cases, even though free on bail, may not travel outside their home districts without special permission. Nixon officials arranged such permission for Dellinger. The U.S. Attorney and federal judge Julius J. Hoffman in Chicago agreed to what Kunstler called an "unusual compromise." Travel restrictions against Dellinger were lifted.<sup>3</sup>

On July 7, Dellinger, acting in the capacity of a representative of the people of the United States, left for Paris to negotiate with North Vietnamese communist officials.

Eight days later, attorney Kunstler asked Judge Hoffman to give Rennard C. Davis a three-week release from travel restrictions so that Davis could go to Paris, get final instructions from the communists, and then proceed to Hanoi to accept release of American prisoners.<sup>4</sup>

Rennard C. Davis is a leader of Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) whose officials generally admit being communists, and whose chief aim is to destroy the United States by force and violence. Davis (like Dellinger) is under federal indictment for conspiracy to incite riots in Chicago last year.<sup>5</sup>

The assistant U.S. Attorney in Chicago said that releasing Davis from travel restrictions would permit him to go to a foreign country where the U.S. government would have no way to get him back for trial if he decided not to return. But, he said, the U.S. Attorney's office would make no objection.<sup>6</sup>

Judge Hoffman had yielded to State De-

partment and Justice Department wheedling a week before when letting Dellinger go to Paris, but he refused to let Davis go. He said: "I had grave misgivings of letting Dellinger go to Paris last week. It puts the court in the position of entering foreign relations."

"Now I'm asked to permit Davis to head his delegation to travel to an enemy country for the purpose of escorting back three American prisoners of war. I think it would be improper for the court to grant him permission for such a purpose; and, therefore, I deny the request."<sup>7</sup>

Attorney Kunstler immediately asked Judge Otto Kerner, U.S. Court of Appeals, for an emergency, closed-session hearing. After Justice Department lawyers gave assurance that the State Department wanted Davis released from travel restrictions, Judge Kerner overturned the decision of Judge Hoffman.

Rennard Davis left that night, July 15, for Hanoi, via Paris—taking six other representatives of "the American peace movement" with him as a "delegation," in compliance with communist instructions.<sup>8</sup>

On August 4, 1969, three American prisoners were released to Davis's seven-man "peace delegation" in Hanoi. On August 5, they arrived in Laos, aboard an International Control Commission plane. A U.S. military plane was waiting there to bring them back home. After a brief conference with U.S. diplomatic officials, the "peace delegation" said the released men would return to the U.S. by commercial plane, because Hanoi would be displeased if they traveled on a U.S. military aircraft.<sup>9</sup>

Pale, gaunt, badly undernourished, sick, and nervous, the three prisoners said they had received adequate food and medical attention, that they had not been indoctrinated, and that they got some exercise in prison camp when they "were allowed to sweep the grounds."

Four days later (August 9), U.S. Secretary of State William P. Rogers cited the physical condition of the three released Americans as proof that North Vietnamese communists are "as inhumane as you can be" in the treatment of American prisoners.<sup>10</sup>

The Vietcong and North Vietnamese will not exchange prisoners, or even give us any information on the identity and number of Americans they have in prison. The Pentagon calls this refusal to provide a prisoner list an "inhumane and clear violation of the Geneva Convention."<sup>11</sup>

The American communist sympathizers who constituted the "peace delegation" to Hanoi are just as inhumane as their communist idols are. Ten days after he had returned to the United States, Rennard Davis (SDS head of the "peace delegation") was still holding some 50 cards or letters which American prisoners in Vietnam had asked him to forward to their anxious relatives back home.<sup>12</sup>

James Johnson (a member of David Dellinger's pro-communist MOBES) was in Rennard Davis's seven-man "peace delegation" to Hanoi. Upon his return to the United States, Johnson was lyrical with happiness about what he had seen in North Vietnam. Speaking of the people there, he said:

"I've never seen such spirit anywhere. I feel they have defeated the United States."<sup>13</sup>

Johnson was right. North Vietnam, a backward, tenth-rate communist nation has defeated the United States, despite the magnificent valor, high morale, and awful sacrifices of our fighting men. They have defeated us because we do not have—and for a long time have not had—top political leadership worthy of respect.

We elect and re-elect such leadership because, apparently, we no longer respect ourselves. If the general American public did have proper respect for itself, for our nation, and for the glorious traditions of our Repub-

Footnotes at end of article.

lic, there would be such deep and wide indignation in this country that Richard Nixon would not have dared permit the shameful spectacle the world has just witnessed.

It is a violation of federal law and of a basic constitutional principle for private American citizens to engage in policy negotiations with foreign powers.<sup>6</sup> The Nixon State Department not only permitted but arranged for this violation of law and of constitutional principle.

The release of three prisoners was not a "humanitarian gesture." It was a propaganda trick to strengthen "the American peace movement," which has been an invaluable ally of the communists, inspiring them to persist, undermining the American will to win. Many American servicemen now dead would be alive but for the help and encouragement "the American peace movement" has given the communists. By conferring quasi-ambassadorial status on leaders of this movement, Nixon has further convinced the enemy that victory will be given him, if he just hangs on a while longer and kills several thousand more Americans.

In 1967, North Vietnamese communists released three American prisoners, and released three more in 1968, under the same circumstances and conditions as in the August, 1969, release.<sup>1, 2</sup> Communists called the 1967 and 1968 releases "humanitarian gestures." President Johnson accepted that propaganda lie, and permitted communist sympathizers to negotiate the releases.

President Johnson permitted communist sympathizers to conduct negotiations with the communist enemy. President Nixon did more than that: he actively intervened to free them from the jurisdiction of a federal court so that they could travel abroad for negotiations with the enemy. Thus, Nixon went further than Johnson did, in conferring respectability and official approval on treacherous subversives.

#### FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> *New York Times*, Aug. 6, 1969, p. C8.
- <sup>2</sup> *New York Times*, July 9, 1969, p. C5.
- <sup>3</sup> *Chicago Tribune*, July 16, 1969, p. 6.
- <sup>4</sup> *New York Times News Service*, Aug. 9, 1969.
- <sup>5</sup> *Associated Press*, Aug. 8, 1969.
- <sup>6</sup> *Dallas Morning News*, July 10, 1969, p. D2.
- <sup>7</sup> *Dallas Morning News*, Aug. 14, 1969, p. A3.

DONALD BRUCE

### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, we have all suffered a grievous loss in the untimely death of our former colleague, Donald Bruce. During his two terms as a Representative from his native State of Indiana, he distinguished himself for his legislative ability and as a dedicated spokesman for the conservative philosophy of Government. He could undoubtedly have looked forward to a long and rewarding career in this body but he chose instead to seek his party's nomination for the U.S. Senate, a bid which he lost by a narrow margin in the 1964 Indiana State Republican Convention.

Outside the Halls of Congress, Don Bruce continued to be an eloquent

spokesman for the views he held so deeply. He helped organize the American Conservative Union and employed his great talents in advancing the principles of Americanism. Few other platform orators of our day had his ability to move audiences. He will be greatly missed and I extend my deepest sympathy to his family in their time of sorrow.

#### THE BALANCED URBANIZATION POLICY AND PLANNING ACT

### HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
Thursday, September 4, 1969

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, shortly before our August recess, I introduced legislation entitled the "Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act," in which I was joined by our distinguished colleague from North Carolina (Mr. FOUNTAIN). The design of the bill is to begin to chart a course of action through the overgrowth of urban congestion and the undergrowth of rural sparsity and decline.

In one sense, it picks up where the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968—Public Law 90-577—leaves off in coordinating intergovernmental policy and administration of development assistance programs. More directly, however, it represents a concerted effort to achieve a balanced growth policy in rural and urban areas. The measure specifically deals with the manifold problems created by the present course of urban growth as documented in the report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations on "Urban and Rural America: Policies for Future Growth" and incorporates major recommendations advanced in this report and in the Commission's earlier survey of "Fiscal Balance in the American Federal System."

The urban and rural America study indicates that rapid urbanization, swollen racial unrest, and deceptive decline in our rural areas constitute three separate but interrelated crises which must be surmounted if the American social and governmental systems are to remain viable. This problem lends itself to overstatement, but not without cause.

The complexities of these challenges are underscored by their separate, but related, causes. The emergence of an urban America, after all, is not a byproduct of black migration. The revolution in race relations has rural as well as urban dimensions. Admittedly, the difficulties of urban America are heightened by the dramatic examples of social and economic segregation and interjurisdictional racial disparities found in our metropolitan areas. But these areas still would be facing a tremendous task—administratively, fiscally and in terms of governmental services—even if all their citizenry were white, and the same obviously can be said of rural areas as well.

When the plight of rural America is added to the problems of race and urbanization, a potentially explosive situation

exists. This is the situation that our Federal system today must deal with. The bill before us today begins to provide the tools for this task at the national level. The need for a national urbanization policy and the development of a more meaningful intergovernmental planning process are underscored by such recent trends as these:

Between 1960 and 1965, metropolitan areas experienced the most rapid population growth, with giant metropolitan complexes—1 million plus—accounting for more than half of the increase in total urban population and those in the 250,000 to 1 million bracket for nearly one-fourth.

Most of this urban growth was concentrated in suburban and outlying areas, not in central cities, and industry more frequently has been seeking location in these same jurisdictions.

Net migration gains were responsible for more than a fifth of the urban population growth and 75 percent of the influx occurred in nine metropolitan areas.

Contrary to some claims, smaller cities and villages outside metropolitan areas have had much slower rates of growth and usually have been bypassed by the mainstream of economic development.

Most black Americans now reside in core cities, with larger jurisdictions having the fastest growth rate and largest proportions; practically all of the remainder live in the rural areas, and the bulk of the white population is suburban.

The total population of rural America has remained nearly static since 1950, but its farming sector has dropped significantly.

In terms of employment, public services and finance, the large central cities and the smaller rural communities and counties share an increasingly tougher task of maintaining healthy levels of economic activity, providing jobs and adequately educating their residents.

Governmental policies involving highway and air transportation facilities, housing and community development, industrial climate and tax levels have influenced industrial location decisions, but not always with beneficial results in terms of the overall public interest.

Present suburban and urban fringe development, in all but a few instances, has tended to follow a mushrooming, meandering or molecular pattern, with an accompanying disorderly, distasteful and destructive use of land.

Estimates of future growth indicate that, with a continuation of present trends, national population will increase about 73 percent by the year 2000, practically all of it urban.

Finally, coordinated and planned development is not aided greatly by the planning requirements that now exist in over 135 Federal grant-in-aid programs and by the 37 or more planning assistance programs that Congress has established.

Mr. Speaker, the facts clearly indicate that there is an ever-widening gap between our national aspirations and actual policy returns. The trends cited above attest to the pressing need for a national urbanization policy, for drawing together the strings of conflicting

purpose. To deny the necessity for such a policy is to ignore the consequences these trends predict:

The prospect of even greater densities in our large metropolitan areas and the attendant higher cost of public and private consumption.

The prospect of more—not less—social and emotional tensions which heavy congestion seems to generate.

The prospect of complicating the already chaotic conditions in our central city ghettos.

The prospect of widening the economic gap between most central cities and most of their surrounding suburbs.

The prospect of even greater economic, educational, and health gaps between rural and urban America.

If these prospects materialize, we will bind future generations of Americans to the same style of urban life that currently prevails. Can we risk this kind of bequest?

Mr. Speaker, I believe we must not permit this. Instead, we must begin now to establish the ways and means of facilitating the development of a sensible, yet bold and balanced, urbanization policy.

Let it be clearly understood, however, that the measure I introduce today is not designed to stem the tide of urbanization. The overriding objective here is a more balanced distribution of urban dwellers and economic opportunity, not a balancing of rural and urban populations. Moreover, the policy envisioned presupposes a broad decisionmaking and planning process—one that is multilevel and multiparticipant. The grant design for future urban growth sought here would establish the priorities and provide the focus that the existing network of intergovernmental relations needs in the areas of improved programing, improved planning, and improved public management. This policy also must deal simultaneously with the problems of central cities in metropolitan areas, while planning for a more balanced geographic distribution of our future urban population.

To hammer out concerted and comprehensive policies in economic, demographic, social, and physical development areas initially requires that new machinery and new methods for policy-making and execution be established in the political branches of national, State and local governments. Both the executive and legislative branches must be involved—given the ramifications of this assignment. Existing mechanisms for interbranch, interagency, and interlevel cooperation must be revitalized.

At the national level, title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 will, in effect, help establish some of these new procedures, especially as they relate to interagency coordination and interlocal planning endeavors. The bill that I am introducing today will institutionalize further this ongoing concern.

Under title II, the President is required to submit annually to Congress a national urban growth report. Its format would include urban trend data

and a survey of the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts affecting the location and rate of population and economic growth. Health and educational programs; resettlement and rehabilitation; housing and large-scale urban development; vocational employment opportunity, and other related programs no doubt would be assessed. The relationship of Federal activities to regional, State, local, and private efforts in these interrelated areas would also be covered and the final portion of the message would set forth the President's recommendations for promoting a more effective urbanization policy. The message would be referred to a new Joint Urbanization Committee.

Responsibility for assembling this report is left wholly to the President, on grounds that no existing unit in the executive branch possesses all the requisite skills to develop the draft. Some would argue that a revamped Council of Economic Advisers, Budget Bureau, or Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President should be singled out for the job. The view of this legislation is that the President should have complete discretion—at least at the outset—to devise his own administrative strategy for initiating this massive job of policy development, coordination, and implementation.

Titles III and IV of this legislation complement title II by seeking to systematize planning assistance and to standardize certain of the planning requirements in Federal grant programs. Development planning to date has tended to be narrow, fragmented, and inadequately coordinated with the efforts of other jurisdictions. It ought to be comprehensive, covering human and economic as well as physical resource development, and encompassing rural as well as urban areas. Since major urbanization policy and planning efforts will have to occur at the State and local levels, the Federal Government clearly has a direct concern in helping these governments to develop comprehensive, policy-based, planning procedures.

Title III of this bill establishes a revamped assistance program for such planning at the interstate, State, area-wide, and local levels. In effect, it revitalizes the existing 701 program by seeking to strengthen the State's role—if they wish to assume it—of coordinating all planning efforts within their respective borders and by structuring the agencies eligible for receiving comprehensive planning grants in a fashion that eliminates much of the overlap and confusion among planning jurisdictions at the local and area-wide levels. Equally significant, the title recognizes only one set of planning agencies at the substate regional level.

The final title in the proposed legislation comes to grips with the lack of uniformity in planning requirements under grant programs, the frequent fuzziness in planning definitions used, and the failure to clearly identify the jurisdiction responsible for or affected by the planning requirement. It does this by standardizing the definitions of compre-

hensive planning and standardizing the functional planning conformance requirements in five program areas—water, sewer, and other public works facilities; public health services; transportation; open space and recreation; and water resources.

Mr. Speaker, the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act advances some dramatically new approaches to the broad and controversial issues in the urban development, planning assistance, and planning requirement areas. The nature of the challenges that face us on the urban, rural, and social frontiers convince me that such approaches are not only desirable but they are desperately needed—if we are again to reach a point where we have some sense of mastery over our physical environment and the problems that beset us in the realm of human relationships.

Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks the text of our bill and a section-by-section analysis, as follows:

H.R. 13217

A bill to provide for the balanced urban development and growth of the United States

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act".*

#### TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 101. The purpose of this Act is to establish within the United States Government procedures—

(1) for analyzing urban growth and developing a national urbanization policy and reporting to the Congress on such growth and policy;

(2) to provide greater coordination in the administration of Federal urban and economic development grants and programs by placing within the Executive Office of the President sole responsibility for policy development, coordination, and planning;

(3) to provide assistance to State and local governments for developing comprehensive coordination, programing, and planning agencies and activities;

(4) to consolidate comprehensive planning requirements for grant-in-aid programs; and

(5) to systematize other planning requirements.

##### DEFINITIONS

SEC. 102. As used in this Act—

(1) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development;

(2) "comprehensive planning" means planning which—

(A) consists of the continuing process of assessing needs, resources, and development opportunities; formulating goals, objectives, policies, and standards to guide long-range physical, economic, and human resources development; and preparing plans and programs for such assessment and formulation;

(B) is not inconsistent with comprehensive planning undertaken by any other Federal or State governmental body and, when undertaken by a political subdivision, also is not inconsistent with comprehensive planning by the next larger jurisdiction; and

(C) meets criteria established by the Secretary; and includes—

(1) preparation of comprehensive plans, as guides for governmental policies and action, which identify and evaluate alternative courses of action and the relationships among the activities to be carried out under such plans, including the effective utilization of

resources, the pattern and intensity of land use, and the provision of public facilities, and other government services;

(ii) programing of expenditures of major activities, including capital improvements, in the order in which they are to be commenced, together with definite plans for financing such activities;

(iii) coordination of all related plans and activities of the State and political subdivisions and agencies concerned;

(iv) provisions for a general guide for functional and project or agency program planning; and

(v) preparation of appropriate regulatory and administrative measures in support of the foregoing.

(3) "functional planning" means the preparation of a functional plan which—

(A) provides coordination of services, activities, and facilities, furnished by a State or political subdivision within the same functional area, including housing, public works, water and sewage facilities, transportation, recreation, open space, public health services and facilities, and pollution control; and

(B) is consistent with comprehensive planning;

(4) "State" means any of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico;

(5) "State comprehensive planning agency" means a State agency, or agencies, designated by the Governor of the State (or in the case of the District of Columbia, designated by the Commissioner), to conduct overall comprehensive planning for the State;

(6) "political subdivision" or "unit of general local government" means any city, county, town, parish, village, or other general-purpose political subdivision of a State;

(7) "planning and development district" means any area that—

(A) is established under State laws, or in the absence of such laws, under a plan approved by the Governor of the State or States;

(B) is composed of two or more political subdivisions of a State, including metropolitan areas;

(C) has common or related problems of development requiring cooperative, comprehensive planning and concerted action for the effective solution of such development problems; and

(D) is composed only of political subdivision and interstate compact areas not included within any other such district.

(8) "planning and development district agency" means the agency responsible for a planning and development district and which is, to the greatest extent feasible, composed of or responsible to the elected officials of a unit of areawide government or of the political subdivisions located partially or completely within the planning and development district;

(9) "areawide comprehensive planning" means comprehensive planning undertaken by a planning and development district agency;

(10) "metropolitan comprehensive planning" means areawide comprehensive planning undertaken by a planning and development district agency which includes within its borders a standard metropolitan statistical area as established by the Bureau of the Budget; and

(11) "city comprehensive planning" or "county comprehensive planning" means comprehensive planning undertaken by a city or county if the city or the county—

(A) has authority over planning, zoning, subdivision, and other land uses and which authority, in the case of a city, extends beyond the boundaries of the city; and

(B) is not included within the compre-

hensive planning of a State comprehensive planning agency or planning and development district agency.

#### PRESIDENTIAL RESPONSIBILITY

SEC. 103. In order to assure that the comprehensive planning and coordination assistance authorized by title III of this Act and the comprehensive and functional planning requirements of title IV are consistent with the purposes of title II of this Act and section 401 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (80 Stat. 1098; Public Law 90-577), the President shall be responsible for continuing policy guidance and continuing review of the administration of this Act, and for promulgating general rules and regulations, which shall be as uniform as practicable to carry out the provisions of this Act and section 401 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. Such rules and regulations shall provide for full consideration of the concurrent achievement of the objectives specified in the statutory provisions cited in this section, and, to the extent authorized by law, reasoned choices shall be made between such objectives when they conflict.

#### TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL URBANIZATION POLICY

##### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 201. (a) The Congress finds that the rapid growth of urban population and expanding urban development in the United States, together with a decline in farm population, slower growth in rural areas, and migration to the cities has created an imbalance between the Nation's needs and resources, and that the economic and social development of the Nation and the achievement of satisfactory living standards depend upon the sound, orderly, and more balanced development of all areas of the Nation.

(b) The Congress further finds that Federal programs already have a significant effect upon the location of population, economic growth, and on the character of urban development; that the purposes of such programs frequently conflict, thereby subsidizing undesirable and costly patterns of urban development; and that a concerted effort is necessary to interrelate and coordinate existing and future programs within a system of planned development and established priorities in accordance with a national urbanization policy.

(c) In order to promote the general welfare and to provide full and wise application of the resources of the Federal Government in strengthening the economic and social health of both rural and urban areas and of the Nation as a whole, the Congress declares that it is a continuing responsibility of the Federal Government, consistent with the responsibilities of State and local government and the private sector, to undertake the development of a national policy, to be known as the national urbanization policy, which shall incorporate social, economic, and other appropriate factors. Such policy shall serve as a guide in making specific decisions at the national level which affect the pattern of urban growth and shall provide a framework for development of interstate, State, and local policy.

(d) The Congress further declares that the national urbanization policy should—

(1) favor patterns of urbanization and economic development which offer a range of alternative locations and encourage the wise and balanced use of physical and human resources;

(2) foster the continued economic strength of all parts of the United States, including central cities, suburbs, smaller communities, and rural areas;

(3) reverse trends of migration and natural growth which create greater disparities among States, regions and cities;

(4) treat comprehensively the problems of

poverty and employment associated with urbanization and rural decline;

(5) develop means to alleviate present trends which accentuate racial conflict;

(6) define the basis for fulfilling the role of the Federal Government in revitalizing existing communities and encouraging carefully planned, large-scale urban and new community development;

(7) assist general governmental institutions in achieving balanced urban growth; and

(8) facilitate increased coordination in the administration of Federal programs so as to encourage desirable patterns of urban growth.

#### URBANIZATION POLICY, PLANNING, AND COORDINATION

SEC. 202. In order to develop the national urbanization policy, the following functions shall be performed within the Executive Office of the President—

(1) the preparation of an annual report, to be known as the Annual Report on Urban Growth;

(2) the collection, analysis, and evaluation of timely and authoritative information, current and prospective, concerning population growth and movement, urbanization, economic growth, patterns of land use, natural resource conservation and development;

(3) a continuing assessment of the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts to carry out the policy described in section 201 (c) and (d) and developed pursuant to this Act, with particular emphasis upon the manner in which efforts involving economic development, health, education and training, the location and pace of population growth, resettlement and rehabilitation, housing and large-scale urban development, and vocational and employment opportunities relate to and affect the pattern and quality of urban growth;

(4) a review and estimate of current and foreseeable needs of interstate, State, local and private plans, and programs affecting the policy described in section 201 (c) and (d) and developed pursuant to this Act;

(5) an evaluation of the relationship of Federal programs and policies to the plans, policies, and programs referred to in clause (4); and

(6) an estimate of current and foreseeable needs of Federal programs which affect the plans, policies, and programs referred to in clause (4).

#### URBAN GROWTH REPORT

SEC. 203. (a) The President shall transmit to the Congress, not later than February 20 of each year, the Annual Report on Urban Growth for the preceding year. The Report shall include—

(1) information and statistics describing characteristics of urban growth and identifying significant trends and developments;

(2) a summary of significant problems facing the United States as a result of urbanization trends and developments;

(3) an evaluation of the progress and effectiveness of Federal efforts designed to meet such problems and to carry out the policy described in section 201 (c) and (d) and developed pursuant to this Act;

(4) a reassessment of the policies and structure of existing and proposed interstate planning and developments, including interstate agencies, affecting such policy;

(5) a review of State, local, and private policies, plans, and programs designed to carry out such policy;

(6) current and foreseeable needs in the areas served by such policies, plans, and programs, and the steps being taken to meet such needs; and

(7) recommendations for programs and policies for carrying out such policy, including such legislation as may be deemed necessary and desirable.

(b) The President may transmit from time to time to the Congress supplementary re-

ports on urban growth which shall include such supplementary and revised recommendations as may be appropriate.

(c) The Annual Report on Urban Growth and all supplementary reports shall, when transmitted to the Congress, be referred to the Committee on Government Operations of each House, the Committees on Banking and Currency of each House, the Joint Urbanization Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and such other standing committees as the presiding officer of each House may designate.

#### AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 204. Not to exceed \$500,000 per fiscal year for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and for each fiscal year thereafter is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Executive Office of the President for expenses necessary to carry out the purposes of sections 202 and 203.

#### JOINT URBANIZATION COMMITTEE

SEC. 205. (a) (1) There is established a joint congressional committee which shall be known as the Joint Urbanization Committee. The joint committee shall be composed of eight Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, three of whom shall be members of the minority party, and eight Members of the House of Representatives, three of whom shall be members of the minority party.

(2) The joint committee shall select a chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the function of the joint committee—

(1) to make a continuing study of the information and recommendations contained in the Annual Report on Urban Growth and supplementary reports on urban growth; and

(2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the national urbanization policy.

(c) The joint committee shall file a report with the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress not later than April 20 of each year. The report shall contain the joint committee's findings and comments with respect to the recommendations made by the President in the Annual Report on Urban Growth. The joint committee may from time to time make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

(d) In carrying out its duties under this section, the joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings; to sit and act within or outside the United States at such times and places; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents; to administer such oaths; to take such testimony; to procure such printing and binding; and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedure as it deems necessary.

(e) Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or by any member designated by him or the committee, and may be served by such person as may be designated by such chairman or member. The chairman of the joint committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. The provisions of sections 102-104 of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with a subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(f) The joint committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, and staff employees as it deems necessary and advisable.

(g) With the consent of any standing,

select, or special committee of the Senate or House, or any subcommittee, the joint committee may utilize the services of any staff member of such House or Senate committee or subcommittee whenever the chairman of the joint committee determines that such services are necessary and appropriate.

(h) (1) The expenses of the joint committee shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate from funds appropriated for the joint committee, upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the joint committee or by any member of the joint committee duly authorized by the chairman.

(2) Members of the joint committee, and its employees, experts, and consultants, while traveling on official business for the joint committee within or outside the United States, may receive either the per diem allowance authorized to be paid to Members of the Congress or its employees, or their actual and necessary expenses provided an itemized statement of such expenses is attached to the voucher.

#### TITLE III—GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

##### SHORT TITLE

SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the "Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act".

##### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 302. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) an effective national urbanization policy is directly dependent upon the cooperative action of the Federal, State, and local levels of government in developing a system of comprehensive planning and coordination in order to achieve a more balanced use of the physical, economic, and human resources of the Nation;

(2) development planning has tended to be too narrow, fragmented, and inadequately coordinated; that to be fully effective, such planning must be comprehensive, embracing the full spectrum of human, economic, and physical resource development and encompassing urban and rural growth and development; and that there is a vital need for the development of comprehensive planning and coordination agencies, processes, and systems that will provide the framework within which functional, project, and agency program planning can be related for fully coordinated development;

(3) urban growth and rural development needs may be coordinated most efficiently and economically at the State and local government level, based on the capability of State and local governments to develop comprehensive, policy-based planning processes which can serve as a guide for functional, project, and agency program planning and can provide a systematic basis for effective coordination of Federal, State, and local development programs; and that such planning and coordination, in order to be effective, requires a governmental organization and structure and accompanying powers and authority capable of implementing planning through effective decisions and for accomplishing coordination through meaningful management; and

(4) improved coordination of programs of Federal assistance administered by various departments and agencies can best be achieved at the Federal level through the Executive Office of the President which can provide an effective focal point for the formulation of consistent planning, policies, standards, and procedures among such programs pursuant to section 202 of this Act and section 401 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 (80 Stat. 1098; Public Law 90-577).

(b) It is the purpose of this title—

(1) to provide assistance for the development of comprehensive planning and coordination capabilities at the interstate, State, regional and local government levels;

(2) to encourage cooperation among local governments in solving mutual and areawide development problems by assisting them in developing or strengthening the comprehensive planning and coordination process;

(3) to foster intergovernmental cooperation in developing coordinated and concerted attacks on problems of national urban and rural development; and

(4) to establish a method for the exchange of development information among localities, the States, and the Federal Government, in order to assist development and implementation of the national urbanization policy described in section 201 (c) and (d), and to aid the States and their political subdivisions in the determination of their needs.

##### PLANNING AND COORDINATION GRANTS

SEC. 303. In order to carry out the purposes of section 302(b), the Secretary is authorized to make comprehensive planning grants in accordance with the provisions of this title—

(1) to collect systematically information concerning any public works, public capital improvements and capital acquisitions, and economic and human resources development programs, projects, and associated activities;

(2) to collect and analyze information related to—

(A) population characteristics, migrations, and densities;

(B) economic trends, location patterns, and projections;

(C) directions and extent of urban and rural growth and change;

(D) employment and unemployment trends and projections;

(E) social, educational, health, recreational, and cultural development trends and needs;

(F) governmental organization and financial resources available within the State and the political subdivisions thereof; and

(G) other information necessary to conduct comprehensive planning;

(3) to develop, use, and encourage common information and data bases for State, regional, and local comprehensive and functional planning;

(4) to establish arrangements for the exchange of planning information among State agencies, and among the various governments within each State and their agencies, including planning and development agencies and city comprehensive planning agencies; between such governments and agencies of neighboring States as appropriate; and with interstate compact agencies and regional commissions established pursuant to Federal law;

(5) to prepare and maintain a coordinated planning system and process including the formulation of long-range, comprehensive plans consistent with the national urbanization policy described in section 201 (c) and (d) and developed pursuant to this Act;

(6) to undertake studies, surveys, and other activities to facilitate the coordination of administration of similar and related programs;

(7) to provide technical assistance and training, and advice and consultation on comprehensive planning and coordination matters on an interagency, interprogram, and intergovernmental basis;

(8) to establish arrangements for the exchange of information with the Federal Government for use by the President in discharging his responsibilities under section 401 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968 and section 103 and title II of this Act; and

(9) to conduct such other related planning and coordination functions as may be approved by the Secretary.

##### ELIGIBLE AGENCIES

SEC. 304. The Secretary, pursuant to rules and regulations as provided in section 103, may make grants to—

(1) a State comprehensive planning agency to carry out the functions of section 303;

(2) a State agency, designated by the Governor, which has entered into an agreement with the Secretary in accordance with section 305(e) to provide assistance to planning and development district agencies, completely or partially within the State, and units of general local government, for carrying out the functions of section 303;

(3) a planning and development district agency, completely or partially within the State, in those States which have not entered into an agreement with the Secretary in accordance with section 305(e):

(A) for carrying out the functions of section 303; and

(B) to provide assistance to units of general local government, for carrying out the functions of section 303, when such district agency has entered into an agreement with the Secretary in accordance with section 305(f);

(4) the following local agencies, for carrying out the functions of section 303, in those States in which neither a State agency nor a planning and development district agency within which such local agencies have jurisdiction have entered into agreements with the Secretary in accordance with section 305(e) or (f), respectively:

(A) a city or county comprehensive planning agency; and

(B) a government planning agency—

(i) for an area in which rapid urbanization has occurred or is expected to occur as the result of the establishment or rapid substantial expansion of a Federal installation; or

(ii) for an area in which rapid urbanization is expected to occur as the result of land developed, or to be developed, as a new community and approved under section 1004 of the National Housing Act or title IV of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968; or

(iii) for an area in which there has been a substantial reduction in employment opportunities as the result of the partial or complete closing of a Federal installation, or a decline in the volume of orders of the Federal Government for articles or materials produced or manufactured within such area;

(5) organizations of public officials eligible to receive grants pursuant to section 701(g) of the Housing Act of 1954, for carrying out the functions of section 303, when such organizations conduct comprehensive planning in parts of two or more States;

(6) the Appalachian Regional Development Commission to carry out the functions of section 303 for the area over which the Commission has jurisdiction;

(7) a regional commission established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 to carry out the functions of section 303 for the area over which the commission has jurisdiction;

(8) a tribal planning council or other tribal body for comprehensive planning for an Indian reservation, as designated by the Secretary of the Interior; and

(9) political subdivisions which have suffered substantial damages as a result of a catastrophe which the President, pursuant to section 2(a) of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize Federal assistance to States and local governments in major disasters and for other purposes," approved September 30, 1950, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1855(a)), has determined to be a major disaster.

#### PROPOSALS FOR GRANTS

SEC. 305. (a) An agency desiring to receive a grant shall submit to the Secretary a proposal in such form, at such times, and in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary may specify, indicating the comprehensive planning and, where relevant, the program of planning assistance that it will undertake, the period during which such activities will be conducted, and their estimated costs, and designating those functions

enumerated under section 303 which qualify for Federal assistance pursuant to this title.

(b) From the sum allocated pursuant to section 310, the Secretary is authorized to make a grant to the agency whose proposal is approved of an amount not to exceed two-thirds of the estimated cost of the planning and, where relevant, the program of planning assistance, except that a grant may be made in an amount not to exceed three-fourths of such estimated cost to an agency referred to in section 304(4)(B)(iii).

(c) A grant for comprehensive planning shall be made to a planning and development district agency pursuant to this title only if the comprehensive planning of such agency is not inconsistent with the comprehensive planning of any interstate or State agency assisted by funds granted under this title.

(d) A grant shall be made to a unit of general local government only if its comprehensive planning is not inconsistent with or duplicative of the comprehensive planning of any interstate, State, or district agency assisted by funds granted under this title.

(e) In order to be eligible for a grant for a program of planning assistance, a State agency referred to in section 304(2) shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to provide comprehensive planning assistance for eligible agencies specified in section 304(2). The agreement shall provide for the following:

(1) a designation by the Governor that the State agency shall have primary authority and responsibility for the development and administration of the local comprehensive planning assistance program;

(2) the relationship that will be maintained between and among local, areawide, and State comprehensive planning agencies, and the techniques that will be used to foster coordination and planning;

(3) specific policies, procedures, and priorities to assure that assistance will be made available to meet the needs of large cities and urban concentrations as well as smaller cities, rapidly urbanizing areas, outlying communities, rural regions, and federally impacted and depressed areas;

(4) the methods that will be used to relate comprehensive planning to functional planning within and among individual jurisdictions;

(5) a reasonable distribution of cost sharing for the non-Federal portion of the planning conducted by the State, and eligible agencies specified in section 304(2), including staff assistance and cash payments;

(6) provisions for an adequate professional and trained staff for the designated State agency to assure a capability for offering technical training, educational assistance and consultants to eligible agencies specified in section 304(2);

(7) provisions for assistance to comprehensive planning agencies within the State to initiate surveys and to develop new program designs for acquiring basic data, information, survey results, and analysis; for establishing comprehensive planning and formulating implementing measures; for maintaining and updating plans and policies through comprehensive planning; and for meeting unusual or nonrecurring needs in existing programs;

(8) provisions that Federal funds made available for the purposes of this title shall increase, and not supplant, State or local funds available for such purposes; and

(9) provisions to establish such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures and administrative reports as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for funds received under this section.

(f) To be eligible for a grant for a program of planning assistance, a planning and development district agency referred to in section 304(3) shall enter into an agreement with the Secretary to provide comprehensive

planning assistance for eligible agencies specified in section 304(3). The agreement shall include, to the maximum extent practicable, the same provisions as required by subsection (e) for an agreement with a State agency (except such provisions contained in clauses (1) and (5) of such subsection). The agreement with the district agency shall provide for a reasonable distribution of cost sharing for the non-Federal portion of assisted programs between the district and assisted eligible agencies specified in section 304(3).

(g) Planning assisted under this title shall, to the maximum extent feasible, cover entire areas having common or related development programs. The Secretary shall encourage cooperation in preparing and carrying out plans among all interested regions, States, political subdivisions, public agencies, and other parties in order to achieve coordinated development of entire areas. To the maximum extent feasible, pertinent plans, studies, information, and data already available for areas shall be utilized in order to avoid unnecessary repetition of effort and expense.

(h) Any grant made pursuant to this title shall be in addition to, and may be used jointly with, grants or other funds available for planning surveys, studies, and investigations under other federally assisted programs.

#### POWERS OF SECRETARY

SEC. 306. (a) In accordance with general rules and regulations promulgated by the President pursuant to section 103 of this Act, the Secretary shall promulgate rules and regulations to administer the provisions of this title, including the terms and conditions under which grants authorized by this title may be made.

(b) In order to carry out the provisions of this title, the Secretary—

(1) is authorized to make advance, progress, or other payments pursuant to any grant made under this title without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529);

(2) is authorized to provide technical assistance to any State, local government, Indian tribal body, or any other eligible agency specified in section 304 undertaking comprehensive planning;

(3) is authorized, by contract or otherwise, to make studies and publish information on problems related to comprehensive planning;

(4) shall consult with other officials of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of Federal assistance programs to States, planning and development districts, political subdivisions, or other eligible agencies specified in section 304, in order to determine how such programs are affected by the provisions of this title;

(5) shall consult with the Secretary of Agriculture prior to approving any grant to be made pursuant to this Act to a planning and development district agency which does not include any portion of a metropolitan area; and

(6) shall consult with the Secretary of Commerce prior to approving any planning grant to a planning and development district which serves as an economic development district or includes any part of such a district as defined and designated under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3121).

(c) The Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of Commerce, as appropriate, may provide technical assistance with or without reimbursement, in connection with the functions of such planning and development districts as may be assisted under this title.

#### INTERPROGRAM COORDINATION AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING SERVICE AGREEMENT

SEC. 307. (a) In order to achieve a high level of interprogram coordination and to eliminate duplication of effort in the devel-

opment of basic planning data and information, any State, regional or local governmental agency administering or receiving funds under any Federal assistance program may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, enter into agreements with comprehensive planning agencies for the provision of services thereby. Such agreements may provide for payments to a comprehensive planning agency (1) in support of comprehensive planning and coordination activities; (2) for planning review and advice, technical assistance, and consultation; (3) for the provision of basic and supporting planning and development information; and (4) for other similar services facilitating the efficient administration of such Federal assistance program.

(b) The head of any Federal department or agency administering a Federal assistance program under which an agreement is made as provided in subsection (a), may approve the expenditure of functional planning funds granted under the program for payments to a comprehensive planning agency for services under the agreement under such conditions as he may deem necessary and desirable.

#### INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Sec. 308. The consent of the Congress is hereby given to any two or more States to enter into agreements or compacts, not in conflict with any law of the United States, for cooperative efforts and mutual assistance in the comprehensive planning and development of interstate, metropolitan, or other development districts and to establish such agencies, joint or otherwise, as they may deem desirable for making effective such agreements and compacts.

#### APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 309. For the purpose of making grants under this title, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; not to exceed \$100,000,000 for each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 1972, and June 30, 1973; and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title. Any amount appropriated hereunder shall remain available until expended.

#### ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

Sec. 310. (a) Fifteen per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 309 for each fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary among the States for State comprehensive planning. From such 15 per centum, each State shall be allocated \$50,000 for each such year. From the remainder of such 15 per centum, each State shall receive an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population of each State bears to the population of all States.

(b) Sixty per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 309 for each fiscal year shall be allocated by the Secretary among the States for comprehensive planning assistance to eligible agencies specified in subsections 304 (2) and (3). From such 60 per centum, each State shall be allocated \$30,000 for each such year. From the remainder of the 60 per centum, each State shall receive an amount which bears the same ratio to the total remainder as the population of each State bears to the population of all States. If a State does not enter into an agreement pursuant to section 305(e), each planning and development district agency within the State, which enters into an agreement pursuant to section 305(f), shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the total amount the State would be eligible for, if it had entered into an agreement, as the population of the planning and development district bears to the total population of the State.

(c) The remaining 25 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to section 309

for each fiscal year shall be expended, as the Secretary deems appropriate, as follows:

(1) for additional grants to eligible agencies referred to in section 304 to carry out the functions of section 303;

(ii) for research, technical assistance, publications, and demonstration projects conducted by the Secretary to advance the purposes of this title (which total expenditures shall not exceed 5 per centum of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year); and

(iii) for sums incurred by the Secretary in administering the provisions of this title.

(d) Any amount allocated to a State under subsection (a) or (b) and not used within such State may be reallocated by the Secretary and may be used for grants to any agencies referred to in section 304 except a State comprehensive planning agency.

(e) The population of a State, of all the States, and of any planning and development district shall be determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Bureau of the Census.

#### AMENDMENTS

SEC. 311. (a) Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 (40 U.S.C. 461) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsections (a)-(f) and (i)(4)-(6) are repealed.

(2) The first sentence of subsection (g) is amended to read as follows:

"(g) The Secretary is authorized to make grants to organizations composed of public officials representative of the political jurisdictions within the metropolitan area, region, or district for the purpose of assisting such organizations to undertake such activities, including implementation of metropolitan, regional, and district plans, as he finds necessary or desirable for the solution of the metropolitan, regional, or district problems in such areas, regions, or district."

(3) Subsection (h) is amended—

(A) by striking out the phrase "(h) In addition to the other grants authorized by this section, the Secretary" and inserting in lieu thereof "(h) The Secretary" and

(B) by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof: "A grant under this subsection shall not exceed two-thirds of the cost of the survey for which it is made, and shall be made to the appropriate State, metropolitan, or regional planning agency, tribal planning council, regional commission established by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 or under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 for comprehensive planning for the regions established under such Acts, or local development districts certified under section 301 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 for comprehensive planning or, if there is no such agency or entity which is qualified and willing to receive the grant and provide for its utilization in accordance with this subsection, directly to the city, other municipality, or county involved."

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) There are authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of this section not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and not to exceed \$1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972. Any amount appropriated under this section shall be subject to terms and conditions prescribed by the Secretary. No portion of any grant made under this section shall be used for the preparation of plans for specific public works. The Secretary is authorized to make advance, or progress, or other payments pursuant to any grant made under this section, without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 529)."

(5) The caption for such section is amended to read as follows: "ASSISTANCE

FOR ORGANIZATIONS COMPOSED OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND FOR HISTORIC SURVEYS".

(b) Section 204 of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 334) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Such rules and regulations may identify the type of projects which may be exempted from coverage because of their relative lack of significance for State or areawide planning and development."

#### TITLE IV—UNIFORM PLANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

##### FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 401. (a) (1) The Congress finds that the rapid increase in the number of Federal grant-in-aid programs has been accompanied by a comparable increase in planning requirements for such programs. These planning requirements lack uniformity, frequently fail to define clearly comprehensive or functional planning, or to identify the jurisdiction responsible for planning, and may result in a variety of overlapping and inconsistent activities related to the gathering and analysis of data.

(2) The Congress further finds that while sound, coordinated, and consistent comprehensive and functional planning is essential to the accomplishment of national objectives through grant-in-aid programs, the present overlapping and inconsistent requirements limit the accomplishment of this objective.

(3) The Congress further finds that Federal grants for comprehensive and functional planning should provide assistance for and encourage planning necessary to meet consistent and coordinated planning requirements in other Federal grant programs.

(b) It is the purpose of this title to eliminate inconsistent and overlapping grant requirements by standardizing the definitions of comprehensive planning and functional planning and to apply these definitions properly by providing a method of identifying planning jurisdictions and by establishing the basis for the development and use of common data and information bases.

##### USE OF COMMON PLANNING INFORMATION

SEC. 402. Federal agencies administering grant programs which require comprehensive or functional planning, or require conformity to existing planning as a condition in making the grants, shall require that such planning proceed from social, economic, demographic, and other base data, statistics, and projections that are common to or consistent with those being employed for planning related activities within the area. Such agencies shall assure that their data requirements for comprehensive and functional planning are common or consistent and shall assist in developing and expanding standard planning information bases.

##### COMPREHENSIVE AND FUNCTIONAL PLANNING REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 403. (a) Title II of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 204(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3334(a)(1)) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) to any State comprehensive planning agency or planning and development district agency, which is designated to perform metropolitan or regional planning for the area within which the assistance is to be used, and".

(2) Section 204(b)(1)(A) (42 U.S.C. 3334(b)(1)(A)) is amended by striking out "areawide agency" and inserting in lieu thereof "State comprehensive planning agency or the planning and development district agency".

(3) Section 204(b)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3334(b)(2)) is amended by striking out "an appropriate areawide agency or instrumentality" and inserting in lieu thereof "the appropriate State comprehensive planning

agency or planning and development district agency."

(4) Section 208 (42 U.S.C. 3338) is amended—

(A) by striking out paragraphs (5) and (7); and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) The terms 'State comprehensive planning agency', 'planning and development district agency', 'area-wide comprehensive planning', and 'comprehensive planning' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(b) The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of section 301(a) (42 U.S.C. 3151(a)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "except that on or after July 1, 1973, such assistance for comprehensive planning shall be made available only to a State comprehensive planning agency, a planning and development district agency, or a unit of general local government".

(2) Section 403(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 3171(a)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (C);

(B) by striking out clause (D) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(D) The proposed district has an overall district economic development program which is part of area-wide comprehensive planning, includes adequate land use and transportation planning, and contains a specific program for district cooperation, self-help, and public investment and is approved by the State or States affected and by the Secretary; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(E) on or after July 1, 1973, the proposed district is a planning and development district";

(3) Section 403(d) (42 U.S.C. 3171(d)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and which, on or after July 1, 1973, is a planning and development district".

(4) Section 706 (42 U.S.C. 3216) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and the terms 'comprehensive planning', 'functional planning', 'area-wide comprehensive planning', 'planning and development district agency', and 'unit of general local government' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization and Planning Act."

(c) The Housing Act of 1961 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 706(2) (42 U.S.C. 1500c-2) is amended to read as follows: "(2) is important to the development of the locality as provided for in comprehensive planning for the political subdivision within which the land is located."

(2) The first sentence of section 709 (42 U.S.C. 1500d-1) is amended by striking out "the comprehensively planned development of the locality" and inserting in lieu thereof "comprehensive planning for the political subdivision within which the area, site, or structure is located".

(3) Section 710 (42 U.S.C. 1500e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) The terms 'comprehensive planning' and 'political subdivision' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(d) The National Housing Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1001 (12 U.S.C. 1749aa) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subsection (d);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of subsection (e) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) the terms 'comprehensive planning', 'planning and development district agency', and 'unit of general local government' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(2) Section 1003(b)(3) (12 U.S.C. 1749cc(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) is consistent with comprehensive planning by the State, a planning and development district agency, or a unit of general local government for the area within which the land is located."

(e) The New Communities Act of 1968 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 404(4) (42 U.S.C. 3903(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) the internal development plan is consistent with State or areawide comprehensive planning for the area in which the land is situated."

(2) Section 415 (42 U.S.C. 3914) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The terms 'State comprehensive planning' and 'areawide comprehensive planning' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(f) The Housing Act of 1949 is amended as follows:

(1) In the parenthetical matter in the last sentence of section 102(d) (42 U.S.C. 1452(d)), strike out "the general plan of the locality as a whole" and insert in lieu thereof "comprehensive planning by the unit of general local government for the area covered by the General Neighborhood Renewal Plan".

(2) The second sentence of section 103(d) (42 U.S.C. 1453(d)) is amended to read as follows: "Such programs shall conform, in the determination of the governing body of the locality, to comprehensive planning by the unit of general local government for the area covered by the community renewal program."

(3) Section 110 (42 U.S.C. 1460) is amended—

(A) by amending subsection (b)(1) to read as follows: "(1) shall conform to comprehensive planning by the unit of general local government for the urban renewal area and to the workable program referred to in section 101 hereof, and shall be consistent with definite local objectives respecting appropriate land uses, improved traffic, public transportation, public utilities, recreational and community facilities, and other public improvements, and"; and

(B) adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(1) 'Comprehensive planning' and 'unit of general local government' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(g) The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 703(c)(2) (42 U.S.C. 3103(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows: "(2) consistent with comprehensive planning by the unit of general local government and with public health, recreation, and other functional planning for the development of the community within which the facilities will be located, and".

(2) The first sentence of section 704(c) (42 U.S.C. 3104(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) No grant shall be made under this section unless the Secretary determines that the land will be utilized for a public purpose within a reasonable period of time and that such utilization will contribute to economy, efficiency, and the development of the area

as provided for in areawide comprehensive planning or comprehensive planning by units of general local government, and public works and facilities, public health, transportation, recreation, or other relevant functional planning."

(3) Section 706 (42 U.S.C. 3106) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The terms 'comprehensive planning', 'areawide comprehensive planning', 'functional planning', and 'unit of general local government' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(h) The Housing Act of 1954 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 702(b)(2) (40 U.S.C. 462(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows: "(2) it conforms to comprehensive planning by the State, a planning and development district agency, or a unit of general local government, and to functional planning for official State, areawide, and local water, sewer and other public works or facilities, public health facilities, recreational facilities, and"

(2) Section 703 (40 U.S.C. 460) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" before clause (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause: "(5) the terms 'comprehensive planning', 'planning and development district agency', 'unit of general local government', and 'functional planning' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

WATER, SEWER, AND OTHER PUBLIC WORKS AND FACILITIES—FUNCTIONAL AND COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING REQUIREMENT AMENDMENTS

Sec. 404 (a) Section 702(c)(2) of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3102(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows: "(2) consistent with official areawide water and sewer functional planning, meeting criteria established by the Secretary, for a unified or officially coordinated areawide water and sewer facilities system as part of areawide comprehensive planning for the development of the area, except that prior to October 1, 1969, grants for projects may, in the discretion of the Secretary, be made under this section when such planning for an areawide water and sewer facilities system is under active preparation, although not yet completed, if the facility or facilities for which assistance is sought can reasonably be expected to be included as essential to such planning, and there is urgent need for the facility or facilities;"

(b) The Housing Amendments of 1955 are amended as follows:

(1) Section 202(b) (42 U.S.C. 1492(b)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) No financial assistance shall be extended under clause (1) of subsection (a) of this section unless the project is consistent with functional planning for official areawide water and sewer and other public works and facilities."

(2) Section 206 (42 U.S.C. 1496) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a comma and the following: "and the term 'functional planning' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(c) Section 306 of the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 (7 U.S.C. 1926) is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) (1) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following sentence: "No loans shall be made or insured under this paragraph unless the Secretary

determines that the project is consistent with functional planning for official areawide and local open space, recreation, and water and sewer and other public works and facilities."

(2) Strike out all the matter of paragraph (3) of subsection (a) following "(iii)" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "is necessary for orderly community development consistent with official areawide water and sewer functional planning and not inconsistent with any planned development under areawide comprehensive planning or comprehensive planning undertaken by the unit of general local government within which the project is located and the Secretary shall establish regulations requiring the submission of all applications for financial assistance under this Act to the city or county government in which the proposed project is to be located for review and comment by such agency within a designated period of time."

(3) Subsection (a) (4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) The terms 'comprehensive planning', 'areawide comprehensive planning', 'functional planning', and 'unit of general local government' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(4) Subsection (a) (6) is amended to read as follows:

"(6) The Secretary may make grants aggregating not to exceed \$15,000,000 in any fiscal year to public bodies or such agencies as the Secretary may determine having authority to conduct official areawide water and sewer functional planning for the development of water and sewer systems in rural areas which do not have funds available for immediate undertaking of such planning."

(5) Subsection (c) is amended by inserting immediately after the word "section" the following: "but complying with the planning requirements of subsection (a) (1) and (3)".

(d) The Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection 101(a)(1)(C) (42 U.S.C. 3131(a)(1)(C)) is amended to read as follows:

"(C) the area for which a project is to be undertaken has an approved overall economic development program, as provided in section 202(b)(10) and such project is consistent with such program and with functional planning for official areawide and local water and sewer and other public works and facilities;"

(2) Section 201(a)(5) (42 U.S.C. 3141(a)(5)) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) such area has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program and with functional planning for official areawide and local water and sewer and other public works and facilities."

(3) Section 202(b)(10) (42 U.S.C. 3142(b)(10)) is amended to read as follows:

"(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall economic development program for the area which is part of areawide comprehensive planning and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program and, where applicable, with functional planning for official areawide and local open space, recreation, and water and sewer and other public works and facilities. On and after July 1, 1973, such finding shall be made only by the State comprehensive planning agency, a planning and development district agency, or a unit of general local government for the area within which the project is to be located.

Nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by the laws of the State or political subdivision in which the project would be located, nor prevent the Secretary from requiring such periodic revisions of previously approved overall economic development programs as he may deem appropriate."

(e) The Federal Water Pollution Control Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 8(b)(5) (33 U.S.C. 466e(b)(5)) is amended to read as follows: "(5) no grant shall be made for any project under this section unless such project is in conformity with the State water pollution control functional plan submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 7 and with official areawide water and sewer functional planning and has been certified by the appropriate State water pollution control agency as entitled to priority over other eligible projects on the basis of financial as well as water pollution control needs;"

(2) Section 8(f) (33 U.S.C. 466e(f)) is amended to read as follows:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, the Secretary may increase the amount of a grant made under subsection (b) of this section by an additional 10 per centum of the amount of such grant for any project which has been certified to him by an official State planning agency or a planning and development district agency empowered under State or local laws or interstate compact to perform metropolitan comprehensive planning, as being in conformity with metropolitan comprehensive planning for a metropolitan area within which the assistance is to be used. The provisions of this subsection may be extended to any urban area, including those surrounding areas that form an economic and socially related region, taking into consideration such factors as present and future population trends and patterns of urban growth, location of transportation facilities and systems, and distribution of industrial, commercial, residential, governmental, institutional, and other activities, which in the opinion of the President lends itself as being appropriate for the purposes hereof for any project certified by an official State planning agency or planning and development district agency as being in conformity with State or areawide comprehensive planning."

(3) Section 10(j) (33 U.S.C. 466g(j)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "the term" in the matter preceding paragraph (1); and

(B) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(C) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "and"; and

(D) by inserting at the end thereof the following: "(3) 'functional planning', 'functional plan', 'metropolitan comprehensive planning', 'State planning agency', and 'planning and development district agency' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

#### PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES AND FACILITIES FUNCTIONAL PLANNING REQUIREMENT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 405. (a) The Public Health Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 314(a)(1) (42 U.S.C. 246(a)(1)) is amended by striking out "comprehensive" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "coordinated".

(2) Section 314(a)(2) (42 U.S.C. 246(a)(2)) is amended by striking out all the matter preceding subparagraph (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(2) In order to be approved for purposes of this subsection, a State functional plan for State public health services and facilities must—"

(3) The first sentence of section 314(b)

(42 U.S.C. 246(b)) is amended by striking out "comprehensive regional, metropolitan area, or other local area plans for coordination of existing and planned health services" and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "functional planning to coordinate existing and planned regional, metropolitan area, or other local area public health services and facilities".

(4) The second sentence of section 314(d)(1) (42 U.S.C. 246(d)(1)) is amended by striking out "State plans for provision of public health services" and inserting in lieu thereof "functional plans for State public health services and facilities".

(5) All the matter preceding subparagraph (A) of 314(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 246(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In order to be approved under this subsection, a State public health services and facilities functional plan must—"

(6) Section 314(d)(2) (42 U.S.C. 246(d)(2)(D)) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof the following: "and not inconsistent with official functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, or other local area public health services and facilities".

(7) The second sentence of section 314(e) (42 U.S.C. 246(e)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: "and are in accordance with functional planning for regional, metropolitan areawide, and other local area public health services and facilities".

(8) Section 314(g)(4) (42 U.S.C. 246(g)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of subparagraph (A);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(C) The terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(9) The first sentence of section 604(a) (42 U.S.C. 291d(a)) is amended to read as follows: "Any State desiring to participate in this part may submit a State public health services and facilities functional plan."

(10) Section 391 (42 U.S.C. 280b-1) is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) the terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(11) Section 393(b) (42 U.S.C. 280b-3(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(B) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) the facility will be in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(12) Section 604(a)(4) (42 U.S.C. 291d(a)(4)) is amended by striking out "community, area, or regional plans" and inserting in lieu thereof "functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, or other local area public health services and facilities".

(13) Section 605(b)(3) (42 U.S.C. 291e(b)(3)) is amended to read as follows:

"(3) that the application is in conformity with the State plan approved under section 604 and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan, or other local area public health services and facilities and contains an assurance that in the operation

of the project there will be compliance with the applicable requirements of the regulations prescribed under section 603(e), and with State standards for operation and maintenance."

(14) Section 625 (42 U.S.C. 2910) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) The terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(15) Section 702 (42 U.S.C. 292a) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) the terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(16) Section 705(c) (42 U.S.C. 292(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) the facility for which assistance is sought is in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health and facilities."

(17) Section 721(c) (42 U.S.C. 293a (c)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (5);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (6) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(7) the facility for which assistance is sought is in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, or other local public health services and facilities."

(18) Section 724 (42 U.S.C. 293d) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) the terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(19) Section 762(a) (42 U.S.C. 295(a)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (1);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by inserting at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the facility for which assistance is sought is in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, or other local public health services and facilities."

(20) Section 766 (42 U.S.C. 295e) is amended—

(A) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) the terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(21) Section 791(b) (2) (42 U.S.C. 295h(b)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of clause (D);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of clause (E) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new clause:

"(F) the facility for which assistance is sought will be in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(22) Section 795 (42 U.S.C. 295h-4) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) The terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(23) Section 807(c) (42 U.S.C. 296f(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) provides that the facility will be in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(24) Section 843 (42 U.S.C. 298b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j) The terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(b) The Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 122 (42 U.S.C. 2662) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon and the word "and"; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) the facility will be in conformity with the State public health services and facilities functional plan and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(2) Section 134(a) (42 U.S.C. 2674(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting in the first sentence between the words "State" and "plan" the following: "public health services and facilities functional"; and

(B) by striking out clause (A) of paragraph (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(A) which is based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities, a survey of need, and (except to the extent provided by or pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 133) is in conformity with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities;"

(3) Clause (C) in the next to the last sentence of section 135(a) (42 U.S.C. 2675 (a)) is amended by inserting immediately after "section 134" the following: "and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(4) Section 142(a) (4) (42 U.S.C. 2678a(a) (4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) in case of an applicant which has in existence (A) a State public health services and facilities functional plan, including services for the mentally retarded, or (B) a State functional plan relating to the provision of services for the mentally retarded, the services to be provided by the facility are consistent with the plan and with relevant functional planning for the region, metropolitan area, and other area."

(5) Section 204(a) (42 U.S.C. 2684(a)) is amended—

(A) by inserting in the first sentence between the words "State" and "plan" the following: "public health services and facilities functional"; and

(B) by striking out paragraph (4) (A) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "(A) which is based on a statewide inventory of existing facilities, a survey of need, and (except to the extent provided by or pursuant to regulations prescribed under section 203) functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services;"

(6) Clause (C) in the next to last sentence of section 205(a) (42 U.S.C. 2685(a)) is amended by inserting immediately after "section 204" the following: "and with functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(7) Section 221(a) (5) (42 U.S.C. 2688a(a) (5)) is amended to read as follows:

"(5) the services to be provided by the center are included in the State public health services and facilities functional plan, including mental health services, or in a State mental health functional plan submitted to the Public Health Service by the State mental health authority in accordance with title III of the Public Health Service Act and are not inconsistent with relevant functional planning for regional, metropolitan area, and other local area public health services and facilities."

(8) Section 401 (42 U.S.C. 2691) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(1) The terms 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

COMPREHENSIVE AND TRANSPORTATION FUNCTIONAL PLANNING REQUIREMENT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 406. (a) Section 101(a) of title 23, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The term 'functional planning' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(b) The last sentence of section 134 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out "comprehensive transportation planning" and inserting in lieu thereof "coordinated transportation functional planning".

(c) Section 11(f) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1965 (82 Stat. 820; Public Law 90-495) is amended by striking out "comprehensive transportation planning" and inserting in lieu thereof "coordinated transportation functioning planning".

(d) The Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 3(c) (1) (49 U.S.C. 1602(a) (1)) is amended to read as follows: "(1) the Secretary finds that such assistance is essential to a program, proposed or under active preparation, which conforms or will conform to official areawide transportation functional planning for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of areawide comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area."

(2) The first sentence of section 4(a) (49 U.S.C. 1603 (a)) is amended by striking out

"for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of the comprehensively planned development of the urban area", and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "and which conforms to official areawide transportation functional planning for a unified or officially coordinated urban transportation system as a part of areawide comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area".

(3) Section 12(c) (49 U.S.C. 1608(c)) is amended—

(A) by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4);

(B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon; and

(C) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(6) the terms 'comprehensive planning' and 'functional planning' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(e) Section 202(d) (1) (42 U.S.C. 1492(d) (1)) of the Housing Amendments of 1955 is amended to read as follows: "(1) that there is being actively developed (or has been developed) for the urban or other metropolitan area served by the applicant a program, meeting criteria established by him and conforming to official transportation functional planning for the area, for the development of a comprehensive and coordinated mass transportation system;"

(f) The Federal Airport Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2(a) (49 U.S.C. 1101(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(13) 'Functional planning' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(2) Section 9(a) (49 U.S.C. 1108(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "No project may be inconsistent with State, areawide, or municipal transportation functional planning which is not in conflict with the national airport plan."

#### COMPREHENSIVE AND OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION FUNCTIONAL PLANNING REQUIREMENT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 407. (a) The Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 5(d) (16 U.S.C. 460 1-8(d)) is amended—

(A) by striking out the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "A coordinated, statewide, open space and outdoor recreation functional plan shall be required prior to the consideration by the Secretary of financial assistance for acquisition or development projects and such acquisition or projects shall not be inconsistent with regional and local official open space and outdoor recreation functional planning;" and

(B) by striking out all the matter following clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The plan shall take into account relevant Federal resources and programs and shall be correlated so far as practicable with other State, regional, and local comprehensive planning and official open space and outdoor recreation functional planning. Where there exists or is in preparation for any particular State a comprehensive plan prepared through comprehensive planning, financed in part with funds supplied by the Department of Housing and Urban Development, any statewide open space and outdoor recreation functional plan prepared for purposes of this Act shall be based upon the same population, growth, and other pertinent factors as used in formulating the Department of Housing and Urban Development financed plans.

"The Secretary may provide financial as-

sistance to any State for projects for the preparation of a coordinated, statewide, open space and outdoor recreation functional plan when such plan is not otherwise available or for the maintenance of such plan.

"As used in this Act, the terms 'comprehensive planning', 'functional planning' and 'functional plan' have the same meanings as given them in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(2) The second sentence in the third full paragraph of section 5(f) (16 U.S.C. 460 1-8 (f)) is amended by striking out "comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan" and inserting in lieu thereof "coordinated, statewide, open space and outdoor recreation functional plan."

(b) Section 703(a) of the Housing Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 1500b(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The Secretary shall enter into contracts to make grants under sections 702 and 705 of this title only if he finds that such assistance is needed for carrying out a unified or officially coordinated program, meeting criteria established by him, and conforming to official areawide, open space and outdoor recreation functional planning for the provision of open space land as part of areawide comprehensive planning for the development of the urban area."

(c) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize acquisition or use of public lands by States, counties, or municipalities for recreational purposes", approved June 14, 1926, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence of section 1(a) (43 U.S.C. 869(a)) is amended to read as follows: "Before the land may be disposed of under this Act, it must be shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the land is to be used for an established or definitely proposed project and that the project is not inconsistent with the open space and outdoor recreation functional plan for the State."

(2) Section 1 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The term 'functional plan' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(d) Section 31 of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act (7 U.S.C. 1010) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Any project undertaken under this authorization may not be inconsistent with State and areawide open space and outdoor recreation functional plans. The term 'functional plan' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(e) Section 7(a) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(8) Any loan extended to a small business concern for recreational development may not be inconsistent with areawide and local open space and outdoor recreation functional planning. The term 'functional planning' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

#### WATER RESOURCES FUNCTIONAL PLANNING REQUIREMENT AMENDMENTS

SEC. 408. (a) The Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 (16 U.S.C. 1002) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"'Functional Plan'—the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(2) Insert after section 4 the following new section:

"SEC. 4A. Any planning or installation of works of improvement undertaken may not be inconsistent with the State and areawide water resources functional plans, and where the planning or installation includes recrea-

tional development, may not be inconsistent with the State and areawide open space and outdoor recreation functional plans."

(b) Section 104 of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610) is amended as follows:

(1) Immediately after the first sentence in subsection (a) insert the following new sentence: "No such control operation may be inconsistent with the State or areawide water resources functional plan."

(2) Add at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) The term 'functional plan' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(c) The Act entitled "An Act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property", approved August 13, 1946, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) The first section (33 U.S.C. 426e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) No project may be inconsistent with State and areawide water resources functional plans, and for those projects which include recreational beaches, they may not be inconsistent with State and areawide open space and outdoor recreation plans."

(2) Before the period at the end of section 4 (33 U.S.C. 426h) insert a comma and the following: "and the term 'functional plan' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(d) The Small Reclamation Projects Act of 1956 is amended as follows:

(1) Section 2 (43 U.S.C. 422b) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(f) The term 'functional plan' has the same meaning as given it in section 102 of the Balanced Urbanization Policy and Planning Act."

(2) Section 8 (43 U.S.C. 422h) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Projects shall be consistent with State and areawide water resources functional plans, and if they include recreational development, they shall be consistent with State and areawide open space and outdoor recreation functional plans."

#### SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE BALANCED URBANIZATION POLICY AND PLANNING ACT

##### TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

##### Declaration of purpose

Section 101 declares the purpose of the Act is to establish procedures for developing a national urbanization policy, to provide greater coordination in the administration of Federal urban and economic development grants, to provide assistance to States and localities for developing comprehensive coordination and planning agencies and activities, to consolidate comprehensive planning requirements for grant programs, and to systematize other planning requirements.

##### Definitions

Section 102 contains definitions of 11 terms, including "comprehensive planning," "functional planning," and "planning and development district."

##### Presidential responsibility

Section 103 makes the President responsible for providing policy guidance and review of the administration of the Act, and for promulgating implementing general rules and regulations, with particular regard to maintaining consistency among the comprehensive and functional planning requirements of this Act and similar requirements of Section 401 of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968. The latter deals with "Coordinated Intergovernmental Policy and Administration of Development Assistance Programs."

TITLE II—DEVELOPMENT OF A NATIONAL  
URBANIZATION POLICY

*Findings and declaration of policy*

Section 201(a) finds that rapid urban population growth and urban development, together with a decline in farm population and migration to the cities, has created an imbalance between needs and resources which threatens the Nation's achievement of satisfactory living standards.

Section 201(b) further finds that Federal programs already have a significant effect on population distribution, economic growth, and urban development; that the purposes of separate programs often conflict; and that a concerted effort is needed to coordinate existing and future programs within a system of planned development and priorities in accordance with a national urbanization policy.

Section 201(c) declares that it is a continuing Federal responsibility, consistent with the responsibilities of State and local government and the private sector, to undertake the development of a national urbanization policy to serve as a guide for specific decisions at the national level which affect the pattern of urban growth and provide a framework for development of interstate, State, and local policy.

Section 201(d) further declares that the national urbanization policy should—

(1) favor patterns of urbanization and economic development which offer a range of alternative locations and encourage the wise and balanced use of physical and human resources;

(2) foster the economic strength of all parts of the nation;

(3) reverse migration and growth trends which increase disparities among States, regions, and cities;

(4) treat comprehensively poverty and employment problems associated with urbanization and rural decline;

(5) develop means to alleviate present trends which accentuate racial conflict;

(6) indicate how the Federal Government can help revitalize existing communities and encourage large-scale urban and new community development;

(7) assist general governmental institutions in achieving balanced urban growth; and

(8) facilitate better coordination of Federal programs so as to encourage desirable urban growth patterns.

*Urbanization policy, planning, and coordination*

Section 202 provides that, in order to develop the national urbanization policy, a number of functions shall be performed within the Executive Office of the President. These include the preparation of an Annual Report on Urban Growth; the collection and evaluation of information on population growth and movement, urbanization, economic growth, land use patterns, and natural resource conservation and development; a continuing assessment of Federal efforts to develop and implement a national urbanization policy; an estimate of the needs of interstate, State, local and private plans and programs affecting that policy; an evaluation of the relationship of Federal programs and policies to interstate, State, local and private plans, policies, and programs; and an estimate of needs of Federal programs which affect those nonfederal plans, policies, and programs.

*Urban growth report*

Section 203(a) requires the President to transmit the Annual Report on Urban Growth to Congress not later than February 20. This Section specifies what the report shall contain, including data describing urban growth characteristics and identifying trends, a summary of key problems arising from those trends, an evaluation of Federal progress in meeting the problems and carrying out the

urbanization policy, a review of interstate, State, local, and private policies and needs affecting the policy, and recommendations for implemental steps, including legislation.

Section 203(b) authorizes the President to transmit to Congress such supplementary reports on urban growth as he deems appropriate.

Section 203(c) provides that the Annual Growth Report and supplements shall be referred to the two Congressional Committees on Government Operations and on Banking and Currency, the Joint Urbanization Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and other standing committees as the presiding officer of each House designates.

*Authorization*

Section 204 authorizes funds to be appropriated to the Executive Office of the President to carry out the development of the urbanization policy and preparation of the Annual Report on Urban Growth.

*Joint Urbanization Committee*

Section 205(a) establishes the Joint Urbanization Committee, composed of eight members from each of the Houses, three of whom from each House shall be members of the minority party. The Committee is to select its chairman and vice chairman from among its members.

Section 205(b) provides that the Joint Committee shall make a continuing study of the Annual Report on Urban Growth and its supplements, and study ways of coordinating programs in order to further the national urbanization policy.

Section 205(c) requires the Committee to file a report with each House not later than April 20 of each year. The report is to contain the Committee's findings and recommendations on the President's recommendations in his Annual Report on Urban Growth. The Committee may make such other reports from time to time as it deems advisable.

Section 205(d) spells out the powers of the Joint Committee or its subcommittees. Section 205(e) prescribes how the subpoena may be used and oaths to witnesses administered. Section 205(f) authorizes the Committee to appoint and fix the compensation of staff and consultants, and Section 205(g) authorizes the use of staff of other committees or subcommittees of either House. Section 205(h) establishes the method of payment of the Joint Committee's expenses.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING AND COORDINATION

*Short title*

Section 301 provides that this title may be cited as the "Comprehensive Planning and Coordination Act."

In Section 302(a) Congress finds that an effective national urbanization policy depends upon Federal, State, and local cooperation in developing a system of comprehensive planning and coordination. It finds that development planning has tended to be too narrow and inadequately coordinated rather than comprehensive, and that comprehensive planning and coordination agencies and processes are needed to coordinate functional, project and agency program planning. It further finds that development needs may best be coordinated at the State and local levels through State and local comprehensive, policy-based planning processes and adequate governmental structure to implement the planning and coordination. Finally, Section 302(a) finds that Federal assistance programs can best be coordinated through the Executive Office of the President, using the powers granted in Section 202 of this Act and Title IV (coordination of development assistance programs) of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

Section 302(b) declares that the purpose of this title is to provide assistance for comprehensive planning at the interstate, State, regional, and local levels; to encourage local

governments to cooperate in solving area-wide problems through comprehensive planning and coordination; to foster intergovernmental attacks on problems of national urban and rural development; and to establish a method for exchange of development information among localities, the States, and the Federal Government.

*Planning and coordination grants*

Section 303 authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make comprehensive planning grants to carry out the purposes of Section 302(b). Activities comprising comprehensive planning include systematic collection of information on physical, economic, and human resource development programs and projects; collection and analysis of information related to population, economic trends, urban and rural growth and change, employment, human resource trends and needs, State and local governmental organization and fiscal resources; development and use of common data bases for State, regional, and local planning; arranging for exchange of planning information among agencies at all levels of government; preparation and maintenance of a coordinated planning system, including long-range, comprehensive plans consistent with the national urbanization policy; undertaking of studies and surveys to facilitate program coordination; provision of technical assistance and training on comprehensive planning and coordination matters on an interagency, interprogram, and intergovernmental basis; and arranging for exchange of information with the Federal Government for the President's use in discharging his responsibilities under this Act and Title IV of the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

*Eligible agencies*

Section 304 provides that the Secretary may make comprehensive planning grants directly to certain agencies and indirectly to others. The channel for making the indirect grants depends on whether a State agency or planning and development district (PDD) agencies administer the planning assistance funds from HUD.

Direct grants may be made to a State comprehensive planning agency, regional councils of government with jurisdiction in two or more States, the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, a regional commission established under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, an Indian tribal planning body, and political subdivisions in Presidentially designated disaster areas. In addition, where a State does not have a planning assistance program channeled through a State agency, direct grants for comprehensive planning may be made to PDD agencies. Finally, where neither a State agency nor planning and development districts administer planning assistance programs, direct grants may also be made to a city or county comprehensive planning agency and to governmental agencies planning for federally impacted areas, for areas undergoing rapid urbanization because of new community development aided by Federal housing programs, and for areas suffering substantial reduction of employment because of the closing of a Federal installation or the reduction of Federal procurement.

Where a State has an approved State agency administering comprehensive planning assistance to PDD agencies and local units, then the following agencies may obtain their Federal funds for comprehensive planning only through the State agency: PDD agencies, units of general local government, and governmental agencies planning for federally impacted areas, for areas undergoing rapid urbanization because of new community development aided by Federal housing programs, and for areas suffering substantial reduction of employment because of the closing of a Federal installation or the

reduction of Federal procurement. If the State does not have an approved State agency for administering the planning assistance program, PDD agencies may administer it. In that case, all planning moneys from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development must channel through the PDD agencies to all the local agencies who would otherwise have to get their grants from the State agency.

#### *Proposals for grants*

Section 305(a) sets forth the conditions that grant applicants must meet in submitting applications.

Section 305(b) provides that planning or planning assistance grants shall not exceed two-thirds of the estimated cost, except that they may be up to three-fourths of the cost for agencies planning for areas suffering substantial reduction of employment because of the closing of a Federal installation or the reduction of Federal procurement.

Under Sections 305(c) and 305(d), a PDD agency may receive a grant only if its comprehensive planning is consistent with the comprehensive planning of any interstate or State agency assisted by funds granted under this title, and a local government's comprehensive planning must be consistent with that of any interstate, State, or PDD agency assisted by funds granted under this title.

In order to receive a grant for a planning assistance program, Section 305(e) provides that a State agency must enter into an agreement with the Secretary of HUD which:

Provides that the Governor designates the State agency as primarily responsible for the assistance program;

Establishes the relationship among local, areawide, and State comprehensive planning agencies;

Assures that assistance will be made available to all types of specified areas;

Sets forth methods for relating comprehensive and functional planning within and among recipient jurisdictions;

Prescribes a reasonable cost-sharing formula for the non-Federal portion of the planning conducted by the State and local assistance recipients;

Provides for an adequate State technical assistance staff and program;

Assures that the grant funds will not be used to supplant existing State or local funds; and

Provides necessary fiscal control and accounting procedures.

Section 305(f) required PDD agencies that apply for grants to conduct a planning assistance program to meet the same requirements as the State agency must meet under Section 305(e), except those relating to designation of the State agency, and cost-sharing of the non-Federal funds. For the PDD agencies, non-Federal costs must be shared between them and the assisted eligible agencies.

Section 305(g) states that planning assisted under the title must cover, to the maximum extent feasible, entire areas having common development problems. The Secretary must encourage cooperation among all parties to achieve coordinated development, and duplication of effort must be avoided. Section 305(h) requires grant funds to be used in addition to other funds available under federally assisted programs.

#### *Powers of Secretary*

Under Section 306, the Secretary is empowered to promulgate rules and regulations to carry out this title, in accordance with those promulgated by the President under Section 103. In addition, the Secretary specifically is authorized to make advance, progress, or other payments; provide technical assistance to eligible agencies; make studies and reports on comprehensive planning problems; consult with other Federal grant-administering agencies in order to determine how their programs are affected by this title; consult with the Secretary of

Agriculture before making any planning grant to a nonmetropolitan PDD agency; and consult with the Secretary of Commerce before making such a grant to a PDD agency that serves as an economic development district. The Secretaries of Agriculture and Commerce may provide technical assistance to PDD agencies assisted under the title.

#### *Interprogram coordination and comprehensive planning service agreements*

Section 307 authorizes any State, regional, or local agency receiving any kind of Federal assistance funds to obtain certain services from comprehensive planning agencies, including planning review, advice, and information and technical assistance. Federal grant-administering agencies are authorized to allow grant recipients to spend functional planning grant funds to pay for such services.

#### *Interstate compacts*

Section 308 gives the advance consent of Congress to interstate compacts for comprehensive planning and development activities and to the formation of agencies to carry on such activities.

#### *Appropriations authorized*

Section 309 authorizes appropriations for the planning grants in the following amounts: up to \$75 million for FY 1971; up to \$100 million for FYs 1972 and 1973; and such sums as necessary for the following two fiscal years.

#### *Allocations to States*

Section 310(a) provides that 15 percent of each year's appropriation shall be allocated for State comprehensive planning, with each State getting a minimum of \$50,000 and the remainder being allocated among the States on the basis of population.

Section 310(b) provides that 60 percent of the appropriation shall be allocated among the States for comprehensive planning assistance to eligible agencies, with each State getting a minimum of \$30,000 and the remainder being allocated on the basis of State population. It provides further that if the State does not enter into an agreement to provide planning assistance, each PDD agency which enters into such an agreement will receive an allocation proportionate to its portion of the total State population.

Section 310(c) authorizes the Secretary to spend the remaining 25 percent of the appropriation as he deems appropriate for additional grants to eligible agencies; for research, technical assistance, publications, and demonstration projects (not to exceed 5 percent of the total appropriation); and for administration. He is further authorized under Section 310(d) to reallocate among eligible agencies any unspent State allocations.

#### *Amendments*

Section 311 repeals all sections of the existing 701 planning assistance statute except those authorizing nonplanning grants to councils of government and grants for historic surveys. It also appropriates \$1 million for each of the fiscal years 1971 and 1972 for these two programs.

#### TITLE IV—UNIFORM PLANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

##### *Findings and declaration of policy*

Section 401(a) finds that there has been a rapid increase in grant programs and planning requirements for such programs; that these requirements lack uniformity and clear definitions of comprehensive or functional planning, and fail to identify the jurisdiction responsible for planning; that they produce a variety of overlapping and inconsistent activities in data gathering and analysis; and that they limit effectiveness of comprehensive and functional planning.

Section 401(b) states that the purpose of this title is to eliminate inconsistent and overlapping grant requirements by standardizing the definitions of comprehensive and

functional planning and applying these definitions properly by providing a method of identifying planning jurisdictions and establishing the basis for developing and using common data and information bases.

#### *Use of common planning information*

Section 402 provides that Federal agencies administering grants that require comprehensive or functional planning, or require conformity to existing planning, shall require that such planning be based on social, economic, demographic and other data that are common to or consistent with those employed for planning related activities within the area.

#### *Comprehensive and functional planning requirements*

The remainder of this title amends the pertinent sections of existing Acts that deal with housing and urban development, water, sewer, and other public works and facilities, public health services, transportation, open space and recreation, and water resources, to make them conform with the definitions in this Act of planning agencies and comprehensive and functional planning.

BARRATT O'HARA

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, out late colleague, Barratt O'Hara, was a man who truly lived to be a Representative of the people. In his long and distinguished career as a Member of this House, from Chicago, he rendered great service to our Nation and outstanding service to his constituents. His perception made him a valuable senior member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, whose advice and counsel was sought by many.

And, of course, Barratt's Irish wit and charm made him a friend to all. As the senior Member of the House at his retirement, his experience was unmatched. From it came many bits of wisdom which his colleagues treasured. He will be missed.

BARRATT O'HARA

HON. JACK BRINKLEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 3, 1969

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, the death of our gentle former colleague and friend, the Honorable Barratt O'Hara, from the land of Lincoln, was especially mourned in the peaceful town of my birth, Faceville, Ga. This is the home of my grandfather, Mr. M. H. Brinkley, who, like Barratt O'Hara, served with distinction in Cuba during the Spanish-American War. My granddad was with Company G, U.S. Volunteers.

The only—then living—Congressman who was his comrade in arms, meant much to my granddad when, during the 90th Congress, my first term, I would relay information between them.

The bonds of friendship ran deep and I particularly share the sorrow of the family, and also share the silent grief which an old soldier has for a fallen buddy.